

Toward an ANTi-Microhistory approach in management and organization studies:
Revisiting the socio-past of Trans Canada Airlines

By
Nicholous M. Deal

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 (Management)

April, 2022, Halifax, Nova Scotia

Copyright Nicholous M. Deal, 2022

Approved: Jean Helms Mills, PhD
Supervisor

Approved: William M. Foster, PhD
Examiner

Approved: Albert J. Mills, PhD
Reader

Approved: Amy Thurlow, PhD
Reader

Date: April 14, 2022

Toward an ANTi-Microhistory approach in management and organizational studies:
Revisiting the socio-past of Trans Canada Airlines

By Nicholous M. Deal

Abstract

In this dissertation I explore the potential of creative synthesis within the debate of method in management and organizational history by developing an approach that I call *ANTi-Microhistory*. It is an approach that draws on three literatures: (1) amodern historiography, (2) ANTi-History and, (3) microhistory. Insights from each of these collectives, especially their opportunities for theoretical dialogue, are brought together to constitute a nascent resolution vis-à-vis ANTi-Microhistory. The formation of this critical approach of conducting historically informed scholarship in management and organizational theorizing synthesizes key points in the field. First, the nearly two-decade intellectual project known as ‘the historic turn’ in management and organization studies has indeed materialized but unnecessarily creates tension between the groundswell of historical scholarship being conducted and an emergent method problematic that results in fragmentation of ‘doing history.’ Second, ANTi-History has injected new understandings of history as the social effect of interest-driven socio-politics but misses analytical value of the individual in history ‘from below.’ Third, seeing the performativity of history in small units (e.g., the individual, community, or event), microhistory holds potential for centring stories of the past in ‘in-between’ spaces – grey areas between institutions and the people connected with them – which deserves a closer look in management and organization studies. The empirical application and demonstration of this approach is explored using materials related to the history of Trans Canada Airlines. In particular, the socio-politics of one individual – Jean Chrétien – during a period of change within the airline’s history is unravelled to pluralize the account. The contribution of this research is to: build on the potential of an ANTi-Microhistory approach which narrows the research frame; reassert the individual in historical research as a unit of analysis; and a crafting of history that converges complementary approaches while maintaining a practice of criticality.

April 14, 2022

Acknowledgements

I could not have made it through this PhD journey without the constant support, guidance, and love of many. I like to think of these people as ‘my community’ and it mostly consists of family, friends, and colleagues from across a variety of places and spaces. Each contributed to this process in more ways than you will know but hopefully these acknowledgements render them a bit more transparently – they are deserving of credit.

In recognizing the important role faith in my life as a Christian, I would like to first acknowledge the Lord Jesus Christ. I am eternally grateful for the work He has done in my life. There were times throughout the last five years that all I had was my faith – it kept me grounded during all the trials, tribulations, and pressures that come with juggling so many responsibilities as a doctoral candidate. I could not have started much less complete this PhD without the help of God. Proverbs 3:5-6 (King James Version): ⁵Trust in the LORD with all thine heart; and lean not unto thine own understanding. ⁶In all thy ways acknowledge him, and he shall direct thy paths.

To my loving wife, Laurie. There aren’t enough words to adequately express my deep love and appreciation for your devotion, care, and support. I simply could not have pulled off this dissertation let alone the PhD without you. You picked up the slack at home during my temporary absences, late night writing sessions, and shortened holidays. These are the less than glamorous parts of marriage, but you did it anyway all while balancing a demanding career and pursuing your MBA. I am looking forward to our next chapter after being a ‘professional student’ this past decade – and, yes, I promise: no more degrees.

My son, Luke. I could not be prouder to be your dad. Without knowing it, you have shown me my ‘why.’ You ground my aspirations to achieve bold things by reminding me of what matters: being present with you in the moment. When you wanted to play, I put down my work. When I needed to write, you didn’t fuss. Throughout the last three years in-between naps and bedtime, your fun-loving nature and curiosity of the world around you restored my virtue to continue pressing on. I will always look back on this season with a smile – you were what kept me motivated through the gruelling dissertating process. Daddy loves you forever.

I would like to express my love to my family. To my mother, Paula: I am indebted to you for working hard to provide for me as a single mother. I will never forget your expectation of me to do well in school so I could have a better life. Thank you for supporting me in everything I can set out to accomplish. To my stepfather, Graham: thank you for simply being there. Your dependability is so appreciated and is something I hope to emulate. To my mother-in-law, Sherry: thank you for treating me as your own. You never thought twice about stepping in the gap when asked. I needed your reminders to keep focused and finish the course. To my extended family: I recognize the responsibility I have had to you in completing this journey. I am the first among us to attend university and so I share this achievement with all of you.

So much honour is due to my pastor, Rev. Justin MacKenzie. Thank you for encouraging me to pursue my dreams even when I couldn’t make sense of how it could all fit together. I have known and loved you for over half of my life – there is no one that has been more instrumental to me than you. Thank you for sharing your voice with me; it is a privilege to serve you and One

Church. Pastor Justin reminded me very early in the program to ‘keep the main thing the main thing.’ These words kept me focused. I am grateful.

I have been fortunate to forge rich, meaningful friendships throughout my life. One friend in particular, Micah (Sasha) Hawkes, has been more of a brother than anything. There are so many things I could say. Thank you for being an outlet for me to bounce off all my thoughts, opinions, and views. You came into my life at just the right time and would not have it any other way. Through thick and thin we’ve been together – I look forward to the future. It is bright.

To the host of incredible thinkers at home and abroad – I owe you this recognition. I have had the immense pleasure of joining a local network of scholars that make-up the Halifax School. There are so many to thank, particularly Gabrielle Durepos, Christopher Hartt, and Larry Corrigan – their scholarship blazed a path ahead of me and, in the process, helped sharpen the arguments of this dissertation. To the virtual community better known as the PhD-10: thank you for your constant support and friendship. There is hardly a group more collegial than ours. I am also grateful to the Management History Division and Critical Management Studies Division of the Academy of Management for helping me ‘find my voice’ and welcoming me into the field.

For as much as I love to publish, I have also taken a liking to serving my colleagues in editorial roles. I wish to recognize the teams at *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management* and the *Journal of Management History* for placing confidence in me as a young scholar and allowing me to take on some administrative duties. I look forward to continuing my work in these journals (and more).

I would like to thank my colleagues in the universities I have taught for since pursuing doctoral studies: Mount Saint Vincent University, Saint Mary’s University, Dalhousie University, Cape Breton University, and Crandall University. Thank you for taking a chance on me – I hope that my engagement with some 1,880 undergraduate and graduate students in the classroom have been as rewarding to them as it was to me. I especially want to recognize the Department of Business and Tourism at Mount Saint Vincent University for welcoming me as full-time faculty while completing the final stages of this dissertation. I owe a great deal to Sandi Findlay-Thompson, Peter Mombourquette, Scott MacMillan, and Amy Thurlow, for their belief in me as an early career academic.

During my teaching stints I was fortunate to work with amazing teaching assistants: Mitchell Archibald, Megan Baker, Ashley Brewster, and Samantha Nightingale. They deserve recognition for not only help carry my teaching responsibilities so I could finish this dissertation but also for being patient with me and, ultimately, their friendship.

I could not have completed this journey without my cohort: Rene Arseneault, Mary Beth Doucette, and Ellen Shaffner. I have had the unique privilege of not only learning with you but also publishing some neat projects together. Thank you for your friendship – we were truly in this together. To my colleagues in the Sobey PhD, especially Kerry Hendricks and Tasha Richard – thank you for sharing your research with me. I look forward to working with you all in the future.

To my supervisor, Jean Helms Mills. What else can I say but thank you. By your example, I have observed up close the type of academic I hope to be. You lead such a demanding life with all your research projects, editorial responsibilities, and international teaching stints yet you still had time to help bring this dissertation together. This is nothing short of amazing. Your unrelenting faith in me as a scholar is humbling (even all those years ago as an MBA student) and I promise to pay it forward.

Last but not least: to my dissertation committee. I could not have asked for a better team to help refine my arguments while also caring about me as a person. Albert, you have influenced an entire generation of scholars. From your encouragement to think differently to your generosity, I count myself lucky to have taken this journey with you. Amy, you have been such a source of inspiration and positivity. Thank you for inspiring me to be better. Bill, you are a force that I am proud to have challenged this dissertation. The fact that you would take interest in my novel idea speaks volumes of your character as a prominent scholar in management studies. I look forward to working with each of you in the future to not only develop my ideas but also jointly pushing the boundaries of our discipline as colleagues.

Table of Contents

Abstract	2
Acknowledgements	3
List of Tables	12
List of Abbreviations	13
Chapter 1: Introduction	14
1.1 Introduction	14
1.2 Debates of Method in MOS as Impetus for Dissertation	16
1.3 Making the Case for AMH: Fusing Amodernism, AH, and MH	17
1.3.1 The amodern condition	18
1.3.2 Opening ANTi-History method	19
1.3.3 Potential of microhistory	20
1.3.4 Toward an ANTi-Microhistory approach	21
1.4 Performing ANTi-Microhistory: A Case Study of Trans Canada Airlines	23
1.5 Organizing the Dissertation	25
Chapter 2: History and Amodern Historiography	27
2.1 Introduction	27
2.2 The Past, History, and Historiography	27
2.2.1 Revisiting the concept of the past	28
2.2.2 What is History?	29
2.2.3 Historiography as crafting history	30
2.2.3.1 The historiographic operation in MOS	31
2.2.3.2 Modernist approach to management and organizational history	32
2.2.3.3 Postmodern approach to management and organizational history	33
2.3 Amodernist Approach to Management and Organizational History	34
2.3.1 Amodern ontology as enactment of different realities	35
2.3.2 Epistemology: Emphasis on enactment through performance	36
2.3.3 Multiple representations of the past and history	38
2.3.4 Relational character of the past and history	39
2.3.5 Amodern historian as co-participant of historical knowledge production	41
2.6 Summary	42

Chapter 3: ANTi-History 44

3.1 Introduction 44

3.2 The ANTi-History Approach 44

3.3 Sociology of Knowledge 45

 3.3.1 Knowledge of the past as a social construction 45

 3.3.2 Categorical apparatus of history 46

 3.3.3 Activistic character of historical knowledge 47

 3.3.4 Potential SoK insights in AMH 47

 3.3.4.1 Unfolding knowledge from behind-the-scenes 48

 3.3.4.2 Potential of minor knowledge in ANTi-History 49

 3.3.4.3 Assumption of axiology rendered transparent 50

3.4 Cultural Theory and Postmodern Historiography 51

 3.4.1 The past-as-history 52

 3.4.2 Accurate relationalist truth 52

 3.4.3 Multiple practice and performance of history 53

 3.4.4 Potential cultural theory and postmodern insights in AMH 55

 3.4.4.1 Problematizing the individual in history 55

 3.4.4.2 Historical style of writing to dilute solemn authority of science 56

 3.4.4.3 Centring context in historical research 57

 3.4.4.4 Treatment of historical traces and ‘evidence’ 58

3.5 Actor-Network Theory 59

 3.5.1 The past-as-history as actor-networks 61

 3.5.2 Relational histories 62

 3.5.3 Histories as performance and ontological politics 63

 3.5.4 Potential ANT insights in AMH 64

 3.5.4.1 Role of networks in producing history 64

 3.5.4.2 Individual as an actor-network 65

 3.5.4.3 Collapsing micro and macro-level processes 66

 3.5.4.4 Politics of network building 66

3.6 Summary 67

Chapter 4: Microhistory 68

4.1 Introduction 68

4.2 What is Microhistory?.....	68
4.2.1 A short background to microhistory	69
4.2.2 Microhistory-as-theory	70
4.2.3 Microhistory-as-practice.....	72
4.2.4 Microhistory-in-geographies	75
4.4 Modern Microhistory	78
4.4.1 Reduction of scale to study historical phenomena	78
4.4.2 Unsettling rationality in history	79
4.4.3 Small clues in historical sources.....	80
4.4.4 Role of the particular in empirical material.....	81
4.4.5 Constructivist narrative as a writing style	82
4.4.6 Treatment of context.....	83
4.4.7 Realist representation of text	84
4.4.8 Potential microhistory insights in AMH.....	84
4.4.8.1 Ontological status (and significance) of the individual	85
4.4.8.2 Revisiting historical reductionism	86
4.4.8.3 Critique of linear history storytelling.....	87
4.4.8.4 Context as world-building activities of actor-networks.....	88
4.5 Postmodern Microhistory	89
4.5.1 Normal exceptions of individual unit(s).....	91
4.5.2 Blurring distinction between historian and narrative	92
4.5.3 Ideological nature of historical sources	93
4.5.4 Centering the individual in history	94
4.5.5 Voice.....	95
4.5.6 Potential postmodern microhistory insights in AMH.....	96
4.5.6.1 A singularization of history by assembling traces	96
4.5.6.2 The textual environment and history-making processes.....	97
4.5.6.3 Tracing the ‘self’ through biography	98
4.6 Summary	99
Chapter 5: Towards an ANTi-Microhistory Approach	100
5.1 Introduction	100
5.2 Foregrounding AMH.....	100

5.3	Prior conceptualizations of AMH	103
5.4	ANTI-Microhistory as a Methodological Approach	105
5.4.1	Intense focus on revealing socio-past as ‘minor knowledge’ through networks.....	107
5.4.2	‘Zooming in’ on a single unit of analysis	108
5.4.3	The individual as the focal point of study	111
5.4.4	The individual as an actor-network	113
5.4.5	Agency of the individual, things, and people	114
5.4.6	Folding traces, fragments, and close reading of text	116
5.4.7	Bringing historical phenomena into focus through context.....	118
5.4.8	Acknowledging the interests of the ANTi-Historian in focalizing phenomena	119
5.4.9	Tracing the individual through biographical writing.....	121
5.4.10	Extensive detail but not exhaustive narrative	123
5.5	Summary	125
	Chapter 6: Method and Methodology	128
6.1	Introduction	128
6.2	Case Study of TCA	128
6.3	Critical Incident.....	129
6.4	Empirical Materials as ‘Data’	130
6.6	Archival Research	133
6.6.1	The case for archival research	134
6.6.2	Some issues with archival research	136
6.6.3	Searching and collecting materials	138
6.6.4	Method of analysis.....	142
6.7	Summary	145
	Chapter 7: Empirically Illustrating ANTi-Microhistory	146
7.1	Introduction	146
7.2	Exploring the TCA Actor-Network and Context	146
7.2.1	Role of federal government in the airline	147
7.2.2	Politics of geography	149
7.2.3	Status of the French language.....	151
7.3	Performing AMH of Events that Transformed TCA to AC.....	154
7.3.1	Composing the actor-network of young Jean Chrétien	155

7.3.2	Aligning early interests of Chrétien as lawyer-cum-political apprentice	157
7.3.3	Enrolling bilingualism as a political cause	159
7.3.4	Turbulent translation of bilingual interests: Precursor and context.....	161
7.3.5	Instigating change through actors trifecta	163
7.3.6	Reassembling minor knowledge: Antecedents of the TCA debate	165
7.3.7	Alternative actors enrolled and conduct interest work	167
7.3.8	Chrétien performs the TCA change.....	168
7.3.9	A surprising counter-enrollment of key allies	171
7.3.10	Chrétien's aftermath and the Air Canada brand punctuates	172
7.4	Discussion of ANTi-Microhistory Method Themes From TCA Critical Incident.....	174
7.4.1	Mapping socio-past of minor knowledge through actor-networks.....	174
7.4.2	Zooming in on critical incident event.....	175
7.4.3	Focalizing the individual as the 'point' of study	176
7.4.4	Reassembling the individual and his/her subjectivities as an actor-network	177
7.4.5	Agency of the individual, people, and things	178
7.4.6	Closely reading traces of the past.....	178
7.4.7	Focusing historical phenomena through networked context	180
7.4.8	Rendering transparent the interest work of the ANTi-Historian	181
7.4.9	Biographical writing style	183
7.4.10	Extensive detail but not exhaustive narrative	183
7.5	Summary	184
Chapter 8: Conclusion		185
8.1	Introduction	185
8.2	Theoretical and Methodological Contributions.....	185
8.2.1	Fusion of amodernist, AH, and MH approaches	186
8.2.2	Ten insights as a methodological approach.....	187
8.2.3	Converging history-as-method	187
8.2.4	Answering methodological questions about studying agency.....	188
8.2.5	Microhistory in management and organizational research.....	189
8.2.6	Utility of self-microhistories in studying the past	190
8.3	Empirical Contributions	190
8.3.1	Refining extant corporate histories of the airline	191

8.3.2 Rendering clear Jean Chrétien’s durability in the airline’s history	192
8.3.3 Role of TCA rebrand in advancing early bicultural policy in Canada	193
8.4 Limitations	193
8.5 Conclusion.....	196
References	197

List of Tables

Table 1: Metahistorical Modes of Doing History in MOS	43
Table 2: Overview of Ten Insights Informing ANTi-Microhistory.....	106
Table 3: Comparing the Dimensions of AH, MH, and AMH.....	126
Table 4: Summary of Empirical Materials Analyzed	140
Table 5: Moving from Traces to Themes to Narratives.....	144

List of Abbreviations

AC	Air Canada
AH	ANTI-History
AMH	ANTI-Microhistory
ANT	Actor-Network Theory
CNR	Canadian National Railway
MH	Microhistory
MP	Member of Parliament
NCA	Non-Corporeal Actant
SoK	Sociology of Knowledge
TCA	Trans Canada Airlines

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Introduction

This dissertation explores the potential of creative synthesis in historicized research by proposing the fusion of three literatures: amodernist historiography, ANTi-History (AH), and microhistory (MH). The idea behind combining these is to offer the field a new approach to ‘doing historical research’ on business and organizations. The term ‘ANTi-Microhistory’ (AMH) is offered as an engagement from among these literatures and draws inspiration from within the emergent critical history (Durepos, Shaffner, & Taylor, 2021) subfield in management and organization studies (MOS). The usefulness of this method to historians is illustrated through an empirical case study of a critical incident (i.e., major change event) involving the socio-politics that helped rebrand Canada’s national carrier, Trans Canada Airlines (TCA) in the early 1960s.

An increasing interest in historical research in MOS, evidenced by a growing record of scholarship in conferences, journals, books, and edited collections (see Bowden, Muldoon, Gould, & McMurray, 2020; Bruce, 2020; Maclean, Clegg, Suddaby, & Harvey, 2021; Mills, Suddaby, Foster, & Durepos, 2016), focusing on histories of business and organizations has reinvigorated debates about history in MOS. One such debate that continues to unfold concerns the way in which management scholars *craft* history (i.e., method) (Van Lent & Durepos, 2019). Debates about method can be useful but even more so when they produce field-level conditions for new modes of inquiry. From actor-network theory (ANT), a literature that is engaged in this dissertation, John Law (2004) in *After Method* notes developing scientific knowledge follows an unending process of refinement through practices; seeking opportunities to rework and combine with others.

Critical historians in MOS are quick to remind us that it is important our conduct in producing historically conscientious research must not be intentionally divisive but rather one that builds consensus across disciplinary divides (Deal, Novicevic, Mills, Lugar, & Roberts, 2021). What this means is that while there are explicit and implicit philosophical differences, especially in disagreements about method and methodology (Suddaby, 2016), we do ourselves as well as the communities of history scholarship a service to “learn from one another and co-construct a more compelling historical research agenda” (Durepos, Shaffner, & Taylor, 2021, p. 451).

With this aim of building common ground, in this dissertation I attempt an exploration of the theoretical insights, tensions, and potential combination among them in AMH. Specifically: (a) amodernism, which explores the production of knowledge through configurations of human–non-human associations that take place as they engage in practice (Latour, 1990a, 1993) but neglects comment on history; (b) AH (Durepos & Mills, 2012a, 2012b), which emphasizes the need for history to be seen as the effect of interest-driven actor-networks but overlooks the analytical value of interrogating a narrow micro-slice of an organization’s past; and (c) MH (Magnússon & Szijártó, 2013), which understands historical narratives as being intricately tied to the individual (e.g., person, thing, or event) but neglects the political nature of developing knowledge of the past. The act of bringing these three literatures in dialogue is an attempt to see how analyzing the past with them together is more robust than the sum of its parts. I posit that AMH equips historians in MOS with the ability to explore historical narratives from close-up while simultaneously pluralizing history.

The rest of this chapter is an overview of how the dissertation unfolds. I begin with a brief discussion of the state of history in MOS, emphasizing the more recent debates of method

to contextualize the impetus of this dissertation. Then, I outline AMH to illustrate motivators and contributions to the overall research. A review of the TCA case and how the process of empirical research using archival material came about is also highlighted before concluding with a brief outline of the chapters.

1.2 Debates of Method in MOS as Impetus for Dissertation

We are closing in on two decades since the call for more historicized research in MOS opened spaces for critical engagements with history (Booth & Rowlinson, 2006; Clark & Rowlinson, 2004). Since then, there has been a growing momentum of history scholarship in MOS that has contributed to the development of alternative ways to engage the *craft* of history (see Bucheli & Wadhvani, 2014; Decker, Kipping, & Wadhvani, 2015; McLaren, Mills, & Weatherbee, 2015). Some have characterized this scholarly inertia as entering a methodological phase that offers new questions about developing appropriate methods and styles of writing (Foster, Mills, & Weatherbee, 2014).

Indeed, a wide range of approaches and methods have grown out of this phase, exemplars include (but are not limited to): rhetorical history (Suddaby, Foster, & Quinn-Trank, 2010); ANTi-History (Durepos & Mills, 2012a, 2012b); and intersectional history (Hendricks, Deal, Mills, & Helms Mills, 2021; Shaffner, Mills, & Helms Mills, 2019). Few since, however, have sought to engage what Arseneault, Deal, and Helms Mills (2021) refer to as ‘creative synthesis.’ That is, sensing opportunities to observe “how much theoretical overlap may or may not exist across two [or more] models” (Arseneault, Deal, & Helms Mills, 2021, p. 302) could present a rare but important step forward in fostering dialogue from within management and organizational research and history. Despite ongoing disagreements about doing history ‘the

right way' (see Helms Mills & Mills, 2021), this has stifled the potential for 'history as method' (Van Lent & Durepos, 2019) in MOS.

It is no wonder that the fruition of innovative historical methods is at present diffused. As noted, AH is an exception. It remains one of the few approaches that have made attempts to contribute to studying phenomena through a clear amalgamation of literatures that emphasize the social construction of knowledge of the past. AH (and by extension, amodernism) has been debated for a decade now. At times, this debate has elicited sharp criticism, especially from those in the modernist historiographic operation that view research critique as political opposition (Bowden, 2018a). MH, as we will learn about in this dissertation, has been more elusive, existing on the edges of MOS. Until recently, it has not caught the scholarly attention of MOS research except for a few direct engagements (Decker, 2015; Mills, 2017; Novicevic & Mills, 2019).

In this way, part of what forms the impetus of my work herein can be viewed as an attempt to address Booth and Rowlinson's (2006) call for greater reflection on historical method and styles of writing. Specifically, the need for methodological reflexivity in building robust studies of the past and how they by fusing literatures that have been previously dismissed by some as 'not serious history research' (Toms & Wilson, 2010) can help move forward the method debate in historical research on business and organizations.

1.3 Making the Case for AMH: Fusing Amodernism, AH, and MH

My intention with this research is to broaden the boundaries of what is accepted as method within historical research of MOS. To open this space even further, I begin by asking a few questions. First, what are the field-level conditions upon which historical knowledge is produced and the past interpreted? This is a point that invites a look into the modes (e.g.,

modern, postmodern, and amodern) for doing management and organization history. Second, who is given a voice and who is spoken for in historical research? AH is a good place to start especially how it privileges the empirical over the theoretical and, in the process, illustrates the voices of those involved in politicking knowledge of the past. Third, how might the individual performing history vis-à-vis micro-relational processes be theorized within a method? In practice, MH includes analysis of the individual from deep within historical narratives. These questions provide the frame around how AMH emerges to further the craft of history making. In this dissertation, I attempt to build the case for AMH with two key contributions in mind: (a) the theoretical development of an alternative approach to ‘doing history’ in MOS which I refer to as AMH; and (b) an empirical illustration of AMH which draws upon archival materials to (re)assemble a critical event that took place in an organization’s history. Both are informed by the other. Below I offer a brief discussion of the three literatures to hopefully underscore their potential for theoretical fusion.

1.3.1 The amodern condition

Amodernism draws on the work of Latour, in the 1990s, that offers a third position beyond modernism and postmodernism. I refer to amodernism as an approach to research and, in the case of this dissertation, historical thinking that is un beholden to normal expectations of doing history. For example, due to its scientific aspirations, most history in MOS tends to produce research that is disassociated, reductionist, and linear. Following Latour’s (1993) *We Were Never Modern*, it is more helpful to think about society as never having been modern. The most significant takeaway from Latour’s claim of our amodernism is that by regarding theoretical categories of humans and non-humans separately, we fail to account for the many combinations that span them in practice. This logic has contributed to the theoretical work of

ANT. Recently, Latour's work has made its way into historical research on business and organizations – mostly with those who rely on ANT to emphasize the relational nature of history (Durepos & Mills, 2012a; Durepos, 2015; Hartt, 2019). The consequences of Latour's amodernism has helped develop it as an alternative conceptualization of historiography, especially for its emphasis on ontology, multiplicity, and relationalism (Durepos, 2015; Durepos, Mills, & Weatherbee, 2012; Mills, Weatherbee, & Durepos, 2014). These facets contribute to my rendering of AMH approach, especially how amodernism emphasizes the enactment of history through its practices of knowledge production.

1.3.2 Opening ANTi-History method

AH will be discussed more thoroughly later in the dissertation but for now, it is a method that attempts to focus on how history is produced through the actions of people, things, and even ideas. AH sets out to simultaneously represent and destabilize selected past events with the aim of pluralizing history (Durepos & Mills, 2012a). ANT concepts inform AH methodology in the way 'following actors around' is used by ANT theorists. To date, much of AH has followed those who can be traced through documents and artifacts in archival research. I argue that while following the development of a history is useful, focusing on what traces of people, things, and ideas that are available can inadvertently privilege some and simultaneously marginalize other narratives. The result of this is that ANT as a topographical analysis may not by itself be able to help AH dig deep in following other assemblages of knowledge. What stories or narratives might be missed by focusing analysis atop of relations involved in knowledge production? Who might we miss in the process?

To help remedy these tensions, I explore a single historical event in the past and consider how the performativity of the people, things, and ideas affect what knowledge these networks

produce. By reaching beyond the production of a history, I attempt in this research to provide a further analytical lens that explores the role (i.e., agency) of individuals involved in performing the past. This will involve a much closer study of those whose story of involvement in history has not been told; an intimate process vis-à-vis narrativizing the individual to recover their theoretical value in MOS (Nord & Fox, 1996).

1.3.3 Potential of microhistory

The most convincing argument that has the potential to bring together the micro processes of individuals in organizations involved in performing the past and the production of the past in AH appears to be best captured in the ideas of MH. This literature will also be engaged more fully in a later chapter but for now, MH is loosely an approach that attempts to understand the history of social life by focusing on what takes place among people, events, or ideas at a micro-level (Magnússon & Szijártó, 2013). MH arose in response to a lacking emphasis of ‘small units’ in historiographical approaches rooted in social history during the 1970s (Levi, 1991). Since then, it has evolved. A reading of MH work yields an appreciation of narrative that features focused detail on the context, story, and voice of individuals. In this dissertation I take MH to be a practice of zooming analysis in on a specific research subject with the intent of generating insights (Lugar, Holland, & Novicevic, 2018). When brought into dialogue with AH, this type of MH would allow for analysis of politics to engage a much more micro-level and could be used to produce ‘small-story’ knowledge (Lyotard, 1984) about the past.

1.3.4 Toward an ANTi-Microhistory approach

No theory is perfect neither are they ever fully developed (Kuhn, 1970). To study the idea of AMH, in this dissertation, I attempt to take amodernism, MH, and AH theorists at their word when they say each literature remains in need of further development (Durepos & Mills, 2017; Latour, 1993; Magnússon & Szijártó, 2013). MH's understanding of the past vis-à-vis the performativity of social life (i.e., individual action) can be understood as being methodologically akin to AH's approach that examines the production of knowledge of the past through the constituent actor-networks of people, artefacts, and ideas. MH maintains the failure of social history in rendering 'ordinary people' "the subject of history on its own terms" (Magnússon, 2003, p. 701), while AH describes so-called 'alternative narratives' as a means to reveal hidden insights into key organizational events from those who have been marginalized by powerful forces across varying discourses (Durepos & Mills, 2012b). It appears that these ideas are commensurable in the way they are practiced empirically. There are also other potential points that bring these literatures together.

The intensive historical study performed on a micro-level is like AH's preference of 'following the actors' through traces of archival research. AH approach allows the researcher to follow actors between various levels of analysis and context (e.g., micro and macro-levels) in pursuit of revealing how knowledges of the past are produced through a course of performances and relational activities. These 'performances' are situated as an outcome of pulling together bits and pieces of the past: "the seemingly 'individual' or 'singular' events that make up the past assume their significance and meaning, as they are constituted or configured in a set of relations or a network" (Durepos & Mills, 2017, p. 59).

The ‘singularization of history’ in Magnússon’s (2003) work in MH suggests each local, contextualized study of people and events provide more insight than that which could be obtained through a generalizable analysis on a grand (i.e., macro) scale. This is a tension point between MH and AH. In AH, analysis is not fixed in any one scale or level. It requires historians to follow actors to uncover the socio-political influences are often subsumed at the micro-level. In effect, AH collapses the micro and macro into contexts in which actors are followed.

The engagement of temporally embedded action is often missed by researchers because their intense research programs and methods target short timespans (Suddaby, Foster, & Mills, 2014). The application of AH in empirical analysis uses a close rendition of ANT’s ethnographic approach of ‘following actors around’ (Latour, 1987, 2005) but using archival research instead of real-time human participants. Durepos and Mills (2012a) argue actors are best ‘followed’ over the various traces they leave behind in archival materials and across different time periods. In this sense MH as research is also processual; it has used historical events and methods based on historiography that is retrospective, documentary, and largely indirect. It makes sense then that the basis of AMH is situated primarily along the lines of history and utilizes archival materials to closely reassemble narratives of individual action.

These are just some of the many points that are explored between the two literatures later in this dissertation. The point here is that there appears to be several points of entry to give rise to the potential of AMH. This involves engagement at the level of theory supported by an appropriate case to perform an empirical demonstrate of its usefulness to historians.

1.4 Performing ANTi-Microhistory: A Case Study of Trans Canada Airlines

It is my hope that AMH could be utilized to interrogate the past using just about any case organization. My study draws on the research of TCA, among other international airlines, over a period of 20 years. Having been involved in this research, it made the most sense for me to use some of the material to inform this dissertation. Beyond that, TCA is an appropriate case for a few important reasons. First, TCA is considered a pioneering airline in the Canadian and international aerospace (Dobson, 2017; McGrath, 1992). Second, the organization has a long history beginning in 1937. Its lengthy 85-year history includes many notable ‘firsts’ including the uninterrupted air service to trans-Atlantic military passenger and postal delivery during the Second World War; the innovation of in-flight recording technology (commonly known as a flight’s black box), and the practice of modern de-icing procedures, to name a few. Third, because of its history there are countless records about the airline across numerous media including corporate and popular histories, documentaries, and news reports. Fourth, and most important to the research, it has a rich and extensive collection of archival material. By drawing on AH, I am presented the opportunity to trace the movement of people, things, and ideas in archives (Mills & Helms Mills, 2018) across time. An in-depth discussion of how the method and methodology in this research unfolded is discussed later in Chapter 6.

Through a process of closely reading¹ empirical material, I was interested in developing an outline of key change events that took place during the TCA days. While the airline has existed in some form since 1937, its brand and image has been revised on numerous occasions. One such change, in what I believe to be among the more important changes, transpired through

¹ A process outlined in Deal, Mills, and Helms Mills (2018) where historians focus on examining each trace in the greatest possible detail to see the networked relationships that arise from within its production as knowledge.

a series of events that eventually saw the entire operation be renamed 'Air Canada' (AC) in 1964. As I will explain later in the research, this change was significant in the way it symbolized an attempt by the federal government to address very serious concerns of national unity. Issues of biculturalism, most notably in the way official bilingualism became a priority in public policy and was sought in federal institutions. Oddly, the account of this bit of history is rather thin and in no place are the micro-politics involved in bringing about this change detailed. My study draws from numerous archival materials collected from the *Canada Aviation and Space Museum, Library and Archives Canada*, and is supplemented by various written histories about the airline after the change and memoirs and biographies of those involved in the change process.

In brief, in my examination of TCA and the archival material, I became reacquainted with a cast of household names in Canadian industry and politics that I had long forgotten, not the least of whom being Jean Chrétien. In 1993, Chrétien led the Liberal Party back to power after leaving politics just prior to the Mulroney landslide in the 1984 federal election. Most of what we know about Chrétien is through the prism of his public service as a perennial figure in the cabinets of successive Liberal governments but most importantly, as the 20th prime minister of Canada. For me, my interest in Canadian politics began in my youth during news coverage of the sponsorship scandal that implicated Chrétien for his role in misspending public funds to Liberal-friendly advertising firms in Quebec. Aside from that, what I find odd is even in his prominence, certain details about his rise to power remains somewhat of a mystery: How does an ordinary working-class Francophone from Shawinigan (a small industrial community in rural Quebec) play such an influential role in the history of TCA?

I had not initially set out to study Chrétien; he (his traces) came to me in my preliminary study of TCA before I took a deep dive with this research. Once I saw his persistence in the

story, I could not help but follow him. As I did, I was surprised to see how a young, newly elected backbencher playing his own game of political calculus helped produce a change incident involving one of Canada's most significant public institutions (TCA) and with it, serious political clout. These all worked to illustrate the analytical value of AMH on producing small-story knowledge.

1.5 Organizing the Dissertation

In the following chapters AMH is laid bare in an incremental fashion. The topic of history, the past, and historiography serves as the starting point to this dissertation. There, in Chapter 2, I am delineating these important conceptualizations and how they contribute to the direction I take using amodernism. To illustrate the fusion of ideas among the literatures that the dissertation uses to develop, I continue in Chapter 3 with an examination of AH by pulling apart its theoretical tenets and raise insights within each that highlight the potential fusion with MH. I follow similar form in Chapter 4. MH is explained there, and its constituent parts problematized for dialogue in the following chapter. Chapter 5 brings together amodernism, AH, and MH as a nascent approach to 'do history' in MOS. AMH is presented as a method and is offered in 10 insights that bring into conversation those that had been raised in the previous chapters. Chapter 6 deals with the topic of method and methodology; specifically, answers to questions about my decision making involving the research and views about how the nature of historical knowledge inform how I illustrate AMH empirically. This dissertation would not do its arguments justice without an empirical demonstration and so in Chapter 7 the theoretical analyses, methods, and insights are applied to an in-depth case study of a critical incident involving TCA's past. Finally, in Chapter 8, I offer some preliminary thoughts on how I see this research contributes to

historical research on business and organizations, discuss limitations, and conclude with what this dissertation may offer to advance historical research in MOS.

Chapter 2: History and Amodern Historiography

2.1 Introduction

In this chapter I offer an exploration of amodern historiography to provide backing to the theoretical development of AMH as a historical method. In so doing, I will begin positioning AMH as an assemblage of key knowledge communities – the first being amodern history – that help support it as a theory and later contribute to how scholars might use it to ‘do’ historical research on business and organizations. To do this, I will: (a) provide a characterization of three key concepts about the subject of history – *the past*, *history*, and *historiography* – to surface some of the dimensions involved in, and their relationship to, AMH; (b) briefly discuss the development of two key positions in historiography to help explain the impetus for an amodernist space that AMH will occupy in management and organizational history, and; (c) introduce and discuss tenets of amodern historiography to explain how AMH is grounded in, and makes use of, this tradition. In all, the purpose of this chapter is to equip the reader with a sense of the philosophical domain AMH draws from and how subsequent chapters build on this foundation.

2.2 The Past, History, and Historiography

To a large extent, the controversy (Novicevic & Mills, 2019) involving the historic turn and its many debates are not that new. Disagreements on the ontological character of concepts such as the past, history, and historiography, are all an outcome of a much larger philosophical struggle of ‘rethinking history’ (Jenkins, 1991). Historians of business and organizations have been undergoing a rethink of their own for at least the last four decades or so (Mills & Novicevic, 2020). Issues concerning the ontological, epistemological, and methodological

orientations of ‘doing’ history such as White’s (1973) work on narrative, Jenkins’ (1991, 1995) notion of history as ‘knowledge of the past,’ and Munslow’s (2010) claim that the past and history are ontologically dissonant, have come to shape our constrained understanding of the discourse of history. It is constrained so that even the constitution of key concepts such as the past, history, and historiography, are conceived and understood from vastly different (and competing) philosophies. These philosophies are broadly construed along metahistorical lines vis-à-vis the perennial pitting between modern and postmodern historiography.

In this section, I offer a conceptualization of three important terms in the discourse of history – the past, history, and historiography – in a non-definitive way so that I may illustrate how these terms are understood by a modern historiography and later, through AMH.

2.2.1 Revisiting the concept of the past

I begin by noting the work of cultural theorists (Jenkins, 1991, Gunn, 2014) who suggest uncoupling the notion of *history* from *the past*. These terms are often taken to mean the same thing but that is not so. Jenkins (1995) argues that what is meant by term *the past* is a point in time when something took place predating our present condition (e.g., the formation of TCA) whereas history is our knowledge of the past (e.g., the written account of the events that formed TCA in 1937). Conceptualizing the past and history objectively means we can: (a) recall a set of events that had indeed occurred; (b) and overcome the metaphysical dilemma of verifying recollection against the existence of some ‘real’ event. Therefore, we cannot ‘know’ the past “in any way that is unmediated by historiography, language, emplotment, voice, ideology, perspective or physical and/or mental states of tiredness, ennui, and so on” (Munslow, 2010, p. 37). That is not to deny what may have occurred prior to our present condition happened, we just cannot travel back in time to verify what ‘actually’ took place. In other words, the past is

unavailable to us. What we do have, though, are knowable pieces of the past that point to the existence of certain events, people, and things. Jenkins (1991) referred to these bits and pieces as ‘traces’ which are materials (e.g., books, correspondence, annual reports) that help us assemble some understanding of the past through a constellation of: (a) those things that remain (e.g., stories, memories, and artefacts); (b) how they (i.e., traces) are sequentially ordered (e.g., event A occurred before event B); (c) and interpreting the meaning we give to those traces (Jenkins, 1995). What is ‘done’ to these traces renders a partial answer to the following question: *What is history?*

2.2.2 *What is History?*

Jenkins (1991) argued that the term *history* is used to mean knowledge of the past. On the other end of the spectrum is *History* (capital-H history) which is the production of “a culturally defined discourse of knowledge implicated in the structures of society and conventions of culture, as much as the given product of the past labour of historians” (Munslow, 1997, p. 3). *History* in this sense is a modern construct (Gunn, 2014) whose goal is to develop and study ‘legitimate’ knowledge of *the* past. *History* is all the activities historians ‘do’ to construct knowledge of the past. Most often this knowledge produced by historians is presented as an ordering of traces using the academic conventions of historically minded scholars to write authoritatively on a subject. Since ordering knowledge is important to historians, *History* becomes an unquestioned chronology of ‘what happened.’

In my empirical demonstration of AMH, I rely on traces especially published histories of TCA that discuss the airline in uncontested terms (e.g., TCA was a brand of national pride). By focusing on a critical incident involving a rebranding of the airline, specifically what and who has been left out of the airline’s history, I attempt to pluralize the account and demonstrate the

shortcomings of History-as-authority. I will return to the role of the historian as I lay out how they may differ in their approach to ‘doing history’ later in this chapter. For now, this understanding of *History* can be conceptualized as the way in which the historian brings his/her work to the fore and how this process is an effect of the interrelationship of the many norms, conventions, and expectations developed by historically minded scholarly communities (Ermarth, 2011).

2.2.3 *Historiography as crafting history*

In conceptualizing *the past*, I believe traces – be it material or as a social construction – help introduce plausibility to an account (e.g., minutes from the House of Commons allow us to make sense of what may – or may not – have happened during debate about the future of TCA’s brand name). However, this is only part of the equation. What is missing is an explanation about *how* these fragments are arranged and whose interpretation is represented in historical accounts.

Traces alone do not mean anything, nor do they ‘tell’ a story. Take, for example, an annual general meeting report. The information that it contains is certainly historical given how it is common for them to report on an organization’s activities (i.e., administrative, operational, and financial) through the preceding year. They may even be useful to shareholders about the firm’s financial performance but without the methods of a skilled accountant, the annual report itself is just that: a compilation of physical paper or digital pages. They do not tell us anything because reports do not talk. People write and organize reports. Jenkins (2003) suggests two relevant insights: (a) *the past* is without form given that traces are meaningless until, (b) a historian, through his/her own sensemaking process, informs the crafting of the story and how it is told. It would appear the mechanics behind producing history – how traces of the past are ordered to then chronicle some history – is important to unpack.

Historiography, for the most part, is a “disciplined means” (Jenkins, 1995, p. 17) that involves the process of how knowledge of the past is produced. The process here means specific method(s), including all the norms, procedures, and standards, that are developed and utilized by a historically informed knowledge community. Marc Ferro (2003), a French historian, in his conceptualization argues that while commonly referred to as the sources, techniques, and theoretical approaches of bringing together knowledge of the past (i.e., crafting history), *historiography* is more so a way of ‘doing history’ than the prescription of a set of conventions that bring shape to the historian’s research. Ferro here seems to suggest historiography as inclusive of all the considerations that go into bringing together knowledge of the past and how these methods are philosophically informed, constructed, and guided by the communities that use them. My work in this dissertation conceives of historiography as both the mechanics involved in and the approach one takes in their craft of historical knowledge.

2.2.3.1 The historiographic operation in MOS

The discipline of management and organizational studies (MOS) draws on many literatures. It has been said that MOS is really a mishmash of other fields (e.g., sociology, psychology, engineering, etc.) that have been co-opted together to form an area of inquiry (Burrell & Morgan, 1979). MOS – whether it originated in ancient times, during the industrial revolutions, or is a more recent development (see Wren & Bedeian, 2020) – has had a rocky relationship with history. In terms of history, there are two categories of scholarship in MOS: studies that draw on the past, and those that completely ignore it (Kieser, 1994). When scholars are engaged in historical research, for the most part, they rely on a modernist approach to management and organizational history (or postmodernism but to a lesser extent).

In the following two sections I lay out an overview of each – modern and postmodern – historiography used in MOS, looking at the way they approach history differently. Giving space to these two approaches allows me to provide partial explanation of the amodern historiographic condition in management and organizational history – a tradition that AMH borrows from.

2.2.3.2 Modernist approach to management and organizational history

Modernist historiography epitomizes the ethos of science. Jenkins (1995) noted that it draws on the socio-cultural condition of modernism which is responsible for Western metaphysics. Modernist history is based on a philosophy that reveres above all else: rationality, progress, and accuracy (Bauman, 1992; Hassard, 1994). Historians who operate this historiography typically point to Leopold von Ranke as being “the most important historian to shape the historical profession” (Hoefflerle, 2011, p. 68). He is credited with developing source-based historical method (Stern, 1973) which emphasizes the reliability of sources used (e.g., authorship, credibility, and authenticity of texts). As a result, the standard for “historical objectivity” (Novick, 1988, p. 1-2) is set so high that any source used by the historian must exist prior to the historian and be included in research that is free from his/her interpretation. The historian in modern historiography is valued as an independent curator of knowledge whose sole responsibility is to construct the past accurately. This approach conceptualizes history in absolute empirical terms using realist ontology and positivist epistemology. Most historians in the MOS sandbox grasp to these ideals in their work and, due in part to how modern historiography closely aligns with scientism (Zald, 1993), this has resulted in the approach being seen as the norm (e.g., Bowden, 2018a; Chandler, 1962; Greenwood, 1981; Muldoon & Marin, 2012; Wren, 1972).

2.2.3.3 *Postmodern approach to management and organizational history*

Postmodern historiography represents a break with the mainstream. The problem with modernist history, to the postmodern historian, is that it has failed to consider the conditions of knowledge production (Kansteiner, 1993). Historians working in this tradition argue reality is an emergent process and history is thus performative of the past (White, 1985). Postmodernists are motivated to ‘do history’ by challenging the dominant narratives of the past (Flynn, 2002). This is often seen by how their research is crafted to destabilize normative accounts of the past.

Jenkins (1995, p. 36) notes that historical accounts are not destabilized to simply tell an untold story but should reflect those voices that have been “forgotten, hidden, invisible, considered unimportant, changed, and eradicated.” In this way, postmodernist accounts use history to aid in emancipation (Brown, 2005) in two ways: (a) the historian is not bound by scientism allow him/her to explore historical inquiry that would not otherwise rise to the standards of source-based methodology; (b) weak, marginalized voices can be brought to the fore to dilute the solemn authority of metanarratives.

Those that inform this flavour of history come from various traditions and perspectives including radical Marxism, feminism, postcolonialism, and cultural theory (Jenkins, 2009; Gunn, 2014; Iggers, 2005). More recently, in MOS, postmodernism has been labeled an enigmatic enemy equated with the intellectual origins of the historic turn in MOS (Bowden, 2018a, 2018b). This is a somewhat imperfect understanding of postmodernism and the critical ideals of the historic turn itself. Nevertheless, it does speak to the reaction it has conjured in our field. Management historians have used postmodern historiography for the last few decades and “have had a significant influence” (Üsdiken & Kieser, 2004, p. 325). Mills and Novicevic (2020)

conclude that postmodern accounts are only now just being normalized as part of the management and organizational history landscape.

2.3 Amodernist Approach to Management and Organizational History

Most historical scholarship in MOS has relied on either a modern or postmodern approach to studying the past. Historians on either side have lobbed criticisms at one another all to define what may be the ‘best way’ of doing history. Helms Mills and Mills (2021) credit these arguments over onto-epistemological positions as having opened space for other approaches. Amid this dispute, a different question about the craft of history has opened in historiography via amodernism.

Amodernism is a conceptual position conceived by Bruno Latour (1990a, 1993) who problematized modernist ideals (e.g., ordering the social world through generalizability, reductionism, and so-called value-neutral research). In essence, amodernism transcends the human-nonhuman divide in social science to focus on the relations between people and objects – in practice. To realize “histories [that] had never been modern” (Jenkins, 2009, p. 15), amodernist history moves past the theoretical damage of modernism toward an orientation just prior to the condition of modernism (which is also prior to postmodernism). This third historiographic tradition has been developed from across several fields over the last three decades (e.g., Haraway, 1988; Mol, 1999; Law, 2008). More recently, amodernism has been dialogued in work theorizing and doing history in MOS (e.g., Bruce & Nyland, 2011; Durepos & Mills, 2012a, 2012b; Hartt, 2019).

In this third section I follow traces from Durepos (2015) to help elaborate the inner workings of amodern historiography approach by doing three things: (a) outline amodern

assumptions of ontology and epistemology; (b) delineate the relationship of past-as-history; (c) and summarize the role of the historian and his/her approach to ‘doing’ amodern history.

Throughout I wish to point out ways that I anticipate AMH may add value to amodernist history and vice versa.

2.3.1 Amodern ontology as enactment of different realities

Amodernism accounts for the complexities that underlie social phenomena by viewing it as an outcome of many relations between humans and nonhumans. Latour (1993) argues that the social cannot be rendered visible through reductionism; characterized by sequential, linear explanations. Instead, what those who practice amodernism concentrate on is the practice of tracing varying forms of human-nonhuman relations that take place *in action*. Mol (2002) refers to these relations as ‘activity.’ Amodern ontology is thus concerned with following sites of action *in action*. While modernists obsess over realism and postmodernists are motivated by relativism, amodernists treat social phenomena (e.g., history) as an “everyday practice” (Kalela, 2012, p. xi). In this way, history is enacted as the *practices* of those who, through their interactions, “participate in reality” (Mol, 2002, p. 153) of its making. These practices are enacted by the activities of people (i.e., actors) and things (i.e., actants). An actor’s ability to hold together depends on who and what is included to move toward some common goal. Take my previous research on the formation of British Airways as an example. The enrolment of certain classes of people, economic imperatives, and aviation technology all helped serve imperialist interests of the British Empire during the interwar period (Deal, Mills, & Helms Mills, 2018). Melding these interests together toward a common purpose (e.g., homeland security) meant that British Airways could be referenced as a single institution. Here we begin to see how Latour’s idea of the social world as being precariously constituted by actor-networks

lends itself to amodernism where the “enactment of different realities” (Law & Urry, 2004; p. 397) is the focus and following “objects while they are being enacted in practice” (Mol, 2002, p. 152) aids in understanding how the past becomes history.

2.3.2 Epistemology: *Emphasis on enactment through performance*

If there is an amodernist epistemology, it is one that considers historical and social conditioning. What this means is the emphasis of amodernism in management and organizational history has been on ontology. Through its view of the social past as being performed as history through the practices in the present, performances of the past must also constitute reality right now. Therefore, epistemology is concerned with *how* history is performed. By using ANT, amodernist history conceptualizes history as an actor. Hartt (2019) refers to this variant as an *actant*: the arrangement of non-embedded, non-material influences that form the past (I will dig into more detail in the next chapter to distill all the bits and pieces of ANT that help flesh out AMH as a method). Tracing an actor’s movement through chains of translation it has traveled, its complex composition of changing interests takes on a new shape. Documenting the time and space the actor has traveled is less interesting to the amodernist than the work of (re)assembling the composition of the historical actor itself. Thus, the aim of amodern history is to trace what results from these relationships across time to ‘do’ history. Thought of this way, following empirical traces are thus privileged over the theoretical persuasion(s) of the researcher. It is about assembling traces to tell a (not *the*) story.

For example, AMH is an outcome of a series of relationships that converge and diverge through various mediums over time. There are many people and things involved in this arrangement. In my storied performance of AMH, they include: a doctoral student in search of an idea, an audience at an academic conference, some preliminary publications (e.g., book chapter

and journal article), and you, as the reader of this research. The idea of producing an AMH analytic has traveled through several points where, at each point, it is modified. Beginning with Mills (2017) whose preliminary work revealed some shared similarities between AH and MH, the idea of some fusion piqued my interest. Drawing on the potential of AMH as a method I presented a paper at the Administrative Sciences Association of Canada conference; displacing Mills' (2017) *Workplace Review* article. My ideas were displaced by reviewer comments and those who attended the presentation. Displacement is also symmetrical. Those who engaged my work be it through the review process or in audience at the conference were also displaced. So too were these ideas following an earlier version of Novicevic and Mills (2019) shared with me at the Academy of Management that same year. Following these interactions, AMH was also performed differently as it was inscribed on paper, followed the peer review process, and subsequently published in *Management & Organizational History*. AMH will be performed in a slightly different enactment as I later advance the potential of its micro-level storytelling analytic. Along the journey that I take in this dissertation, you as the reader also contribute to the enactment of my AMH research by following me through the process and allowing it to challenge your thinking of 'doing history.' The performance of the ideas within this dissertation is mediated by the practices in which it is enacted.

As you can see, this example focuses on one idea (e.g., AMH) and many different versions of its performance. This is only one performance of AMH as an actor and it is durable, but that does not mean it is the only version. Each actor on my dissertation committee would render their own account as well. These multiple versions of history are what Mol (1999, 2002) offers in *multiplicity* – an idea that a modern history uses to orient representations of the past and history.

2.3.3 *Multiple representations of the past and history*

There has been a noticeable uptake in MOS theorizing the idea of multiplicity. The suggestion of an object or theory being performed through multiple practices (or ‘relations’) has caught on more recently (e.g., Alcadipani & Hassard, 2010; Steyaert, Marti, & Michels, 2012; Zhao, Fisher, Lounsbury, & Miller, 2017). An interesting dialogue has emerged within the multiplicity debate vis-à-vis AH that offers the past and history as a multiple representation in amodernism (Durepos & Mills, 2012a).

AH uses multiplicity to mediate a contrast between singular and plural history. The suggestion of history to be multiple is to mean there may be “more than one but less than many” (Law, 1999, p. 11) accounts of a phenomenon. Multiple histories imply that the same account may be enacted differently in various practices or relations; understanding histories as “things manipulated in practices” (Mol, 2002, p. 4). Instead of focusing on the linear history of anything, multiplicity allows focus to turn inwardly into the historiographic operation of historians. It calls into question how by the way historians analyze historical phenomena, they not only give insight into what *may* have happened in the past but also play a part in performing it as knowledge (e.g., choice of traces, narrative, style). In this way, multiplicity allows us to unravel the process of how practices help enact a sense of the past.

A demonstration of multiplicity in AMH analysis would be the process used in this dissertation to study TCA’s past. My research draws on several published histories of TCA/AC. Each provide a different version of the airline’s past. I detail in later chapters how I focus on the socio-politics involving a critical incident within TCA that led to its rebranding. However, this incident is an assemblage of few, sparse traces that are inscribed in Pigott’s (2001) *National Treasure: The History of Trans Canada Airlines*. In few other texts of TCA’s past are we given

details (e.g., who, what, when, where, and why) of this important change event. As previously stated, my goal is to give insight into this change event and in the process, produce a multiple version of the organization's past. I introduce multiplicity to this story by unraveling how narrative is performed politically in both empirical material and in my assembly of them. Through these practices and in my performance of story, the airline's past can be enacted.

If a modern history holds that reality is multiple through enactment and in practices, and if the past is performed yielding different versions, then the interconnected relations between these enactments and how an account is produced are also worth explanation.

2.3.4 Relational character of the past and history

Assuming that the making of any one history is really an effect of a "fabric of relations" (Lechte, 2008, p. 7), working within a modernism means that we are also interested in how these different performances are understood as outcomes of their empirical investigation. In other words, a modern history is curious about *how* a version of the past can be performed relationally including what and who is studied as well as the political interests of the historian. Doing a modern history is concerned with the relational character of the past and history through a close examination of how the historian constructs his/her account and the different versions of the same history actor. This is the crux of the AH approach; Durepos and Mills (2012a) suggest the past is enacted and performed in actor-networks that, through the political relations (i.e., relationalism) among and between actors, an understanding of the past can emerge.

Here's how relationalism works in practice. If we understand history as a sum of political activities in translation, then 'tracing' (Law & Mol, 1995) relations that give history its shape is important. How this works is through a process of "tracing the relations and movements of actors" (Durepos & Mills, 2017, p. 61). What this process looks like involves an empirical study

where the historian follows traces and examines them at each point of an actor's movement to bring into focus the many translations that occur along the way (Durepos, Mills, & McLaren, 2020). Following these breadcrumbs allow us to see how actors enact the socio-past² as history. In a way similar to MH (which we revisit in a later chapter), Latour (2005, p. 12) notes "tracing actors themselves" allows for the researched to be research. In terms of historiography, this close read of relationalism lets us see *how* actors configure history and how history is comprised of actor-networks. Finally, a relational approach to 'doing history' focuses on the ties that loosely bind the socio-past together with an eye to what bits and pieces of history are changed through associations (which may or may not be significant in the grand scheme of things).

In considering relationalism-as-practice, AMH is informed by two literatures that complement the potential of micro-level analysis in producing knowledge of the past: (a) Sociology of Knowledge (SoK) – historical knowledge is relational because it is composed (Mannheim, 1985) through practices knowledge communities typically engage in (e.g., professional development workshops, symposia, conference presentations, peer review process of journal articles and book editors, to name a few) and, as a result, *how* history is produced is of interest; (b) similarly, ANT theorists (e.g., Law & Mol, 2001; Law & Urry, 2004) see relationalism as the metaphoric 'glue' between the activity (i.e., relations) of actors and their socio-politics which makes 'tracing the actor's movement' an important part of the historical account.

² The term 'socio-past' used here and throughout relates to the combination of the social and historical past.

2.3.5 *Amodern historian as co-participant of historical knowledge production*

In his proposal of the social world as configured by actor-network associations, Latour (2005) reminded us that the efforts of observers (i.e., researchers) has an effect – plays a role – in the knowledge that is ultimately produced. From a perspective informed by amodernism “the socio-past as history is what is created through our very efforts to define it” (Latour, 2005 quoted in Durepos, 2015, p. 175). The historian, then, is arguably a co-participant in this process. Offering the historian as a co-participant of the practices in which history is produced is a far different understanding than what is offered in modern and postmodern historiography. Durepos, Mills, and McLaren (2020) offer three responses to the question: Who is the amodern management historian and what is his/her role?

The answer to the above question involves dialogue about the historian’s response to handling historical knowledge. Modernist historians see it their responsibility to write history impartially, objectively, and as ‘according to the facts.’ He or she is thus a gatekeeper of ‘legitimate history.’ A postmodern historian inserts him/herself into the history making process by explicating how their decisions shaped the research. The amodernist response is to view history as practices enacted “in a multitude of places, and in a variety of ways” (Kalela, 2012, p. 75). Rather than focusing on the outcome of history making (i.e., knowledge produced), the historian instead sees history in everyday practice – it is everywhere for everyone to reassemble.

The influence of actor-networks in amodern history also helps orient the role of the historian. Just as an actor – human, nonhuman, and non-corporeal³ – can work together with other actors to enact history, then they too must also have the potential to participate in the

³ A subcategory of actors/actants developed by Hartt (2013) to describe the forces or powerful influences on human and non-human actors in a network that affect decision making processes.

practice of history making itself. In this way the historian is an actor, an “active co-participant” (Tsekeris, 2010, p. 146) in the never-ending process of history making (Kalela, 2012) where his/her role is to understand “actors know what they do and we have to learn from them not only what they do, but how and why they do it” (Latour, 1999, p. 19). The amodern historian’s role is not solely one of a decision-maker (e.g., which traces are best representative of the truth) or narrative-making but learning “from the actors without imposing on them an a priori definition of their world-building capacities” (Latour, 1999, p. 20). AH has mobilized this *a priori* definition to justify privileging the empirical so actors speak for themselves. AMH will similarly focus on allowing actor associations to tell the story but without expectations of shape, size, or direction.

2.6 Summary

In this chapter, I have taken the debates from within historical research on business and organizations to refine three metahistorical ways of ‘doing history’ in MOS. I first provided a nondefinitive conceptualization of three key terms (i.e., the past, history, and historiography) before moving on to a brief outline of modern and postmodern history. Table 1 summarizes these metahistorical modes of doing history in management and organizational studies. Setting up the chapter this way allowed amodernism to be presented as a collection of these debates in history while also a historiographic tradition that AMH will draw on. Through this process, I lay out the areas that inform AMH as well as offer some preliminary thoughts on how AMH might also benefit amodern history. In the following chapter I take up these insights to help illustrate the second literature of AMH: ANTi-History.

Table 1: Metahistorical Modes of Doing History in Management and Organizational Studies

	Modern	Postmodern	Amodern
Ontology	Realism – Historical phenomena exists outside of consciousness and lay awaiting our discovery in research.	Post-realism – The past does not exist in the present; ontologically unavailable and, thus, cannot be verified with scientific hypotheses.	Arealism – The socio-past is performed through practices that perform history through the enactment of history at the site of actor(s) relations.
Epistemology	Positivism – Accurate representation of the past ‘as it happened’ as history whose sources can be verified.	Postpositivism – Emphasis on understanding reality of the past as mediated through our ‘knowledge’ of it (e.g., textual representation).	Apositivism – Notions of ‘the past’ and ‘history’ are understood as performances of history in practices that constitute multiple realities.
Methodology	Source-criticism – Evaluating information sources (e.g., a document, text, observation) to determine validity, reliability, and relevance.	Deconstruction – Seek to understand the conditions of text (e.g., how it was created).	(Re)assembly of knowledge – Historian follows traces of the past to observe how they perform in actor-networks.
Nature of representation	Singular – Objective is to offer a complete, undisputed version of the past through process of verification.	Plural – Historian creates different versions of knowledge based on different perspectives on the same past.	Multiple – Practice and different enactments of one phenomenon that vary on situated practices and different sets of relations.
Relationship of past and history	Real – History is the accurate portrayal of the past.	Relative – There is one past but plural representations as histories.	Relational – The past is enacted as history in relations of/between actors in-action.

Chapter 3: ANTi-History

3.1 Introduction

In this chapter I will examine the second of three key literatures that inform AMH. I begin with a discussion of AH and how it has been taken up by a growing corpus of critical management scholars in historical organization studies. No theory is perfect, including AH. Herein, then, I wish to capture my own thoughts on each of the three facets of AH and hopefully illustrate how they may benefit from dialogue with MH and vice versa. The point that I will try to make is that through this process of pulling apart the mechanics of AH, I am able to underscore the conditions of possibility for bringing about my contribution in this thesis – that is, a theoretical fusion among amodernism, AH, and MH. Along the way I will offer what I feel are insights that could help remedy this fusion and later inform a method of AMH.

3.2 The ANTi-History Approach

In its essence, AH is – in the words of its architects: “an approach to the study of the past that ... sets out to simultaneously represent and destabilize selected past events with the ultimate aim of pluralizing history” (Mills & Durepos, 2010, p. 27). It arose as a methodological development that answered the call for more critical history scholarship in MOS almost 20 years ago (Booth & Rowlinson, 2006; Clark & Rowlinson, 2004).

AH is an alternative critical historiography involving multiple facets in the study of knowledge of the past. These facets detailed more extensively elsewhere (see Durepos & Mills, 2012a, 2012b) rest on three pillars of literature involving: the sociology of knowledge (Mannheim, 1985; Marx & Engels, 1846/1971), cultural theory and Marxian historiography

(Foucault, 1982; Jenkins, 1991), and the French school of ANT (Latour, 1999, 2005; Law, 1994).

Equally as important to the ‘what’ of AH is understanding its ‘how.’ Regardless of where AH has been taken in MOS, ANTi-Historians – a term used to describe those who practice AH research – have understood ‘how’ it works by dialoguing these three literatures. In this dissertation, to help answer *how*, it makes sense for me to briefly outline each of the three literatures, including the facets that have been developed from them. Thus, in the three sections that follow, I will focus in on a literature and the facets that support them to seed insights and offer ways that I feel can help bridge their potential for fusion with MH.

3.3 Sociology of Knowledge

AH draws heavily on a reading of Karl Mannheim’s (1953a, 1953b, 1985) work by questioning the socio-cultural basis of our knowledge about the past. In doing so, AH draws on several specific insights (that have been explored at length elsewhere, see Durepos, 2009; Durepos & Mills, 2012a) to inform its practice as an approach for doing history. Like any theory, some insights are more pronounced in their contribution to theory-building than others and AH is no exception. There are three insights that I see AH engage with SoK literature that provide the best support of furthering MH: (a) knowledge of the past as a social construction; (b) categorical apparatus of history; (c) activist historical knowledge.

3.3.1 Knowledge of the past as a social construction

Drawing on Mannheim (1985) and Berger and Luckman (1967), AH assumes that the inquisitive nature of human curiosity shapes how we try to understand the world and this, in turn, influences how knowledge is created. It is assumed in AH that all knowledge is socially

constructed by the interest work of disparate people, things, and ideas from the past that are active in conveying some meaning upon the stories they wish to share about history. This view of knowledge as a social construction has been absent in all flavours of MH. Surprisingly, given its wide appeal to historians, the process of historical knowledge production is a subject that remains undisturbed in MH. In this way, then, history is assumed; what we can know about the past using MH is what is provided to us in sources that ‘speak for themselves.’ AMH, thus, may stand to benefit from questioning what we know of the past through the meaning making activities of historical actors.

3.3.2 Categorical apparatus of history

AH resurrects Kantianism to critique the disciplinary conventions that border the activity of history ‘making.’ That is, the work of historians who write history. For Kant, the ‘maturing of humanity’ meant individuals could be liberated from their intellectual inferiorities (Rabinow, 1991) by understanding how knowledge is ordered. Gunn (2014) discusses the ordering of institutionalized knowledge as an outcome of modernism, arguing the socio-cultural condition of intellectualism formed categories of thought. These categories form an exclusive imperative. The categorical apparatus of history (as an academic category), then, is socially constructed and governed by rules of its own making (Bachelard, as cited in Lechte, 2008). For AH, this means questioning the academic history’s attempt to discipline the historian’s craft of source criticism, ordering traces, and objectify ‘truth’ without considering how doing history may itself provide ‘emancipatory potential.’ MH stands much to gain from questioning the ‘disciplined ordering’ of history, especially in who shares knowledge of the past since MH has yet to be fully developed as a theory or method. In other words, there is a blank canvas for AMH to encourage those who

are not bound by the apparatus of history (i.e., historian) and its conventions to engage in and explore historical craft in MOS.

3.3.3 Activistic character of historical knowledge

It is assumed in AH that all knowledge is activistic (Mannheim, 1953b, 1985). It is difficult, if not impossible, to separate what is passed as knowledge from who, what, and how it came to be. This sentiment is shared by Durepos, Shaffner, and Taylor (2021, p. 454), who in their development of an agenda for critical historiography, argue: “It is always history for the ideological sake of someone or something whether women, race or ethnicity or, even neoliberal capitalism.” The idea (or ideal for that matter) of ideologically ‘neutral’ histories is simply fantasy. How can one truly go about ‘controlling for’ things such as bias, subjectivity, or even politics? The foundation of knowledge of the past is thus cast in an unending process of activism – a negotiation in which actors are always engaged in. An ANTi-Historian is thus interested by questions about the constitutive nature of knowledge. Often, their expedition in historical work focuses on revealing the insidious socio-political processes of interest-driven knowledge production. AMH will build on this research style by looking for ‘minor knowledge’ – that is, knowledge seen as trivial but with potential for insights about the past (Magnússon & Ólafsson, 2017).

3.3.4 Potential SoK insights in AMH

Those interested in SoK are usually motivated by questions of process: How does an idea find its existence? Why do some ideas seemingly catch on while others falter? What are the origins of what we know? Answers to these questions help us know ‘how’ we know what we know. Allies of SoK take a social constructivist view, holding knowledge production as a

socially active process. They argue knowledge is constructed when its contents are ascribed meaning by people involved in the manufacture of knowledge (Rosenberg, 2018).

For the most part, this approach is limited by what it accepts as knowledge. AH disturbs the modernist socio-cultural understanding of knowledge by accepting humans and nonhumans as actors in the production of knowledge – including people, things, and ideas that all play a role in forming what we may know of the past. However, there may be more to help support this characterization of knowledge to include: (a) the unfolding of knowledge from behind-the-scenes; (b) potential of minor knowledge; (c) transparent axiology. I unpack these three suggestions as complementary to AMH fusion.

3.3.4.1 Unfolding knowledge from behind-the-scenes

AH problematizes the political nature and supposed ‘accurate representation’ of knowledge of the past to understand and explain how history unfolds behind-the-scenes. It includes a strong empirical focus on processes involving people, objects, and ideas to see how the past is presented to an audience as historical knowledge held together by political activity. Drawing on these insights allow ANTi-Historians to see the production of social phenomena in situ.

In addition to the false necessity (Unger, 1987) on ordering knowledge, AH might benefit from asking how knowledge is unfolded to see stories of the past come together. What I am suggesting here is thinking about turning the research into research; this is a story of ‘the story’ in history and it includes all the small bits and traces of knowledge of the past that could be reassembled up to, and including, the history that an ANTi-Historian wishes to pluralize. I see this as building upon AH’s work on ‘knowledge and folding through elapse of time’ (Durepos & Mills, 2012a) by giving space to Mannheim’s (1985) suggestion of folding knowledge

existentially. The process of knowledge production does not develop linearly and neither does the activities that work together to produce knowledge act in unison.

Folding knowledge in AMH should demonstrate a clearly spelled out process of how is studied about the past might be understood as knowledge that is situated ideologically, spatially, and temporally. That means attention to knowledge that resists modernist assumptions of linearity but also upholds curiosity about the significance of a story's prologue – that is, all those relevant people, things, and ideas whose actions contribute to the story just beyond what is normally expected in an AH analysis.

3.3.4.2 Potential of minor knowledge in ANTi-History

AH commits to privileging the empirical over the theoretical (Durepos & Mills, 2012a) in tracing knowledge of the past. It follows a process that has the historian reassemble socio-materials or 'traces' from archives to give shape to an alternative rendering of the past. Recall how diverse traces can be (i.e., they can come from just about anywhere and represent almost anything in history). Stitching together a historical account, as a result, can quickly get messy. In all this messiness, what may have been missed in AH is an empirical focus on one person, object, or idea, long enough to see how one (or a combination) of these contributes to producing 'minor knowledge.' Minor knowledge is a borrowed term from MH and are those traces "perceived as trivial and inconsequential, material that has barely been touched by academic researchers" (Magnússon & Ólafsson, 2017, p. 3). This oversight may be partly explained by the way ANTi-Historians follow actors in their performance(s) to avoid imposing an ordering scheme on the way knowledge of the past is created. In a way, though, ANTi-Historians must decide between following the politics of knowledge production 'as-they-appear' or fleshing out the small, 'minor' traces that build up the character of the knowledge production enterprise. By reclaiming

the socio-past as minor knowledge, it may be worth incorporating the additive nature of trivial, inconsequential knowledge in AMH.

There appears to be some effort to do this already. Take Myrick, Helms Mills, and Mills' (2013) study of the Academy of Management. In their examination of the supposed 75th anniversary of the association, the role and influence historical knowledge played on legitimizing the Academy was found to be an important element of legitimizing management scholarship and practice. Tracing the early accounts of who 'founded' (i.e., a group of male faculty from universities across the United States sharing some previous relationship) the organization and the process of how it emerged through the years, we see the impact political practices have on the production of knowledge. By drawing on select accounts of the association's past vis-à-vis the annual conference's presidential address (i.e., minor knowledge), we see how just one or two inconsequential traces might give way to new insights about the past.

3.3.4.3 Assumption of axiology rendered transparent

AH takes an amodern posture that rejects generalizable facts. Instead of seeking absolute truth, AH draws on Mannheim's (1985) insights about relational truths to assume 'accurate knowledge' of the past – 'knowing' that it is situated ideologically, spatially, and temporally. ANTi-Historian's engage in transparent research, among other things, to illustrate the futility of absolute truth assumptions in history and demonstrate the partiality of knowledge by welcoming the possibility of other accounts of the same phenomenon (Durepos & Mills, 2012a). While AH's research philosophy is transparent (e.g., relational ontology, amodern epistemology, and ANT methodology), it may stand the addition of axiology. In *Research is Ceremony*, Wilson (2008, p. 34) introduces the idea of axiology as "the ethics or morals that guide the search for knowledge [to] judge which information is worthy of searching for." AH has embodied this

perspective – especially how it sees knowledge nested in conflicts in and contradictions about historical accounts – but AMH will attempt to practice this by amplifying seeing knowledge of the past as inseparable from those who help produce it. The opportunity here is to build upon the consequence of transparency in AH by centring subjectivities (e.g., my preferences, politics that exist within research, those that are researched) that inevitably inform the crafting of knowledge of the past.

3.4 Cultural Theory and Postmodern Historiography

The second literature informing AH draws on insights from cultural theory and postmodern historiography. These two areas are broad, but they do intersect one another in the way AH uses them. For instance, AH sympathizes with cultural theory for its focus on political dynamics, historical foundations, and group conflicts within contemporary culture (Edgar & Sedgwick, 2007). Cultural theory has united theorists around rejecting positivism and, to some degree, an embrace of Marxism (Foucault, 1982). AH embodies this by holding history as an interest-driven activity and that historical analyses can be emancipatory (Durepos & Mills, 2012a) to actors from constrained or disenfranchised interpretations.

The postmodern historiography tradition espouses pluralism which holds there is no one ‘true’ way but rather many different approaches of interpretation (Jenkins, 2003). AH draws upon postmodernism and pluralism specifically to open multiple ways (i.e., multiplicity) history can be assembled. AH is concerned about the ways researchers do history to destabilize narratives that are certain (Jenkins, 1995). Durepos and Mills (2012a) provides a fulsome review of AH’s use of cultural theory and postmodernism. For now, I see these two literatures in AH as

three insights that may help better an AMH fusion: (a) the past-as-history; (b) accurate relationalist truth; (c) multiple practice and performance of history.

3.4.1 The past-as-history

This first insight of historiography in AH borrows ideas from cultural theorists to bring the ontological character of history to the fore. It asks: What is history? Since I spent time in the previous chapter discussing the historiography trifecta (e.g., modern, postmodern, and amodern) in MOS, what is important now is how AH treats history. Working in the amodern space, ANTi-Historians see history not on a realist footing (i.e., substantiated by real facts and truth) but as ‘knowledge of the past.’ This means we cannot know the past for certain but are able to gain a sense of it through traces “such as fragments of the past in oral storytelling, books, museums, archives, budget worksheets, annual financial reports, and numerous other communication devices” (Corrigan, 2016, p. 84). The idea that the past and history is distinct allows ANTi-Historians (Durepos, Mills, & McLaren, 2020) to focus on the many relations that attempt to depict a version of the past. MH stands to benefit from this logic as most of its scholarship assumes history as the past and does not discuss this important distinction about knowledge of the past through traces.

3.4.2 Accurate relationalist truth

Offering a critique of the way history in MOS mostly followed a modern philosophy, AH reminded us of Jenkins (2003) who said explanations imply a form of interpretation, and in turn, interpretations of the past can vary. In short, this means that there are many different ‘truths’ in history as well as ways of crafting knowledge of the past. It is best to revisit Mannheim’s thinking of relational truth.

AH denies the link between knowing history and absolute truth by offering up accurate representation of relational truth as a better way to conceive history. There is merit to this in terms of potential dialogue with MH. For example, using this dissertation's case study of TCA, as I read through the various histories of the airline, it appeared that the story of remaking TCA into AC was generally left undisturbed. Perhaps there is very little else to tell. Maybe the accepted version of history – that the debut of 'Air Canada' was a rebranding strategy to showcase a new name, look, and feel – accounts for all the interests that went into its production. To the modern historian in MOS, he/she would attempt to exhaust every possible means in proving this historical fact. In-so-far as the way AH assumes there are multiple ways of constructing knowledge of the past, the story might not end with a lack of historical facts. If we were to accept this knowledge 'as is' – that there be little to know about the process of change within the airline – we would be doing so uncritically. However, by questioning the knowledge production activities involved in this story I go beyond what is concealed to reveal the microprocesses that went into producing the airline as new. That is, I disturb the limits of the so-called truth of TCA/AC's history by interpreting the relational character of the organization's past to instead glean an accurate version of actor relations. My intent is to use this understanding of accurate relationalist truth to complement scrutiny of knowledge at the micro-level in MH.

3.4.3 Multiple practice and performance of history

As previously noted, AH draws on Annemarie Mol's (2002) *The Body Multiple* – specifically, the idea of multiplicity – to describe how, through practice, multiple versions of the past are performed. Mol demonstrates in *The Body Multiple* how multiple practices of medicine (e.g., general practitioners, radiologists, and cardiologists) produce varied performances of atherosclerosis. Let us use coronary artery disease (a complication caused by atherosclerosis) to

give you an idea of how multiplicity works. Someone who suffers from high cholesterol may request from their general practitioner a patient information leaflet that describes atherosclerosis as a condition where the build-up of waste products (e.g., fats, cholesterol, and other substances) in the blood can cause arteries to narrow and lead to serious cardiac complications. In the practice of medicine in the hospital, this disease can appear to be many other things. A radiologist may see the disease as abnormal shades on a coronary angiogram. The practice of this serious condition may be the regular interaction between the cardiologist and patient. From one moment, context, speciality, or interaction to the next, a slightly different coronary artery disease is practiced.

While not as serious of a matter between life and death, multiplicity in AH represents a key breakaway from normative approaches of ‘doing history.’ Since AH is concerned about dominant histories certain in tone (Durepos & Mills, 2018), the idea of multiplicity means history is not studied in the way that assumes a discovery of fact but through practice and performances. To illustrate, let us take the research of this dissertation into consideration. In my pursuit of following traces of TCA, I became acquainted with several actors and actants of interest that each contribute to the airline’s history. For example, I follow the traces of pilots, executives, and government legislation. Specifically, I narrowed my focus on how key actors perform the past of TCA for Canadian aviation enthusiasts, consumers of historical Canadian politics, and non-fiction readers. A vastly different version of the airline’s past was performed as history in each set of practices (e.g., TCA’s history for aviation enthusiasts, those interested in historical Canada politics, and non-fiction readers). In my following of each performance of TCA across these sets of practice, I engaged at least three different versions of the same thing: TCA. This research is later dialogued with aspects of MH but for now, multiplicity, through

practice and performance, lends support to AMH's approach to studying history as different versions of the same past.

3.4.4 Potential cultural theory and postmodern insights in AMH

It can be said of AH that it is a “multifaceted approach to the study of history” (Durepos & Mills, 2018, p. 430). This is so because of the way it has drawn on cultural theory and postmodern ideas to have us see the past as political and multiple. What I am left to question, though, is how might AH be used to help explain how a combination of practices of the past turn into a more-or-less dominant notion of the past? MH may be of value here, especially through its microscopic focus on historical phenomena. Fusing practices of the past with a look at the socio-politics that serve to create singular notions of the past may be an entry point for AMH. To make this case, however, it is important to help support it by noting four potential opportunities to build on AH's use of cultural theory and postmodernism: (a) problematizing the individual in history; (b) historical style of writing to dilute solemn authority of science; (c) centring context in historical research (in MOS); (d) the treatment of historical traces and ‘evidence.’ I will now turn to distilling each of these suggestions as further support to bridge AH and MH.

3.4.4.1 Problematizing the individual in history

It seems like postmodernist scholars have long been problematizing the way people are theorized in MOS (e.g., Alvesson, Ashcroft, & Thomas, 2008; Calás & Smircich, 2019; Chia, 1995), in particular, the field's neglect to consider the theoretical value of the individual as a unit of analysis. Alvesson (2010) extends this criticism to the traditions of the ‘post’ (e.g., postmodernism). As a paradigm in historical studies, cultural theory and postmodernism includes many ideas but has been, at least until recently, rather mum on the topic of the analysis of the

individual. Bettin (2019) adds a twist into this mix of oversight in claiming that even ANT, in its affinity for analyzing the creation of knowledge, has neglected analytical focus on individuals. When they are included, it usually involves multiple people and different levels of analysis (e.g., group) and thus splinters the empirical focus on any one person. AMH will provide a partial answer to this opportunity to problematize the absence of the individual in MOS (Nord & Fox, 1996, 1999) by infusing empirical accounts of history with analysis of individual(s) – durable or otherwise – who produce knowledge of the past.

3.4.4.2 Historical style of writing to dilute solemn authority of science

Postmodernism writ-large is known for its unique combination of diverse fields including art, philosophy, literature, and sociology, to name a few. Its close affinity between artistic and intellectual genre allows for an unruly style that refuses to “comply with a single set of artistic rules or principles” (Prasad, 2005, p. 220). Postmodernists are known to employ antithetical genres in their writing (Bauman, 1993). Adopting a variety of playful and unexacting modes of expression served as a catalyst for the historic turn’s agenda of “experiments in historical styles of writing using multiple methods” (Booth & Rowlinson, 2006, p. 9). When it was developed, AH served as an answer to this call of ‘writing history differently’ by borrowing ANT prose from the science and technology studies literature. What I see AMH doing is adopting some ANT language in analysis but also encourage creative writing – mostly through engagement with AH’s penchant for reflexive writing and MH’s biographical narrative. This style could also contribute to postmodernist style that encourages styles that undermine the mainstream (Wrethed, 2020).

3.4.4.3 Centring context in historical research

We are told in MOS that context is important because it affords researchers the possibility of developing stronger, more relevant, and illustrative knowledge in an overly complex social world (Bamberger, 2008). How context is engaged in research means different things to different people. It really all depends on research philosophy. For example, those in a positivist space see context as something that can be manipulated and tested in ‘valued added’ scholarship (Bamberger, 2008). As you may anticipate, postmodernism – a tradition fiercely opposed to positivism – appreciates context differently: “research has the capacity to strengthen or generate certain realities” (McLaren & Durepos, 2021, p. 78) and so context is thus seen as a practice.

Durepos, Mills, and McLaren (2020) outline how historians using modern, postmodern, and amodern historiography each perform contextualized research differently. In their chapter, they point out an important distinction between postmodern and amodern history: whereas the former sees the past in pre-existent time, space, and location contexts, AH uses amodern context that is “composed of a trail of associations of multifarious connections between heterogenous actors” (Durepos, Mills, & McLaren, 2020, p. 290). Here the difference is in how they see context ontologically. What both of these approaches to history may need to consider is how even historical narrative itself – what an ANTi-Historian produces – is subject to and explained best by “the world-building activities of actor-networks” (Durepos, Mills, & McLaren, 2020, p. 287). Reorienting the scale of actor-network activity, which appears to assume analysis on a micro-level (the same way MH treats context in narrative), may hold promise of empirically demonstrating how even the smallest trace contributes to what we can know about historical

phenomena. Empirical research in AMH will attempt this by considering context as an actant within the network of my 'doing' a TCA history.

3.4.4.4 Treatment of historical traces and 'evidence'

The way history is presented as a continuous constitution void of disruption from one event to the next is something that has annoyed postmodern historiographers. This is clearly evidenced by the way Hayden White (1985, p. 50) – including his contemporaries (e.g., Foucault, 2002; Jenkins, 1995) – wrote about how the historian “serves no one well by constructing a spacious continuity between the present world and that which preceded it.” Ordered knowledge of the past conceals disparate traces of an alternative history. Authoritative interpretations of the past are what most historians produce. They see historical continuity in the way historical knowledge is justified in evidence (Taylor, Bell, & Cooke, 2009; Toms & Wilson, 2010). History is thus stable, fixed, and concrete. AH offers an antidote to the postmodern angst caused by historical continuity through its illustration of the political character that disperses history through the traces included in actor-networks. Once the ANTi-Historian (re)assembles historical traces into a web of relations, the past can no longer be seen as stable but in endless discontinuities. An opportunity is ripe for AMH to be even more clear about how traces themselves play a part in these discontinuities of history. In other words, it would be helpful if ANTi-Historians could closely examine the traces and fragments within a network to explore the multiple discontinuities that may stem from their assemblage. Some fusion with MH may help unearth the redemptive value in intensely focusing on surfacing and storying the traces that build actor-networks.

3.5 Actor-Network Theory

The third literature supporting AH is a combination of insights from ANT. The theoretical contours of AH all make way for a central point: that all knowledge of the past is characterized by interest work (Durepos & Mills, 2018). White's (1985, p. 104) thoughts are particularly useful, that the past is almost always offered up as "history for" some interest(s) as opposed to the facade of a neutral 'history of' phenomena. This is an important distinction that lays the groundwork for ANT analysis in the AH approach. If what we know about history is not value-neutral, then how knowledge of the past is performed as history yields important insight into how politics shape what we know.

The history of AC provides an excellent illustration. There are several versions of the airline's history that, taken together, attempt to weld a continuous sense of service from founding to present-day. Regardless of which version of history that is read, each account is written from, and representative of, an interest. Peter Pigott's popular history of the airline reads rather complimentary including detail of aircraft machinery, key dates of importance, and anecdotes from employees and customers, giving the impression that his is really written *for* management as an ideological tool (Tinker & Neimark, 1987) in legitimizing the organization's past⁴. Demonstrating this character of interest-driven history opens the door to understanding history as an effect of politics within actor-networks.

AH helps historians study the past by focusing on *(re)assembling* the constitution of the socio-past and does so by using ANT "to inform the method for doing history" (Durepos &

⁴ I raise Peter Pigott's version of the airline's past to demonstrate how interest-driven history telling can be, especially the circumstances surrounding its publication. Near the time of *National Treasure*, Air Canada faced an unstable period involving reorganization efforts due to an expensive merger with Canadian Airlines and the global aviation market downturn following the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. Could it be that these challenges helped sell the value to managers of authorizing the airline's 'actual' history?

Mills, 2018, p. 432). Scholars who have used ANT in the past show us that by ‘following around’ humans, nonhumans, and processes, we can see how they come together to produce knowledge. Before moving to a discussion of insights, it may be useful to briefly outline some of the common terminology used in ANT⁵ – especially the terms that will be used later in the empirical research of this dissertation.

An *actor* is typically understood as an individual human (e.g., researcher, pilot, and manager) whereas non-humans (e.g., paper, computer, and airplane) are considered *actants*. Often these two terms are used interchangeably. *Non-corporeal actants* (NCAs) are a set of actants used to describe “reified values, beliefs, concepts, and ideas which have no physical entity (corpus) but interact with the other human or non-human actors/actants of the network” (Hartt, 2013, p. 19). ANT theorists are interested in tracing how actors *enroll* (i.e., to join a viewpoint) and how these views join by a process of *translation* (i.e., bringing disparate actors and actants together to form a network through the acceptance of a dominant view or ideas of the network) to, over time, *punctuate* (i.e., act together as one). The resulting configuration of these actions establish a *network* (i.e., stable relationships of actors and actants that engage in interest work to form ephemeral heterogeneous ordering, see Law, 1994). Any actor, actant, or network is considered *durable* when their relational activities persist. We can know of a network’s existence by its *inscriptions* (i.e., traces in the form of a book, letter, or other material artifacts). Following the bread trail of inscriptions point to or describe the process a network is *black boxed* (i.e., inputs of a network are identifiable but how they piece together is indistinguishable) (Latour, 1999).

⁵ I follow Farías, Blok, and Roberts (2020) who urge those who seek to explain ANT to refrain from complicating an already commonly misunderstood practice by clearly spelling out how it can be used in research.

With all this in mind, I see AH's engagement in ANT literature in three insights that I believe provide a map to complement a fusion with MH. They are: (a) the past-as-history as actor-networks; (b) relational histories; (c) histories as performance and ontological politics.

3.5.1 The past-as-history as actor-networks

Following Munslow's (2010) critique of the oft-conflation between the past and history, AH attempts an uncoupling of the socio-past from history. By drawing on ANT, ANTi-Historians can see how history is indeed an effect of many actor-network relationships that oscillate back-and-forth between being punctualized as an actor in other networks and being a collection of actors within a network (Callon, 1999; Durepos & Mills, 2017). In other words, we can see history is not a replica of the past but rather an effect of how people (including historians), things, and ideas frame what happened before now.

Actor-networks help us understand the point at which actors come together, through political interests and actor practices, to concretize a sense of the past. By holding the past and history as actor-networks in AH, historians can follow socio-politics from atop their topographies in networks as they (the network) produce history. In other words, the past-as-history pictured as actor-networks is the point where an account of the past comes to take on the character of history and where that history is then seen as playing a role in the past. For example, we might be curious to see how the idea of official bilingualism in Canada played a leading role defining the history of TCA. Later, in my empirical work, I surface this discourse to help refine the analytical benefits of AMH.

3.5.2 *Relational histories*

AH leans on relationalism to explain how “history is made up of a series of relationships that bound actors (i.e., traces of the past) as networks (i.e., plausible histories) and networks-as-actors (i.e., histories that conceal their conditions of creation and participate in subsequent history production) (Durepos & Mills, 2017, p. 58). Relationalism here looks at how relations between actors contribute to their formation of multiple histories. AH borrow this idea to support how the political work that actors engage and the multiple translations that arise in ordering a specific network is a never accomplished. In practice, the way AH demonstrates this is by tracing the relations that go into forming a history; then, the historian can see for him/herself how histories are composed and performed *over time* (Durepos & Mills, 2018). This bit invites longitudinal analysis that, attending to Latour’s (1986) emphasis on following the breadcrumb trail of actors, attempts to trace association(s) between actors to reveal their many movements across time. Sensing this ‘point of oscillation’ (Durepos & Mills, 2017) is central to performing a relational history.

AH borrows from ANT the idea that actors can oscillate as networks and vice versa. It also means that once a network becomes an actor, it can be involved in other networks. The best way to illustrate this is through the Droste effect: the illusion of a photograph that recursively appears within itself, tunneling ad infinitum. This so-called loop could theoretically go on for quite a while (depending on how far and at what level the historian would want to go). Through mapping the position of past actors in an actor-network, relational history seeks to reveal “a set of links or relations” (Law, 1999, pp. 6-7) that, with the help of “variously constituted bits and pieces of the past have stabilized as histories” (Durepos & Mills, 2017, p. 59), allow us to see this transformation. What MH may lend here is a practice of ‘zooming in’ on a point of interest

within the network and empirically isolating this ‘in-between’ moment (Cooper, 2005) through isolating a critical incident within relations that configure knowledge of the past.

3.5.3 Histories as performance and ontological politics

Actors engage in socio-politics to translate their interests. In AH terms, the past is thus translated into history *relationally* by actor practices. Treating history as a performance scales back emphasis on what actors do and, instead, is interested in following the shape historical phenomena take on while being produced in practice (Mol, 2002). Practices are how the relations of actors and networks attempt to manipulate what is offered as knowledge of the past. These so-called ‘practices’ (e.g., how a historian carries out his/her craft) inform positions that actors can take to shape an historical narrative. Law (2004, p. 55) stresses the composition of any social phenomenon produces “different sets of methods assemblages.” In terms of history, historical representations are really performances in networks that help shape (and reshape) a version of history. The historian shifts from assembling a history to deciding which version of the past he/she performs as history and why.

AH encourages us to follow actors’ relations in deciding *how* the past-as-history are performed and/or choosing which version of the past *should* be performed. If by many versions of the past, then why is one performed and another not? What and whose history is worth sharing? Law (2004) asked similar questions, alerting us to ontology concerns: Whose interests punctuate? What story is preferred? AH’s potential here rests in how historians trace actors’ interests in revealing the past-as-history while simultaneously exposing the process of how accounts become privilege or marginalized. By dialoguing MH, particularly its emphasis on micro-politics, my hope is that it will support AH’s emphasis on performance but a deeper dive in emphasizing stories of those whose interests fail to enroll and the processes behind them.

3.5.4 Potential ANT insights in AMH

I believe the way AH deploys ANT as a method of ‘doing history’ has illustrated its value for studying the past and problematizing history. I am particularly drawn to how AH uses the idea of history in actor-networks to help empirically demonstrate the socio-past in action. However, in my attempts to focus more closely on the action(s) of actors individually, I feel ANT method underappreciates the value of focusing on the interest work of a single actor/actant. This point creates an opening to fuse how history can be seen in actor-networks in AH and an emphasis on the particular in MH. To build this out, I offer four points that highlight potential opportunities to bring ANT into AMH: (a) role of networks in producing history; (b) the individual as an actor-network; (c) collapsing micro and macro-level processes; (d) politics of network building.

3.5.4.1 Role of networks in producing history

While MH does not engage with the idea of history practiced in actor-networks, there is some potential in combining this analytic through the way both see phenomena in constitutive relations. In ANT, networks comprised of actors and actants form history (Durepos & Mills, 2012a). AH seeks to observe the role networks play in constructing historical knowledge. MH, on the other hand, sees history through narrative; arguably situated in the past and by historians. The missing link to close this gap is a reorientation of the level of analysis ANTi-Historians use in their study of the past. At present, AH analyzes networks to reveal the socio-politics behind the manufacture of history by generating narratives as stories that combine people, things, and ideas largely atop the topography of the network. Certainly, this is a level worth exploring but it begs the question: might the network be sliced into its constituent parts (e.g., an actor or actant)?

What knowledge might we see performed in an exploration of people, things, or ideas that bind traces of the past together? AMH attempts to answer these types of questions by bringing actor-networks into micro-analyses of the past.

3.5.4.2 Individual as an actor-network

ANT theorists have debated what and who is considered an actor (see Callon & Latour, 1992). It is generally accepted that actors are people whereas other materials and ideas are either specified as *nonhuman* actors or actants (Latour, 2005). A consequence of this is the belief that an actor is useful to researchers so long as they are tied to other actors and actants within a network. What this means empirically is that the individual actor is not an important point or ‘site’ of research but an association to produce another topography. Nord and Fox (1999) similarly argued that the individual in MOS has also suffered neglect from research that essentializes. In studying the self in ANT, Bettin (2019, p. 116) argues that an individual holds together “in practice as a multiple object, as the effect of a hinterland of associations of heterogenous elements.” Individuals constitute an actor-network. MH would have it that the individual is him/herself worth exploring as either the focal point or protagonist of historical research. I argue that these ideas – as an ideology of narrow scope – lends itself to practicing ANT of individuals “because they are patterned networks of heterogeneous materials” (Law, 1992, p. 4). What this means for the way I develop and use AMH in the dissertation is that we may, through pinpointing an actor of interest, understand more about the shape of the network (e.g., TCA) and pull apart an actor’s politics (e.g., Chrétien and his enduring activism).

3.5.4.3 *Collapsing micro and macro-level processes*

While those who conceive ANT claim that it bypasses the structure-agency debate by combining actors (i.e., agency) and networks (i.e., structure), both levels of analysis have been practiced in scholarship using ANT (McLean & Hassard, 2004). For example, ANT was used to emphasize local (i.e., micro) processes like leadership succession in an airline's senior management team (see Hartt, Mills, Helms Mills, and Corrigan, 2014). Broader, structural forces like competitive environments or forms of discrimination have also been studied using ANT (Passoth & Rowland, 2010). AH encourages historians to focus on the meso-level to observe how knowledges of the past evolve. However, what I feel is under-utilized is empirical focus on the actor that is being followed (as opposed to the actors – plural – that make up a network). In MH, as we will learn, analysis is configured on a micro-level study of events and narratives that interlock around small units (e.g., individual) so history can be seen everywhere in practice. The benefit of combining ANT with MH may be in drawing out the way non-human and NCAs influence knowledge outcomes that ultimately shape historical narratives of *someone* (e.g., individual) or *something* (e.g., event).

3.5.4.4 *Politics of network building*

AH not only uses ANT to arrange the canvas of socio-politics involved in making history, but it also understands the historian as an effect of a punctuated actor-network vis-à-vis the historians' choices and the effect of actors (e.g., academic training, archival materials, political influences). It does all of this in a way that is transparent; ANTi-Historians explicate the process of how a version of history is produced using actor-network terminology so that readers may know for themselves the unfolding of his/her research. I believe this aspect of performing

AH as an ethical practice of research holds potential to improve MH. There remains, however, potential in refining how AH may explicitly acknowledge and make part of the research the historian's ideological situatedness.

Take any issue of political concern; feminism is an example of how the view of politics often fail to materialize action from analysis (Wajcman, 2000, 2010). AMH as it is practiced in this dissertation does not make a direct play for feminism but, through the process of following Jean Chrétien in the development of TCA/AC, does surface the exclusionary effects of male power in Parliament. In this case, a female Member of Parliament, Judy V. La Marsh, first raised the TCA name debate but Chrétien's proposal ultimately succeeded with legislative and professional consequences. I use feminism as an example of a collective that takes issue with the way that ANT falls short in considering how the historian's interest in building networks is a political affair shaped by "who and what are considered relevant groups of actors" (Passoth & Rowland, 2010, p. 835). AMH will attempt to overcome the way traditional ANT ignores individuals who become or are excluded from participating in networks by giving voice to "everyday life', the experiences, actions and habits of ordinary people," (Brewer, 2010, p. 90) in performing the past.

3.6 Summary

The purpose of this chapter is to explore the AH framework through each of its three underlying literatures while surfacing the most salient insights to help advance AMH. These insights from SoK, cultural theory and postmodernism, and ANT will help inform our understanding of AMH as they are dialogued with MH later in the dissertation. For now, the third literature to round out AMH method is MH and it will be the focus of the next chapter.

Chapter 4: Microhistory

4.1 Introduction

This chapter takes up MH as the third and final literature to inform AMH. First, I begin with an overview of MH; much has been of it in social and cultural history, yet it remains relatively unexplored in historical research on business and organizations (Vaara & Lamberg, 2016). By fleshing out its background and exploring how it can be thought of as a theory or practice, I foreground the two metahistorical perspectives that each approach takes in studying historical phenomena differently. Second, I explore the insights that build up the modern and postmodern MH tradition. These points will allow me to lay out how they might complement AH engagement. Third, I raise potential insights from MH that go into theorizing AMH. I do all of this by carrying on the analogy of ‘framing up’ AMH as an engagement among the amodern, AH, and MH literatures and, where possible, pull examples from the empirical material of my TCA research.

4.2 What is Microhistory?

What is MH? Admittedly, it is a complicated question with no straightforward answer. It is abstract in some ways because it is neither a theory nor method of history. Nearly all those who engage or actively draw upon it, conceptualize MH in their own terms. There are some who take it as much of a historical research tradition (Robisheaux, 2017) as, say, postmodernism is to qualitative research. Still, others emphasize MH’s propensity to be more of a novel approach to writing history absent of methodological baggage (Hosek, 2019).

Two leading historians in MH, Sigurður Gylfi Magnússon and István M. Sziujártó (2013) – each representing quintessential understandings of MH itself – co-authored *What is*

Microhistory? Theory and Practice to tackle this question. In what they themselves describe as “the first accessible and comprehensive introduction to the origins, development and methodology of microhistory” Magnússon and Szigjártó (2013, p. i) survey the literature by bringing together the most common characteristics shared by microhistorians while advancing their own – albeit different – understanding of it as an approach to history. Their book serves not as a starting point to my thinking about MH but as a convenient way to access these debates.

In this section, I will attempt to unfold the scholarship to get a better sense of what exactly MH is. To do this, I will discuss MH in the following four points: (a) a short background to MH; (b) microhistory-as-theory; (c) microhistory-as-practice; (d) microhistory-in-geographies

4.2.1 A short background to microhistory

The story goes that MH began as a set of practices among a group of Italian historians during the 1970s – Carlo Ginzburg, Edoardo Grendi, Giovanni Levi, Carlo Poni, and their students – who felt mainstream historiography had gone too far in its pursuit of science thereby neglecting the empirical value of ordinary people in the process (Arcangeli, 2012). From their work came a redress of social history that up to this point found its home in French historiography (i.e., Annales school – see Burke, 1990). Primo Levi (1975, p. 224), an Italian chemist, whose collection of short stories in *The Periodic Table*, introduced MH to an Italian audience for the first time:

The reader, at this point, will have realized for some time now that this is not a chemical treatise: my presumption does not reach so far – “*ma voix est faible, et même un peu profane.*” Nor is it an autobiography, save in the partial and symbolic limits in which every piece of writing is autobiographical, indeed every human work; but it is in some fashion a history. It is – or would have liked to be – a microhistory, the history of a trade and its defeats, victories, and miseries, such as everyone wants to tell when he feels close to concluding the arc of his career, and art ceases to be long.

Levi's introduction of MH appears to suggest an approach that is reduced-scale history marked by autobiographical style.

In a review of the rise and fall of French historiography's popularity within social and cultural studies, Megill (2004) wrote that beyond Simiand – figures like Bloch, Febvre and even Braudel – historians have taken turns building the history enterprise as a science vis-à-vis method and empirical validation. This model of social history was left unchallenged until the late twentieth century, beginning in the late 1970s and early 1980s. Just as social history was arriving at the height of its fame, historians were also encountering institutional forces that sought to protect the legitimacy of history as an academic discipline. Paul Ricoeur's (1988) early work problematizing the discipline's mistreatment of temporality represented a challenge to the previously open and unified character of history. Add critical theory and its critique of history absent of moral positions of the past (Alvesson, Bridgman, & Willmott, 2009) and the picture becomes all the clearer: a period marked by an eroding faith in the previously held macrosocial approach to doing history. As these developments along with other questions of doubt took root, Revel (1995) noted that the early formation of MH arose from this crisis and became an outlet for forming objections and making them concrete. The question was: would Levi's introduction to MH catch on?

4.2.2 Microhistory-as-theory

In partial answer to the question of MH as a literature, we begin by looking at how it has been proposed as a theory of history. Magnússon and Szijártó (2013) note that at its most fundamental level, MH encompasses a wide range of ideas about the object of history. There are at least three premises that capture the way MH is treated as theory.

The first premise is that historical knowledge as it has been studied from traditional, quantitative, and structure-oriented modes of thinking yields a notion of ‘total history’⁶. It is not important for us to know about the whole (macro) but how “faint traces or observable discrepancies (the dog that did not bark in the night)” are accepted as hidden truths (Brewer, 2010, p. 99). In terms of my dissertation research, the fact that TCA has been chronicled in published histories is a testament of its interest to historians, yet I am interested in taking a slice of the organization and explore the faintest of traces (e.g., political memoirs and parliamentary proceedings) that help paint a different yet-untold story: the involvement of Chrétien facilitating its name change. As the etymology of MH would suggest, the idea of a complete history on a grand scale is a false necessity. If there is a story to unravel or new insight about knowledge of the past, history must be seen as an unending process in-the-making (Latour, 1993). MH theory suggests there is significance in taking a slice out of total history and scrutinize the happenings of the past on a minute level to demonstrate what history ‘from the ground up’ means for a new historical comprehensiveness (Borzeix, 2007).

Second, MH theory is methodologically different than macrohistory scholarship which tends to gloss over empirical details. Those who have used MH as theory escape the totalizing view of history as the only way for ‘legitimate’ inquiry by embracing what one might observe about the past in an extremely small scale. It appears that for MH, the past is constituted by, and holds together through small, nearly inviable fragments of ‘evidence.’ These insignificant pieces of the past (Novak, 2014) may tell us something about, and help us to understand, the past without losing the sight of larger historical processes (e.g., modernization, industrialization, commodification) entirely. Giovanni Levi (1991, p. 97-98) summed up this view:

⁶ This is mainstream history in its attempt to produce and legitimize *the* history of something.

The unifying principle of all microhistorical research is the belief that microscopic observation will reveal factors previously unobserved ... [P]henomena previously considered to be sufficiently described and understood assume completely new meanings by altering the scale of observation. It is then possible to use these results to draw far wider generalizations although the initial observations were made within relatively narrow dimensions and as experiments rather than examples.

Levi is an early example of microhistorians emphasizing micro-processes of ordinary people living their everyday life in their scholarship to forge a theory of history.

Similarly, the third premise builds on the impetus of small-scale study to theorize the social action performed in the past. According to MH theory, revealing the agency of ordinary people in 'everyday life' is considered an objective of scholarship. In MH theory, agency is important since history is primarily about "people who lived in the past are not merely puppets on the hands of great underlying forces of history" (Magnússon & Szijártó, 2013, p. 5). People who are the subject of MH are thus theorized as active, conscious actors. Agency is important in MH theory because it is connected to the belief that historical research unfairly gives stardom to exceptions (e.g., Winston Churchill, Cold War, or civil aviation) than 'ordinary people' who are not 'seen' by history but nonetheless acted and made choices independent from whatever narratives that he/she have been plotted in by historians. Thus, MH theorizes agency to be the antidote to the malpractice of glossing over people in historiography.

4.2.3 Microhistory-as-practice

In the same way MH has been theorized as theory, there is also a collective whose scholarship I believe typifies *practice*: that is, a way of appreciating history as a performance of limited proportions vis-à-vis MH. To treat MH as a practice means focusing closely on 'doing history' at a granular level; writing about the politics of what takes place on a finite scale

(Beaudry, 2011). Microhistory-as-practice thus can be discussed in three ways: *who* may engage in it, *where* it is occurs, and *how* it unfolds.

The first premise looks at *who* (or what) practices MH and their role in doing this approach to history. In MH, the historians' role is not as straightforward as it is in the mainstream. While MH practice involves human historians, it also includes those 'things' engaged in the production of knowledge too. The normative 'who' includes historians working in material sites like public archives. A focus on practices in MH, however, appreciates histories "learned in a multitude of places, and in a variety of ways" (Kalela, 2012, p. 75) including documentaries, commentaries, and visual art. Magnússon's (2015) practice of including ego-documents is a prime example. Ego-documents are socio-materials (e.g., memoirs, diaries, and travel documentation) that play a part in the history-making process, working with the historian to produce knowledge of the past. Thus, actors and actants can participate in this practice and, thus, are part of the *who*

Where MH is practiced concerns research scale. Like historians, MH is circumscribed in small units of analysis on a reduced scale (Paul, 2018). Ginzburg (2005, p. 665) stresses: "By knowing less, by narrowing the scope of our inquiry, we hope to understand more." Most historians refine MH as a practice by concentrating their efforts on historicizing phenomena using a tightly bound research frame (although the more common term is 'focal'). Drawing from statistics – admittedly an unlikely but fitting example here – to demonstrate what this looks like: microhistory-as-practice occurs at the local level⁷. Like statisticians do when they draw a sample from their sampling frame, Lara Putnam (2006) observed this strikingly similarity of

⁷ Although there are some, including Magnússon – a leading authority in postmodern microhistory – who, instead, prefer the term 'minor' to make the point that the smallest unit in society is the individual him/herself and should thus be viewed separately than a local (e.g., groups).

microhistorians who also work to reduce their scope of inquiry (in this case, history) by bringing into focus a fragment or two of the past that can cohere to help produce a story. An example of this process can be found in a MH study of a goldsmith-banker, Sir Francis Child, during the 1690s. Here Quinn (2001) uses the smallest unit possible – an individual (Child) and his lending portfolio as a jeweler to King William – to better understand the relationship between public and private finance during England’s Financial Revolution. Throughout the article, Quinn draws exclusively on fragments like financial ledgers from the Royal Bank of Scotland and Child’s personal notes that help sketch out his role in shaping fiscal policy of the English monarchy. As the profile of Child is weaved throughout the historical account, especially using his lending decisions over 25 years, the point of the MH practice is bringing into new light the “English story... of irony that political upheaval can both foster and stifle economic growth” (Quinn, 2001, p. 613) more than anything else. Microhistory-as-practice is thus found in ‘in-between spaces’ (e.g., a single event, family or person) that “open up between the institutions themselves and the people connected with them” (Magnússon & Ólafsson, 2017, p. 9) to give clues toward solving their historical problems.

How might microhistory-as-practice be practiced begins with a commitment to recovering forgotten voices and stories of individuals from historical narratives. Unlike modern history, this practice does not take place in fact-finding expeditions. With MH, we attend to “competing histories, critiquing dominant narratives, and offering alternative understandings of the past” (Hosek, 2019, p. 45). This is practiced by historians who cast phenomena as “problems of historical knowledge” that invites “readers to join interpretation’s labor” (Cohen, 2017, p. 55).

It is essentially spotting and “filling the gaps” (Shahbazi, 2019, p. 567) in history⁸; revisiting an account of the past to disturb the assumed narrative by exploring what more could be said or might have been previously glossed over. In essence, it goes beyond what happened and moves closer to process questions about people who might have otherwise been neglected by the ‘forces of history’ (i.e., macrohistory) (Andrade, 2010). For this dissertation, aspects of MH practice will be illustrated by focusing on the socio politics of Jean Chrétien to reveal the lacking historicity of AC’s transformation as a unified, pan-Canadian brand.

4.2.4 Microhistory-in-geographies

MH does not represent a cohesive collective of scholarship. Rather, it is a collection of ideas about approaching historical research with scale in mind. Regardless of who tells the story, MH is routinely placed as a development out of Italian historiography beginning in the 1970s with roots in critical theory and cultural anthropology “with its emphasis on small-scale field research” including detailed (thick) descriptions of contextualized behaviour (Hosek, 2019, p. 45). The earliest iteration of MH began with Italian historians who wished for “analysis, at extremely close range, of highly circumscribed phenomena – a village, community, a group of families, even an individual person” (Magnússon & Sziójártó, 2013, p. 16) but since then, the work of historians located in different places have refined it to their own liking. Two geographies stand out in leading the way of fleshing it out: Italy (microhistoria) and Iceland (postmodern-esque MH). I will discuss both to round out my explanation of MH and set them up as opposing philosophies whose constituent parts, in the next section, will be discussed as insights to AMH.

⁸ At different points in literature the argument is made that microhistory shares striking similarities of methodological practice with anthropology, most notably in the way that they “unravel hidden connections between aspects of a social and cultural system that would be invisible to a macro analysis” (Trivellato, 2011, p. 17).

It has long been believed MH began in Italian historiography – a group at odds with the macro-historical methods of the *Annales* – to reimagine a practice that would elucidate historical phenomena at a level of small groups where society is held together (Muir, 1991). In the way that postmodernism eschews rules, microhistoria similarly sought to insert an eclectic tone to ‘doing history’ by encouraging historians to focus on individuals through isolating small details in order to answer a ‘great historical question’ (Ginzburg, 2000). Perhaps “the most popular and widely read work of microhistory” (Tristano, 1996, p. 26) of this ilk is Carlo Ginzburg’s (1976) *The Cheese and the Worms*. Ginzburg’s work is a perfect example of how microhistoria studies ‘history from below;’ his MH focused on the life of a peasant Italian miller, Menocchio, whose outspoken religious beliefs during the Roman Inquisition stigmatized him as a heretic. More important than the plot, Ginzburg demonstrates through an intimate narrative focused on Menocchio’s trial that MH is derived from a sense of belonging and connectedness to both the person and details of the past. Brewer (2010, p. 89) remarks that this close-up of history pulls the writer and reader into a process of “sympathy and understanding – a measure of identification which can range from the quite abstract to the deeply emotive – as essential to historical knowledge and insight.”

In addition to Italian microhistoria and the national ‘schools’ (e.g., Italian, French, and German) that are informed by it, there also exists an English-language collective. Szijártó in *What is Microhistory?* (Magnússon & Szijártó, 2013) makes note of MH practiced in English and refers to those who do as the ‘Anglo-Saxon perspective.’ This collective is usually associated with Iceland through a small independent research institute known as the Center for Microhistorical Research at the Reykjavik Academy. Like the other schools of MH, the Anglo-Saxon collective is a network led by a prominent historian. Sigurður Gylfi Magnússon, an

Icelandic historian, has been at the fore of this style of MH and has, with a small group of colleagues (Magnússon & Ólafsson, 2017; Mímisson & Magnússon, 2014), contributed to its development. For Magnússon (2003), MH is neither theory nor methodology. His hypothesis is that the word ‘ideology’ is more fitting because it blends three principal factors of knowledge production: research, narrative, and method. To refer to it as any one of these three separately is to mistakenly infer “the historian’s perspective and interpretation are merely technical factors, of no greater importance than the system of annotation” (Magnússon & Szijártó, 2013, p. 159). The Anglo-Saxon approach is thus an ideology in the social history that dialogues ideas of postmodernism vis-à-vis the way it attempts to unveil subjectivities of the individual in history. Later in this chapter, I will show how postmodernism is engaged in the Icelandic school. Suffice it to say, Magnússon offers Anglo-Saxon microhistorical analysis inwardly; focusing the small unit of study for detailed accounts that pluralize knowledge of the past. If you consider Magnússon’s disdain for metanarratives with the postmodernist preoccupation with focusing on local contexts or the singular event to discredit the grand narrative, you begin to see a likely kinship between these theoretical perspectives.

Keeping in mind the way microhistoria is developed and similarly refined by the Italian historiography scene is different than the Anglo-Saxon perspective, how MH is used as a historiography follows either a modern or postmodern posture. The next step in exploring MH, especially how it is used to help build AMH in this dissertation, is to flesh out its facets more clearly. The remaining two sections draw out insights that inform the historian’s work from either approach.

4.4 Modern Microhistory

The facets of MH are not located in any one work but over a series of contributions mostly inspired by Ginzburg and his contemporary, Giovanni Levi. Together, they form the standard for modernist MH. They argue that first and foremost, MH is best thought of as ‘the method of clues’ (Ginzburg, 1993; Levi, 1991). The method of clues was Ginzburg’s conceptualization of MH in an essay that compared common features of MH with the fictional private detective Sherlock Holmes. Both share a knack for ‘getting to the bottom’ of cases that are considered suspect. For MH, they are individuals or events with little perceived ‘theoretical value’ that are ignored by mainstream history. Just as detectives start their investigation “from something that does not quite fit, something odd that needs to be explained” (Peltonen, 2014, p. 106), MH views detail of a peculiar event or historical phenomenon as a sign of a larger yet, hidden structure.

This method of clues guiding MH is the development by diversely located social and cultural historiographers. Thus, there is no one best way to capture modernist MH but Levi’s (1991) sketch of its facets serve as a great place to start. Herein are seven key insights that inform the modernist character of MH method: (a) reduction of scale to study historical phenomena; (b) unsettling rationality in history; (c) small clues in historical sources; (d) role of the particular in empirical material; (e) constructivist narrative as a writing style; (f) treatment of context; (g) realist representation of text. From these, I offer preliminary thoughts about potential insights that can inform AMH later.

4.4.1 Reduction of scale to study historical phenomena

At its most basic level, MH is grounded in the idea that to see the bigger picture of history the historian must first reduce his/her scale of observation. This is evident in the

etymology of the term MH (the prefix ‘micro’ separates it from other history work suggesting that its defining facet is its size on a small scale). MH supposes historical phenomena are related to its subject matter: historians approaching history from ‘the bottom up’ rather than deterministic history that is observed from the top-down (Lamoreaux, 2006). This assumption is among the few unifying characteristics among MH ‘schools.’

The concept of scale, and with it, micro and macro consequences, originates from methodological ideas about sociology research during the 1960s (Peltonen, 2014) and the emphasis on a micro-level view vis-à-vis ethnomethodology and symbolic interactionism (Roberts, 2006). Ginzburg and Poni (1991) likened the issue of scale similarly to Geertz’s (1973) ‘thick description,’ specifically, the idea that research is conducted finitely rather than on a grand scale. Instead of starting with a series of observations to induce a grand theory of explanatory value, MH starts from a small scale with signs that the historian attempts to order sense into an intelligible structure (Levi, 1991) we call ‘narrative.’ This treatment of scale is kaleidoscopic; history as comprised of a complex mix of social interaction that, when aggregated, enables us to see a much bigger picture: “A small incident, a peripheral and obscure clue that the microhistorian starts to follow is not small as such but only relative to something bigger or longer” (Peltonen, 2014, p. 114). These engagements provide an opening to MH’s attempt at craft for historians to expose individuals hidden in structures through the ample traces of life normally kept outside the narrative.

4.4.2 Unsettling rationality in history

Early MH used interpretive anthropology to illustrate social performativity at the micro-level. The work of Geertz is relied upon extensively and perhaps to a fault. Handelman (2005) remarks that the ‘thickness of scope’ that MH uses to illustrate detail in studies of micro social

life is more semantic than anything. It would seem then that MH differs from Geertz on how human rationality is dealt with.

As interpretive anthropology seeks to envision probable meaning of actions (Fischer, 1977; Geertz, 1983) the reduction of its rationalist character is one of hierarchical thinking. That is, interpreted events are fashioned scientifically eloquent by drawing on the density of facts that render a history of some culture absent of in-depth social analysis (Levi, 1991). What is missed in the process is a close reading of actions, social structures, and detailing relationships between humans. To microhistorians, symbolic structures produce fragmented, multiple representations that then become the focus of study (Levi, 1991) as opposed to anthropology's assumption of human rationality within specific, cultural and contextual situations. MH unsettles rationality away from intense studies of cultural history and toward focus of a micro approach that "interpret[s] experience on the level of experience" (Martin, 1997, p. 14).

4.4.3 Small clues in historical sources

Like most modern history, MH places importance on primary sources and interpretation. Historians of this ilk are trained in source criticism – a skill rooted in a scientific paradigm so to get the facts 'straight' of verifiable and 'true' history (McNeill, 1986). Much of mainstream historiography elucidates phenomena using primary sources and, for the most part, so too is it of MH. Ginzburg's (1989) notion of small 'clues' provides an opening for MH to focus its efforts on scale rather than wholesale truth. He points out that the contemporary focus on signs (Thibault, 2013) does not easily lend itself to the historian's craft arranging facts into a plausible narrative. Concern about lacking engagement with evidence in historical research led Ginzburg to style 'clues' in MH within an 'evidential paradigm' "which had at its heart the reading of seemingly insignificant signs and clues in the construction of narratives about the otherwise

unobservable” (Crossland, 2009, p. 71). This is the subtext of primary sources that contain details often missed in the historian’s craft of narrating the past. What MH attempts is a recalibration of the importance to ground historical analysis using empirical traces (clues) that can be pieced together as some narrative of what happened. AMH will follow a similar pattern in stressing clues by writing up history through a modern historiography that privileges the empirical rather than the theoretical (Durepos & Mills, 2012a). While subtexts are read closely, they must not be accepted at face value. AMH attempts to follow traces that assemble the construction of small clues by inserting ANT method to distill power relations between trace and narrative (knowledge of the past).

4.4.4 Role of the particular in empirical material

There is a persistent friction between those who practice micro and/or macro-analysis in historical studies. De Vito (2019) points out that the crux of this struggle is the disagreement with how generalization should be regarded in historical studies. These debates have created a dichotomy of epistemology. On one side, Italian microhistorians are keen to “search for answers to large questions in small places” (Shifflet, 1995 quoted in Magnússon & Szijártó, 2013, p. 5) and believe generalization can be drawn from, and is implicit in, far-reaching case study-like investigations. On the other side, the ‘global turn’ of historical writing – also referred to as ‘macro-history’ (Trivellato, 2011) – values the collapse of the particular for grand narratives that are revealed by the scientific aspirations of history as a discipline. For microhistoria, then, epistemology is really a question about scale. Where mainstream historiography vis-à-vis the Annales school focuses a high-level accounting of historical phenomena, MH strives less on ordinary, everyday people and more so attracts the interest of historians fascinated by idiosyncratic figures so “to test the validity of macro-scale explanatory paradigms” (Trivellato,

2011, p. 4). The role of the particular (historical phenomenon) is always at the forefront. Take the biography of a 17th century exorcist in Levi's (1985) work that demonstrates the connection between land prices in Piedmont, Italy's most northern region bordering France and Switzerland, and political actors. It was found that the logic of supply and demand in northern Italy was obfuscated by the effects of familial relations, social stratification, and geography. The particular – the life history of an exorcist – helped uncover the socio-political webs that affected early modern land value rather than normative explanations of supply and demand economics. The role of the particular is akin to an AMH approach but with a caveat. Unlike the way scale has been used to revisit commonplace notions from European markets (Levi, 1985) to English private finance (Quinn, 2001) and everything in between, AMH relies on actor-networks to bring power back into focus of historical narratives through an analysis of the individual. In this way MH lends itself to AH in demonstrating the importance of reconstructing networks of relations (Trivellato, 2015) to understand how power is distributed and thus, history enacted. I unpack this rendition of MH – Magnússon's postmodern flare – in the section that follows.

4.4.5 Constructivist narrative as a writing style

Extant MH scholarship has been more interested in exploring historical evidence contained within narrative than on text itself. MH is about *what* is communicated of the historical phenomenon itself which “may or may not have wider [research] repercussions” (Burke, 2008, p. 265). Constructivist narrative in MH it about *how* a historian ‘does history’ by narrating it (Ginzburg, 1993). Supporting this move of narrative as a style is Lawrence Stone's (1979, p. 3-4) ‘revival of narrative’ which implied the importance of MH is not asking big questions of ‘why’ but on a small descriptive arrangement dealing with the “particular and specific rather than the collective and statistical.” Undeniably, facts and history are important. For example, the date of

Canadian confederation is unimportant. However, acknowledging how bringing together this sense of nationhood on a particular date in the past might serve as a powerful socio-historic-political context that could help us locate stories of events, people, or communities that have been otherwise concealed. MH thus treats facts as bits of detail in a story (narrative) as opposed to functionalist exposition where reception is a ‘true’ reporting of monocausal explanations (Szijártó, 2002). In this way AMH is interested in the representation of history as narrative specifically through the historian’s attention to the small details that form in actor-networks and punctuate as a story.

4.4.6 Treatment of context

MH draws on clues (e.g., traces) to appreciate the construction of knowledge of the past. This begins with the particular and then moves to building context around a history. Modern MH uses the Durkheimian model of contextualization (i.e., focusing on context to explain social behaviour) (Richman, 2002). To microhistorians, concentration on contradictions, fragmentation, and plurality of viewpoints accentuates how context is an outcome of historiography “in which an apparently anomalous or insignificant fact assumes meaning when the hidden incoherences of an apparently unified social system are revealed” (Levi, 1991, p. 107). By reducing the unit of scale, explanations of context and how it may (or may not) cohere become part of the historian’s analytical toolkit. What makes this research strategy rich in MH is how the reduction of scale renders contradictions of meaning more visible than normative historical methods.

AMH intends to build on the idea that context is needful in producing a narrative (McLaren & Durepos, 2021) in small units of study by explaining how it is “created through world-building activities of actor-networks” (Durepos, Mills, & McLaren, 2020, p. 287).

Whereas MH sees context as a frame of reference, AMH will draw on amodernism to view it as a relational process involving actor-networks that negotiate past as history.

4.4.7 Realist representation of text

Levi (2012, p. 122) stressed “methodology and discussion of the cognitive dimension of the historical research” is at the core of MH. As it was conceptualized by Italian historians, MH is a method sympathetic to historical narrative ‘from the bottom up.’ This means studying the lives and events of individuals is meant to be analogous to constructing historical narrative. It does not mean MH is not motivated by generalization though; indeed, it resolves that history is ‘found’ in small places and spaces but that the historian must not have a singular focus on answering historical questions using generalizable methods. Notice here a historians’ ‘finding’ (i.e., discovery) assumes historical phenomena exists outside our mental appreciation of them. In other words, history is seen through the prism of realism.

The method of MH is a careful balancing act to find “more realistic and less mechanistic representations” while also “broadening the field of indeterminacy without necessarily rejecting formalized elaborations” (Levi, 1991, p. 109). Extending AH’s amodernist assumptions of the nature of historical reality, AMH will seek to ground interpretation as multiple rather than singular or even plural in hopes of clarifying MH caught in realism.

4.4.8 Potential microhistory insights in AMH

The promise of modern MH is that it can be used in just about any way the historian sees fit. For the most part, it is understood to conduct and analyze historical research on a micro-level. I am drawn to this approach for several reasons, especially the way it emphasizes the individual in history and shares common ground with AH in the role empirical traces play in historical

scholarship. Where I see MH contributing to AHM is in the four discussion points that follow: (a) ontological status (and significance) of the individual; (b) revisiting historical reductionism; (c) critique of linear history storytelling; (d) context as world-building activities of actor-networks.

4.4.8.1 Ontological status (and significance) of the individual

In MH, the reduction of scale allows micro-analysis to focus on the historical situatedness of people. MH appreciates the individual in historical analyses like few other approaches. Microhistories of individuals have become quite popular in MH studies. They include research that forms an interesting array of people in history: featuring character studies of Elias of Babylon (Ghobrial, 2014), Pope John Paul II (Ginzburg, 2001), and Elka Björnsdóttir – a working-class woman from Reykjavík who lived during a critical time in the city’s development (Magnússon, 2011). What these do not address, however, is the constitution of personhood. Extant MH work assumes an essentialist perspective that views the individual existing in a material world separate from subjectivity. It appears that the individual is understood as belonging to a rational order. Notice here how very little is made clear about what relations might act to produce the individual as a subject. Instead, modernist MH understands the individual as an object that can be studied using historical method so that we might know more about historical social-structure and not the person him/herself.

The missing piece is the analytical value of an individual in history and how he/she may be constituted. We, as persons, not only have human bodies that constitute our personhood but things like our ideas and sense of identity also play a part. MH currently misses the mark in understanding the ontological status of the individual. This is an important oversight given the

emphasis on the individual in MH especially their agency. Latour's (1993) notion of ontological amodernism may lend the needed support in considering how concrete material practices produce the individual and not just what can be found in sources. For example, using the TCA case, I explore how Jean Chrétien – the individual – materially existed as a person in the history of AC may have emerged from the practices of being a masterful politician. Chrétien-politician unfolds by performing political things: running to be Member of Parliament for Saint-Maurice; introducing private member's bills; jockeying for the attention of Prime Minister Lester Pearson, and so on. MH brings the individual to light and AH dives into the constitution of his/her subjectivities.

4.4.8.2 Revisiting historical reductionism

MH claims to be motivated by a concern with looking for answers to “great historical questions” (Magnússon & Szijártó, 2013, p. 5) when studying small units. These ‘great’ questions have consequences for research; namely, that there are mysteries of great historical significance out there demanding intense, micro-level investigation. As well, questions of historical importance appear to link MH with structure-oriented social history. It reveals a philosophical commitment to mainstream historiography rather than the promise by Ginzburg and Poni (1979) to provide an alternative to ‘top-down’ research. This logic would seem, then, that what is of focus in MH must have some connection (i.e., relevance) on a scale far significant than history for history's sake. That is, a reductionism of ‘total history’ but “this time built from the ground up” (Brewer, 2010, p. 8).

Magnússon (2003) disagreed with this direction of MH and developed the idea of ‘singularization of history’ which rejects grand narratives by looking inward to the subject, studying all aspects in close detail to tease out nuances of historical phenomena. As he states:

“the idea is that the focus will always be fixed on the matter in hand and on that alone”

(Magnússon & Szióártó, 2013, p. 122). The singularization of history, therefore, is based on performing MH that is more concerned with micro-aspects of phenomena for the scholarly value it renders than how it might create a macro-link to total history. This points to an opportunity to dialogue AH’s premise of favoring the empirical. By embracing empirical knowledge, AMH can return MH’s focus on disturbing histories that previously essentialized people, processes, or even events themselves rather than study the past for a ‘total history.’

4.4.8.3 Critique of linear history storytelling

MH treats history as a progression between time and place. What is meant here is the way microhistorians orient their story to be reflective of progressive explanation of history. This views history as something that goes through a series of transformations that progress incrementally (Liter, 1994). Take Menocchio’s life presented in *The Cheese and The Worms*. Ginzburg (1976) writes in an uninterrupted chain of events: (1) beginning from his peasant life situation in Montreale; (2) through to developing enough wherewithal to learn how to read; (3) and then standing by his non-conformist religious beliefs that eventually; (4) lead to him being burnt at the stake during the Roman Inquisition. At each successive point, Menocchio’s story sees him presented chronologically. However, we know this is not how most stories naturally develop: at what time does the plot thicken, narrative rupture, or the unexpected happen? White (1982) lets us know that what we tend to see in retrospect is history in stories that have been shaped by politics of interpretation.

MH squeezes out plot twists in storytelling by neglecting to see the role politics play in the manufacture of knowledge. Instead, we see MH presented in neatly packaged stories. Somewhere along the way there needs to be a break from this form of progressive storytelling

long enough to see the effect of how socio-political relations fold traces and fragments into history. AH's propensity to see knowledge of the past in actor-networks may allow MH to contend for storytelling that is reflective of multiple, not linear, histories.

4.4.8.4 Context as world-building activities of actor-networks

Historians often rely on their contextualization of the past to help explain history. In fact, the practice of context is among the more commonly used methodological tools in a historian's repertoire (Levstik & Barton, 2018). Historians from all metahistorical perspectives have grappled with the treatment of context in their work. MH is among the few exceptions; it not only identifies context as a facet but claims it as central to performing micro-analysis.

The way context is explained in MH is that it is used to connect phenomena to the broader historical milieu (Magnússon & Sziártó, 2013). In this way, MH practices context in strikingly similar ways as modernist historiography. For example, modernist historians assume that the 'true' meaning of any primary source can be found in its context, requiring him/her to immerse themselves in the past context to yield a more accurate understanding (Durepos, Mills, & McLaren, 2020). James Shapiro's (2005) MH of William Shakespeare offers an exemplary demonstration. In *A Year in the Life of William Shakespeare*, Shapiro obsesses over the Elizabethan era and with it, the unusual period of peace within the social, cultural, and religious environments in England, to understand how this 'golden age' of colonial triumph made it possible for the performing arts scene in London to flourish. By practicing this modern treatment of context, Shapiro (2005) places Shakespeare's tragedy, *Hamlet*, into the year of its first draft, 1599, all so that he could understand the significance of the play in English theater.

What is missing from MH's practice of context is how it is performed in actor-networks. Context, understood in this way, is what is "created through the world-building activities of

actor-networks” (Durepos, Mills, & McLaren, 2020, p. 287). Actors create context through how and what they negotiate as their past; most notably through the temporary formations of ‘what happened in the past’ and ‘why.’ These negotiations within actor-networks give us context that is not used as a method to explain but what needs to be explained. MH may thus stand to benefit from engaging context through following the small movements between and among actor-networks that produce history.

4.5 Postmodern Microhistory

Modern MH sees historiography as a focus on small parts that represent a larger whole. Peltonen (2001, p. 350) describes the motivation of modernist microhistorians as trying to “discover big things with their microscopes.” They attempt a close-up program of study on variations from the normal – what we expect are general patterns of behaviour and structure – to ‘fill the gap’ of larger patterns that are otherwise hidden from view (Brown, 2003). This seems to be the point where most MH ends. By focusing on conclusions (that are tenuous at best) to make generalizable statements about history, it would appear microhistorians of this ilk have lost sight of tight microhistorical analysis. Magnússon and Szijártó (2013) blame a shift in MH from being the subject of research to now helping contextualize history evidenced by the way it has been utilized in several fields (e.g., economic history, accounting, English) without further methodological refinement (Gebhardt, 2017). As a result, little additional theoretical lifting by those who claim to ‘do MH’ has taken place since the mid-2010s because the same modernist MH approach is performed again and again.

From reading around the limits of MH I have come to appreciate the equivocality from those who keep even a half-open mind to it. The most pointed of these criticisms is from Gregory (1999, p. 108) who wrote:

Since its beginnings in the 1970s, microhistory has been dogged by questions about how representative or typical are the cases it investigates... To be consistent with their own empiricism, systematic microhistorians must recognize the restricted character of their work. One could simply eschew a wider context altogether, but this would contradict the desire to investigate broader processes 'on the ground.' If a particular village is to tell us about something more than itself and systematic microhistorians certainly intend that it do so then one must pre-suppose, know, or expect something about larger patterns.

Even those who have dabbled in MH and use it as a historiography seem to point out the smorgasbord of alternative method, historical style, and empiricist configuration committed to taking historians in circles with no end in sight. Until the development of the Anglo-Saxon perspective, playing it safe in MH was the norm. I believe this, at least in part, has contributed to a significant rethink of MH that Sigurður Magnússon called for.

At about the same time postmodernism presented a radical reassessment of theory from within the academic world (Fournier & Grey, 2000), social history began opening to radical ideas too, including Keith Jenkins, Hayden White, and Alun Munslow's arguments about the constitution of history. Magnússon, an Icelandic scholar, seeing historiography open up to postmodernism, began to grow impatient with the structuralist character of mainstream social history. His problem laid with the general attitude within the discipline that favoured global understanding of the social which, in the process, overlooks people. Magnússon (2003, p. 719) recounts his philosophical break with the mainstream as being concerned with the production of metanarratives and the lack of motivation among historians

to look beyond the metanarratives, since they impose such strong limitations on all possibilities to understand the past as a forum for knowledge... each and every one of us need only to look inside himself or herself to see that life is characterized by endless

contradictions and arbitrary accidents. Such things cannot be accounted for within the frame of reference provided by metanarratives.

Magnússon's revision of MH represents the most distinct break with other microhistorical approaches yet. His visibility among those who are familiar with his work is mainly to do with repurposing MH practice with postmodernist ideas about history and method. Magnússon's postmodern-esque iteration of MH can be found in his understanding of it as an ideology⁹ and the way it is practiced. I offer five insights from postmodern MH and briefly discuss the way I see them as tenable to AMH fusion: (a) normal exceptions of individual units; (b) blurring distinction between historian and narrative; (c) ideological nature of historical sources; (d) centering the individual in history; (e) voice.

4.5.1 Normal exceptions of individual unit(s)

MH work tends to focus on the importance of narrowing the focal point of analysis down to small units (e.g., an individual, event or small community). What the historian chooses to focus on is a matter of their own scholarly interest. Engaging in this approach empowers the historian to gather a sense of ordinary people who are perceived to stand out from 'the crowd' in history and how studying the traces of the individual may demonstrate their significance in historical debate. This process is not focused on romanticizing exceptions but, instead, on those whose conduct is perceived out of lockstep with traces in the norm. Of course, those who stand out – normal exceptions – are generally understood as such based on the sensibilities of those who have power. These include the historian him/herself but also the narrative, trace, or context as well. The *normal exceptions* take into account the microhistorian's assessment of the small

⁹ Magnússon stresses that microhistory is an ideology of scholarly research as opposed to a method because "methodology refers only to technical aspects of how the subject is handled" (Magnússon & Szijártó, 2013, p. 159). Method infers the historian's perspective and interpretation are merely technical factors; Magnússon wishes for microhistorians to centre these in their craft.

unit and why it is worth singling out by studying the relationship between the text and the people involved to see stories of the past emerge (Magnússon & Sziujártó, 2013). Often critics of MH fail to move beyond their questions of how ‘representative’ small units are to appropriate an acceptable historical account. They do not see that MH approaches the structure of history in an ‘evidential paradigm’ that reads traces ‘closely’ and ‘into’ the text to deconstruct the conduct, thinking, or action of the historical individual. Whilst conventional history relies only on empiricism to construct the historical account, AMH will take a closer look at normal exceptions of individual units, involving historian’s reflexivity as well as his/her interpretation of the individual traced in text to forge a plausible story.

4.5.2 Blurring distinction between historian and narrative

In addition to the emphasis MH places on focusing on minutiae, Magnússon’s postmodern turn critiques the false dichotomy between scholar-historian typified as concern with narrative and analysis to scholarly material, respectively. In its veiled realism, MH writing is the outcome of historians’ concern for making sure the sources ‘speak for themselves’ (Froeyman, 2017). Not only does a postmodern MH draw its strength from within its “capacity to break with metanarratives” (Magnússon & Sziujártó, 2013, p. 10), it embraces the idea that narrative and analysis should be brought together instead of kept separate or nested in some grand narrative. It relies on constructing a historical account through attention to language (Jenkins, 1991; Munslow, 1997) rather than recreating some ‘reality’ of the past (Barnes, 1998). This means microhistorical research blends postmodern historiography by encouraging the narrator (i.e., historian) to become part of the study itself; both the narrative as well as the process it follows. The mechanics of writing-up history become part of the narrative as does he/she who reads it participates in the construction of historical knowledge: “the microhistorian becomes the narrator

in his/her own study... focus[ing] not only on telling the story of the historical events, but also on analysis of individual aspects of them, and exposition of the form and origins of the extant source” (Magnússon & Sziártó, 2013, p. 151).

AMH attempts to follow a similar logic. Narrative is as much about telling a story about *how* the story becomes narrative as it is about *whose* story is told. In this form, narrative takes on a rich meaning as the researcher slows down the process of ‘doing history’ by favouring “imaginative contemplation of phenomena concerned with people’s everyday lives” over “glib and shallow statements” (Magnússon & Sziártó, 2013, p. 151) as is so often captured in mainstream historiographical means.

4.5.3 Ideological nature of historical sources

Just as AH premises the empirical rather than the theoretical when it comes to (re)assembling traces of the socio-past, MH is similarly driven by sources. Indeed, MH relies on a variety of diverse sources (e.g., diary, correspondence, autobiography, statistical records) to paint a plausible picture of the past. Both these analytics also require an exegesis (Munslow, 1997) – that is, a critical interpretation of text to include historical and cultural situation of the author, text, and intended audience – to offer critical knowledge of the past. Where MH differs is in how close it resembles modern source criticism. The microhistorian sifts through historical demography data to find outliers – assumably those who are normal exception to the official record. Then each source is critiqued for its socio-politics (e.g., creation of records carried out with some objective in mind) before it is included in analysis. A missing link, at least in forming an AMH approach, remains between sources and narrative: it is not so much important as what conventional source is consulted but that the process of knowledge gathering – history – is seen

as ideologically motivated. MH is the production of political ordering of sources just as any other method of research. Magnússon (2015a) problematizes the way some using MH have assumed sources as ‘neutral’ and argues for transparency using ego-documents and biographical writing. AMH goes a step further by suggesting even these fall short unless the historian is reflexive, with a clear acknowledgement that narrative (history) “is always history for the ideological sake of someone or something” (Durepos, Shaffner, & Taylor, 2021, p. 454). This will be taken up in more detail later in premising the voice and traces of the past in AMH.

4.5.4 Centering the individual in history

Long before Nord and Fox (1996) pointed out the individual in MOS had disappeared from analysis, MH had been offered as a means to refocus ordinary people back into historical research (Iggers, 2005). This has been an important point in advancing MH as a method, especially held in contrast to more conventional methods including macro-history that use historical statistics to give shape to the past. Studies about people – absent of their social status (e.g., recognized or unknown) – comprise the vast majority of microhistorical work. While the individual has been the focus in MH analysis, Magnússon’s postmodern MH stresses agency is crucial to analysis because “they [people] are regarded as active individuals, conscious actors” (Magnússon & Szijsártó, 2013, p. 5).

Reorienting microhistorical research to centre the individual in history research suggests an exploration of not just the social framework the individual had acted upon but emphasis on how the historian studies the way people “understood their situation and defined their actions” (Kalela, 1999, p. 153). The historian’s role is one of exploration (of diverse traces, sources, and discourses), involving the individual as the subject of research so that a “plausible and fair description” (Kalela, 1999, p. 153) in AMH is rendered clearly. The point being is that people

should be detailed in MH – not because of their historical significance but how, through detailing their own actions, they might shape our ideas about history.

4.5.5 Voice

The final insight of postmodern MH is voice. Similar to its storytelling analytic, MH focuses narrative on the individual. A well-developed MH details a small unit of analysis supported by traces that ‘speak for themselves’ as a story. This means that it is not so important *who* is studied – although MH does appeal as an analytic for people (especially individuals) who are concealed by the discourse of history – but *how* the actor is characterized. By using small units, the ‘how’ is answered by making historical analysis intimate through premising the voice of the actors themselves. This voice should appear central in the analysis. AMH is not a method of explanation but should be seen as an extension of ANT at a granular level that believes “the actors’ objection to their social explanations offer the best proof that those explanations are right” (Latour, 2005, p. 9). In other words, actors can speak for themselves and AMH hopes to allow for this process.

Voice also means the emplotment of the historian him/herself into narrative. A weakness of MH is that it attempts to include the historian within the story but falls short of research reflexivity. What I mean is voice is the way the historian resists the temptation of conventional history (i.e., contextualizing their findings). Reflexive voice in MH should recognize that, as an author, there is only one voice but the reader is “likely to ‘hear’ many voices in the narrative” (Magnússon & Szijártó, 2013, p. 158). AMH attempts to recover the lost world of small units to grand narratives by telling the story of people using their own voice – both traces and the historian – in the research process.

4.5.6 Potential postmodern microhistory insights in AMH

The Anglo-Saxon perspective, influenced by Magnússon and his postmodernist redress, brought MH into a research tradition known for its experiments with writing style, analytical value of people, and research reflexivity emphasis (Prasad, 2005). However, even these well-intentioned insights fall short on their promise to “approach the perspective of the individual as closely as possible” (Magnússon & Szijártó, 2013, p. 137) through their neglect of relationalism. This led me to ponder the constitution of the individual in research. For example, who is Jean Chrétien and how does his relations bear on the history of TCA? I believe these questions give an impression of the AH potential in MH and how they might combine, especially for seeing the past as a series of configurations that ultimately produce the individual-in-history. To see this more clearly, I lay out the following three insights that present an opportunity to dialogue the Anglo-Saxon postmodern MH perspective with AH:

4.5.6.1 A singularization of history by assembling traces

Central to postmodern MH is a concept Magnússon and colleagues at the Center for Microhistorical Research developed to encourage microhistorians to value their research about the individual. The idea is called ‘singularization of history’ and is described as an approach that “consists in investigating with great precision every fragment connected with the research material and bringing up for consideration all possible means of interpretation that bear directly upon it” (Mímisson & Magnússon, 2014, p. 137). It requires a closed-looped, single-sided analysis of empirical material. That is, a close study of not only the content of traces but how the traces create a tapestry for historians to investigate further “their creation, their context within the events they describe, the opportunities they present for analysis, and how they tie in with events that take place when they are used” (Magnússon, 2015, p. 87). Since we are attempting in

MH to bring out the individual in history making processes, it is important to point out how the scholar's choice of *how* he or she assembles these traces also plays a role in the shape the history eventually takes. As much as a thorough study of empirical materials can bring about a fulsome appreciation of the individual in full view, understanding that it is the historian's role of ordering the past that makes it plausible. Therefore, AH's assumption that historians, in addition to traces, participate in production of historical knowledge reinforces the idea that individuals themselves do not make history but the scholars who write it do.

4.5.6.2 The textual environment and history-making processes

If the singularization of history reminds us of the importance traces have on the history making process, then a close second would be 'the textual environment.' That is, the idea that historians closely examine traces in the greatest possible detail to gain insight into what influences help produce the individual and, in turn, shape our appreciation of how knowledge is produced locally (see Magnússon, 2015a, 2015b, 2017).

Historians in MH are expected to scrutinize the "formative influence on people in past times and the nature of the interplay between texts (narratives) and life (reality)" (Magnússon & Szijártó, 2013, p. 134). These 'formative influences' are typically the context that the historian will place around the individual. As previously discussed, AH sees context as being relationally produced through actor-networks. What I believe the textual environment does is help historian's see how formative contexts affect an individual's action(s) and thus, reveal knowledge about the decisions he or she has made. In turn, these texts can be treated as actants that contribute to the 'making' of individuals through their multiple relations. In AMH, I see the textual environment helping form our understanding of how key actors within the history of TCA made decisions and

acted upon them. For example, I suspect engaging the formative context of ‘nationalism’ (e.g., Prime Minister Lester Pearson’s domestic agenda including legislation to unify the bilingual ‘Air Canada’ brand across the country) served as an actor-network that, for (partisan) political reasons, Jean Chrétien eventually acted on which served a role in producing the airline and its past.

4.5.6.3 Tracing the ‘self’ through biography

It is difficult to avoid how MH has developed into an alternative method of writing (Kusch, 2011). Historical biography has emerged as a style in MH and is evidence by the way those in the Anglo-Saxon perspective write about protagonists in research. Magnússon practices this close writing style by taking readers through short stories about the life of individuals he studies. For example, he details a young love story between two Icelanders to gain insight into the emotional culture in nineteenth century Iceland (Magnússon, 2016). Normative historical approaches would gloss over these seeming ‘insignificant details’ but biographic narrative may lend itself to better understand the individual.

Over the last few decades cultural and social historians have used biography as a writing style (Banner, 2009). Biography in historical research is not limited to the academy either. Publishers are printing political biographies at breakneck speed because they understand how compelling this genre of storytelling history is to a wide audience.

I see the practice of biography in MH in how it takes some fragmentary knowledge of an individual and details aspects of it through ‘life writing’ (Renders & De Hann, 2014). This type of MH tends not to focus too much on tracing exhaustive, remote details (e.g., trajectory of a life from birth to death) but, true to MH’s practice of framing history in small units, biography aids the illustration of ‘self’ in a circumscribed period (Lepore, 2001). What postmodern MH misses

in the process is how traces that makeup biographies provide a potentially fruitful opportunity to study the individual, unleashing historians' ability to see the self as a puzzle (i.e., network) of fragmented relations. In AMH, the process of tracing the amodern self through biography should ask us how the politics of presenting the 'self' in fragments can help assemble our knowledge of the past.

4.6 Summary

This chapter provided a discussion of MH literature from three vantage points. First, I outlined what MH is and how some have treated it as a theory or practice of 'doing history' research. Second, I refined my sketch of MH more clearly by attending to the two main metahistorical perspectives in MH: modern and postmodern. There I drew out insights from each and illustrated their theoretical potential with AH engagement. Lastly, as I have tried to do in the previous chapters, I offered my thoughts on areas that I see ripe for synthesis among amodernism and AH in MH and laid out ways that this may be accomplished. With this complete, the stage is now set for taking the potential of all three literatures together in presenting the AMH approach.

Chapter 5: Towards an ANTi-Microhistory Approach

5.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I bring together insights from the amodern historiography, AH, and MH literatures from the three previous chapters and configure them as AMH. I contend throughout that AMH is a critical historiography that can be used to study the socio-past in finite detail using archival traces that build the network of an individual to help offer alternative histories of management and organization. To do this, I first offer some narrative around the development of AMH as a thought experiment in my study of organizational history. It is important to lay out how this iteration of AMH had come to be since a smattering of recent work in MOS has also attempted theoretical fusion between AH and MH. As I will point out, my research is the first to flesh it out as a method for ‘doing history’ with specific implications for researchers. Then I will take those potential insights from previous chapters and tie them together through an outline of AMH. I offer ten insights that attempt to detail how historians may action this approach.

5.2 Foregrounding AMH

Until this point in the dissertation I have dealt with amodernist history, AH, and MH as separate literatures. On their own they each represent innovative approaches to studying the past, yet as I hope to have pointed out in the previous chapters, they share some theoretical similarities as well as key differences. Each have been utilized a bit differently by scholars in their efforts to produce knowledge of the past. How I came to think about AMH as an approach in MOS arose from a place of frustration and curiosity. I will briefly discuss some background on the opportunities that helped shaped AMH.

First, I had been drawn to AH for its concern about history making as a political process of interest work among people, things, and ideas. I saw its use of ANT as a method to allow for a closer exploration of how history is produced through a combination of the people who write it (e.g., historians), those involved (e.g., actors), and the things (e.g., actants) that perform it as knowledge of the past. ANTi-Historians follow action in this combination of people, things, and ideas to sketch out the shape of history as a network based on how and where they interact. As a result, AH tends to focus on the relations that present atop the actor-network topography of history-making. Take, for example, my AH study that drew on the decision to hire (and later dismiss) a historian by the name of Wolfgang Langewiesche, whose corporate history of Pan American World Airways never materialized (Deal, Mills, Helms Mills, & Durepos, 2019).

Specifically, in the Langewiesche paper, we used ANT to follow the enrollment (and counter-enrollment) process of involving Langewiesche in the airline's history project. The resulting narrative focused on the backstory of bringing Pan Am's history through to publication. This eventually included writing several people into the account. I noticed that with the introduction of each new actor (or actant) within the narrative, it looked like Langewiesche kept getting pushed back and eventually onto the peripheral. I felt AH limited the focus on Langewiesche as a unit of analysis. The research was much more focused on the political process than on a potential outcome of said process: the counter-enrollment of Langewiesche. In other words, instead of taking a deep dive into his situatedness within the narrative and turning analysis inwardly on him, he remained somewhat an enigma to the airline's history. Unfortunately, AH was unable to centre analysis on him, favouring the politics surrounding his involvement on the history project instead. AH scratched the surface but I felt there was more to

the story left underneath the topography of the airline's actor-network where many actors and actants are hard at work performing history.

I walked away from the Langewiesche study frustrated by the prospect that more of his involvement could have been more closely examined. At about the same time, I had also been involved in research about war and peace in organizational memory. Specifically, I was engaged in a deep analysis of British Airways archival material. What I had found was not surprising: a lacking narrative of women involved in early British civil aviation. Far too often women are neglected in historical studies of business and organizations (Mills & Williams, 2021). What stood out to me was how women were routinely overlooked in similar studies of the histories of aviation. British Airways' past includes traces of women who staffed the airline but seldom are they remembered in research.

To remedy this, we considered those with limited voice – women – and sought to turn the spotlight on them empirically by giving space to what traces we had (Deal, Mills, & Helms Mills, 2018). Just a year prior, Mills (2017) openly pondered about the theoretical potential of some combination between AH and MH. I took a first attempt at combining them by introducing MH's notion of 'close reading' (Magnússon & Szijártó, 2013) to AH's portrayal of history in political processes. I used AH to build the relationship between the past and history in socio-political movements and elaborated on how a reading of localized texts paves the way to connect a study of miniscule proportions to the larger context of the historical past. In the article, we succeeded in giving space to these forgotten women in British Airways' past (e.g., Dorothy Young as one of the only female administrative assistants) but I felt limited in exploring the potential of MH in AH analysis. The focus felt more on various macro-level themes (e.g., gender, peace and conflict, and nationalism) that arose from mapping actor-networks than it

could have been on those specifically involved in the politics of a critical event within the airline's history (e.g., merger with Aircraft Transport & Travel). To me, the method of AH became snagged on meso-level analysis. This led me to accept that more could be done to smooth out AH's propensity to configure history as an outcome of relational processes with MH's level of analysis that narrows in on the actor(s) or actant(s) embedded within the network itself.

I took these two experiences – both the Langewiesche and British Airways studies – and made them fodder for my exploration of potential theoretical fusion; thus, AMH in this dissertation is a thought experiment. I am not alone. There have been a few others who have attempted a conceptualization of AMH in their own way.

5.3 Prior conceptualizations of AMH

My research is not the first to raise the potential of combining AH and MH, nor is it the first to attempt dialoguing MH in MOS (Decker, 2015). However, most of the extant work is admittedly preliminary and it has not been practiced in similar ways as I am proposing. Prior conceptualizations of AMH can be explained as the effect of a network of management and organizational scholars whose interests lie in historiography, philosophy of history, and alternative styles of historical writing (Booth & Rowlinson, 2006). My conceptualization in this dissertation, however, is unlike previous explorations. Before I detail the AMH approach that I have developed, it may be helpful to trace the antecedents of the extant research attempting dialogue between AH and MH to see how they differ. Four points are worth noting.

Tracing the origins of combining AH with MH will bring you back to Mills' (2017) paper in the *Workplace Review* where he provides a first look at potential links between the two

approaches. He suggests that “while they do have some distinct differences both can learn from each other” especially Magnússon’s notion of “the singularization of history in which actors are studied at the level of their particular contextual relationships free of metanarrative baggage” (Mills, 2017, p. 23). Mills invites scholars to continue this exploration; AMH in this dissertation builds on this call by illustrating where the two literatures may speak to each other but importantly, how, when fused together, it may be used.

The second point where early seedlings of AMH appears is in a professional development workshop entitled “Interrogating the Claims of MicroHistory: A Skeptical but Still (Mostly) Positive Overview” coordinated by Michael Keller at the annual Academy of Management conference in 2018. Specifically, Albert Mills and Milorad Novicevic attempted a link between AH and MH by raising how both share characteristics of what is called ‘evaluative history’ (Bondi, 2017). That is, how history is interpreted by historians and that interpretation in context of a debate is foregrounded in either approach. These two points will be addressed later in the AMH method.

A third attempt at AMH occurred with a collaboration between Milorad Novicevic and Albert Mills (2019) whose paper followed the relations of key actors from within the management history community to unpack recent debates about method. Their contribution is important to my work for two reasons. First, their research was the first to conceptualize the term AMH. Novicevic and Mills (2019) moved the conversation from exploring theoretical convergence to suggesting a name for uniting the literatures. Second, the paper offers the potential of autobiographical texts (Lepore, 2001) as ‘self-microhistories’ used to uncover alternative narratives of the past. In fashioning AMH, the use of self-microhistories as empirical material will be important; it reveals the politics of ‘authoring’ the past while simultaneously

recalibrates the importance of uncovering untold histories specific to an event, person, or context.

The final and most recent attempt to build AMH (at least at the time of writing this dissertation) came together as an historical case study of paternalist leadership by John Humphreys and Stephanie Pane Haden (2020). The article uses AMH as an ‘analytic framework’ powered by its technique of producing alternative histories. Humphreys and Pane Haden (2020, p. 5) argue that following an “ANTI-Microhistorical approach may be particularly constructive when trying to grasp the interactions between behaviors, context, identity, and embedded social processes.” In other words, studies at the micro-level appear to be better equipped at rendering history in a state of flux (e.g., process) and thus, ripe for surfacing alternative narratives than fixed in time in a singular account. This is particularly important to my development of AMH given how they approach their empirical analysis: (1) the focal point of their study is a single historical actor, Milton Hershey and (2) they draw an alternative history of Hershey from an intense reading of multiple sources.

My accounting of the process of how these prior conceptualizations have contributed to the idea of AMH, and the theoretical opportunities to improve upon them, helps bring together the context of AMH. Now we turn to how I propose fusing AH and MH together and unpack them as AMH method.

5.4 ANTi-Microhistory as a Methodological Approach

One of the key points of this dissertation is to continue the development of AMH as an approach of ‘doing history’ in MOS. To bring about how its facets may be further refined, I turn to how certain elements of MH may lend itself to flourish AH. The following ten insights

punctuate where I see both literatures speak to one another and how AMH may draw from both literatures to form a nascent historiographical approach (seven of these points help build the mechanics of AMH as a method and three describe how it may also inform a style of writing). These insights pick up from the points I problematized in the previous chapters as well as my read of the potential for them to combine. In AMH fashion, this discussion begins broadly and, with the addition of each subsequent point, becomes more granular in purpose. Table 2 provides an overview of the ten insights that inform AMH.

Table 2: Overview of Ten Insights Informing ANTi-Microhistory

ANTi-Microhistory

Method	Style of Writing
1. Intense focus on revealing socio-past as <i>minor knowledge</i> through networks.	8. Acknowledging interests of ANTi-Historian.
2. <i>Zooming in</i> on a single unit of analysis.	9. Tracing the individual through biographical writing.
3. The individual as the focal point of study.	10. Extensive detail but not exhaustive narrative.
4. The individual as an actor-network.	
5. Agency of the individual, things, and people.	
6. Folding traces, fragments, and close reading of text.	
7. Bringing historical phenomena into focus through context.	

5.4.1 Intense focus on revealing socio-past as 'minor knowledge' through networks

AH provides a methodology for the study of history by focusing on the composition of the *socio-past* through tracing the actor-networks that go into its production. Unlike most postmodern histories that set out to study the construction of history as subject (i.e., Foucault's archaeology and genealogy) or a modern analysis of social processes (i.e., Latour's focus on how 'the social' is really an arrangement and, thereby, performance of social relations in actor-networks), AH is interested in seeing how the past follows a political posture in actor-networks to be constructed as history. This works by regarding the past as a compilation of actors who, for political reasons, enroll other actors and form a network (alliance). These formations punctuate a certain sense of the past to the point where they begin to appear in unison (i.e., act as one). The ANTi-Historian sees this process between actors becoming networks and networks becoming actors as the 'site of oscillation' (Durepos & Mills, 2017). You may see from here then how AH attempts to capture the interest work of actors by tracing their movements. This is an important but likewise complicated task.

While AH attempts to draw the constitution of the socio-past as it is being constituted, the political work of actors is never accomplished (Durepos, 2015). That means in embracing an historical account as unsettled, AH must place a frame of analysis atop the socio-past composed of many actors, actants, and networks. MH, on the other hand, does not theorize the past *per se* nor has it been fashioned to wholly 'fit' into any one historiography. If the literature on MH is representative of the ways in has been used, we can reasonably conclude that it is philosophically flexible. Van Lent and Durepos (2019, p. 430, emphasis added) argue "[t]he practice of integrating historical data collection and analysis into empirical strategies for performing theoretically motivated studies can be referred to as '*history as method*'" – what unites MH is

how it is united in its offering of a method that intensely focuses on history from ‘the bottom up.’ That is, limiting historians’ gaze to local knowledge (i.e., small objects such as a single event or historical individual) which, in my view, lends itself to AH that focuses on “processes that are unpredictable and unstable,” seeing history as “actions and conditions of process that can be produced, changed, and explored” (Tureta, Américo, & Clegg, 2021, p. 1019).

AMH accepts the theorization of the socio-past as constituted by actor-networks. It borrows the methodology of ANT to begin analysis by first establishing an actor-network topography of an historical account. As with any history (and research for that matter), what is brought to the forefront is a matter of choice. In addition to mapping out actor traces, in AMH, the historian draws from the metaphor of a microscope to refine analytical focus; he/she brings into focus the actor-network not only for the sake of observing the shape that that history may take in actor-relations but to take a more intense dive into tracing individual relations. They ask: What narrative(s) are revealed from within the network itself when the spotlight is focused on minor knowledge? Where can the traces and fragments of the past take us in the plot of a history? What story does the minor local knowledge of the past tell us? I refer to this process as the ‘zooming in’ of AMH that encourages the ANTi-Historian to reassemble stories of the past using an intense, single unit of focus – be it the voice of one actor, a single frame from a critical incident, or the microcosm relations shared within an organization – as opposed to a sprawling analysis that features a broad story of many actors and actants who perform history from atop networked relations.

5.4.2 ‘Zooming in’ on a single unit of analysis

The second point concerning the way AMH is used as an approach has to do with *how* an ANTi-Historian follows the ‘zooming in’ process. To reiterate, the first step in blending AH with

MH involves mapping the socio-politics of the past as an actor-network. This happens as the ANTi-Historian draws on ANT to ‘follow the actors around’ (Durepos & Mills, 2012a) as they perform the socio-past. Often this means you are following the traces of what is left behind by actors across various contexts and levels of analysis to see how people, things, and ideas came together to develop knowledge of the past (Mills, 2017). By following actors using AH, history takes on the shape of its interest-driven construction and is often produced as a collapse between the micro and macro-level. For example, by following traces of Wolfgang Langewiesche in the Pan Am historical project I traced relations both on a small and large scale, from his previous employment relationship with Readers Digest magazine to his messy counter-enrolment that found an afterlife in subsequent contractual terms between Robert Daley (the author of a history of Pan Am that differed from that envisioned by Langewiesche) and Pan Am. AMH draws attention to analysis on the micro-scale to help fill in the gaps of the historical narrative that is missed beneath the surface of the actor-network topography in AH.

This second assumption departs from the usual AH focus which follows associations to analyze how the socio-past holds together. While AMH upholds the commitment to pluralize history through observing the many enactments of the past through actor-networks, it breaks the limit of seeing the production of history from an analytical level other than small scale. Herein lies what I refer to as ‘zooming in.’ It follows the first step of AMH that sketches a broad actor-network of the socio-past. This may include a combination of people (e.g., Jean Chrétien), things (e.g., aircraft), or ideas (e.g., Canadian nationalism), within a single case study such as TCA for example. Like the craft of an artist, the ANTi-Historian first studies a historical phenomenon and sketches the big shape of an actor-network in preparation for what is to come: the process where details like adjusting colour and value bring a painting to life.

I borrow the expression ‘zooming in’ in AMH from Jarrett and Liu (2018, p. 367) who use this language as a metaphor in video ethnography to describe “close scrutiny of social interactions between organizational players.” In AMH terms, to ‘zoom in’ means to bring into focus the granularity of socio-politics from within the actor-network. This may be the details of interactions memorialized in text, micro-behaviours written into the record, or some trace that raises questions about an actor in some critical moment. What is brought into focus and analyzed is a matter of choice. A durable actor (Latour, 1990b) – a person, object, or idea remains persistent across time – is an obvious starting point as there are likely many historical traces to pull from. The more difficult (and what AMH attempts to surface) points of focus are counter-enrolled actors and/or voices who may only feature few traces for the ANTi-Historian to assemble a plausible narrative (I will return to the topic of empirical sources in AMH later in this chapter). In this dissertation, I attempt to fit AH into a single unit of analysis by choosing to focus on tracing Jean Chrétien’s involvement in developing AC both during and following his then-short life in federal politics. Regardless of what or who is the focus of AMH, by refining analysis to a single unit, multiplicity is foregrounded in the practice of histories being produced each time the ANTi-Historian zooms into historical phenomena.

Whether the ANTi-Historian’s focus is on an actor or a narrowly defined episode from a critical incident, zooming in on this single unit of analysis can help make sense of the pattern that history takes and how it was performed at the micro level. Engaging the production of the past from close-up enables historians to see the trees through the forest, pointing out interesting and theoretically important phenomena.

5.4.3 The individual as the focal point of study

Picking up on the previous point about zooming in, AMH attempts to represent the constitution of the socio-past through actor-networks (Latour, 2005). The ANTi-Historian does so by relying on historical traces. Traces are those materials and fragments of knowledge that have been left behind from the past (i.e., communication devices) that give us the opportunity to (re)assemble a network of people, things, and/or ideas not so that we might see what happened for certain but rather the shape that history takes as an outcome of how these interact. This step establishes the topography of a network so that the ANTi-Historian can understand, by the multiple points in time that actors come together, how a sense of history can come together (or fail to materialize) as ‘knowledge.’ In its strength – of furnishing an understanding of history making through politics within an actor-network – my previous work has pushed the limits of AH’s analytic of actor-networks by attempting to go deeper into the space of history than that which is configured atop the topography of a network. I have found that an ANTi-Historian’s focus is throttled by what occurs at the ‘site of oscillation,’ which Durepos and Mills (2017, p. 60) claim to be “a point at which a series of actors, through their actions, fuse together to fix or dissipate a sense of an event.” Following actors to this point occurs across various levels of analysis (micro, meso, and macro) that ultimately collapse with its view of history as an outcome of a series of performances and relational activities (Mills, 2017). AH is used to help researchers bring historical accounts to the fore by drawing on the whole of an actor-network.

Inserting MH’s emphasis on the performativity of social life through historical analysis means ANTi-Historian’s inquire about what may be missed empirically by focusing on the big picture rather than examining a small slice of an organization’s processes, people, and/or event(s). What I propose in this third insight is not an intense level of study for the purposes of

‘scaling up’ history but instead how micro aspects of social life might infuse significance in seeing history performed by the individual tucked in small spaces. As Putnam (2006) argues, MH reduces the scale of observation to the level of personal encounters or individual life histories to challenge our understanding of social processes. AMH can then be seen as a way to pull apart the relations of a social network to explore how the individual plays his/her part in the actor-network of history. I see refocusing the individual not only as a legitimate point of study in MOS (Nord & Fox, 1999) but also as the focal point of historical scholarship in our field. Performing AMH means taking the ‘situation of the individual’ – disparate minor details and the construction they put upon things – seriously to observe how granular knowledge of the past is produced.

How might a researcher go about performing this type of an approach in their historical work? Through a gentle shift of AH as an analytic away from its empirical focus atop the network and toward an isolated point from within the network assemblage. Seeing everything (and those things that cannot be seen) as belonging to a network. I refer to this as a ‘network within the network.’ What this means is AMH draws on the process of mapping an actor-network to get a sense of the politics behind historical knowledge production, but it does not end there. Instead, it extends analysis further by taking a slice out of the network and bringing it up close to observe how the individual him/herself is performed in history.

Following Peltonen (2014), AMH assumes that the focal point of history is more meaningful to an audience when it moves from temporal to spatial logic; not so much on a historical phenomenon but from the point at which the historic individual experiences that phenomenon. Narrowing the research frame draws attention to the point of AMH research. That is, that we may study history not only for theoretical inspection and development but, more

importantly, as a performance by individuals cast in an event belonging to a context. In other words, the whole point of historical work in this vein is to form narrative around those whose voices are neglected, glossed over, or completely ignored by historians (Durepos, Shaffner, & Taylor, 2021). The research begins and ends with the individual on centre-stage.

5.4.4 The individual as an actor-network

Once research that has been framed around the individual-as-focal, then the analytic of AMH can begin to take place. This insight may at first appear to be quite familiar to those who already practice MH ideology. The whole point of historical work in this vein is to form narrative around those whose story is half-told, neglected, or glossed over by historians who would rather answer ‘great historical questions’ (Szijártó, 2017). How AMH builds on this orthodoxy is in how it brings forward ideas from ANT in advancing the individual as a unit of analysis. Over the last half century MOS has come to fully embrace the scientific movement in social theory (Üsdiken & Kipping, 2014). Never too far behind and coupled with the professionalization of business studies as a ‘professional science’ embodied in the development of sociology’s ‘administrative science,’ aspirations for more science-as-legitimate-research and less history-as-liberal-arts has won the day in management and organizational history (Deal, Novicevic, Mills, Lugar, & Roberts, 2021). As a result, the historic individual as a subject has all but disappeared.

An impetus of my concern lies with Nord and Fox’s (1999) observation of organization studies in how they treat the individual in quantifiable and essentialist terms reminiscent of mainstream psychology. Instead of focus on social (and historic) context, understanding the “science of the individual” (Venn, 1984, p. 127) measured as an “independent variable” (Nord & Fox, 1999, p. 152) has made it difficult to take a deep dive into the storying of the historic

individual. This remains a sticking point even in current management and organizational history whose flavour is remarkably broad, seeing individuals in groups rather than as *the* focus of study. There are a few exceptions but even then, they are purposed differently than micro-analysis. An example of this exception is the work of Williams and Mills (2017, 2018), whose research problematizes the role of management history in the neglect of key historic female proto-management theorists from Canada and the United States. These studies are critical, and their point is more focused on developing a style of feminist writing than the historic individual herself.

AMH, on the other hand, is concerned with the individual as a subject of study by understanding all the parts that make up how a person is plotted into a historical narrative. Drawing on ideas of socio-materiality from ANT, the historic individual in AMH is accepted as the relational effect of configurations (and re-configurations) that combine and hold steady as networks. What this may look like is how Law (1992, p. 4) saw messy relations holding together: “analytically, what counts as a person is an effect generated by a network of heterogeneous, interacting, materials... [p]eople are who they are because they are patterned networks of heterogeneous materials.” AMH thus sees the individual as an actor-network whose relations give us clues as to how history is performed on a small scale. It also focuses on piecing together the small details (traces) of the individual nested in messy enactments that build out the network him/herself.

5.4.5 Agency of the individual, things, and people

Previously, I had made the point that the empirical application of MH in social and cultural history has followed a divide between two intellectual schools: *microhistoria* (the Italian school) – which stresses the historian’s focus on action at the micro-level be useful for ‘great

historical questions’ – and postmodern-esque (namely Magnússon) – that studies historical individuals who are otherwise deemed insignificant or ‘too ordinary’ to historians. As you can see, the divide is along the lines of approach. Where MH may seem at odds with itself, there is a point that most – if not all – agree: “micro-analyses are suitable for unveiling the *agency* of past individuals, and the justification for concentrating historical research at the micro-level and giving answers to ‘great historical questions’ on the basis of individual *agency* is given by the conviction that structures of history are built, upheld and demolished by the actions of individuals” (Magnússon & Sziártó, 2013, p. 75, emphasis added).

MH is part of a larger body of historical literatures and fields that, in the last half century, have sought to bring the ‘everyday life’ experiences and actions (i.e., agency) of ordinary people to the forefront of historical enquiry. New social history, taken up primarily by history departments in the United Kingdom, Canada, and the United States, focuses on social structures and processes and has been defined as “history with the people put back in” (Fulbrook, 2005, p. 17). This understanding of history as a concern for the lives, beliefs, and practices of those previously ‘hidden’ from history has all contributed to MH opening the obscure *social* – emphasis on individuals – world as a subject of study.

The engagement of agency aids in bringing the literatures of AH and MH together while at the same time extends them in AMH. In terms of AH, Durepos and Mills (2012) follow Law’s (1994) rejection of dualist modalities (e.g., agency-structure) by focusing on the relational manner of social processes as an effect of heterogenous actor-networks. How these actors demonstrate agency was the question of Hartt’s (2013a) idea of the NCA in AH; it sees how values, beliefs, ideas, and views go into an individual’s decision-making processes. Without knowing it, AH bumps up against MH practice that similarly rejects ‘ordering work’ as “the idea

of a regular progression through a uniform and predictable series of stages in which social agents were considered to align themselves in conformity with solidarities and conflicts in some sense given, natural and inevitable” (Levi, 1991, p. 94). The alternative, according to Levi (1991), is a way to see the individual in history as “the result of an individual’s constant negotiation, manipulation, choices and decisions” (p. 94). MH, in this sense, stresses the notion of agency as people who lived in the past, acted, and made their own decisions as “active individuals, conscious actors” (Magnússon & Sziártó, 2013, p. 5).

Not until this research, though, has either of these literatures been dialogued to include agency through an individual’s performativity vis-à-vis actor-networks. That is, how, through the summation of choices an actor decides, these micro-processes uncover how individuals, things, and people each play a role in producing knowledge in context. In AMH, then, agency is thus viewed as the ability of individuals, things, and groups of people to make decisions based on their own sensemaking in relation to producing knowledge of the past. Thought of this way, the agency of the individual in AMH can be studied in situ without the trappings of metanarratives that constrain (Klein, 1995); forcing us to question whether a person’s action is reflective of a greater discourse or metanarrative.

5.4.6 Folding traces, fragments, and close reading of text

AMH offers a way for ANTi-Historians to approach studying the past differently; to slow down and explore individual fragments of history with an aim to understand historical phenomena and the past through individuals who were previously omitted from research. That is, those who “disappeared from the picture” of historical narrative by “the broad-brush approach of historians” in the mainstream (Magnússon & Sziártó, 2013, p. 124). Magnússon (2003) argued for the abandonment of ‘single-edged’ history – a singular accounts of the past that is used to tell

a broad macro-level story. He pointed out that mainstream historiography emphasizes ‘macro-links’ through contextualization – the placement of small units of study into a much broader (global) context. To eschew this temptation, MH focuses on phenomena in close detail with an aim to surface as much nuance as possible.

The ethos of AH – if it can be summarized – is that, through the ANTi-Historian’s assembly of traces, history may be pluralized. These fragments produce multiple histories based on how empirical traces of archival material combine to craft an alternate historical account (before ‘alternative facts’ were a thing). AMH will bring these two ideas together through how it handles these artefacts by fixing analysis onto the traces within the research frame and nothing more. The ANTi-Historian must scrutinize empirical material by questioning “their creation, their context within the events they describe, the opportunities they present for analysis, and how they tie in with events that take place when they are used” (Magnússon, 2015, p. 87). It is through this ‘close reading’ of material “to the greatest possible detail” (Deal, Mills, & Helms Mills, 2018, p. 380) that AMH enables historians to see how traces and fragments left by individuals hold the past together.

The promise of the AMH approach is that, by focusing on traces, fragments, and close reading of history, ANTi-Historians see the value of and give space to including stories of how the actor-network of empirical materials contributes to producing knowledge of the past. I will demonstrate what I mean by using the TCA case. The Canada Aviation and Space Museum located in Ottawa, Ontario, houses the archival collections that detail a history of Canadian flight. Fragments of the past retrieved in this archive can be found supporting the content of corporate histories like McGregor’s (1980) *The Adolescence of an Airline: Story of Air Canada*. In this text, Gordon R. McGregor – a former President and lifelong employee of the airline –

uses traces such as oral storytelling and autobiographical writing to produce an understanding of how Canadian nationalism played a role in the rebranding of the national air carrier. From these traces I closely read Pigott's (2001) history of TCA to follow the idea of nationalism, only to discover how the political interests (e.g., electoral fortunes) of the federal Liberal Party contributed to the rebranding of the national air carrier. AMH builds on this 'textual environment' (Magnússon, 2015) of traces to make explicit those actors and/or actants previously concealed and render transparent those salient voices and untold stories.

5.4.7 Bringing historical phenomena into focus through context

As a seventh point to build out AMH, concern for how the ANTi-Historian places context around historical phenomena is worth addressing. Following Durepos, Mills, and McLaren (2020), my use of the term 'context' is to mean the 'bigger picture' of how history is practiced in human-nonhuman associations we find everywhere. A great deal of historical research on business and organizations is produced by historians who believe the only thing that belongs in an historical account are verifiable sources used to support *the* history of a phenomenon (Deal, Novicevic, Mills, Lugar, & Roberts, 2021). What this type of historiography does not appear to recognize is the socio-political environment that forms around sources (the 'textual space'). I agree with Magnússon and Szijártó (2013, p. 135) that this environment in historical work is best conceptualized as contextual with "meanings and connections that constitute the textual whole." What this means is more than any source or bit of 'evidence' that may (or may not) tell us about the past, historical context of the research 'frame' including the materials we draw upon, are all parts of the puzzle that we piece together in our scholarship. This is not an entirely new idea. Over the last decade in MH, Magnússon (2015, 2017) has developed what he calls the 'textual environment' to describe how even the seeming insignificance of ego-documents help us

construct the past. Where he falls short though is in his inability to see history as an outcome of communities or networks that include the minute yet formative context as well. Certainly, there is value in scrutinizing “formative influence on people in past times and the nature of the interplay between texts (narratives) and life (reality)” (Magnússon & Szijártó, 2013, p. 134).

AMH simply adds another layer of analysis by considering the relational character of the dominant social values and its effect on individual action in history. These are, at least according to AH vis-à-vis NCA theory (Hartt, Mills, & Helms Mills, 2020), actors and actants worth studying. I see AMH building on these two ideas through ‘closely reading’ empirical materials to surface not only traces of the past to reassemble as one plausible historical account but also to situate the contexts in which they have been produced.

Including context within and around the actor-network of history permits the ANTi-Historian to gain an appreciation for analyzing the seemingly insignificant traces within materials, detecting ‘hidden’ clues, and considering subtext. Through material found in ego-documents (e.g., memoirs, diaries, letters, and travel accounts, to name a few) and self-microhistories (Novicevic & Mills, 2019), these personal traces re-centre the historical individual to “come to life and [turn] into a ‘living archive’” (Magnússon, 2015, p. 88). This way, by getting a better understanding of the “set of assumptions, arrangements, and shared ideas that exist to produce and preserve a particular version of social life” we may be able to appreciate the agency of actors.

5.4.8 Acknowledging the interests of the ANTi-Historian in focalizing phenomena

Recently, Alvesson and Deetz (2020) have called for reflection on how organizational knowledge is produced, specifically in capturing an ethic of transparency. They plead with critical scholars to be ever cautious that our process of research remains true to the values of our

scholarly community (e.g., research reflexivity and transparent auditable record of the research). This admonishment mirrors the sentiment shared by Lamond (2008) who urged historical work be fully transparent of its epistemological and ontological positioning. Therefore, it is important for AMH to be founded on ensuring that both the craft of history and the historical knowledge it helps produce is conducted in an ethical manner.

From Mannheim (1985) we come to know that knowledge is socially constructed. What we ‘know’ is not a matter of the truth but how knowledge is represented as ‘truth.’ What this means for AMH is that historians accept that “history is always history for someone” (Jenkins, 1995, p. 22). It is ideologically motivated in numerous ways including *who* writes the history; *what* is ultimately written into the account; *how* the historical account is written; *where* the sources for said history are retained (e.g., corporate archives) and how they were initially collected, and so on. Durepos and Mills (2012) discuss how AH is designed to expose instrumentality of historical accounts, questioning the political conditions that belie the reassembly of the socio-past. The work of an ANTi-Historian, then, is clearly an effect of how a history is assembled.

There are three ways in which AMH attempts transparency in focalizing historical phenomena. First, in AH fashion, it acknowledges the political role that is played by an ANTi-Historian. Crafting ‘scientific knowledge’ is itself an act rife with politics (Bell & Willmott, 2020) including knowledge of the past. AMH establishes that all historical scholarship is an outcome of the ANTi-Historian’s own interest in what is being researched. This involves opening space for reflexive writing style in the research, allowing the ANTi-Historian to acknowledge their interest(s), and provide personal context to the historical account – a MH of the MH so to speak. For example, my enthusiasm for ‘second chair leaders’ (see Deal, 2015) and

personal curiosity of the post-war Canadian political economy helped shape my deep dive into Chrétien – a historical figure that brings together these two areas of interest – and the role he played in forging AC.

Second, as the ANTi-Historian assembles the historical account, he/she must allow actors to speak for themselves by restraining from imposing a preformulated order on the activities of actor-networks. This might result in a history being seen as lacking what is commonly expected of storytelling and sequencing (e.g., beginning, middle, and end) but recall from MH that we are “directed to examine a small slice” (Mills, 2017, p. 21) of historical phenomena. Following the performativities of an actor (or actors) allows the researched to speak louder than *a priori* assumptions of theories and takes whatever shape the traces might lead the researcher (Latour, 1987).

Third, as Perillo (2008) argues, the idea of constructing participation as networked practice is important since ANTi-Historians themselves co-produce knowledge of the past alongside the historical phenomena that is studied. AMH as a style of writing would mean the ANTi-Historian must also acknowledge and demonstrate how he/she is a co-participant in the production of historical knowledge. This could be achieved in empirical work by how he/she writes the research in such a way that readers can easily identify the broad answers to ‘the Five W’s’ – who, what, when, where, and why – thereby bringing readers behind the scenes of the ANTi-Historian’s choice of what to ‘zoom in’ on and the processes of how they co-produce knowledge.

5.4.9 *Tracing the individual through biographical writing*

It can be said of MH that is as much about a style of writing that dabbles in the genre of biography than it is about scale. In terms of it being a writing style than anything else, take

Ginzburg's (1976) MH of a miller, Menocchio, from Montereale Valcellina, Italy, who was accused of heresy and subsequently burnt at the stake. In *The Cheese and the Worms*, Ginzburg uses narrative structure, voice, and context – common facets of biography – to bring together an epic. The MH is really about the origins of religious belief during the Roman Inquisition, yet it borrows biographic writing style to profile an individual for their exemplariness of broader issues. Often, though, biographies attempt to recapitulate as much of the protagonist's life story as possible. MH differs in this approach.

Microhistorians often write about playing the role of detective (Mari, 2013) snooping about for clues about *what* is studied, akin to questions of process rather than biographers who are frequently accused of romanticizing *who* is studied (Renders, 2014). The life story, like a mystery, “is merely the means to an end” (Lepore, 2001, p. 133) of a microhistorian's nonbiographical goal: recovering the subjectivity of protagonists to tell a story of some greater purpose. A biographer might write about the life of Jean Chrétien but a microhistorian would study just a portion of Chrétien's life as a public servant because it allows him/her to craft an alternative history of TCA.

My research may be first in AH to embrace biographical writing style. Most of the time the research narrative in AH is written in analytical terms (e.g., using ANT language) to help explain the story. Not all AH research is taken up with people as the subject of research. It has been deployed in other areas of study including accounting (Corrigan, 2016), architecture (Sarvimäki, 2019), and responsible research and innovation (Shanley, 2021). Biography, in those instances, would not make sense as a genre of writing. It is not that the underutilization of biographical writing style in AH is borne out of opposition to it but, through its mode of explanation as narrating (Maclean, Harvey, & Clegg, 2016), AH has not had the opportunity of

allowing ‘life writing’ style to flourish. What this means is while AH uses history to explain the political form and origins of knowledge production, it may miss the scholarly value of tracing stories of a protagonist (single) into the research narrative. Durepos (2009) empirically drew upon a corporate biography – *An American Saga: Juan Trippe and His Pan Am Empire* – by Robert Daley (1980) to help build AH method. Empirical applications of AH follow actors (multiple) through an array of relations with other actors and actants. Including many into the narrative diffuses the point of view of any one actor. AMH intends to offer a happy medium by using ANT to trace the individual through empirical material, including self-microhistories but engaging a writing style that is biographic in genre. That is, enough narrative to whet the appetite of readers interested in the individual while using ANT as an analytical explanation to develop an understanding of the past.

5.4.10 Extensive detail but not exhaustive narrative

The tenth insight of AMH is concerned with writing style, particularly the historian’s attention to including detail in reporting their historical research. Being ‘extensive in detail’ borrows MH style that emphasizes dense retelling of history in descriptive narrative (Putnam, 2006). For some, including details is meant to resemble anthropological writing. There is a sect within Italian MH who take to writing history using Geertz’s (1973) belief of ‘thick description’ to ensure the credibility of their interpretation through rich, thickly described details. They have gone to great lengths to capture detail by writing tome-like stories (see Darton, 1984; Kurlansky, 2002; Shapiro, 2005). These are characteristically exhaustive in detail with content that often reads like a personal diary. Still, others have taken detail in MH to mean the quality of narrative in building a cohesive story of the past (see Magnússon, 2016). Instead of exhausting readers, these microhistories are concise and focus on detailing a historical narrative. A good example of

this ‘lean’ writing style is Yu and Mills’ (2021) study of Harold Bixby, an executive with the now-defunct Pan American Airways. In particular, the authors narrate Bixby’s experience as an expatriate living in China during the 1930s with such detail that you could close your eyes and almost experience for yourself his narrative of making bold business maneuvers in Asia. The beauty of MH, at least as you can see from how it has been operationalized to-date, is that it can be enacted as a detailed writing style in just about any way. So, then, AMH is not so much about writing to emphasize the novel insights from historical sources as it is with shaking up the process of assembling narratives by telling a thorough story of the past.

In addition to the more normative elements of a story including plot, setting, and tension, the hallmark of a *really* good story involves the author’s attention to detail in the narrative. Effective storytellers are skilled at creating immersive settings; placing the reader as though they are in the scene themselves. Much like stories in the mainstream, historical research accomplishes this by deploying detailed writing in the ‘exposition’ – introducing the scene and cast of characters using descriptive language (Boje, 2018). Similarly, AH attempts this by relying on ANT language to help tell stories of process behind a history’s creation. Where it falls short is in style, particularly involving details that build up the narrative to read as a storyline of knowledge of the past. For example, in a recent study of the Pan American Airways – a familiar case study organization used in AH work – Kivijärvi, Mills, and Helms Mills (2019) draw on AH to trace the evolution of the airline’s corporate form as a multinational organization. The research uses narratives from archival material to understand the airline’s development as a multinational enterprise. In all this, the style of writing reads analytically but with no definite focus on a critical incident or protagonist. AMH as an alternative historical writing style, on the other hand, privileges the subject-as-protagonist (e.g., processes, people, or an event itself) in

historical inquiry. That means the writing style should read as pulling together the threads of an historical account through detailed, plausible storytelling narrative.

5.5 Summary

In this chapter I have brought together AH and MH by detailing how they might be fused as AMH. Below, in Table 3, I offer a comparison of AH, MH, and AMH across key dimensions. To foreground AMH, I shared my experiences doing historical research using AH that left me with the impression that more could be explored at a deeper level of analysis. These experiences along with the work of others through their conceptualization, led to the development of AMH as method. This new approach was proposed as the culmination of ten insights dealing with AMH method and writing style. Simply put, AMH is best thought of as an attempt to flesh out the stories of how actor-networks producing knowledge of the past written from a finite point of analysis: historical processes, the individual, or an event. Doing history this way brings together the aspiration of history performed in small spaces and places with historical research as emancipation; importantly, ANTi-Historians and their role in revealing how an actor-network performs the past from the bottom-up. In the following chapter, I detail the method and methodology that will ground the empirical demonstration of AMH in this dissertation.

Table 3: Comparing the Dimensions of ANTi-History, Microhistory, and ANTi-Microhistory

	ANTi-History	Microhistory	ANTi-Microhistory
Ontology	Anti-realist – The past is unavailable and cannot exist in real(ist) form.	Post-realism – The past is ontologically absent but can be appreciated through empirical and rational form.	Post-anti-realist – The past is unavailable, cannot exist but historical inquiry allows for a ‘sense’ of what may (or may not) have been.
Epistemology	Postpositivism – ‘The past’ and ‘history’ are performed at the site of actor(s) relations and is studied without <i>a priori</i> understanding.	Post-postivism – Historical reality can be understood using interventions that do not impose pre-conceived notions of ‘the past’ and ‘history.’	Apositivism – Notions of ‘the past’ and ‘history’ are understood as performances of history in practices that constitute multiple realities.
Method	Actor-network theory – Tracing the constitution of the socio-past (or historical subject) using concepts from actor-network theory.	Narrative – Forming stories about the past through the construction of narrative drawing on empirical data.	Actor-network narrative – Embeds actor-network concepts in the construction of historical narrative about/around the individual.
Unit of Analysis	Actor-network – Socio-past is traced through the combination of actors, actants, and networks that form a topography.	The particular – History is studied from ‘the bottom up’ that focuses on a single event, community, or individual.	The individual – Emphasis is placed on a single person, critical incident, or organization out of the historical norm.
Data	Text – Any document that allow the researcher to trace actor/actant movement(s).	Text – Variety of documentary evidence (e.g., ego-documents) about a person, event, or community that stand-in for the past.	Naturally occurring – Any data that is not produced for the research especially archival material.
Context	Practice(s) creates own context – The outcome of what actors produce in	Place in context – Event and phenomena is better explained when historian relates	Emergent context – Historical ‘reality’ is constructed through the world building practices of actors

	their performance of the socio-past.	‘what happened’ into broader context.	and researcher who shapes context.
Role of Researcher	Co-participant – Researcher is part of the performance of knowledge.	Observer – Researcher observes history and is responsible for reporting what has emerged.	Participant-observer – Researcher follows breadcrumbs of actor-networks of interest to see performance of knowledge.

Chapter 6: Method and Methodology

6.1 Introduction

This chapter details how the empirical work of this dissertation was actioned. In it, I explain the philosophical choices I have made including the ontological and epistemological basis of postpositivist qualitative research practice (Bryman, Bell, Mills, & Yue, 2011; Prasad, 2005). To illustrate the usefulness of AMH, I employ archival research as part of my method repertoire. It is important to discuss my approach to archival research involving the TCA/AC materials, especially since I am dealing with a case study of one ‘critical incident’ (i.e., important change event) occurring in the airline at a specific time. Thus, including answers to *what* I looked for; *where* I found it; and *how* I studied them; will help distill my perspective on the research. I offer a descriptive account of these and figuratively bring readers backstage to get a sense of how this research ultimately came together. By the end of the chapter my presentation of the material aspects of AMH method, discussion on making decisions about the research, and views about the nature of historical knowledge should provide a more complete picture about how I attempt ‘doing’ AMH.

6.2 Case Study of TCA

The empirical research of this dissertation uses data from TCA archival materials. In this way, the research I conducted within the data could be considered a case study. Like most qualitative scholars, who use case studies in their research, I subscribe to the idea that this research strategy stands out in how it provides in-depth, detailed inquiry of phenomenon within real-life context (Eriksson & Kovalainen, 2015; Yin, 1981). The process by which I attempt to bear out AMH as an alternative approach using TCA data is partly my own, but it is also part of

a much larger research project funded by numerous Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) grants studying the organizational culture of airlines. In addition to TCA, material from British Airways, Pan American World Airways, and QANTAS have also been collected.

I enrolled in the Sobey PhD program three years after the conclusion of the data collection phase of the project but what I have enjoyed by association is a network of scholars with shared interests in national airlines, Canadian knowledge, and management and organizational history. There are likely several organizations that could provide the empirical materials necessary to demonstrate the utility of AMH. I had the opportunity to publish research using each of the airlines mentioned. From this experience I concluded that none would seem more appropriate and as valuable as a research site that succinctly brings together my disparate interests in history, Canadian society, and politics, as well as have enough material to study than TCA.

In addition, TCA made for an interesting case to illustrate AMH for a few reasons: TCA is considered a pioneering Canadian institution (Dobson, 2017); there are numerous popular and corporate histories that chronicle the airline's past; the airline has operated for over 85 years; and, most importantly, access to company records is readily available in several forms (i.e., physical documents, digital copy, film).

6.3 Critical Incident

Magnússon and Szijártó (2013) suggest the term 'critical incident' to describe a research strategy for historians to focus on events needing historical explanation. The idea is that the researcher approach history without any a priori understandings of what may emerge from the

material. When the scope of MH is scaled down, the ‘data’ should begin to reflect the social relations that contribute to ‘meaningful events’ in a case study (Lamoreaux, 2006). It is thought that the critical incident places parameters around the case study, focusing specifically on “a small episode involving a single individual or community, sometimes in the briefest span of time, and often with no pretense of being typical or representative” (Himmelfarb, 1997, p. 150). I attempt for AMH to channel this propensity in MH of studying cases by building on the intimacy of detail, scope, and scale of TCA. Here is the process of choosing the critical incident.

The critical incident (i.e., event) that I selected for this research is very much the outcome of my work in the TCA collection. As I read through traces accounting for the early years of the airline, I noticed some social and cultural changes occurring within Canada that spilled over into TCA during the early 1960s. In my opinion, an important change in the airline had involved the socio-political proposals introduced by the federal government seeking to address issues of Canadian biculturalism notably the status of Quebec and the French language in federal operations. Within this context are a series of related issues that had occurred within the airline (e.g., maturing of the crown corporation, relocating company headquarters to Montreal, and language rules) that culminate in the incident that my research explores: the introduction of the airline’s new English name, AC. Archival records around this incident were thin. This dearth of material piqued my interest to read around the peripheral in attempt to fill in this gap and provide some plausible explanation.

6.4 Empirical Materials as ‘Data’

I have chosen to use the term ‘empirical materials’ to describe the collections of documents (e.g., annual reports, correspondence, newsletters), artifacts (e.g., awards,

photographs, memorabilia), and media (e.g., interviews, documentaries, websites) that were consulted in the process of this research. Most historians prefer the term ‘sources’ (Marwick, 2001) by subscribing to the belief that these primary-source materials provide evidence of what ‘actually happened’ in the past. Like other research philosophies, this is of course a matter of ideology.

The decision to accept archival materials as ‘naturally occurring’ (Golato, 2017) followed two main considerations. First, manufactured data by other means, be it interviews or observations, would not necessarily improve the veracity of data this research uses. Choices about the selection, collection, and processing of social data can influence results. In the conceptual stages of the empirical research, I entertained the idea of supplementing archival material with interview data. For pragmatic reasons, I ultimately decided against it. Interviewing participants involved in or with direct knowledge of the TCA name change would be difficult (e.g., memory) given the event took place nearly 60 years ago. Given that the protagonist of this research, Jean Chrétien, is a former prime minister and public figure, I also felt that securing his interview would be difficult. An observation study would just not be possible given the research context and the fact that time travel does not exist. I opted for a close examination of the networks involved in producing the TCA archival material instead so that the data I compiled could be studied transparently and include historical reflexivity (Barros, de Toledo Carneiro, & Wanderley, 2019; Decker, Hassard, & Rowlinson, 2021).

Second, the data I consulted drew partly from an extant collection of AC materials assembled by Jean Helms Mills and Albert J. Mills over a period of 20 years. By working with them on the airlines project, I was able to explore these records more fully and appreciate the ever-evolving actor-network of TCA across time. Since AC has operated for over eight decades

(51 years as a crown corporation), it would make sense then that its archive would be replete with a treasure trove of materials that are publicly available. This is not always so of organizations. Rowlinson (2004) reminds us archivists (including managers) remain powerful gatekeepers of what and who is presented as the organization's history. I found even though at various points, AC being either a federal utility or publicly traded organization, there were gaps in the historical record. In one instance, the lacking historical account of what I saw as an important event within the airline's past became the focus of my inquiry. From this break in the airline's historical narrative, I take the critical incident of TCA brand change to demonstrate AMH's value to research.

6.5 Dialoguing Amodernism, AH, and MH

Some dialogue around the methodological consequences of the three theories that inform my empirical illustration of AMH is needed. Both AH and MH arise from a 'textual turn' (Jenkins, 1995) in social theory which advocates departure from studying the social world using realist ontology and positivist epistemology and, instead, embracing the idea that social reality is accessible through cultural products (e.g., text) (Perriton, 2001). By channeling amodernism, AH is dedicated to using relational, textual, and contextual analysis of what is considered 'fact' to uncover influences ordering traces into a particular re-telling of history. For MH, it is quite malleable which gives it flexibility in fusing AMH. If you take a step back, you will see all three imply a thematic analysis of texts. Given this, there are many methods of analysis that AMH could have taken (e.g., content, narrative, or network analyses, for example), the use of archival materials seemed to make the most sense.

Using archival material as data follows an iterative process combining AH and MH. First, informed by ANT means AH follows text and its creators to map out networks. AMH extend this by exploring the (re)assembly of the socio-politics of TCA, interrogating the actor-network to distill the context that acted, in part, to produce the critical incident. Without a much closer engagement of the relations from deep within the actor-network, what we may know about TCA's history is limited to what is found from atop networks: durable actors and actants that interact to produce a version of the past. Secondly, drawing on MH, it is necessary to zoom in on a micro-slice of the airline's past vis-à-vis the critical incident to see if it be possible to observe how the relations and actions of one actor worked to transform the shape of the network. By using archival material, I looked to surface key actors within the change event in TCA's history and, in the process, uncover those networks that, up to this point, remain undisturbed from previous history work. I contend that these dimensions are interrelated in AMH.

6.6 Archival Research

What is archival research? This is a question that would at first beg a ready answer. Most historians broadly accept that it is a broad range of activities that are undertaken to facilitate the interrogation of textual materials (e.g., meeting minutes, correspondence, electronic databases) produced by and for organizations (e.g., TCA) or social groups (e.g., public relations practitioners) to help others understand the official record (Ventresca & Mohr, 2017). Informing and shaping how archival research is conducted are vastly different research philosophies (or approaches) of 'doing history:' modernist, postmodernist, and amodernist. Each understand archives differently. Whereas modernist historians see archives as being in physical location that house documents and artifacts (e.g., Canadian Aviation and Space Museum) and postmodernists

see the archive everywhere across sources and discourses (Foucault, 1978), an amodernist view goes even further. The empirical study of this dissertation draws on the amodernist understanding. What this means is beyond appreciating the archive as being either ‘an empirical data corpus’ (McHoul & Grace 2003) or sets of rules and practices, it concerns the potential for the production of knowledge as “a site of networked relations to be explored and uncovered” (Mills & Helms Mills, 2018 p. 34).

Data that is used in the empirical study emanates from archival materials¹⁰; the method used in research was broadly thematic for ease in identifying connections between and among actor-networks; and since the material being used is archival and is subject to history, the methodology was informed both by AH (Durepos & Mills, 2012a) and MH (Magnússon & Szijártó, 2013) vis-à-vis AMH. The research was derived from constructivism which argues knowledge is constructed to depict reality through practices (Law, 2004). Based on these considerations discussed above, the following sections provide a more thorough presentation of my understanding of archival research and how it informed my research accordingly. Below I discuss: (a) the case for archival research; (b) some issues with archival research; (c) empirical data drawn upon to study TCA’s history; (d) the methods used to search, retrieve, and select materials; (e) research process I chose to employ to make sense of the empirical data.

6.6.1 The case for archival research

The value of archival research is closely aligned with the importance of history to MOS. If issues of history and the past are vital to studies of business and organizations, then archives

¹⁰ To be clear, the data in this dissertation is not archival *per se* but was selected from a collection of the TCA/AC archival material.

are also an important site for tracing what has happened before now (Mills & Helms Mills, 2018). Naturally, archival research relies on socio-cultural texts produced at some point in the past. These texts are curated by organizations and are compiled in collections for a variety of reasons. In business and organizations, archives serve a variety of functions including but not limited to: (a) impression management (e.g., the British Airways Heritage Collection presents the airline as being founded uncontrovertibly to 1919, see Coller, Helms Mills, & Mills, 2016); (b) repository of institutional memory (e.g., code of conduct, employee handbook, meeting minutes); (c) management of specialized media (e.g., metadata of an organization's digital footprint, training videos, voice recordings).

While archival research has been a mainstay in 'doing history' in the mainstream, it has seen a revival of interest as of late¹¹. Specific to MOS, archival methodology and the use of archives has gained traction in being accepted as 'legitimate research' (Booth & Rowlinson, 2006). Today, there is a growing corpus of research that demonstrates how scholars can use and action historical archives (Durepos, Mills, & Helms Mills, 2008; Hartt, Mills, Helms Mills, & Corrigan, 2014; Maclean, Shaw, Harvey, & Booth, 2020; Russell, 2015; Tennent, Gillett, & Foster, 2020). Durepos and Barros (2022) point out though that amid the bustle, there have been many discussions on the practicalities of archival research while building a theoretical basis for it has taken a backseat. The case for archival research that I build in this research touches on both.

It should not matter the mode of archival material – be it housed in buildings, boxes, or folders – traces of the past in archives are considered more reliable than other forms of qualitative data (Conway, 2015; Gilliland, 2011). For example, oral histories rely on human

¹¹ Cook (2011) might disagree by pointing out that the social sciences (of which MOS is included) have long relied on the work of archivists whose impulsive efforts compiled many of the archives used in research today.

recollection which, at its best, is susceptible to issues of memory/forgetting (Foster, Coraiola, Suddaby, Kroezen, & Chandler, 2017). It is difficult, if not impossible, to confirm the veracity of data such as myths, legends, and folklore. What the use of archival material does is allow for open understandings of business and society. The historian's moves can be auditable with "copious notes listing documentary sources" (Booth & Rowlinson, 2006, p. 9).

Most of the time archival materials exist having not been prepared for, nor created by, the historian. Taylor, Bell, and Cooke (2009) suggest documentary material allows researchers to follow inscriptions that reflect raw, diverse viewpoints given those who wrote them did not write for posterity. This means the documents and artifacts that researchers can draw from have not been produced for the research which helps mitigate some bias. For instance, qualitative interview data is generated by researchers and is thus not considered naturally occurring data. Like survey data that can be manipulated to take a certain shape, quotes can be massaged, and meanings inferred by a researcher framing interview data. Archival material can provide researchers with a depiction of reality that highlights messy social dynamics, conflict, and diverse viewpoints (Greene, 2003).

6.6.2 Some issues with archival research

Archival research is imperfect. In my opinion, one of the practical difficulties of conducting credible archival research concerns access. Many public organizations, especially so in the case of crown corporations (e.g., TCA), strive for (if not legally bounded by legislation) transparency. Researchers benefit from using public archives. Access to documents from these are conceivably more readily accessible than private firms who have no responsibility or expectation to open their records to historians (Russell, 2019). Some of the archival material

used in my empirical study originated from a repository assembled by Jean Helms Mills and Albert J. Mills. These materials were collected over 20 years from Library and Archives Canada and the archives held at the Canada Aviation and Space Museum in Ottawa, Ontario. Since TCA was funded by the federal government for its entire existence, its records are publicly available.

Beyond physical access, there are also concerns about the politics of archival silences. Manoff (2004) and Schwarzkopf (2012) offer how we might consider the archive as an interest-driven site of knowledge production. Some in MOS have sought to expose the socio-political character of archives, especially problematizing *who* organizes them (Decker, 2013; Wanderley, Alcadipani, & Barros, 2021) and *how* they are assembled (Barros, Carneiro, & Wanderley, 2019; Durepos & Barros, 2022; Mills & Helms Mills, 2018). This research forwards concerns about what is left out in the archives. Researchers rely on archivists' diligence to maintain an orderly collection. It is a common condition of archival material (e.g., business records) to be kept in a patchy manner (Decker, 2013) which affects the research. In my research I thought about the traces that were available to me and those that were not. Since part of my research drew from data collected that I had no direct involvement assembling, there were bound to be omissions. I added additional material to the data and, through this process, assembled the network of TCA's name change.

Foroughi, Coraiola, Rintamäki, Mena, and Foster (2020) remind us that historians have little power over traces of the past. The job of the ANTi-Historian is not so much to fret over what materials may or may not be available to develop histories but how specific histories come to be developed (Myrick, Helms Mills, & Mills, 2013). Being aware of these dynamics through reflexive disclosure should help resolve these tensions (Durepos & Vince, 2021; Cunliffe, 2003; Swartz, 1997).

Documentary materials like the parliamentary proceedings that are included in my research are useful, but historians are wise to not fall into the trap of accepting them as fact. Those responsible for producing records (e.g., minute-takers) are part of an organization's power structure. They may write for posterity but hardly is it possible to rid personal interest(s) and/or motivation(s) from the accounting of what took place (Bennett, 1999). Issues of credibility of records and the plausibility of events must be addressed. There are a few strategies to counter this problem. Use of ANT analysis helps to see the authors' network and political activities that go into producing the text, offering clues as to motivations and inclusion/exclusion of information (Latour & Woolgar, 1979). The notion of 'close reading' in MH suggests a "technically informed, fine-grained analysis of some piece of writing, usually in connection with some broader question of interest" (Herrnstein Smith, 2016, p. 58). Engaging in this ideology critique highlights the politics of the scribe and his/her text. Expanding the data set to ensure heterogeneity among the traces informing the research can help too. Beyond the official record of TCA or Parliament, documents like autobiographies or popular histories add different perspectives that can be used to contrast/compare with official records. Introducing a variety of evidence means findings may be more reliable.

6.6.3 Searching and collecting materials

Earlier in this chapter I detailed my views of the data included in this dissertation. They are 'naturally occurring' which is to say the materials existed as text before the research. I did not play a role in their creation, and neither were they produced for the research (as is often the manner using interview or survey data) (Anderson, 2013). The data collected was based on the network sampling method (Noy, 2008). This approach allowed me to use one trace to help locate

another trace. The idea behind it is that with the addition of each new trace, some relevant insight can be gleaned until a network of data emerges.

Drawing from the TCA/AC collection allowed me to contain my search to one organization, which made it easier to fill out the data with supplementary materials to gain a more rounded appreciation of the airline. The search began by reading annual reports and meeting minutes. I noted key figures including C.D. Howe (Minister of Transport), Gordon McGregor (President), and Lester Pearson (Prime Minister), to name a few. From these I continued to flesh out my understanding by tracing the shape of early civil aviation in Canada. I read histories of the industry (Blatherwick, 1989; Molson, 1974; Stevenson, 1987). This process included follow-ups with corporate (Smith, 1986) and popular histories of TCA/AC (Ashley, 1963; Collins, 1978; Pigott, 2001, 2014).

To make my method of collection as straightforward as possible, I began locating published histories through the Novanet interprovincial library system. Initially I searched for books related to TCA/AC. Through the process of my reading – paying attention to details, references of people, events, and institutions playing a role in developing the airline – I decided to cast my net wide to help identify other traces related to TCA. This exercise helped me identify other traces, yielding vast material being collected. I sourced histories of the Liberal Party of Canada (McCall-Newman, 1982; Whitaker, 1977; Wearing, 1981); political memoirs and biographies of durable actors involved directly and indirectly with TCA including Gordon McGregor (1980), C.D. Howe (Bothwell & Kilbourn, 1979; Roberts, 1957), Jean Chrétien (1985, 2008, 2018; Martin, 1995; Plamondon, 2017), Judy LaMarsh (1969), and other materials. For instance, news media, academic journal articles, and industry reports related to TCA/AC

came to light in my searches. I was most impressed with the digital Library of Parliament records. I found the transcript of debates about TCA in the House of Commons to be thorough.

After searching through enough of the records and published histories to get a sense of the socio-politics of TCA (approximately 20,000 pages of data), I reached the point where I felt comfortable to conduct a closer read of the materials. Most of the material in the collection spans between the late 1960s and early 2000s; recent enough to help lend support to studying the airline's past. In all the tens of thousands of pages of records there are only a handful of traces that were produced in, or refer to, the TCA days. Even a search online for traces did not provide meaningful leads. In my haste to understand TCA's history, I began to ask myself: What was it about the airline, the actors who constituted it, and the socio-cultural factors of Canada during TCA that has marginalized its footprint in official records? Table 1 summarizes the empirical materials consulted in this research.

Table 4: Summary of Empirical Materials Analyzed

Data Source	Trace	Period	Pages
Helms Mills/ Mills Collection	Annual reports	1938 – 1970	480
	Interorganizational memoranda	1940 – 1967	240
	Correspondence	1937 – 1965	950
	Internal communication: <i>Between Ourselves</i>	1965 – 1968	125
	Internal communication: <i>Horizons</i>	1970 – 1972	110
	Industrial Histories	Blatherwick, J. (1989). <i>A history of airlines in Canada</i> . Toronto: The Unitrade Press.	1937 – 1989
	Molson, K. (1974). <i>Pioneering in Canadian air transport</i> . Winnipeg: J. Richardson.	1909 – 1941	315
	Stevenson, G. (1987). <i>The politics of Canada's airlines: From Diefenbaker to Mulroney</i> . Toronto: University of Toronto Press.	1957 – 1987	236

 Popular
Histories

Ashley, C. A. (1963). <i>The first twenty-five years: A study of Trans-Canada Air Lines</i> . Toronto: Macmillan Company of Canada.	1937 – 1962	72
Collins, D. H. (1978). <i>Wings across time: The story of Air Canada</i> . Ancaster, ON: Griffin House.	1937 – 1977	94
Pigott, P. (2001). <i>National treasure: The history of Trans Canada Airlines</i> . Madeira Park, BC: Harbour Publishing.	1937 – 1968	476
Pigott, P. (2014). <i>Air Canada: The history</i> . Toronto: Dundurn.	1964 – 2004	328

Corporate
Histories

McGregor, G. R. (1980). <i>The adolescence of an airline</i> . Montreal: Air Canada.	1948 – 1968	289
Smith, P. (1986). <i>It seems like only yesterday: Air Canada – The first 50 years</i> . Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Limited.	1937 – 1986	368

Political
Memoirs

Chrétien, J. (1985). <i>Straight from the heart</i> . Toronto: Key Porter Books.	1934 – 1985	248
Chrétien, J. (2008). <i>My years as Prime Minister</i> . Toronto: Vintage Canada.	1993 – 2003	448
Chrétien, J. (2018). <i>My stories, my times</i> . Toronto: Random House Canada.	1955 – 2017	259
LaMarsh, J. (1969). <i>Memoirs of a bird in a gilded cage</i> . Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Limited.	1924 – 1969	377
McCall-Newman, C. (1982). <i>Grits: An intimate portrait of the Liberal Party</i> . Toronto: Gage Publishing.	1957 -1979	481
Wearing, J. (1981). <i>The L-shaped party: The Liberal Party of Canada, 1958–1980</i> . Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson.	1958 – 1980	260
Whitaker, R. (1977). <i>The government party: Organizing and financing the Liberal Party of Canada, 1930-1958</i> . Toronto: University of Toronto Press.	1930 – 1958	512

Biographies

Bothwell, R., & Kilbourn, W. (1979). <i>C.D. Howe: A biography</i> . Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Limited.	1886 – 1960	397
Martin, L. (1995). <i>Chrétien: The will to win</i> . Winnipeg: Lester Publications.	1937 – 1995	404
Plamondon, B. (2017). <i>The Shawinigan fox: How Jean Chrétien defied the elites and reshaped Canada</i> . Ottawa: Great River Media.	1937 - 2003	427

Parliamentary Proceedings

Official meeting records: 26th Parliament, Session 1	1963	1,818
Official meeting records: 26th Parliament, Session 1	1963	4,960
Official meeting records: 26th Parliament, Session 2	1964	4,597
Official meeting records: 26th Parliament, Session 2	1964	483

6.6.4 Method of analysis

After taking detailed notes in each of the traces mentioned, I felt confident what I had produced was an extensive collection of traces engaging the critical incident that I could begin actioning my research plan. Questioning the dearth of TCA archival material grounded my approach to first consider traces from published histories. There were only a select few that focus on TCA exclusively.

Pigott's (2001) *National Treasure* provides one of the more detailed accounts. His work is roughly balanced between the technical details of airplane machinery and the people and events involving the airline itself. Between my reading of the scant traces and published histories, I realized a subtle yet certain shift in reference to the airline's brand. From any one of the traces, it was not entirely clear when, why, and how it happened but the critical incident of

this research is a story generally left untold. Pigott's account comes the closest to offering an explanation but the history he offers is light on detail and quite topical. For example, the narrative he offers briefly mentions the legislative process whereby Jean Chrétien introduces a private members' bill that is sent to committee and subsequently passed in both the House of Commons and Senate but lacks a fulsome exploration about how this event materialized through a unique choreographed waltz among national, government, and business interests.

Given the potential importance of this research studying the TCA name change I decided to focus on the circumstances involving this event, especially Chrétien at the centre of it. By exacting this point in the past – a time in Canada's history characterized by multiple controversies threatening national unity including language disputes and concerns of nationalism – the research illustrated AMH's analytical value in taking a micro-slice of an organization to generate new understandings of the past. Traces from the period extends from 1960 to 1965 with a clear emphasis on 1963-1964. This followed a data analysis process similarly laid out by Hartt, Mills, Helms Mills, and Corrigan (2014) who organized traces into themes to generate narratives. It was an iterative process, surfacing and following traces to saturate themes. The traces that were most relevant to the research focused on two broad themes: bilingualism and nationalism. Table 5 outlines how I moved from traces to themes to narratives. I admit that, from these, the traces I followed to generate narratives that pluralized TCA's history are all choices I made. However, in true AMH form, in each step of the analysis, I remain self-aware of the role I play assembling the past and do so by offering reflexive disclosure.

Table 5: Moving from Traces to Themes to Narratives

Trace	Excerpt	Code(s)	Theme(s)	Narrative(s)
Industrial History	Staniland (2003, p. 78): “You stay out of the taxpayer’s pockets and I’ll stay out of your hair.”	Government intervention Financial responsibility Regulatory oversight	Paternalism	An intimately involved federal government within the affairs of the airline.
Popular History	Pigott (2001, p. 447): “...the relabeling of Canada... [and soon] a new national flag and a new identity based on biculturalism.”	National symbols	Nationalism	An independent nation-state free from the old English order for all to organize.
Parliamentary Proceedings	House of Commons (1964b, p. 479): “I feel that that name is quite acceptable, that its use would be advantageous throughout the world and that, in Canada itself, it would correspond to the bicultural nature of the country.”	Distinct society Identity politics	Biculturalism	A new era of Canadian business and society based on English and French culture co-existing.
Political Memoir	Chrétien (1985, p. 39): “In 1964 I wanted to change the name Trans-Canada Airlines to Air Canada. This was the period of rampant, sometimes violent nationalism in Quebec, and the old name had become a hateful symbol because it didn’t translate easily into French.”	English supremacy French minority Official languages	Bilingualism	An unofficial period of early bilingualism reflected in the renaming of visible, federal institutions beginning with Canada’s national air career.

6.7 Summary

Throughout this chapter I have sought to lay bare the mechanics of the program of research taken to illustrate AMH and, along the way, reveal my philosophical assumptions about the nature of knowledge. I claim that while there is no perfect research, researchers in MOS best serve the scholarly community by committing to transparency (Foster & Wiebe, 2010). Thus, why I have chosen the route of conducting a study using archival material is more about research pragmatics than anything else. The literature in our field showcases expansive methods of ‘doing history.’ Bell, Bryman, and Harley (2018), however, note that there is value in determining best fit among metatheoretical assumptions, choice of method(s), and methodology. The use of naturally occurring data that is auditable can be useful for others to gain insight into how micro-history in an actor-network approach is produced as knowledge.

A discussion about using archival material helped to reveal the amodern approach that this research uses to understand how specific histories develop over time. Specific to the TCA case, analysis of the material, grounded in my belief that historical research dealing with questions of ‘how,’ was informed by the qualitative postpositivism tradition (Prasad, 2005) which problematizes research as critique. It is not enough to accept history at face value. AMH attempts to help this research uncover those people and things that until now have not been closely analyzed in one place. Through the inclusion of various types of sources and material, we can see how themes emerge to form alternate accounts of a key change event that took place over 55 years ago in TCA/AC. In the chapter that follows, I use a critical incident within TCA’s history to bring about an empirical illustration of the potential of AMH and through this process, hope to underscore the importance of granularity in historical research of business and organizations.

Chapter 7: Empirically Illustrating ANTi-Microhistory

7.1 Introduction

This chapter is about illustrating the usefulness of the AMH approach by practicing it empirically using the TCA case as an example. The premise of AMH is that in its combination of literatures, it promises a way of ‘doing history’ that personifies creative synthesis in MOS. It offers a straightforward yet innovative historical method in practice. The research herein first looks at a (re)assembly of the socio-politics of TCA and its context in the early 1960s, the period in which the critical incident involving the airline takes place. From there, I take a closer look at the organization’s historical narrative. By closely examining relations from deep within the actor-network, what we may know about the organization’s history is more rounded than atop networks (e.g., durable actors and actants that interact to produce a version of the past). Then, the research concentrates on the slice in time when TCA faced an important moment in its history. A freshman backbencher in the federal government at the time, Jean Chrétien, is at the centre of this story. Closely following his interest work sheds light on how TCA was reintroduced to the domestic market as a fully bilingual, pan-Canadian brand vis-à-vis AC. The final section draws on the methodological insights of AMH to illustrate how several factors, actions, and relations worked together to inform this research.

7.2 Exploring the TCA Actor-Network and Context

The story of Trans Canada Airlines can be recounted across numerous works (Ashley, 1963; Collins, 1978; Blatherwick, 1989; Molson, 1974; Pigott, 2001, 2014; Stevenson, 1987). TCA was formed on April 10, 1937 as a crown corporation for four key reasons: (a) to fend off a perceived growing threat from foreign competition (e.g., Imperial Airways of Britain and Pan

American World Airways in the United States were actively seeking government approval to add Canadian destinations); (b) consolidate and legitimize an era of civil aviation in its infancy; (c) provide service from coast to coast for passengers to travel across the country, and; (d) facilitate the transportation of postage service across the country (Molson, 1974). Against this backdrop of growing nationalist, social, and economic concerns (Sampson, 1984), the birth of TCA can be viewed as a significant point in history with far reaching implications; it was more than just the founding of a trans-national airline. Throughout its history, TCA proved to be a symbol of Canadian industry, national pride, and culture. There are few examples more illustrative of this than the politics involved in the maintenance of TCA. What I wish for this section to do is provide insight into the first layer of TCA's history revealed as three actants that inform the assembly of a broad network of context: (a) the role of federal government in the airline; (b) politics of geography; (c) inclusion of French language. Each are interrelated in their contribution to helping surface the gap in knowledge about the airline's past and will, through the second part of my analysis, help in (re)assembling this mystery involving the airline's brand name.

7.2.1 Role of federal government in the airline

The founding of TCA helped establish a framework of political intervention in the air transport business (Mills & Helms Hatfield, 1998). Organized as a crown corporation, the federal government had a vested interest in its affairs and often went to great lengths to ensure its going concern. For instance, the federal government took responsibility for numerous aspects of the airline from selecting TCA's top management team (see Hartt, 2015, 2018) to approving new travel routes and services. After all, the airline was supported with money from the Canadian

taxpayer. It was expected of the airline's leadership to work closely with its overlords (i.e., the Department of Transport), especially the man who, as Minister of Transport, founded the organization: C.D. Howe.

As the airline took flight – literally with its first voyage carrying fare-paying customers in September 1937 and figuratively through its success in the early years – it became evident to Howe and his colleagues in cabinet that fostering growth within the competitive environment would require someone ‘on the ground’ to run the organization (Collins, 1978). Howe saw a missed opportunity – it was for good reason that the president of the airline has some knowledge of, and background in, aviation. After the war, in 1946, Gordon McGregor had joined TCA on its operations management team. His military experience as an air force ace (Pigott, 2014) likely earned him a spot. Howe, a businessman-turned-politician, had not served Canada this way but made up for it in his determination to see a national airline succeed in its service to Canada, especially an outplacement for returning veterans of the war (Lemieux & Card, 2001).

Howe's enrollment of Gordon McGregor as TCA's third president was one that made sense. While it is not entirely clear the reasons why Howe, who regarded the airline as his “progeny and generally promoted its interests” (Stevenson, 1987, p. 198), selected McGregor as chief executive, his (1) service as a decorated Group Captain in the Royal Canadian Air Force during the Second World War; (2) reputation as a prudent manager; (3) and infatuation with TCA rivaling only Howe's, made him “an ideal president to get the government airline out of the red” (Pigott, 2014, p. 42). According to McGregor's (1980, p. 1) memoirs, TCA “had two substantial deficit years behind them” and was “already headed for a very much greater loss in 1948.” McGregor checked off a lot of boxes for Howe. At his first meeting with the man responsible for his appointment as president, McGregor inquired about the nature of his mandate

to which Howe advised: “You stay out of the taxpayer’s pockets and I’ll stay out of your hair” (Staniland, 2003, p. 78). No doubt McGregor’s service as a decorated pilot in the air campaign instigated Howe’s translation of the TCA network.

Beyond involving itself in TCA’s leadership, the federal government also played a key role in creating conditions for the airline’s success in the marketplace. By virtue of its being owned by the government, TCA was a bureaucratic enterprise lacking the same entrepreneurial spirit than that of its competitor, the *Canadian Pacific Air Lines*. The government made up for this lack by continuing to regulate the air industry and restrict the approval of new air routes that would threaten the viability of TCA. Keith (1972, p. 295) referred to these interventionist policies as constituting a competitive environment as “the largest pool of air traffic anywhere in the world monopolized by a single carrier, with one exception... RUSSIA.”

Returning to the example of McGregor, we see numerous traces of McGregor’s influence as a de facto agent of the federal government that translate interests of actors within the Canadian aviation actor-network, including service providers (e.g., the Douglas Company), competitors (e.g., Canadair), and trade associations (e.g., the International Air Transport Association). Among these examples is McGregor’s enrollment of the federal government to allow TCA to embrace the Jet Age (Pigott, 2001). As a result of the federal government’s enduring role within the airline, TCA was able to flourish at the intersection of industry and politics.

7.2.2 *Politics of geography*

The topic of geography is an important part of the TCA actor-network and its historical context. When the federal government formed TCA in 1937, it did so under the guise of a nationally owned organization and likewise affixed the transnational brand identity to the

organization's name. It is tempting here to delve into the politics that produced the airline. If that were so, a discussion about the early railroad system (Daniels, 2000) would draw attention to the fact that the government owned *Canadian National Railways* (CNR) competed with its privately held rival, *Canadian Pacific Railway*, and these two railways served the political interests of the federal government at different points (e.g., linking Canada's economy to both coasts). These 'national' railways were instrumental in contributing to the idea of civilian flight in Canada (Helms Mills, 2002). TCA was formed from within CNR which meant the railroad industry shaped the airline during its early days.

Among the more visible outcomes of TCA's founding as a subsidiary out from the railway is its geography. For most of its formative years, TCA was associated with its regional base in Montreal where CNR also operated. Smith (1986) notes that beyond this, Montreal made the most sense because it was close to Ottawa and the *International Civil Aviation Organization*. Many of its air routes served Eastern Canada, with only a smattering of destinations west of Toronto. The politics of geography may have been more strategic than how it first appears.

During McGregor's tenure as president, TCA relocated its home base from Winnipeg to Montreal. McGregor was a native of Montreal, having graduated from McGill University before switching careers from corporate management for Bell Telephone Company to the Royal Canadian Air Force (McGregor, 1980). In the late 1950s, at the dawn of the Jet Age in civil aviation took hold, McGregor became eager to match Pan American World Airways' enthusiasm (Deal, Mills, Helms Mills, & Durepos, 2019) for turbo engine aircraft. His interest in the technology was met with concern by maintenance personnel. Jet aircraft meant the airline would phase-out its Viscount turboprop aircraft. The Viscount base in Winnipeg began to relocate to Dorval airport in Montreal but not without first enrolling the mayor, Stephen Juba, and several

members of parliament from Manitoba to the cause. While personnel transfers were temporarily halted, eventually the airline closed shop in Winnipeg and officially relocated its headquarters to McGregor's home city.

What these politics of geography illustrate is how TCA's (and by extension, the federal government's) supposed favouring of Eastern Canada, especially Montreal, over the West furthered the cultural divide across the country. There were political implications involved in the move to Montreal too. Hartt, Mills, Helms Mills, and Corrigan (2014), for example, illustrate the growing influence of Quebec in TCA by following the decision-making processes involved in naming Yves Pratte (a Quebec lawyer and Francophone) as McGregor's successor. Shortly, I will also show how the federal government's concern for bilingualism, among other factors, instigated a proposal by a newly minted member of parliament from Quebec (i.e., Chrétien) to rename TCA. This narrative renders a picture of tension between Eastern and Western Canada reflected in Canadian culture during the 1960s. An expression of this tension between geographies is the issue of language.

7.2.3 Status of the French language

This third issue of language worked in tandem with the previous two. Given the federal government's active involvement in the airline's affairs and that it was headquartered in Montreal, a clear association of TCA as a bilingual company had become quite clear (Stevenson, 1987). This was not always the case. Smith (1986, p. 278) describes TCA's management as an "old school tie network" of Anglophone men. In fact, by the early 1960s, a mere 8 percent of the Montreal-based employees were Francophones and less than half were considered bilingual

(Mills & Helms Hatfield, 1998). A series of events took place for TCA to enroll the French language in its operations.

A cultural struggle attempting to define and understand Canadian identity separate from the old English order took place about the same time period that TCA settled into its new home in Montreal. The idea that since Confederation, Canada had moved ‘from colony to nation to colony’ frustrated a growing group of Canadians that saw the country stuck historically and geographically between two of the world’s largest English-speaking empires (i.e., United Kingdom and the United States). A few policy changes – namely the *Statute of Westminster 1931* and the *Citizenship Act of 1946* – helped quell unrest. Still, key English symbols remained intact and the Liberals, now led by Lester B. Pearson, were ready to undo them.

It can be said that the counter-enrollment process of the English order in Canada took form in Pearson’s legislative agenda of rebranding Canada’s national symbols and institutions. For example, the Great Flag Debate (Champion, 2006) resulted in the Union Jack’s displacement for a new maple leaf design. During this time in Canada, status of the French language within Quebec and between the federal government and the province, was a contentious political issue. Pearson is said to have been sympathetic to the plight of French-speaking citizens who did not see themselves (or language) in national life (English, 2011). Before forming the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, Pearson moved “to render the activities of federal institutions thoroughly bilingual, and the most visible (at least difficult) place to start the reforms was with respect to official nomenclature” (Christiano, 1996, p. 51). TCA thus appeared to be ripe for change.

Three attempts in the past had been made involving the French language and TCA’s name. McGregor (1980) notes that the term ‘Air Canada’ was authorized in 1953 as a trade name

used in international routes to mimic the practices of other national carriers (e.g., Air France). Use of the AC name was limited to promotional activity to non-English speaking customers including the Quebec market. Then, in 1959, McGregor saw AC as a brand “which being bilingual avoided the need to use two names in the Canadian market” (McGregor, 1980, p. 140-141). TCA could not translate well into the French language without sounding clumsy. However, in this attempt, the Transport Ministry (Hees) disapproved of the proposed change. The third bid involved the first attempt using federal legislation. Judy LaMarsh – a little known member of the Liberals’ rank and file – took up the cause. It failed to gain traction in the Conservative-led House of Commons. Mills and Helms Hatfield (1998) note that the growing bilingual character of TCA gave symbolic form when the airline was officially renamed AC in 1965. What we do not yet see, though, is how this change unfolded in a series of small but consequential moves.

At this point in the research, the story of TCA is contained within an actor-network that is quite broad and includes three actants that give it shape: the federal government, geography, and language. These work together to punctuate an account of TCA’s past. What we see now is that throughout the histories of TCA/AC (or those works that include it), there is a gap in the narrative. The next section attempts to illustrate how, by taking a slice of the organization’s past and bringing it up close using AMH, we can see an important change that involves the airline’s brand occur quietly in the open. There may be more to the story than what meets the eye; this research attempts a fulsome analysis of the socio-politics that glue the historical narrative together. We will zoom in on this case and surface the interest work of a little-known Liberal backbencher from Quebec, Jean Chrétien, and see the role he played in bringing about change at TCA.

7.3 Performing AMH of Events that Transformed TCA to AC

The previous section took up the task of setting the stage and exploring TCA's network up to the critical change incident. This featured an analysis of actor-networks that engaged in a process of interest-driven politics to negotiate a historical context of TCA. That process helped sketch the shape of the organization's network, illustrating how this can only bring us so far analytically. The analytical focus atop the topography of TCA's history helps us see how knowledge of the past comes together but what it lacks is greater insight. In the case of TCA, details of specific interest work from actors and actants within the network are amiss. Extant histories of TCA attempt a chronological account of key events that took place over the course of its past, some even include reference to the name change. By essentializing the narrative (i.e., focus only on the fact that AC took over the TCA brand), important insights may be glossed over. Crafting history this way misses the opportunity that I take in this dissertation of exploring the micro-political processes of change.

The task at hand now is to take the research deep into the socio-politics of TCA's history straddling the years 1963 and 1964, tracing the minor knowledge involved in TCA's critical change incident. Here we go beneath the surface of dates and perform an in-depth investigation of those people and things engrossed in activity that work together to pull off the AC rebrand. Zooming in on a point of interest, in this case, interrogating TCA's socio-politics through the interests of Jean Chrétien, allows us to see AMH at work. We will see how the effect of Chrétien in the airline network eventually produced the sense of a refurbished corporate identity vis-à-vis the AC brand outside Quebec (the term 'Air Canada' had long been used in the airline's French operation). Raising Chrétien in this case supports how AMH centres analytical value on focalizing an actor/actant and their role in the production of historical knowledge.

Before we dig deep into the network, let us set the stage. It is 1963 in Canada. The decade had opened with a Conservative populist, John Diefenbaker, as prime minister but now the passing of the torch to a new generation of national leadership is well underway. The country has just weathered the 26th federal election that saw the rise of fortunes for Pearson's Liberals and their promise of '60 Days of Decision.' This election theme was designed as a series of proposals to help flesh out the grand idea of a new Canada. Included in Pearson's platform was a promise to legislate a return to 'common sense governance' that would punctuate Canadian nationalism: issues like a publicly funded national health care strategy and the Canadian Pension Plan serve as a starting point. Among this loose legislative framework stood one policy that would invariably shape the politics behind federal institutions: official bilingualism. This policy served a role in the airline that was more than what you would expect from any political or symbolic gesture. Canadian nationalism was becoming an actant that evolved within the ranks of the federal government machinery and, ultimately, enrolled in one of Canada's important institutions: TCA.

7.3.1 Composing the actor-network of young Jean Chrétien

For a person of his notoriety, Chrétien is not one to give us too many clues about himself. Since before his time as prime minister and in the years following, he has published three memoirs (Chretien, 1985, 2008, 2018). In each of them he makes either a passing remark or dedicates a few pages to letting readers into his life apart from public service. His writing is somewhat divorced from shining the spotlight inwardly on his early life and career. He favours big ideas than finer microhistorical details. What follows is the best arrangement of traces available to me in archival material. This will help us understand the individual – Chrétien –

better in his multiple subjectivities and reveal insight into his socio-politics involved in TCA's critical change incident.

Joseph Jacques Jean Chrétien was born on January 11, 1934. He is the eighteenth of 19 children born to Wellie and Marie (née Boisvert) Chrétien. Shawinigan, a small township in southern Quebec known for its Catholic working-class Francophone population, had been the home of the Chrétien family for generations. His grandfather, François Chrétien, first exposed his family to the world of Liberal politics by volunteering as a party organizer and later, serving as mayor of Saint-Étienne-des-Grès (neighbouring village) for 30 years (Chrétien, 1985). Wellie had only known Liberal politics. He was a complicated man whose staunch Liberal beliefs attracted much disapproval from within his community but especially the local parish priest who all but banished the Chrétien family from the church for their lacking support of the conservative Union Nationale party (Martin, 1995). This made it difficult for young Chrétien in his schooling in Catholic schools where he developed a reputation as being a tough guy with an "atrocious temper" (Martin, 1995, p. 23) who preferred to scrap than study. Despite this dynamic, Chrétien gravitated to his father's political preferences.

From the age of 14 years old, Chrétien accompanied his father to canvas for local Liberal candidates. Not one to backdown from a political fight, in his senior year, Chrétien often skipped school to give speeches to Liberal-friendly events. When in the 1952 Quebec provincial election Premier Maurice Duplessis threatened to withhold approval of a badly needed bridge for the community if they did not elect a Member of the National Assembly from his Union Nationale party, Chrétien retorted: "I will cross the river swimming, but I will never cross on my knees" (Chrétien, 1985, p. 16). The political bug had bitten. His father saw in him the making of a future career in elected politics.

When Chrétien finished secondary schooling at Séminaire Saint-Joseph de Trois-Rivières, the topic of university had come up with his father. Wellie steered the young Chrétien toward studying law as a path to public office (Chrétien, 2008). This was an era in Canadian politics that even businesspeople had a difficult time succeeding in elections let alone a Francophone from rural Quebec. Law school made the most sense, the Université Laval was closer to home and less expensive than McGill, and Chrétien had the grades for it. A good Catholic, Chrétien obeyed his father and graduated from Laval as president of the Young Liberals (Chrétien, 1985).

7.3.2 Aligning early interests of Chrétien as lawyer-cum-political apprentice

Chrétien's subjectivity as 'Chrétien-employment-lawyer' is of concern as we see how the assemblage of relations hold together in producing the TCA change situation. To begin, the bundle of relations that produces Chrétien-employment-lawyer involves his social consciousness. In his later years, Chrétien reflected that his social class as both a child of a blue-collar family and a Francophone in an increasingly English-speaking province produced an inferiority complex (Granatstein & Hillmer, 1999). It was nothing for Chrétien to leave the busy city life and return home to Shawinigan. He was comfortable wearing inexpensive suits, driving a small car, and living in the working-class neighbourhood of Shawinigan North (Plamondon, 2017). There, Chrétien set-up shop as an employment lawyer often representing locals in labour disputes advocating for better working conditions and living wages. Chrétien-employment-lawyer himself later reflected on his personal attachment to the lower and middle-class: "My social ambition was to be on the populist side, not the side of business" (Granatstein & Hillmer, 1999, p. 101). These experiences along with being the son of a mechanist, grandson to a local

Liberal prodigy, de facto excommunicated Catholic, schoolyard scrapper, and political activist hold Chrétien-employment-lawyer together.

Over time, these interests became more stable in the way Chrétien enrolled the Saint-Maurice-Laflèche Liberal riding association. Since a young boy, Chrétien was raised to be politically active. Now that he completed his schooling and had a few years practice, the next step would be to finally get his name on the ballot. Loyalty to the Liberal Party, though, meant he would not even consider challenging Joseph-Adolphe Richard (the incumbent Liberal MP) for his home riding's nomination. Richard had been the Member of Parliament since 1949 but was swept out of office by the Créditiste party wave in Quebec that elected twenty-six members during the 1962 Canadian election (McCall-Newman, 1982). That election produced a minority Conservative government that eventually lasted for a mere 304 days. The interregnum was unusually long, and the Saint-Maurice-Laflèche Liberal riding association had difficulty recruiting candidates for the nomination (Hill, 2002). Lamy had wrestled the riding away with nearly double the Liberal vote. Frustrated with Lamy's performance and lacking enthusiasm within the riding association, Chrétien harped that the riding "needed a legislator" (Plamondon, 2017, p .12) and campaigned for the nomination. He easily won the nomination but was seen as an underdog up against the incumbent.

Chrétien denied even to his own campaign team that he had little chance of winning. This doubt only fueled Chrétien's ethic of hard work. He spent long hours on the campaign trail doing retail politics: enrolling voters to his cause one person at a time. It was this approach that would later lend success to Chrétien's national campaigns: "If you make the voter feel happy or comfortable, you'll get his vote. If you're pushy or tense or clumsy or self-satisfied, you'll lost that vote forever" (Chrétien, 1985, p. 25). He was so convinced of himself that throughout his

first campaign he waged a series of friendly bets with family, friends, and supporters alike.

Chrétien (2018, p. 111) recalled that “all this activity created a sense of change, and it began to be said that the Liberal candidate Jean Chrétien was going to win, which is what happened on April 8, 1963.”

While it is impossible to know for certain, but had it not been for these networks of working together to help remake the performance of Chrétien, the shape of TCA’s history may look a lot different than what it is today. In the next section we will follow him to Parliament – a network itself that, with his activism, changed form especially its performance of the TCA critical incident. The subjectivity of Chrétien–employment-lawyer was necessary to make his next big move.

7.3.3 Enrolling bilingualism as a political cause

The period between the election and opening the 26th Canadian Parliament was a mere 38 days. This was unusually short in those days given the logistical challenge of bringing together members from across the country back to the House of Commons. Having only won a slim minority government, the Pearson Liberals acted in haste to begin their 60 Days of Decision policy. Chrétien had very little time to wind up his law practice and head for Ottawa. The story goes that he packed up his car and drove the four-hour trek to the nation’s capital to conduct the peoples work (Chrétien, 2008).

Chrétien arrived in Ottawa at a momentous time. He was part of a team that had won government based on Pearson’s political instincts of enrolling his party to the idea of Canadian nationalism. This was a politically popular move. The Conservatives had intentionally slow walked policy for six years, quashing any idea that threatened to upset their political orthodoxy of bearing full allegiance to the Commonwealth. By the time the Liberals replaced them, the

administrative state in Ottawa had all but officially embraced the idea of a distinctly Canadian national policy. As has been raised previously, the Great Flag Debate is a good example of this but an even better one is the way the Gordon Royal Commission on Canada's Economic Prospects was handled by both the incoming Diefenbaker government and the federal bureaucracy in 1957. The Commission was initiated by the St. Laurent Liberals to develop a new policy framework for the Canadian economy (Azzi, 1999). The Chair, Walter L. Gordon (a Liberal supporter) questioned the federal government's (which had been governed by Liberals for a near-generation) practice approving foreign companies to take controlling interests in Canadian natural resources and other domestic business. Diefenbaker became prime minister after the election in 1957 and ignored the Commission's recommendations to implement a mild program of economic nationalism (Newman, 1963). At the same time, the federal bureaucracy, under the leadership of Robert Bryce as Clerk of the Privy Council, quietly began laying groundwork for the eventual Canada Development Corporation (Johnson, 2006) – a public-private partnership charged with developing and maintaining Canadian-controlled commerce.

Nationalism was a durable actor in the Pearson Liberal Party that Chrétien had just joined as an elected MP. A part of that new Canadian nationalism would be aspirations for biculturalism and official bilingualism. At the start of the 26th Canadian Parliament, Canada was largely characterized by a social divide between English and French speakers. Federal institutions also reflected this pattern. Chrétien, himself a Francophone with very little grasp of the English language (Plamondon, 2017), discovered the business of government was conducted totally in English. Only a handful of parliamentarians could speak French (including those representing Quebec). Pearson, himself unilingual, was concerned about the lacking bicultural and bilingual character of the civil service and “felt at the time that it would have been good to make Canadian

institutions more acceptable to the Francophone” (Stursberg, 1978, p. 327). The issue of French integration would become a legislative framework for Pearson and, so, Chrétien enrolled this cause and distinguished himself by becoming “friends with many of the anglophone parliamentarians” (Chrétien, 1985, p. 26).

7.3.4 Turbulent translation of bilingual interests: Precursor and context

His enrollment strategy set and bilingualism his cause, all that was left for Chrétien was to attempt translation of these interests. Chrétien saw an opportunity for his opening act as a freshman in Parliament. He decided to make a play for the TCA name issue. On July 4, 1963, he introduced Bill No. C-81, ‘The Trans-Canada Air Lines Act: Amendment Respecting Name of Company’ (House of Commons [HOC], 1963a). According to the Library of Parliament records, Chrétien’s private member’s bill attracted little interest beyond receiving initial approval for a first reading in the House. In his first memoir, Chrétien (1985, p. 39) explained

it is almost impossible for a back-bencher to get a bill passed. There’s only an hour a day, between five and six o’clock, for the discussion of private members’ bills, so not many come up in a session. Those that do must be passed in the hour or they’re sent back to the bottom of the list, and seldom surface again. Each party can speak on the bill, and the government can always kill it by getting a member to talk till six o’clock.

This was his first attempt, and he learned that it would take him corralling a much stronger network of actors to translate his interests.

Brushing off his failure, he had set aside his introversion and forged friendships across party loyalties for when he needed them. On one occasion, six months into his new job, Chrétien found himself at odds with his party. The Liberals had proposed adjusting the dual inscriptions of ‘Postes/Postage’ from stamps (HOC, 1963b), effectively ridding the French translation. Chrétien enrolled Real Caouette and Louis-Joseph Pigeon (both opposition MP’s) to oppose this change. He even went so far as to join in on questioning the politics of the Postmaster General during

Question Period: “In view of the of the reports published in some newspapers, can the minister tell the house if it is true that the words ‘Postes’ and ‘Postage’ used by the Post Office Department will disappear?” (Chrétien quoted in HOC, 1963b, p. 4960). This was important to Chrétien because the Postmaster, Azellus Denis, was a Liberal cabinet minister and therefore, was supposed to be onside the bilingual cause. To top it off: Denis was also a Francophone representing a Quebec riding. Chrétien was successful in swaying the decision of his own government’s policy. As is the case in politics, his success was a moral victory than anything else. Translating his leader’s interests was also advantageous: aligning himself with Pearson and mobilizing the national bilingual project would eventually pay off in increasing visibility within the Liberal party (e.g., cabinet positions, fundraising, earned media).

Translating Pearson’s interests for bilingualism within Canadian institutions proved tricky for Chrétien after the postage issue though. He appeared to have developed a taste for welding together his own interest with the Canadian franchise. Chrétien attempted a hat trick in bilingual policy. Where he made only a serious attempt at enrolling nationalism to the House of Commons network with the postage debate, another ‘easy win’ presented itself: the country’s national holiday. ‘Dominion Day’ seemed an awkward reminder of British imperialism in an increasingly independent Canada. Chrétien borrowed the exact legislation, Bill No. C-104, ‘Provision for Name for National Holiday on July 1,’ that had previously failed approval in the Senate in 1946 (HOC, 1964a). His proposal was dropped from government business at the conclusion of the second session of Parliament. When Chrétien tried to resurrect the bill a second time in 1965 it was filibustered by the opposition out of fears of republicanism (Reid, 1984).

7.3.5 *Instigating change through actors trifecta*

What Chrétien learned in his first year in Ottawa was that the interests of his leader, Pearson, meant bilingualism would enroll (and be enrolled) in public policy throughout the federal government apparatus. It would serve him well to help translate these into substantive legislation wins. Indeed, it was this logic (or perhaps his naivety) that instigated Chrétien into action. If he were to ever become more than the ‘little guy from Shawinigan’ (Lackenbauer, 2002) then he needed a breakout moment. Without knowing it at the time, Chrétien was about to bring together several key actors and their interests spanning TCA, the federal government, and business media to orchestrate the renaming one of Canada’s most significant, visible institutions (Mills & Helms Mills, 2006; Smith, 1986). Here is a brief sketch of these actors that further build context around Chrétien’s bold TCA debate.

TCA vis-à-vis McGregor. Through the political work of McGregor, TCA long lobbied the government to approve the AC brand for domestic use. Two previous attempts failed to materialize but an opening seemed to present another opportunity when the Liberals returned to power. McGregor quickly met with the new minister of transport, George J. McIlraith, and, to his delight, “the minister took pains to point out that he was out of touch with the company... and this constituted a gap in his knowledge” (Pigott, 2001, p. 439). It was just a year prior to this meeting that LaMarsh’s attempt failed in Parliament by technicality. Before McGregor could advocate for the issue once more, John Pickersgill replaced McIlraith at the Department of Transport. A new minister meant another careful waltz between balancing the interests of TCA with the political agenda of a minority government. Coupled with the game of musical chairs at Transport and two failed attempts at change, McGregor was once burned and twice shy. If change were to happen, it would need to come from power brokers deep within the government.

Federal government. From archival material, it appears that the issue of TCA had simmered in Parliament since following LaMarsh's attempt in 1962. At different points the machinery of government was seemingly reluctant to tackle the issue and excuses ran the gamut. An approved AC name would be dangerously confusing to English air traffic controllers working outside of Quebec (Christiano, 1996). Pigeon, a Conservative from Quebec who had previously teamed up with Chrétien in the bilingual stamp debate, encountered the old NCA of financial prudence as he drew the admission from McIlraith that such a change would be too costly even if all it took was "a few members of parliament" who agreed to "pool their pennies" to supply the materials and paint the refurbished aircraft themselves (Pigott, 2014, p. 63). The lack of will within Parliament to take on the legislative burden of amending the *Trans-Canada Air Lines Act* much less be criticized by the Opposition for 'unnecessary nationalism' meant the status quo would rue the day. In ways that we will find out, these issues Chrétien would time correctly and succeed where others before him had failed.

Canadian business news media. The ways in which the business news media played a part in instigating the TCA debate centres on Chrétien's early political work. When he arrived in Ottawa, as is the practice at the start of a new Parliament, committee assignments were being doled out. Party leaders make these decisions, and we are told they are not easy (Bakvis, 2000). It typically follows a process wrought with socio-politics that a leader attempts to negotiate. Backroom deals, special interests, and promises made in recruiting star candidates during elections must be honoured. The story goes that when Pearson had been agonizing over these early decisions, he was met with a rather unusual request: Chrétien, the rookie MP from a politically insignificant township in rural Quebec, volunteered to sit on the House of Commons powerful banking and finance committee (Chrétien, 1985). Plamondon (2017) notes that this was

highly unusual of a MP from Quebec because it was thought that economic policy was a responsibility for Anglophone politicians only. The attitude at the time was such that a Francophone would not be seen to add much value given most Canadian business was conducted in the English language. The innerworkings of Pearson's decision are unknown but Chrétien succeeded in his request. This was his way of learning the ropes; he made it a habit of educating himself by being widely read of business news.

Just as Bay Street was growing restless with the federal government's indecision of TCA's name, an article with the provocative title *Be Brave Ottawa, Be Brave* appeared in the *Financial Post*. What Chrétien saw that morning during his habitual practice perusing the daily news was his colleague's (Louis-Joseph Pigeon) cause front and centre:

Despite the needling of amused French Canadian members of the House, the government and Trans-Canada Air Lines demonstrate a remarkable unwillingness to use the expression Air Canada except in a limited manner and where considered appropriate... Why not call our government airline Air Canada? Why perpetuate a dualism that is clumsy, confusing and wholly unnecessary? Air Canada would be a proud and splendid name in international usage, and if it incidentally recognized the bilingual character of this country that would be a plus of not inconsiderable importance (National Post, 1963, p. 8).

Here was a business news institution in English Canada encouraging the federal government to change the TCA brand in the interest of equality. The successive attempts over the years originating from both TCA and the federal government had finally come home to roost. Chrétien could sense the opportunity before him.

7.3.6 Reassembling minor knowledge: Antecedents of the TCA debate

By the time Chrétien stood to his feet in the House of Commons chamber on March 3, 1964, to attempt his second proposal of changing TCA's name, he had not even been an MP for a full year. In his short time in Parliament, Chrétien had quickly learned the vagaries of politics.

He started his term an unknown commodity. That was not for long though. By forging friendships from within his party, across partisan lines, and spanning language and cultural barriers, Chrétien had taken these as lessons in personal politics. These experiences – from his early fumbling of the TCA proposal to the postage stamp debate – became actants in his political network that would serve as a reminder of what it takes to make it in Ottawa much less in jockeying for a future cabinet role.

Some 104 days had now passed since the *Be Brave Ottawa, Be Brave* provocation aroused his interest. Few details let us trace exactly what Chrétien had done between reading the article and standing again for a private members bill, but we can see by the way Chrétien was about to align several interests that he had been working hard to win over to his cause. So, then, just before Chrétien took to the floor, he enacted his plan. Among his memoirs and TCA corporate histories, the minor knowledge of the TCA debate proceeded in the following way.

Quite a few things had to align before Chrétien could make his move. First, he timed the introduction of his bill at exactly the right moment. During the second session of Parliament, the shine of the new Pearson government had worn off and there were a host of policy issues (e.g., the Flag Debate) that the Conservatives felt were overly nationalistic and potentially inflammatory (Pigott, 2001). Second, Pearson had to confide in Chrétien his commitment to developing a ‘true biculturalism’ where francophone interests would be reflected throughout the federal government (Hillmer, 1999) which gave Chrétien his courage. Third, rising cultural tensions following a string of explosions in Montreal by the Quebec nationalist group Front de libération du Québec underscored the importance of federalist policy in Ottawa. Fourth, Pickersgill – a mainstay in Liberal establishment politics for three decades – needed to be okay with a backbencher (i.e., Chrétien) taking the policy lead since the national airline file

technically fell to him as the incoming minister of Transport. Pickersgill appeared to be fine with allowing Chrétien tackle what could be a politically volatile issue.

As the moment of all this interest work aligned, the network of the TCA debate was finally set. There was no way Chrétien would repeat the same mistakes as his first attempt; this may have been the only opportunity to revisit the issue again before the opposition were to trigger an election – such is the life of a minority government. The second reading of the bill was about to take place.

7.3.7 Alternative actors enrolled and conduct interest work

Just before five o'clock (the usual time reserved for the House to consider private members' business), Chrétien cashed in on his months' long campaign of personal politics. He knew from experience that the rules of engagement in the House of Commons favoured 'the little guy' filibustering motions by running out the debate clock. He had done this himself on occasion. When it came his turn, though, he took every precaution to protect the TCA debate from the usual shenanigans of backbenchers who simply stood to agitate. The ever-politicking Chrétien enlisted the help of a group of MPs from across partisan lines with whom he spent time socializing.

From his memoirs, we are told that he first went to see Rémi Paul – a staunch conservative representing Quebec. Even though their politics were different, they had a lot in common. Both were 'sons of Quebec;' attended the same schools; and even belonged to the same local bar association. Chrétien (1985, p. 40) appealed to him on this basis by letting him know: "I have my bill on Air Canada coming up and you guys will kill it. That's not very good for Quebec. Help me. At least say nice things about it." Paul was a tough sell since his party was strongly opposed to the change, but he eventually acquiesced. Having convinced his

Conservative friend, he rehearsed the same plea to others but this time pitching the consequences for Canada (rather than Quebec). Soon, he enrolled an all-party alliance. Bob Prittie, a bilingual MP representing the New Democratic Party in British Columbia with a soft spot for Pearson's efforts to expand bilingualism throughout the federal franchise, agreed to the debate scheme. Even Réal Caouette, leader of the Social Credit Party and fellow-Quebecker, agreed not to speak too long.

7.3.8 Chrétien performs the TCA change

As the clock struck the top of the hour and the chamber began thinning out, Chrétien was about to deliver a speech that was unlike him. His opening remarks were prepared out-of-character: his reputation for grandiose, Canada-or-else rhetoric was sacrificed for a "very short, deliberately unprovocative speech" (Chrétien, 1985, p. 40). He wanted to be pragmatic and nothing more. Just as the Speaker finished announcing the second reading of Bill No. C-2, 'Trans-Canada Airlines Act: Amendment Respecting Name of Company,' the moment arrived for Chrétien. Clearing his throat, he began:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the honour of being the first member to introduce a bill during the second session of the present parliament. I moved the first reading of this bill during the last session and I am pleased to see that by chance it is the first one to be considered during this session. It is a bill of national interest...

I would like to summarize some of the main factors behind the introduction of Bill No. C-2. First, the name Air Canada is certainly bilingual. It has precisely the same connotation and meaning in English and in French, the two official languages of our nation. The name Air Canada is a shorter appellation which does away with cumbersome translation, as is the case with Trans-Canada Air Lines, which in French is Les Lignes Aériennes Trans-Canada. Many countries of the world are already using a designation of this kind to identify their national air lines. This is the case with Air India, Air France, Air Liban, Air Algerie, and Swissair, to name but a few. Originally the name Trans-Canada Air Lines served to designate an air line which serviced a domestic network of communications. This designation is no longer acceptable because the air line now services routes that go beyond the nation's geographical frontiers, indeed routes that touch many parts of the world. (HOC, 1964b, p. 478).

Chrétien then pointed out that his bill was “similar in nature and substance” (HOC, 1964b, p. 478) that was introduced previously by LaMarsh while the Liberals warmed the opposition bench during the previous Parliament. This was not the first time he had reintroduced legislation. Recall his attempt to resurrect legislation that would rename Dominion Day. It is interesting note that at the time of this TCA debate, LaMarsh had been promoted from the backbench to cabinet. Her appointment as Minister of National Health and Welfare is worth noting its historic significance: LaMarsh was only the second female federal cabinet minister in all Canadian history and the first to serve in a Liberal cabinet (Bennett, 2007). We do not know from the empirical materials if her attempt to change the TCA name played a role, but it certainly did not hurt her political fortune. Chrétien’s nod to LaMarsh’s previous attempt was likely a gratuitous gesture but also reminded others that the issue had not been fully vetted.

By bringing the debate back to the durable actants of nationalism and bilingualism, Chrétien attempted an enrollment of the *Be Brave Ottawa, Be Brave* article to legitimize the support of a broad network that cut across the country:

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw your attention to an editorial by Mr. Ayotte, published in *La Presse* on October 12, 1963, and which refers to an article published on the same subject in the *Financial Post*. It said in French: “Even Toronto wants the designation Air Canada.” It is not only French Canada which is requesting that our state-owned air line should be designated only by the words Air Canada. The *Financial Post* of Toronto advocates it in terms much more pressing than those we used at any time we raised the question these last few years...

Mr. Speaker, I have tried to be as objective as possible in presenting a few arguments in favour of the designation Air Canada. I feel that that name is quite acceptable, that its use would be advantageous throughout the world and that, in Canada itself, it would correspond to the bicultural nature of the country, not to mention the fact that it would indicate the international character of Trans-Canada Air Lines, a corporation which in a few minutes time, I hope, will see its name changed to Air Canada. (HOC, 1964b, p. 479).

His speech finished; the fate of the TCA debate was finally out of his hands. Any thought of a future within the Liberal ranks rode on what would happen with his private members' bill but at least he made a serious attempt this time. Now came time to test the strength of the network of his TCA debate. Just as soon as he finished speaking, Rémi Paul from the Conservatives took to the floor and surprised even his own party by congratulating Chrétien and pledging his support: "I am convinced that the house will waste no time in adopting the bill which, in my humble opinion, will be the first official gesture in support of this bilingualism so strongly advocated by our honourable friends opposite" (HOC, 1964b, p. 479). Bob Prittie stood for the New Democrats and lent his support: "Mr. Speaker, generally speaking I approve of the views of the honourable member for St. Maurice-Lafleche (Mr. Chrétien)." The enrollment of alternative actors appeared to pay off. In fact, the network grew unexpectedly as it enrolled two additional actors: Guy Marcoux representing the Social Credit Party in a Quebec riding voiced his support and Gordon Fairweather a Conservative from New Brunswick agreed that the bilingual AC name was important. When it came time for Réal Caouette to speak, his endorsement gave closure to the debate, commenting his Social Credit Party would "certainly not prevent the passing of this bill which is a definite improvement over the present name of the main Canadian air lines which from now on, in the country and outside, will have to be called, I hope, Air Canada" (HOC, 1964b, p. 480).

Within the archival material there is an interesting version of events that to this day remains in dispute. Pigott (2001, p. 446) reports that the famed New Democrat who defeated C.D. Howe in his Port Arthur riding, Douglas Fisher, helped 'run interference' for Chrétien by "inviting opposition members to a discussion in the lobby" during the debate. However, in

Chrétien: The Will to Win, biographer Lawrence Martin (1995) asks if Fisher had indeed played this important role to which Chrétien disputes Fisher's recollection.

The most important piece to Chrétien's TCA debate strategy was to make sure no other member spoke more than just a few minutes to protect the hour it was allotted. Even with the two actors picked up along the way, there was still plenty of time left but no one whose sentiments had already been expressed. The second reading of the bill and debate had ended. The matter picked up immediately by the House for a third and final reading without delay since, as Louis-Joseph Pigeon argued, "its coming into force is a matter of urgency" (Pigott, 2001, p. 446). The public record notes that the "bill reported and read the third time and passed" (HOC, 1964b, p. 483) all before the hour was up.

7.3.9 A surprising counter-enrollment of key allies

The performance of the TCA debate and the durability of Chrétien within the network would not be complete without some consideration of Pickersgill and McGregor's counter-enrollment process. To recap, Pickersgill was exactly one month into his new role before this question of TCA had come up. Imagine the haste in becoming familiar with the portfolio as vast as Transport only for a private members' bill involving your department demands your attention. Involving a different configuration of actors, the debate may have taken a different posture. Not Pickersgill. He appeared to be indifferent at best. The fact Chrétien's bill made it as far as it did was evidence that he at least supported the idea, but he did not seem to be as involved as one would expect as minister responsible for TCA. When the bill went to full committee, Pickersgill chaired the meeting. Aside from a few remarks about process, his comments were succinct; pledging that "the government is quite sympathetic, as I say – indeed, is entirely sympathetic – to the idea of the change..." (HOC, 1964b, p. 481). By bringing about the debate the way he did,

Chrétien effectively began a counter-enrollment process of Pickersgill in the critical change event before his influence could overshadow his political ‘win.’

The second actor to be de-enrolled from the TCA name debate was none other than the president of the airline himself. We do not know if leaving McGregor out was by accident or on purpose, but the timing of Chrétien’s bill may suggest it benefited his cause. At the time when Chrétien was building his broad coalition of like-minded actors, McGregor had found himself in trouble among Francophones. Three months prior he committed a gaffe that would dog him for years to come. Before a French audience and with the help of a translator, McGregor announced that a bilingually acceptable brand for TCA was inevitable, but it would not happen for a long time (Montreal Gazette, 1963). This upset his mostly French audience. What they did not know was McGregor had appealed to Ottawa about this very issue once before but was unsuccessful during the Diefenbaker years. His gaffe had occurred during the same time the Liberals were quelling fears of domestic terrorism in Montreal. Being from Quebec, Chrétien knew McGregor’s comments would not play well in the TCA debate. This matter was up to the will of Parliament anyway. McGregor’s role came at the eleventh hour when the Senate – long after the House approved the change – took up the legislation. He convinced its members to an amendment that would restrict the name TCA from being used by another organization in the future (Pigott, 2014).

7.3.10 Chrétien’s aftermath and the Air Canada brand punctuates

Immediate aftermath was generally positive for Chrétien and he soon reaped the benefits. Legacy media in Quebec fawned over the idea. *Le Nouvelliste* went so far as to credit the legislation as “an example of a nationalism that is positive without whining” (Pigott, 2001, p. 446). Not all coverage was favourable though. *Le Devoir* ran an editorial by a Jean-Marc

Laliberté (1964, p. 4) who blasted the cause as “the most ridiculous thing... the name ‘Air Canada’ is no more French than English” and that it was “absolutely false to present the adoption of the name ‘Air Canada’ as a victory for French or even for bilingualism” since “a few French labels are not going to change our basic condition and give us the resources of a normal nation.” Aside from the credit he received in the press, Chrétien’s politics changed overnight. The next day, Pearson sent a letter thanking him “for solving a problem in a painless way” (Chrétien, 1985, p. 40). His big break came a year later when Pearson institutionalized the function of parliamentary secretary in Parliament. Chrétien was the first person to ever be named to this junior leadership role (a role that is now commonplace) and his first assignment: Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister. Could he have been given this promotion without his work on the TCA bill? It is plausible but his socio-politics in bringing the name change to a resolution certainly played a factor that cannot be understated.

Following Parliament’s approval of the AC name, Pickersgill effectuated the change to take effect by no later than New Years Day (Pickersgill, 1994). This put in motion what needed to happen within the TCA network. Ever ambitious, McGregor set an internal deadline for the first of June to have the AC name reflected throughout the entire organization (e.g., telephone greetings, business cards, and tickets). As one might anticipate, embossing the jetliners with a stylized maple leaf featuring the new brand name received applause from Canadians. Pigott (2001, p. 447) points out the symbolism behind the refreshed AC brand as being a prelude of “the relabeling of Canada” and soon, “a new national flag and a new identity based on biculturalism.”

With the stroke of a pen, the network Chrétien had worked hard to assemble had completed its work and disbanded. The law changing the brand of Canada’s national airline had

received royal assent on January 1, 1965. As the public record reports, Chrétien's bill was one of 298 private members' bills introduced during the 26th Canadian Parliament and his was among only four that were made law. His work behind the AC change was so important to him that in his latest memoir, *My Stories, My Times*, Chrétien (2018) attributes the story as being *the* catalyst behind his successful career in Ottawa stretching over four decades.

7.4 Discussion of ANTi-Microhistory Method Themes From TCA Critical Incident

This section discusses the empirical demonstration of AMH to its ten methodological insights. Some of these insights are featured more prominently than others but all are present within the research analysis of this chapter. Below I outline each and bring them into dialogue with the TCA/AC critical incident.

7.4.1 Mapping socio-past of minor knowledge through actor-networks

AMH builds on literature that argues history is a socio-construction of interests and that this is best understood through actor-networks (Durepos & Mills, 2018). Actors engage in political tactics that attempt to persuade other actors to join their cause. In the process, actors change their interests and begin to act as one. TCA's history, at least the account that I supply in this research, is an example of the many interests that went into performing the airline throughout the years prior to the AC rebrand. I intentionally took space to detail the socio-politics of TCA's past to demonstrate both how vast its history is and the durability certain actors and actants had on context. As noted, it involves a configuration of heterogenous interests including the federal government, political leaders, the civil service, and ideas/ideals/ideologies of a nascent Canadian nationalism. An example of how minor knowledge is enacted through actor-networks concerns McGregor's idea of changing the airline's name. Part of his role as

president had him take frequent trips to Parliament Hill. There he politicked on behalf of TCA to anyone who would listen. His exchanges were mostly successful in approving new routes, additional aircraft, and key personnel changes. Enrolling his overlords at Transport to change initiatives, especially following the Howe-era, proved bruising. Recall Minister Hees' bewilderment at McGregor's request in June 1959 to adopt "the name 'Air Canada' as TCA's primary trade name" (Smith, 1986, p. 141). This engagement did not go as planned but the idea of a bilingual name appeared to 'stick' (i.e., durability) in the airline's network as evidenced in reference to multiple subsequent attempts. By studying this point in the airline's network, we were able to gain an opening for how the little-known change process unfolded.

7.4.2 Zooming in on critical incident event

Once the contours of my reassembling of TCA's history network and context was mapped out, I narrowed in on a point within the actor-network as my single unit of analysis. The process behind this relied on the AMH metaphor of 'zooming in.' The empirical material used in this chapter provided a sense of the airline and the many politics that went into performing it as history. This view, however, only scratched the surface of the actor-network topography. For AMH to work, someone (e.g., Chrétien) or thing (e.g., bilingualism) must be the focus of the research. This can only occur when the ANTi-Historian follows the process of going beyond the network itself and digging deep into a point from within the network to investigate. The spirit of this is to hone the analytic viewpoint to a person, thing, or event.

There are several corporate and popular histories that detail the airline. In terms of this dissertation, what I found to be interesting was the lack of a fulsome account detailing the bilingual name change in the 1960s and contextualize its significance for understanding a critical event in the making of modern Canada. In inscriptions of the airline, it appeared to just happen

without much explanation. References to the airline's name changed in the mid-1960s from TCA to AC. This was the critical incident I needed to help give shape (frame) to my analysis. I treated this as a starting point. What still lacked was an explanation of who (or what) might have brought about this knowledge of the past. By supplementing archive material with traces from the public record I observed an actor who persisted across this point in time: none other than Jean Chrétien. This was the more focused unit of analysis I had been looking for. Following Chrétien, his life story, and actions within the TCA network meant I could observe his movements which illustrated his interest work. For political purposes, he became the common denominator to the name debate. From there the traces gathered through his self-microhistories (e.g., memoirs) and biographies served to compose him as the focal point of study.

7.4.3 Focalizing the individual as the 'point' of study

One of the most important facets of MH is how it brings 'ordinary people' up close by making them the point of the history. Often microhistories are written about people with little notoriety. Absent of this explanation, Jean Chrétien might seem to be antithetical to any historical approach involving MH. However, we now have the benefit of hindsight to see the arc of his political career spanning four decades as one of Canada's most recognizable public servants, especially for his 10-year reign as prime minister. In the setting of the 26th Canadian Parliament, young Chrétien was no more than an unknown to the airline network let alone the political process that would ultimately work to produce the brand name change in TCA/AC. It is important that I specify 'the young Chrétien' here to highlight the fact that my analysis of him was specific to his subjectivities involving the critical incident. He was mostly an unknown character in federal politics up to this point. It is stressed then that AMH be used to recover the individual in history and that their performance in the production of knowledge be the purpose of

study. If in the process of reassembling the past there are further socio-political activities that yield some greater insight on a meso or macro-level, then that is fine, but it must not be what motivates the ANTi-Historian. In the case of this research, I set out to understand the gap in historical knowledge of TCA/AC and in the process, came to refocus the study on Chrétien and his politics that produced change.

7.4.4 Reassembling the individual and his/her subjectivities as an actor-network

Being informed by ANT, AMH analysis attempts to understand the individual as the research focal by mapping out the ways in which the actor is being constituted as a network. This logic is drawn from Law (1992) who takes ‘the self’ to mean a person who is composed as a network effect of heterogenous, interacting materials that pattern the individual. That is, the subjectivity of an individual can be better understood through a closer look at the practices that hold the actor together. In my analysis of Chrétien, I laid out the effect of him as a network constantly ‘in the making’ by spelling out his subjectivities through his relations with others. For example, in his formative years he was understood as Chrétien: protégé of local Liberal politics; schoolyard scrapper; employment lawyer. Then, arriving in Ottawa, he was a freshman backbencher; fraternizing colleague; ambitious rising star. AMH thus draws on relationalism to yield insights about how these small details help construct the individual at different points of the history. By understanding the way an individual is performed we can get a better sense of their socio-politics. We can see how Chrétien’s ambition to rise within the Liberal Party produced a socializing version of himself at social events with MPs that he would later enroll in his performance of the TCA debate. Piecing these traces presents all his messy entanglements but also shows how he constituted himself and, later, conducted interest work of his own.

7.4.5 Agency of the individual, people, and things

AMH relies on its theorization from amodernism, AH, and MH literatures to support the idea of agency as a tenet in historical analysis. In these instances, agency is a central facet of how history is performed through ordinary people. AH stresses that the voice of actors be premised over that of the historian. This way social explanations are transparent. Similarly, MH posits that through the study of ordinary people, historians are less tempted to act in their own interests rather than choosing what shape the research narrative ultimately takes. What is different in AMH is that the analytical viewpoint of the historian is fixed on studying the individual in history which means the relational manner of social and historical processes become part of the research itself.

It is not that Chrétien was free to decide at different points in the networks he found himself in to pursue a certain decision (e.g., enrolling Pearson's bilingualism). At different points we see Chrétien as an effect of his own will yet at others, though not entirely clear, he succumbs to others. His father played an influential role in raising him to pursue a legal career to benefit his future political interests. Through his own actions, however, he produces knowledge of the past that we now understand as 'the TCA debate' where he is durable actor supreme. In turn, his decisions whether they be nested in metanarratives (e.g., biculturalism) or informed solely out of his own interest, become part of the research: ANTi-Historian's must follow the effect of these decisions as socio-materials that, in turn, play a part in building networks like Canada's national airline or the Liberal Party.

7.4.6 Closely reading traces of the past

A consequence of AMH and its amodern bend is the way the historian engages with traces of the past. Amodernist historiography makes no qualms about the historian's participation

in the history making process. The ANTi-Historian is understood as an actor who conducts interest work him/herself to enroll others (humans and things) in punctuating a history. ‘Close reading’ in AMH places the historian within the research. This means the traces that are assembled are those that a historian feels are useful in helping tell a history of some phenomenon. However, it is understood that by piecing together traces (or ‘tracing’) the past, the historian is constructing knowledge absent of an a priori understanding on the fragments that are to be followed. Seeing minor knowledge as actor-networks composing the socio-past suggests there are no preordained orderings of traces that eventually give shape to history.

Following the process of socio-politics engaged in and through traces, the historian must rely on materials available to him/her to empirically study the past. Any semblance of a singular history is thus weakened since the version one historian punctuates is dependent on who, what, and how traces are used. The research of this dissertation is an effect of the literature available to me; my understanding of concepts like historiography; and the TCA archival material collected over two decades. That is to say even a slight difference in how they work together would produce a different (i.e., multiple) version of the same case organization.

A close reading of traces and how they are assembled strengthens the ANTi-Historian’s commitment of exhausting all that is available to them in detailing historical knowledge of an actors’ or actants’ movement. Closely reading traces that go into building a network follows a strict process by the researcher. Shifting focus to the process of the empirical research in this chapter, I followed actors for as far they involved themselves in the critical incident. This had me consider them across archival sources, biographies, and corporate histories available. C.D. Howe, for instance, was enrolled in the airline’s history from the start. From traces I gathered, Blatherwick’s (1989) history of airlines in Canada in particular, Prime Minister MacKenzie King

had tapped Howe to oversee the new crown corporation. Little other detail gave insight into the prime minister's choice, so I dove into the Howe biographies. There I observed MacKenzie King's promise to Howe that he would play a consequential role in any future cabinet if he were to win his seat in Port Arthur for the Liberals. This assurance assuaged concerns that his leap into politics would bore him rather than stimulate his insatiable drive to solve problems. Had I not sensed this weak point in the material (what drew him to political life) I would have overlooked this important detail that explains his appointment to the Transport portfolio. This move set off a series of events that would eventually help produce TCA and later, Chrétien's mark on the airline and its history.

7.4.7 Focusing historical phenomena through networked context

Using AMH, the way the individual researched is brought into focus is important. The historian's effort to focalize – or 'pinpoint' – the individual from within history is a start but appreciating the role context plays in composing him/her brings the past into focus. Context here is the way amodernist historiography understands it: what actors do (i.e., build) to hold together the past. Since we are drawing from the amodern condition, context is the outcome of human and nonhuman actors who negotiate their efforts to do history (Durepos, Mills, & McLaren, 2020). Through the trail of traces left behind the ANTi-Historian pieces together a plausible description and inscription of how people, things, and ideas came together to build a story (or narrative) of the past. The researcher's task is then not one of explication but description; we simply cannot know nor are we interested in the complete picture of what 'actually happened.' AMH requires historians to consider how the individual constructs and is produced by contexts through the networks that they actively participate in.

In the case of the research, I was able to see Chrétien as an activist in the TCA history. At least in the traces that were drawn to produce this account we come to see how he was part of, but also participant in, the networks that built the critical change incident. The way Chrétien was assembled in the research should delineate context forming around what we saw of his interest work. At each point, more clearly in his first year in Ottawa, Chrétien appeared to engage with three common actants in the TCA history network: TCA's contexts (e.g., constant involvement of federal government, politics of geography, and language rules); new Canadian nationalism; and Pearson's commitment of policy sympathetic to biculturalism.

Long before he enrolled in the government machinery, TCA had been characterized by a network that worked to protect the financial interests of taxpayers. Opposition to early change attempts involved this concern. The undoing of social, cultural, and political dependence on the UK especially after the war, produced a critical opening for a distinct Canadian institutionalism offered as new national policies. Biculturalism, understood mainly as the legitimization of the French language, was the driving force behind translating Chrétien's – a Francophone from Quebec – policy interests into political work. Each of these three networks were intertwined, giving form to his context and the socio-politics that eventually produced his policy win vis-à-vis the AC brand name. Chrétien is thus positioned ideologically, historically, and culturally by these actants. It is important that we pay attention to these actants, especially who were involved in building them as key contexts and how they influenced action within Chrétien's TCA network.

7.4.8 Rendering transparent the interest work of the ANTi-Historian

At first glance AMH appears to engage the familiar facet of transparency in AH research. Mannheim (1985) highlighted a concern about the relational character of knowledge production

that for the longest time fell on deaf ears of researchers. He proposed that since all knowledge – by virtue of it being produced through human activity – is infused with activism, it is best that researchers voice their ideological, spatial, and temporal situatedness up front. AH draws on this by presenting historical analysis as a concert between the historian and the actor-networks he/she empirically engages. My dialogue of MH to AH orients analysis away from topographies and toward a slice of the actor-network that involves a durable (or previously concealed) actor to help pluralize understanding of some historical phenomenon.

The history of TCA's brand refresh involves several actors and actants, including C.D. Howe, Gordon McGregor, and Lester B. Pearson, but special attention was paid to the activities involving the young Jean Chrétien and his 'mobilization' efforts to change the airline. Following traces within the TCA actor-network led me to Chrétien. The study of TCA's history did not begin with him in mind nor was it what I had set out to study, but once I began to follow him a bit, I could not ignore his durability. In my reassembly of the critical incident, I sought to unfurl performativities as they were followed. Through this process, admittedly, I was surprised to see just how extensive his involvement was. Most of the airline's histories 'black box' the critical incident with only a few traces to draw on. Following these traces allowed me to transverse the archive and take a deep dive into Chrétien's own actor-network through other empirical materials. There I gained an appreciation for just how deeply entrenched Chrétien was (and remains to this day).

Since in AMH the focus is on the individual, it is important for the ANTi-Historian to be transparent about their interest work in the research process. In this case, once the initial surprise wore off, I interpreted this unique intersection between TCA and Canadian politics to be a rare opportunity to dialogue them both simultaneously. Sure, by virtue of being a crown corporation,

the airline had always been shaped by bureaucratic politics but now its history includes the early career of a renown public servant.

7.4.9 Biographical writing style

As the combination of literatures, AMH is similarly offered as a historicized style of conducting research and writing. It is an experiment in a historical writing style that is not widely adopted in MOS. Biography is itself a genre that is used quite often in history popular press much less the choice of style on which MH is routinely employed. Where AMH differs is that it is not beholden to this genre but does draw on biographic writing. Since we are concerning history to be seen ‘up close’ through the small unit of an individual, small details can provide clues to how he/she configures the past. An example of biographical writing in this research is illustrated through the personal references that were traced in composing Chrétien. Inserting background of his family’s socio-cultural experience being Francophone, Liberal, and practicing Catholics during the Quiet Revolution in rural Quebec allowed us to see the persistence of his formative years perform into his personal politics. He took these experiences as motivation to see political opportunity in inconspicuous spaces like federal policy on bilingualism within federal institutions (e.g., Post Office and TCA). We appreciate the durability of Chrétien and the things (experiences) that make him proliferate in the machinery of federal politics by taking up his past as empirically important to the TCA case study.

7.4.10 Extensive detail but not exhaustive narrative

More than anything else, AMH is used to aid researchers in assembling knowledge of the past. These knowledges – also known as ‘stories’ – are at their best when fleshed out with just enough detail to allow an audience to see themselves in the narrative. This takes practice. AMH

emphasizes rich description of action, especially detailing the individual being followed from within the slice of the network. The temptation is to include every bit of detail. However, an extensive-not-exhaustive narrative only reveals what details are needed to both interest readers but importantly, pull together the plausibility of the account. How the TCA case demonstrates this approach is through the way the airline grounds the study. Chrétien is the actor that we study because he is ultimately the one whose socio-politics were successful in changing the national brand. What is important (and was detailed) is his influence on the airline's network to translate the change. The narrative is read through all the traces that oscillate between detailing Chrétien and understanding the subtle change to TCA's brand.

7.5 Summary

In this chapter I have sought to provide an example of how one might go about 'doing' an AMH of the past. By channeling the insights from the previous chapters with the theorized AMH practice, we were able to see a new research process begin to take form. This nascent approach starts with a sketch of the socio-past as actors politicking in networks. In the research, TCA was a combination of several actor-networks that each worked together in one point of time to reintroduce itself to Canadians as a pan-national institution. The analysis focuses on reassembling the airline's history from the perspective of a durable actor, tracing Jean Chrétien and his politics of translating the TCA cause in federal politics. The picture I hoped to convey in presenting AMH empirically is one of possibility. This alternative account of changing the airline's name illustrates the need for those who practice historical research to consider the value of observing network politics 'up close.'

Chapter 8: Conclusion

8.1 Introduction

In this final chapter I summarize the key takeaways of this dissertation. I begin with a discussion of contributions. AMH attempts several contributions to theory and method. In the process of conducting archival research, there are also empirical contributions worth noting. Then, limitations to my research are offered and following that, a brief conclusion about what I think the fusion of amodernism, AH, and MH may take historical research in MOS.

8.2 Theoretical and Methodological Contributions

The origin of AMH, at least the concept I have forwarded in this dissertation, began as a hypothetical. What had motivated me to explore this thought experiment was my experience working with AH and MH in other research projects. I felt AH research could be improved upon the what it traces the unseen socio-politics of an actor-network involved in producing knowledge of the past. I had been introduced to MH serendipitously by recommendation. My read of it gave me pause; it held up ordinary people as a valid unit of study but needed a sensible methodological backing to help support the history it produces. I saw these not as limitations per se but opportunities to improve them together in one historical method. Developing AMH, thus, resulted in key theoretical and methodological contributions worth noting.

8.2.1 Fusion of amodernist, AH, and MH approaches

One of the aims of this dissertation was to explore the potential of moving AH forward by addressing opportunities to dialogue with MH and vice versa¹². Durepos and Mills (2017, p. 57) invite those who practice historical research on business and organizations to consider ways to “theoretically develop” and “outline practical research implications for researchers who wish to use the [AH] approach.” Apart from Hartt’s (2013b) contribution of non-corporeal actant theory, the potential of AH-as-method remains vastly unexplored. My research specifically aspires to encourage a new level of analysis. Despite the many uses of AH, it has focused the historian’s analysis of socio-political relations from atop the history making network. Mills (2017) notes this by suggesting AH is pitched across various micro and macro research contexts. However, what matters here is how actors are viewed through a series of performances and in their many relations. A micro-historical perspective that includes AH picks up on the micro-macro collapse by focusing on individual action ‘from below.’

MH, on the other hand, has been taken up in the social and cultural history field as an empirical tool in the hands of historians. My research suggests MH mostly absent of discussions about theory. The common thread among MH literature is that it is used to trace the individual through an intense study on a micro-level. It is left for historians to decide what to do with actioning it methodologically. The point of most MH work is thus to reoffer the ordinary as legitimate research. Our sense of how knowledges of the past are developed using MH broadens when we concentrate on what action (i.e., a single point within an actor-network) historians may miss while analyzing the ‘big picture.’

¹² As per Durepos (2015), in most of the discussion of AH throughout, amodernism acts to foreground the philosophical condition (e.g., history composed in relational activities of human–nonhuman networks) that allows AH to flourish as an alternative approach to history.

By bringing together these literatures, I attempt to move on the debate within each approach through fusion that addresses some gaps. As a single method vis-à-vis AMH, an emphasis on granular points of interest from within network analysis strengthens AH and MH is benefited from use of ANT concepts. The result is that historical narrative focused on one actor in his/her/their performance of a single event can hopefully now be seen as a legitimate form of study as opposed to being part of a network of actors and actants constituting a historical phenomenon.

8.2.2 Ten insights as a methodological approach

In dialoguing the tension points between the two literatures, ten insights were outlined. Specifically, in Chapter 5, a methodological approach was offered to help ANTi-Historians pursue the assemblage of history from deep within actor-networks. This process was delineated in how one might move from one insight to another. The idea of AMH method is that one starts by mapping out the socio-past through actors-networks to understand what shape history might take through empirical material. As actors, actants, or things ‘pop out’ at the ANTi-Historian, he/she pays close attention to action within the network and ‘zooms in’ on a single unit of analysis. This process is fluid. It may be conducted in concert or iteratively with archival material. The point is this dissertation attempts to flesh out an approach of ‘doing history’ with AMH.

8.2.3 Converging history-as-method

The call for a critical historic turn (Clark & Rowlinson, 2004; Booth & Rowlinson, 2006) has produced a corpus of research that examines how history can be used to study business, management, and/or organizations. Despite the flurry of research that has been produced since,

Greenwood and Bernardi (2014) suggest that the historic turn has not yet fulfilled its promise. The possibility of alternative historical methods (beyond normative approaches of yesteryear) in MOS remains incomplete. How can this be so? Among a litany of reasons, this dissertation attempted to highlight how emphasizing philosophical differences may have gotten in the way of methodological progress (i.e., breakthroughs) that had been previously hoped for. Instead, what we appear to have is a divide that each uses history differently: ‘history-as-method’ and ‘history-as-theory.’

Suddaby (2016) argues the extent of the historic turn’s potential in methodology may be realized by MOS scholars and historians’ ability to relax these philosophical assumptions. Van Lent and Durepos (2019, p. 432) suggest a way out of this methodological diffusion “might be reached by scholars working at the disciplinary periphery.” AMH is located at such a fringe point between AH amodernism and MH’s empiricism. Rather than participate in furthering the dispersion of niche method, I have chosen to dialogue these literatures together on points that they agree while also addressing some areas that prove difficult. In this way, AMH can be applied with great theoretical flexibility. This is important because it answers Decker, Kipping, and Wadhvani’s (2015) call for historical styles of research and writing to be purposefully broad, requiring their empirical demonstration in theoretically motivated studies so that all who practice may benefit equally. Capturing the potential of bringing together an appreciation of an alternative historical approach (i.e., AH) and the theoretical flexibility of MH succinctly sums up the impetus of this dissertation.

8.2.4 Answering methodological questions about studying agency

Much has been written on problematizing the absence of the individual in MOS. Our field has long called for the methodological responses to studying agency (Bendickson,

Muldoon, Liguori, & Davis, 2016; Helms Mills, Thurlow, & Mills, 2010; Weick, 1995). How microhistory is used in this research underscores the scholarly importance of action at the individual level as a site of historical research. Far too often historical research in MOS treats people as research data nested in some grand narrative instead of studying the person or event on its own merits. In other words, in busying ourselves trying to look for the answer to great historical questions we ignore what is performed as minor knowledge of the past. The people (or person) that we study matters; they are more than puppets in the hands of storytellers (historians). AMH picks up this critique by understanding the process as how and where history is performed (even in small spaces from within networks) and that the agency of the individual is an effect of networks that are paramount to composing the socio-past. It attempts focus on the researcher's practice of scrutinizing analysis on how or whether a person's action is composed of other people, things, or ideas. The 'micro situation' (e.g., critical incident within TCA's history) is then studied for how people (e.g., Chrétien) have acted to produce knowledge, not for any other 'grand' project.

8.2.5 Microhistory in management and organizational research

There are only a handful of works that take up MH in management and organizational research. As referenced in Chapter 5, most of them attempt a performance of microhistory without fully engaging with it as a method. I suspect this may be an effect of the disciplinary conventions of MOS that emphasize 'legitimate research' as macro-social studies using quantitative analysis. I believe that aspects of MH as theory, method, and practice provide opportunities to reassess the role of historical research in MOS. For example, a greater emphasis on reflexivity about historical research practices (Decker, Hassard, & Rowlinson, 2021), reemphasizing agency in studies about the past (Suddaby, Foster, & Mills, 2014), and

methodology-practice affecting micro-level research (Hargadon, 2015) are all inquiries that MH has drawn on to distinguish itself in the historical tradition. These synergies make the way microhistory is used in AMH ripe for engagement with the excellent research underway in MOS.

8.2.6 Utility of self-microhistories in studying the past

Through the empirical materials that were used to demonstrate AMH ‘in-action,’ this dissertation made extensive use of self-microhistories. That is, related autobiographical texts (Lepore, 2001) written by key actors involved in the making of the micro situation. Making such use of self-microhistories is not new to the historical tradition but is to historical research on business and organizations. It is generally frowned upon to use text that is anything-but-disinterested. However, like Mannheim (1985), I see all knowledge as representing some interest. What makes self-microhistories valuable is in fact their political nature. It is plausible that they are written to enroll readers to their cause – whatever that may be. Chrétien’s memoirs are clearly written as a project of his own legacy building. The same can be said of the others like Gordon McGregor and Jack Pickersgill. Self-microhistories, like biographies of people or organizations (i.e., corporate histories), inscribe a sense of the past (Munslow, 2012) that is intensely personal in tone and both even-centred and actor-network-centred (Novicevic & Mills, 2019). Read alongside other textual material (e.g., archival traces) the use of this lens may provide valuable insights in disrupting taken-for-granted historical accounts.

8.3 Empirical Contributions

This dissertation likely favours making contributions to management historical styles of research and writing than any significant empirical insight. However, in the research process of demonstrating AMH, the TCA empirical material was rife with possibility. It became clear to me

that the change narrative (or lack thereof) of TCA held promise as a case. In my read of archival material I began to develop a hunch for what I can only now describe retrospectively as this ‘gap’ in historical knowledge: reference to the airline had subtly changed from its previous trade name (TCA) to fresh, new brand – *Air Canada* – to the English market domestically near the end of 1964. Throughout, I have been able to draw the following empirical contributions.

8.3.1 Refining extant corporate histories of the airline

Bringing together the research of this dissertation involved extensive use of text. The archival data of TCA provided an opportunity to unravel multiple narratives of the airline. For the most part, it mattered whose account was followed. Hartt (2013b) took a key change event (i.e., leadership succession in 1968) to furnish three perspectives of the airline: government, union, and management. Each advanced a different perspective of the same event. In my foray into the archival material, I was met with a dearth of texts explicitly focused on the TCA years. I explored what was there in terms of narratives by supplementing them with an arduous read of several corporate and popular histories. These produced a few leads of actors whom I followed in other empirical material. Through the interest work of Howe, McGregor, and Chrétien, I observed how each played a part in performing another version of the airline.

Although not intended, insights generated by my empirical research help refine the extant histories of the airline. TCA/AC has enjoyed being a regular feature in corporate/aviation history and, in one instance, has seen a second edition (see Pigott, 2001, 2014). While each feature a slightly different perspective – Pigott spends more time with technical details whereas Smith (1986) gives us a picture of the business side of things – they do not specifically narrow in on the events leading up to the AC rebrand. Thus, while I set out to pluralize the history of TCA, in the

process, I contribute to the corporate history without engaging a corporate history genre (Delahaye, Booth, Clark, Procter, & Rowlinson, 2009).

8.3.2 Rendering clear Jean Chrétien's durability in the airline's history

As noted previously, I had not intended on taking my archival work of TCA down the path of scrutinizing its history through a close study of micro-processes. In my read of the archival material, however, I noticed that references to the airline in text had changed somewhere in the mid-1960s. It was as though the organization had undergone a significant change process and no one who memorialized it bothered to mention the backstory of how, why, or when. I had kept this observation in mind when reading up on the airline's operations during McGregor's watch as president. Through this process, a eureka moment happened. From closely reading the events in 1963, I saw Jean Chrétien figuratively leap out from TCA's history. He had been elected for less than a year before hitching his politics to the airline vis-à-vis legislation to change its name. I was flabbergasted. How did the other corporate histories leave out this detail?

Each one of the extant histories fall short by not going far enough behind-the-scenes to see Chrétien's durability in the event. McGregor (1980) glosses the change process entirely. He simply reports the airline's new name. That's it. Further, even when the histories do mention Chrétien, it is mostly in passing references. Few details are offered about his interest work that eventually sees him succeed where others savvier than him – Judy LaMarsh and Gordon McGregor – failed. Chrétien himself appears blinded by his durability as his memoirs mention the TCA debate in terms of a policy 'win.' Reassembling these traces from empirical materials ultimately contributes to a more fulsome analysis of the airline. It punctuates another version of the airline's past that is not found elsewhere: intentional in detailing Chrétien's role, durability,

and performance of the TCA change. Therefore, this research places Chrétien as a protagonist in the story of TCA/AC and, in effect, sheds new light on the cast of its history making.

8.3.3 Role of TCA rebrand in advancing early bicultural policy in Canada

The Liberals returned to power in Ottawa at an auspicious time for bicultural policy. Canada had long endured tensions between English and French cultures. Historically, biculturalism was accepted to mean English tolerance of the French (see Esman, 1982). In 1963, seeing the threat of Quebec nationalism, Pearson set out to establish policy that would redress under representation of French-Canadians in federal institutions. The Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism began its study but would take several years to release its full report. The primary requisite of bicultural policy began much sooner. The Liberals ignited reforms by revisiting official nomenclature. The TCA disjointed brand – operating as AC in French-speaking jurisdictions – had twice been the focus of previous change attempts. Chrétien’s TCA debate laid bare the government’s early reparation policy. It is long held that the Official Languages Act was the first reform toward addressing biculturalism in Canada. Indeed, it is the first *significant* change. This dissertation’s empirical research, however, reveals the adoption of the airline’s French name (Mills & Helms Hatfield, 1998), as its new brand the first piece of early legislation to advance bicultural policy in Canada. The passage of Bill No. C-2, ‘Trans-Canada Airlines Act: Amendment Respecting Name of Company’ marks the turning point in franchising French in federal law. Since then, numerous policies have seen the wholesale transformation of Canada as a nation-state in the process of becoming more inclusive.

8.4 Limitations

The research involved in AMH is not perfect. There are a few limitations to note.

1. Literatures from all three facets of AMH – admodern historiography, AH, and MH – were processed from my reading of the field. For example, in this dissertation I relied heavily on Magnússon and Szijártó as a destination for present-day MH. That may be true in the sense of it being developed as an approach for ‘doing history’ but the literature covers more ground than what I have highlighted. In recent years, MH has been offered as a pedagogical tool (Robisheaux, 2017), approach to theatre (Davis, 2014), and even a framework to appraise environmental science (Franco, 2018). I have not engaged with these interdisciplinary contributions. Not including these works is a limitation for this dissertation that future work will sort out more thoroughly.

2. The area of study is a single sector (i.e., airlines), focusing on the history of one organization (TCA/AC), and in a very specific time (1964). Mainstream history may see these as glaring weaknesses. Modernist researchers may claim that: (a) these research frames cannot tell us anything generalizable, and (b) the level of analysis is far too narrow to contribute anything meaningful to the field. These claims do not impel amodern historians who see the value of novel research context as ‘new history’ (Cummings, Bridgman, Hassard, & Rowlinson, 2017). Gregory (1999) invited social history to consider how examining something up close and in great detail – the way microhistory purports – allows for new understandings of the past. AMH brings this research ethic to MOS by offering a view of the past and organizations through micro-processes and practices. While focusing attention on the particular may be limiting, historical research on business and organizations is fertile ground to explore the many

stories of the past.

3. The nature of archival research may be construed by some to host a slew of limitations. Often arguments about archival research focus on the veracity of data. For example, how do we know from the traces made available to us that Jean Chrétien *really* pulled together a coalition to expedite the TCA debate in the parliament? The research process in this dissertation attempted searches of traces from across multiple places and sources to flesh out the socio-past (Chapter 6 discusses the research process in more depth). Traces captured in this study were pieced together to give narratives a sense of plausibility. Future research supplementing archival work with qualitative interviews may help surface new traces and insights that strengthen the dissertation's theoretical basis. The difficulties here, however, are more pragmatic in nature like access (i.e., difficulty of securing interview with Chrétien himself) and the interviewee's recollection of events.
4. Reassembling traces to give shape to the critical narratives of TCA's history involved choices. Alvesson and Deetz (2020) assure us that the researcher's choices are always a factor in research; the difference being how transparency is an important facet in critical studies. My research kept to a process including certain archival materials, interpretation of the writing of others, and even my own interests. My enthusiasm for Canadian history and politics influenced who, what, and how I followed actors in the airline network. In this way, this historical account is the reflection of my own interests, understanding of the empirical material, and research context. These factors ultimately came together to help produce TCA in this dissertation, the way Chrétien is presented, and the significance of

the airline's brand change in English Canada. Others may have focused on a different period, incident, or other actors and networks. The value of critical history and, AMH specifically, is that because of these factors, I acknowledge my role in assembling this account and place myself in the history. After all, as pointed out in the method of AMH, historians produce history and because of that no two histories are the same.

8.5 Conclusion

History in MOS has always been a 'broad church' of research philosophies. The iteration of AMH that I advance in this research is my contribution to the development of new historical styles of research and writing intended to unite our field. I participated in this synthesis by setting my sights on continuing the theoretical work of amodernism, AH, and MH. Its potential for ethically pluralizing history through the performance of politics in networks is worth a fair trial in our field. I have sought to bring micro-processes and practices of knowledge production up close to reveal how ANTi-Historians might go about reassembling stories that may have been otherwise concealed. The history (or lack thereof) behind TCA's name change helps illustrate this point. In conclusion, it remains to be seen how AMH will be received. What I am confident of, though, is that as far as this research is concerned, its potential as a method has been given full consideration.

References

- Alcadipani, R., & Hassard, J. (2010). Actor-network theory, organizations and critique: Towards a politics of organizing. *Organization, 17*(4), 419-435.
- Alvesson, M. (2010). Self-doubters, strugglers, storytellers, surfers and others: Images of self-identities in organization studies. *Human Relations, 63*(2), 193-217.
- Alvesson, M., Ashcraft, K. L., & Thomas, R. (2008). Identity matters: Reflections on the construction of identity scholarship in organization studies. *Organization, 15*(1), 5-28.
- Alvesson, M., & Deetz, S. (2020). *Doing critical research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Alvesson, M., Bridgman, T., & Willmott, H. (Eds.). (2009). *The Oxford handbook of critical management studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Anderson, K. (2013). The footprint and the stepping foot: archival records, evidence, and time. *Archival Science, 13*(4), 349-371.
- Andrade, T. (2010). A Chinese farmer, two African boys, and a warlord: toward a global microhistory. *Journal of World History, 21*(4), 573-591.
- Arcangeli, A. (2012). *Cultural history: A concise introduction*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Arseneault, R., Deal, N. M., & Helms Mills, J. (2021). Accounting for management and organizational history: Strategies and conceptions. *Journal of Management History, 27*(2), 288-308.
- Ashley, C. A. (1963). *The first twenty-five years: A study of Trans-Canada Air Lines*. Toronto: Macmillan Company of Canada.
- Azzi, S. (1999). *Walter Gordon and the rise of Canadian nationalism*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's Press.
- Bakvis, H. (2000). Prime minister and cabinet in Canada: An autocracy in need of reform? *Journal of Canadian Studies, 35*(4), 60-79.
- Bamberger, P. (2008). Beyond contextualization: Using context theories to narrow the micro-macro gap in management research. *Academy of Management Journal, 51*(5), 839-846.
- Banner, L. W. (2009). Biography as history. *The American Historical Review, 114*(3), 579-586.
- Barnes, T. D. (1998). *Ammianus Marcellinus and the representation of historical reality*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

- Barros, A., de Toledo Carneiro, A., & Wanderley, S. (2019). Organizational archives and historical narratives: Practicing reflexivity in (re) constructing the past from memories and silences. *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal*, 14(3), 280-294.
- Bauman, Z. (1992). *Intimations of postmodernity*. London: Routledge.
- Bauman, Z. (1993). *Postmodern ethics*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Beaudry, M. C. (2011). Stitching women's lives: Interpreting the artifacts of sewing and needlework. In M. C. Beaudry & J. Symonds (Eds.), *Interpreting the early modern world: Transatlantic perspectives* (pp. 143-158). New York: Springer.
- Bell, E., Bryman, A., & Harley, B. (2018). *Business research methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bell, E., & Willmott, H. (2020). Ethics, politics and embodied imagination in crafting scientific knowledge. *Human Relations*, 73(10), 1366-1387.
- Bendickson, J., Muldoon, J., Liguori, E., & Davis, P. E. (2016). Agency theory: the times, they are a-changin'. *Management Decision*, 54(1), 174-193.
- Bennett, A. (1999). On posterity. *The Yale Journal of Criticism*, 12(1), 131-144.
- Bennett, C. (2007). Which way to Ottawa? *Canadian Woman Studies*, 26(2), 42-54.
- Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1967). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Bettin C. (2019). *Towards an amodern, aesthetic and existentialist approach to subjectivity in management and organizational studies* (Doctoral thesis), Saint Mary's University, Halifax, Nova Scotia.
- Bettin, C., Mills, A. J., & Helms Mills, J. (2016). 'CMS, Canada & the network:' 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.
- Blatherwick, J. (1989). *A history of airlines in Canada*. Toronto: The Unitrade Press.
- Bondi, M. (2017). What came to be called: Evaluative what and authorial voice in the discourse of history. *Text & Talk*, 37(1), 25-46.
- Boje, D. M. (2018). *Organizational research: Storytelling in action*. New York: Routledge.

- Booth, C., & Rowlinson, M. (2006). Management and organizational history: Prospects. *Management & Organizational History*, 1(1), 5-30.
- Borzeix, A. (2007). Jeux d'échelles. *Le Libellio d'Aegis*, 3(2), 25-28.
- Bothwell, R., & Kilbourn, W. (1979). *C.D. Howe: A biography*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Limited.
- Bowden, B. (2018a). *Work, wealth, and postmodernism: The intellectual conflict at the heart of business endeavour*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bowden, B. (2018b). How to kick postmodernism. *Institute of Public Affairs Review: A Quarterly Review of Politics and Public Affairs*, 70(4), 16-23.
- Bowden, B., Muldoon, J., Gould, A. M., & McMurray, A. (Eds.). (2020). *The Palgrave handbook of management history*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Brewer, J. (2010). Microhistory and the histories of everyday life. *Cultural and Social History*, 7(1), 87-109.
- Brown, C. G. (2005). *Postmodernism for historians*. London: Pearson.
- Brown, R. D. (2003). Microhistory and the post-modern challenge. *Journal of the Early Republic*, 23(1), 1-20.
- Bruce, K. (Ed.). (2020). *Handbook of research on management and organizational history*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Bruce, K., & Nyland, C. (2011). Elton Mayo and the deification of human relations. *Organization Studies*, 32(3), 383-405.
- Bryman, A., Bell, E., Mills, A. J., & Yue, A. R. (2011). *Business research methods* (Canadian ed.). Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Bucheli, M., & Wadhvani, R. D. (Eds.). (2014). *Organizations in time: History, theory, methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Burke, P. (1990). *The French historical revolution: The Annales School, 1929–89*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Burke, P. (2008). The invention of micro-history. *Rivista di Storia Economica: Nuova Serie* 24(3), 259-274.
- Burrell, G., & Morgan, G. (1979). *Sociological paradigms and organisational analysis*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

- Calás, M. B., & Smircich, L. (2019). *Postmodern management theory*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Callon, M. (1999). Actor-network theory – the market test. In J. Law & J. Hassard (Eds.), *Actor network theory and after* (pp. 181-195). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Callon, M., & Latour, B. (1992). Don't throw the baby out with the Bath school! In A. Pickering (Ed.), *Science as practice and culture* (pp. 343-368). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Champion, C. P. (2006). A very British coup: Canadianism, Quebec, and ethnicity in the flag debate, 1964-1965. *Journal of Canadian Studies*, 40(3), 68-99.
- Chandler, A. D. (1962). *Strategy and structure: Chapters in the history of the industrial enterprise*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Chia, R. (1995). From modern to postmodern organizational analysis. *Organization Studies*, 16(4), 579-604.
- Chrétien, J. (1985). *Straight from the heart*. Toronto: Key Porter Books.
- Chrétien, J. (2008). *My years as Prime Minister*. Toronto: Vintage Canada.
- Chrétien, J. (2018). *My stories, my times*. Toronto: Random House Canada.
- Christiano, K. J. (1996). From TCA to Air Canada: The political patterns of a future prime minister. *American Review of Canadian Studies*, 26(1), 49-66.
- Clark, P., & Rowlinson, M. (2004). The treatment of history in organisation studies: Towards an 'historic turn'? *Business History*, 46(3), 331-352.
- Cohen, T. V. (2017). The macrohistory of microhistory. *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, 47(1), 53-73.
- Coller, K. E., Helms Mills, J., & Mills, A. J. (2016). The British Airways heritage collection: An ethnographic 'history'. *Business History*, 58(4), 547-570.
- Collins, D. H. (1978). *Wings across time: The story of Air Canada*. Ancaster, ON: Griffin House.
- Conway, P. (2015). Digital transformations and the archival nature of surrogates. *Archival Science*, 15(1), 51-69.
- Cook, T. (2011). The archive(s) is a foreign country: Historians, archivists, and the changing archival landscape. *The American Archivist*, 74(2), 600-632.
- Cooper, R. (2005). Peripheral vision: relationality. *Organization Studies*, 26(11), 1689-1710.

- Corrigan, L. T. (2016). Accounting practice and the historic turn: Performing budget histories. *Management & Organizational History*, 11(2), 77-98.
- Crossland, Z. (2009). Of clues and signs: The dead body and its evidential traces. *American Anthropologist*, 111(1), 69-80.
- Cummings, S., Bridgman, T., Hassard, J., & Rowlinson, M. (2017). *A new history of management*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cunliffe, A. (2003). Reflexive inquiry in organizational research: Questions and possibilities. *Human Relations*, 56(8), 983-1003.
- Daley, R. (1980). *An American saga: Juan Trippe and his Pan Am empire*. New York: Random House.
- Daniels, R. L. (2000). *Trains across the continent: North American railroad history*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Darton, R. (1984). *The great cat massacre and other episodes in French cultural history*. New York: Basic Books.
- Davis, P. A. (2014). Asking large questions in small spaces. *Theatre Survey*, 55(1), 3-5.
- De Vito, C. G. (2019). History without scale: The micro-spatial perspective. *Past & Present*, 242(Supplement_14), 348-372.
- Deal, N. M. (2015). *Is leading from the second chair a new leadership theory? Examining the theoretical underpinnings* (Masters research project), Saint Mary's University, Halifax, Nova Scotia.
- Deal, N. M., Mills, A. J., & Helms Mills, J. (2018). Amodern and modern warfare in the making of a commercial airline. *Management & Organizational History*, 13(4), 373-396.
- Deal, N. M., Mills, A. J., Helms Mills, J., & Durepos, G. (2019). History in the making: Following the failed attempt of Wolfgang Langewiesche in Pan American Airways history project. In C. M. Hartt (Ed.), *Connecting values to action: Non-corporeal actants and choice* (pp. 37-51). Bingley, UK: Emerald.
- Deal, N. M., Novicevic, M. M., Mills, A. J., Lugar, C. W., & Roberts, F. (2021). Taking an eventful historic turn down the cultural memory lane. *Journal of Management History*, 27(1), 61-79.
- Decker, S. (2015). Mothership reconnection: Microhistory and institutional work compared. In P. G. McLaren, A. J. Mills, & T. G. Weatherbee (Eds.), *The Routledge companion to management and organizational history* (pp. 244-260). Abingdon: Routledge.

- Decker, S., Hassard, J., & Rowlinson, M. (2021). Rethinking history and memory in organization studies: The case for historiographical reflexivity. *Human Relations*, 74(8), 1123-1155.
- Decker, S., Kipping, M., & Wadhvani, R. D. (2015). New business histories! Plurality in business history research methods. *Business History*, 57(1), 30-40.
- Delahaye, A., Booth, C., Clark, P., Procter, S., & Rowlinson, M. (2009). The genre of corporate history. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 22(1), 27-48.
- Dobson, A. (2017). *A history of international civil aviation*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Durepos, G. (2009). *ANTI-History: Toward an historiographical approach to (re)assembling knowledge of the past* (Doctoral thesis), Saint Mary's University, Halifax, Nova Scotia.
- Durepos, G. (2015). ANTi-History: Toward amodern histories. In P. G. McLaren, A. J. Mills, & T. G. Weatherbee (Eds.), *The Routledge companion to management and organizational history* (pp. 153-180). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Durepos, G., & Barros, A. (2022). Haunted houses: Addressing archival silences in business (hi)storytelling. In A. J. Mills, & N. M. Deal (Eds.), *History and business storytelling*. Singapore: World Scientific Publishers.
- 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.
- Durepos, G., & Mills, A. J. (2012a). *ANTI-History: theorizing the past, history, and historiography in management and organization studies*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Durepos, G., & Mills, A. J. (2012b). Actor-Network Theory, ANTi-History and critical organizational historiography. *Organization*, 19(6), 703-721.
- Durepos, G., & Mills, A. J. (2017). ANTi-History, relationalism and the historic turn in management and organization studies. *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal*, 12(1), 53-67.
- Durepos, G., & Mills, A. J. (2018). ANTi-History: An alternative approach to history. In C. Cassell, A. L. Cunliffe, & G. Grandy, *The Sage handbook of qualitative business and management research methods* (pp. 431-449). London: Sage.
- Durepos, G., Mills, A. J., & Genoe McLaren, P. (2020). Contextualizing the historian: An ANTi-History perspective. In K. Bruce (Ed.), *Handbook of research on management and organizational history* (pp. 275-292). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

- Durepos, G., Mills, A. J., & Weatherbee, T. G. (2012). Theorizing the past: Realism, relativism, relationalism and the reassembly of Weber. *Management & Organizational History*, 7(3), 267-281.
- Durepos, G., Shaffner, E. C., & Taylor, S. (2021). Developing critical organizational history: Context, practice and implications. *Organization*, 28(3), 449-467.
- Durepos, G., & Vince, R. (2021). Towards a theory of historical reflexivity. In M. Maclean, S. R. Clegg, R. Suddaby, and C. Harvey (Eds.), *Historical organization studies: Theory and applications* (pp. 39-56). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Edgar, A., & Sedgwick, P. (2007). *Cultural theory: The key concepts*. London: Routledge.
- English, J. (2011). *The worldly years: The life of Lester Pearson* (Vol. II: 1949-1972). Toronto: Vintage Books.
- Eriksson, P., & Kovalainen, A. (2015). *Qualitative methods in business research: A practical guide to social research*. London: Sage.
- Ermarth, E. (2011). *History in the discursive condition: Reconsidering the tools of thought*. London: Routledge.
- Esman, M. J. (1982). The politics of official bilingualism in Canada. *Political Science Quarterly*, 97(2), 233-253.
- Fariás, I., Blok, A., & Roberts, C. (2020). Trading zones of ANT: Problematisations and ambivalences. In A. Blok, I. Fariás, & C. Roberts (Eds.), *The Routledge companion to actor-network theory* (pp. 155-157). Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Ferro, M. (2003). *The use and abuse of history: Or how the past is taught to children*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Fischer, M. M. (1977). Interpretive anthropology. *Reviews in Anthropology*, 4(4), 391-404.
- Flynn, T. R. (2002). Lyotard and history without witnesses. In H. J. Silverman (Ed.), *Lyotard: Philosophy, politics, and sublime* (pp. 151-163). New York: Routledge.
- Foroughi, H., Coraiola, D. M., Rintamäki, J., Mena, S., & Foster, W. M. (2020). Organizational memory studies. *Organization Studies*, 41(12), 1725-1748.
- 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.
- Foster, W. M., Coraiola, D. M., Suddaby, R., Kroezen, J., & Chandler, D. (2017). The strategic use of historical narratives: A theoretical framework. *Business History*, 59(8), 1176-1200.

- Foster, W. M., & Wiebe, E. (2010). Praxis makes perfect: Recovering the ethical promise of critical management studies. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 94(2), 271-283.
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge and the discourse on language*. New York: Tavistock Publications Limited.
- Foucault, M. (1978). Politics and the study of discourse. *Ideology and Consciousness*, 3, 7-26.
- Foucault, M. (1982). *The archeology of knowledge and the discourse on language*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (2002). *The archaeology of knowledge*. London: Routledge.
- Fournier, V., & Grey, C. (2000). At the critical moment: Conditions and prospects for critical management studies. *Human Relations*, 53(1), 7-32.
- Franco, M. P. V. (2018). An appraisal of environmental microhistory: Epistemological and historiographical insights. *Fronteiras: Journal of Social, Technological and Environmental Science*, 7(3), 262-274.
- Froeyman, A. (2017). Reading microhistory: Three layers of meaning. In J. Wolfreys (Ed.), *New critical thinking: Criticism to come* (pp. 99-122). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures: Selected essays*. New York: Basic Books.
- Geertz, C. (1983). *Local knowledge: Further essays in interpretative anthropology*. New York: Basic Books.
- Ghobrial, J. P. A. (2014). The secret life of Elias of Babylon and the uses of global microhistory. *Past and Present*, 222(1), 51-93.
- Gilliland, A. (2011). Neutrality, social justice and the obligations of archival education and educators in the twenty-first century. *Archival Science*, 11(3), 193-209.
- Ginzburg, C. (1976). *The cheese and the worms: The cosmos of a sixteenth-century miller* (J. Tedeschi and A. Tedeschi, Trans.). Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin Books.
- Ginzburg, C. (1989). *Clues, myths, and the historical method*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Ginzburg, C. (1993). Microhistory: Two or three things that I know about it. *Critical Inquiry*, 20(1), 10-35.
- Ginzburg, C. (2000). *The enigma of Piero: Piero della Francesca*. London: Verso.

- Ginzburg, C. (2005). Latitude, slaves, and the bible: An experiment in microhistory. *Critical Inquiry*, 31(3), 665-683.
- Ginzburg, C., & Poni, C. (1979). Il nome e il come: Scambio ineguale e mercato storiografico. *Quaderni Storici*, 14(40), 181-190.
- Ginzburg, C., & Poni, C. (1991). The name and the game: Unequal exchange and the historiographic marketplace. In E. Muir & G. Ruggiero (Eds.), *Microhistory and the lost peoples of Europe* (pp. 1-10). Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press.
- Ginzburg, C. (1993). Microhistory: Two or three things that I know about it. *Critical Inquiry*, 20(1), 10-35.
- Golato, A. (2017). Naturally occurring data. In A. Barron, Y. Gu, and Gerard Steen (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of pragmatics* (pp. 21-26). London: Routledge.
- Granatstein, J. L., & Hillmer, N. (1999). *Prime Ministers: Ranking Canada's leaders*. Toronto: HarperCollins Publishers.
- Greene, M. A. (2003). The messy business of remembering: History, memory, and archives. *Archival Issues*, 28(2), 95-103.
- Greenwood, A., & Bernardi, A. (2014). Understanding the rift, the (still) uneasy bedfellows of History and Organization Studies. *Organization*, 21(6), 907-932.
- Greenwood, R. G. (1981). Management by objectives: As developed by Peter Drucker, assisted by Harold Smiddy. *Academy of Management Review*, 6(2), 225-230.
- Gregory, B. S. (1999). Is small beautiful? Microhistory and the history of everyday life. *History and Theory*, 38, 100-110.
- Gunn, S. (2014). *History and cultural theory*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Handelman, D. (2005). Microhistorical anthropology: Toward a prospective perspective. In D. Kalb & H. Tak (Eds.), *Critical junctions: Anthropology and history beyond the cultural turn* (pp. 29-52). New York: Berghahn Books.
- Haraway, D. (1988). Situated knowledges: The science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective. *Feminist Studies*, 14(3), 575-599.
- Hargadon, A. (2015). Using microhistorical case studies to build grounded theory in organization studies. In R. Kramer & K. Elsbach (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative organizational research: Innovative pathways and methods* (pp. 122– 133). New York: Routledge.
- Hartt, C. M. (2013a). Actants without actors: polydimensional discussion of a regional conference. *Tamara Journal of Critical Organisation Inquiry*, 11(3), 15-25.

- Hartt, C. M. (2013b). *The non-corporeal actant as a link between actor-network theory and critical sensemaking: A case study of Air Canada* (Doctoral dissertation), Saint Mary's University, Halifax, Nova Scotia.
- Hartt, C. M., Mills, A. J., Mills, J. H., & 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.
- Hartt, C. M. (2015). Change at the top of Air Canada: the governing liberal party perspective—an analysis of non-corporeal actants. *Journal of Business and Economics*, 6(1), 21-34.
- Hartt, C. M. (2018). Writing out praise: Air Canada employees and the 1968 CEO change. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences/Revue Canadienne des Sciences de l'Administration*, 35(2), 265-279.
- Hartt, C. M. (Ed.). (2019). *Connecting values to action: Non-corporeal actants and choice*. Bingley, UK: Emerald.
- Hartt, C. M., Mills, A. J., & Helms Mills, J. (2020). The role of non-corporeal actant theory in historical research: A case study of Henry Wallace and the New Deal. *Journal of Management History*, 26(1), 60-76.
- 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.
- Hassard, J. (1994). Postmodern organizational analysis: Toward a conceptual framework. *Journal of Management Studies*, 31(3), 303-324.
- Helms Mills, J. (2002). Employment practices and the gendering of Air Canada's culture during its Trans Canada Airlines days. *Culture and Organization*, 8(2), 117-128.
- Helms Mills, J., & Mills, A. J. (2021). Guest editorial: Debates in management history. *Journal of Management History*, 27(1), 1-7.
- Helms Mills, J., Thurlow, A., & Mills, A. J. (2010). Making sense of sensemaking: The critical sensemaking approach. *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal*, 5(2), 182-195.
- Hendricks, K., Deal, N., Mills, A. J., & Helms Mills, J. (2021). Intersectionality as a matter of time. *Management Decision*, 59(11), 2567-2582.
- Herrnstein Smith, B. (2016). What was “close reading”? A century of method in literary studies. *The Minnesota Review*, 87, 57-75.

- Hill, T. L. (2002). *Canadian politics riding by riding: An in-depth analysis of Canada's 301 federal electoral districts*. Minneapolis: Prospect Park Press.
- Hillmer, N. (1999). *Pearson: The unlikely gladiator*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Himmelfarb, G. (1997). Beyond method. In A. Kernan (Ed.), *What's happened to the humanities?* (pp. 143-161). Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Hoefflerle, C. (2011). *The essential historiography reader*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Hosek, L. (2019). Osteobiography as microhistory: Writing from the bones up. *Bioarchaeology International*, 3(1), 44-57.
- House of Commons. (1963a, Jul. 4). "Trans-Canada Air Lines Act." Canada. Parliament. House of Commons. *Canadian Parliamentary Historical Resources*. 26th Parliament, 1st session (vol. 2), p. 1818. Retrieved from Parliament of Canada website: https://parl.canadiana.ca/view/oop.debates_HOC2601_02/856?r=0&s=1
- House of Commons. (1963b, Nov. 20). "Post Office Department." Canada. Parliament. House of Commons. *Canadian Parliamentary Historical Resources*. 26th Parliament, 1st session (vol. 5), p. 4960. Retrieved from Parliament of Canada website: https://parl.canadiana.ca/view/oop.debates_HOC2601_05/892?r=0&s=1
- House of Commons. (1964a, June 23). "Canada Day." Canada. Parliament. House of Commons. *Canadian Parliamentary Historical Resources*. 26th Parliament, 2nd session (vol. 5), p. 4597. Retrieved from Parliament of Canada website: https://parl.canadiana.ca/view/oop.debates_HOC2602_05/113?r=0&s=1
- House of Commons. (1964b, March 1). "Trans-Canada Air Lines Act." Canada. Parliament. House of Commons. *Canadian Parliamentary Historical Resources*. 26th Parliament, 2nd session (vol. 1), pp. 478-483. Retrieved from Parliament of Canada website: https://parl.canadiana.ca/view/oop.debates_HOC2602_01/480?r=0&s=2
- Humphreys, J. H., & Pane Haden, S. S. (2020). Leadership on request: Constructing Milton Hershey's leader identity. *Journal of Management Research*, 20(1), 3-13.
- Iggers, G. G. (2005). *Historiography in the twentieth century from scientific objectivity to the postmodern challenge*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.
- Jarrett, M., & Liu, F. (2018). "Zooming with" a participatory approach to the use of video ethnography in organizational studies. *Organizational Research Methods*, 21(2), 366-385.
- Jenkins, K. (1991). *Re-thinking history*. London: Routledge.

- Jenkins, K. (1995). *On 'what is history?' From Carr and Elton to Rorty and White*. London: Routledge.
- Jenkins, K. (1999). *Why history? Ethics and postmodernity*. London: Routledge.
- Jenkins, K. (2003). *Refiguring history*. New York: Routledge.
- Jenkins, K. (2009). *At the limits of history*. London: Routledge.
- Johnson, D. (2006). *Thinking government: Public sector management in Canada*. Peterborough, ON: Broadview Press.
- Kalela, J. (1999). The challenge of oral history: The need to rethink source criticism. In A. Ollila (Ed.), *Historical perspectives on memory* (pp. 139-157). Helsinki: SHS.
- Kalela, J. (2012). *Making history: The historian and uses of the past*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kansteiner, W. (1993). Hayden White's critique of the writing of history. *History and Theory*, 32(3), 273-295.
- Keith, R. A. (1972). *Bush pilot with a briefcase: The happy-go-lucky story of Grant McConachie*. Don Mills, ON: Paperjacks.
- Kieser, A. (1994). Why organization theory needs historical analyses – and how this should be performed. *Organization Science*, 5(4), 608-620.
- Kilduff, M., & Mehra, A. (1997). Postmodernism and organizational research. *Academy of Management Review*, 22(2), 453-481.
- Kivijärvi, M., Mills, A. J., & Helms Mills, J. (2019). Performing Pan American Airways through coloniality: An ANTi-History approach to narratives and business history. *Management & Organizational History*, 14(1), 33-54.
- Klein, K. L. (1995). In search of narrative mastery: Postmodernism and the people without history. *History and Theory*, 34(4), 275-298.
- Kuhn, T. S. (1970). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Kurlansky, M. (2002). *Salt: A world history*. Toronto: Vintage Canada.
- Kusch, M. (2011). Reflexivity, relativism, microhistory: Three desiderata for historical epistemologies. *Erkenntnis*, 75(3), 483-494.

- Lackenbauer, P. W. (2002). *An inside look at external affairs during the Trudeau years: The memoirs of Mark MacGuigan*. Calgary: University of Calgary Press.
- Lablerté, J. M. (1964, March 7). 'Air Canada,' une victoire? *Le Devoir*, p. 4.
- LaMarsh, J. (1969). *Memoirs of a bird in a gilded cage*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Limited.
- Lamond, D. (2008). Editorial. *Journal of Management History*, 14(4), 309-312.
- Lamoreaux, N. R. (2006). Rethinking microhistory: a comment. *Journal of the Early Republic*, 26(4), 555-561.
- Latour, B. (1986). The powers of association. In J. Law (Ed.), *Power, action, and belief: A new sociology of knowledge?* (pp. 264-280). London: Routledge.
- Latour, B. (1987). *Science in action: How to follow scientists and engineers through society*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Latour, B. (1990a). Postmodern? No, simply amodern! Steps toward an anthropology of science. *Studies in the History and Philosophy of Science*, 21(1), 145-171.
- Latour, B. (1990b). On actor-network theory A few clarifications plus more than a few complications. *Soziale Welt*, 47(4), 1-14.
- Latour, B. (1993). *We have never been modern*. Hemel Hempstead, UK: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Latour, B. (1999). On recalling actor-network theory. In J. Law & J. Hassard (Eds.), *Actor network theory and after* (pp. 15-25). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Latour, B. (2005). *Reassembling the social. An introduction to actor-network-theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Latour, B., & Woolgar, S. (1979). *Laboratory life: The construction of scientific facts*. Beverley Hills: Sage.
- Law, J. (1992). Notes on the theory of the actor-network: Ordering, strategy, and heterogeneity. *Systemic Practice and Action Research*, 5(4), 379-393.
- Law, J. (1994). *Organizing modernity*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Law, J. (1999). After ANT: Complexity, naming and topology. In J. Law & J. Hassard (Eds.), *Actor network theory and after* (pp. 1-14). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Law, J. (2004). *After method: Mess in social science research*. New York: Routledge.

- Law, J. (2008). Actor network theory and material semiotics. In B. S. Turner (Ed.), *The new Blackwell companion to social theory* (pp. 141-158). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Law, J., & Mol, A. (1995). Notes on materiality and sociality. *Sociological Review*, 43(2), 274-294.
- Law, J., & Mol, A. (2001). Situating technoscience: An inquiry into spatialities. *Society and Space*, 19(5), 609-621.
- Law, J., & Urry, J. (2004). Enacting the social. *Economy and Society*, 33(3), 390-410.
- Lechte, J. (2008). *Fifty key contemporary thinkers: From structuralism to post-humanism*. London: Routledge.
- Lemieux, T., & Card, D. (2001). Education, earnings, and the 'Canadian GI Bill'. *Canadian Journal of Economics/Revue canadienne d'économique*, 34(2), 313-344.
- Lepore, J. (2001). Historians who love too much: Reflections on microhistory and biography. *The Journal of American History*, 88(1), 129-144.
- Levi, G. (1991). On microhistory. In P. Burke (Ed.), *New perspectives on historical writing* (pp. 93-113). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Levi, G. (2012). Microhistory and the Recovery of Complexity. In S. Fellman & M. Rahikainen (Eds.), *Historical knowledge: in quest of theory, method and evidence* (pp. 121-132). Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Levi, P. (1975). *The periodic table*. New York: Schocken Books.
- Levstik, L. S., & Barton, K. C. (2018). *Researching history education: Theory, method, and context*. New York: Routledge.
- Liter, T. (1994). The unassimilable otherness of the "post" of postmodern and the radicality of radical sociology. *Critical Sociology*, 20(2), 51-80.
- Lugar, C. W., Holland, J., & Novicevic, M. M. (2018). Missionaries and internationalization of education: The generative and collective leadership of Joe Hale and Dennis Lugar. In D. Spies (Ed.), *Missionaries and their role in society* (pp. 21-42). New York: Nova Science Publishers.
- Lyotard, J. F. (1984). *The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge* (G. Bennington & B. Massumi, Trans.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Maclean, M., Harvey, C., & Clegg, S. R. (2016). Conceptualizing historical organization studies. *Academy of Management Review*, 41(4), 609-632.

- Maclean, M., Shaw, G., Harvey, C., & Booth, A. (2020). Management learning in historical perspective: Rediscovering Rowntree and the British interwar management movement. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 19(1), 1-20.
- Magnússon, S. G. (2003). The singularization of history: social history and microhistory within the postmodern state of knowledge. *Journal of Social History*, 36(3), 701-735.
- Magnússon, S. G. (2011). The life of a working-class woman: Selective modernization and microhistory in early 20th-century Iceland. *Scandinavian Journal of History*, 36(2), 186-205.
- Magnússon, S. G. (2015). Tales of the unexpected: The 'textual environment', ego-documents and a nineteenth-century Icelandic love story—An approach in microhistory. *Cultural and Social History*, 12(1), 77-94.
- Magnússon, S. G. (2016). The love game as expressed in ego-documents: The culture of emotions in late nineteenth century Iceland. *Journal of Social History*, 50(1), 102-119.
- Magnússon, S. G., & Ólafsson, D. (2017). *Minor knowledge and microhistory: Manuscript culture in the nineteenth century*. London: Routledge.
- Magnússon, S. G., & Szijártó, I. M. (2013). *What is microhistory? Theory and practice*. London: Routledge.
- Mannheim, K. (1953a). Conservative Thought. In P. Kecskemeti (Ed.), *Essays on sociology and social psychology* (pp. 74-164). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Mannheim, K. (1953b). Structural analysis of epistemology. In P. Kecskemeti (Ed.), *Essays on sociology and social psychology* (pp. 15-73). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Mannheim, K. (1985). *Ideology and utopia: An introduction to the sociology of knowledge*. New York: Harcourt Brace.
- Mari, F. (2013). The Microhistorian. *Dissent*, 60(2), 81-85.
- Martin, L. (1995). *Chrétien: The will to win*. Winnipeg: Lester Publications.
- Martin, R. (1997). The essential difference between history and science. *History and Theory*, 36(1), 1-14.
- Marwick, A. (2001). *The new nature of history: Knowledge, evidence, language*. New York: Red Globe Press.
- Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1846/1971). *The German ideology*. New York: International Publishers.

- McCall-Newman, C. (1982). *Grits: An intimate portrait of the Liberal Party*. Toronto: Gage Publishing.
- McGrath, T. M. (1992). *History of Canadian airports*. Ottawa: Lugus Publications.
- McGregor, G. R. (1980). *The adolescence of an airline*. Montreal: Air Canada.
- McHoul, A., & Grace, W. (2003). *A Foucault primer: Discourse, power and the subject*. New York: New York University Press.
- McLaren, P. G., & Durepos, G. (2021). A call to practice context in management and organization studies. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 30(1), 74-84.
- McLaren, P. G., Mills, A. J., & Weatherbee, T. G. (Eds.). (2015). *The Routledge companion to management and organizational history*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- McLean, C., & Hassard, J. (2004). Symmetrical absence/symmetrical absurdity: Critical notes on the production of actor-network accounts. *Journal of Management Studies*, 41(3), 493-519.
- McNeill, W. H. (1986). Mythistory, or truth, myth, history, and historians. *The American Historical Review*, 91(1), 1-10.
- Megill, A. (2004). Coherence and incoherence in historical studies: From the “Annales” School to the new cultural history. *New Literary History*, 35(2), 207-231.
- Mills, A. J. (2017). Getting down and dirty: Microhistory from the ANTi-History perspective. *Workplace Review*, (April issue), 18-26.
- Mills, A. J., & Durepos, G. (2010). ANTi-History. In A. J. Mills, G. Durepos, & E. Wiebe (Eds.), *Sage encyclopedia of case study research, Vol. I* (pp. 26-29). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mills, A. J. & Helms Hatfield, J. (1998). Air Canada vs Canadian: Competition and merger in the framing of airline cultures. *Studies in Cultures, Organizations and Societies*, 4(1), 93-124.
- Mills, A. J., & Helms Mills, J. (2006). Masculinity and the making of Trans-Canada Air Lines, 1937–1940: a feminist poststructuralist account. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences/Revue Canadienne des Sciences de l'Administration*, 23(1), 34-44.
- Mills, A. J., & Helms Mills, J. (2018). Archival research. In C. Cassell, A. L. Cunliffe, & G. Grandy (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative business and management research methods: methods and challenges* (pp. 32-46). London: Sage.

- Mills, A. J., Suddaby, R., Foster, W. M., & Durepos, G. (2016). Re-visiting the historic turn 10 years later: current debates in management and organizational history—an introduction. *Management & Organizational History*, 11(2), 67-76.
- Mills, A. J., Weatherbee, T. G., & Durepos, G. (2014). Reassembling Weber to reveal the-past-as-history in management and organization studies. *Organization*, 21(2), 225-243.
- Mills, A. J., & Williams, K. S. (2021). Feminist frustrations: the enduring neglect of a women's business history and the opportunity for radical change. *Business History*, <https://doi.org/10.1080/00076791.2021.1896706>.
- Mímisson, K., & Magnússon, S. G. (2014). Singularizing the past: The history and archaeology of the small and ordinary. *Journal of Social Archaeology*, 14(2), 131-156.
- Mol, A. (1999). Ontological politics: A word and some questions. In J. Law & J. Hassard (Eds.), *Actor network theory and after* (pp. 74-89). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Mol, A. (2002). *The body multiple: Ontology in medical practice*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Molson, K. (1974). *Pioneering in Canadian air transport*. Winnipeg: J. Richardson.
- Montreal Gazette. (1963, December 13). Friendly Parley: McGregor meets U of M students. *Montreal Gazette*, p. 2.
- Muir, E. (1991). Introduction: Observing trifles. In E. Muir & G. Ruggiero (Eds.), *Microhistory and the lost peoples of Europe* (pp. 7-28). Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Muldoon, J., & Marin, D. B. (2012). John Florio and the introduction of management into the English vocabulary. *Journal of Management History*, 18(2), 129-136.
- Munslow, A. (1997). *Deconstructing history*. London: Routledge.
- Munslow, A. (2010). *The future of history*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Munslow, A. (2012). *A history of history*. London: Routledge.
- Myrick, K., Helms Mills, J., & Mills, A. J. (2013). History-making and the Academy of Management: An ANTi-History perspective. *Management & Organizational History*, 8(4), 345-370.
- Nelson, J. (2017). Using conceptual depth criteria: addressing the challenge of reaching saturation in qualitative research. *Qualitative Research*, 17(5), 554-570.

- Newman, P. (1963). *Renegade in power: The Diefenbaker years*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Limited.
- Nord, W. R., & Fox, S. (1996). *The individual in organizational studies: The great disappearing act?* In S. R. Clegg, C. Hardy, & W. R. Nord (Eds.), *Handbook of organization studies* (p. 148–174). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Nord, W. R., & Fox, S. (1999). The individual in organizational studies: The great disappearing act. In S. R. Clegg & C. Hardy (Eds.), *Studying organization: Theory and method* (pp. 142-169). London: Sage.
- Novak, S. A. (2014). Leave taking: Materialities of moving over land. *Cambridge Archaeological Journal*, 24(3), 477-485.
- Novicevic, M. M., & Mills, A. J. (2019). Controversy as a non-corporeal actant in the community of management historians. In C. M. Hartt (Ed.), *Connecting values to action: Non-corporeal actants and choice* (pp. 129-143). Bingley, UK: Emerald.
- Novick, P. (1988). *That noble dream: The 'objectivity question' and the American historical profession*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Noy, C. (2008). Sampling knowledge: The hermeneutics of snowball sampling in qualitative research. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 11(4), 327-344.
- Passoth, J. H., & Rowland, N. J. (2010). Actor-network state: Integrating actor-network theory and state theory. *International Sociology*, 25(6), 818-841.
- Paul, J. (2018). What is microhistory? *Social Evolution & History*, 17(2), 64-82.
- Peltonen, M. (2001). Clues, margins, and monads: The micro-macro link in historical research. *History and Theory*, 40(3), 347-359.
- Peltonen, M. (2014). What Is Micro in Microhistory? In H. Renders & B. de Haan (Eds.), *Theoretical discussions of biography: Approaches from history, microhistory, and life writing* (pp. 105-118). Boston: Brill.
- Perillo, S. (2008). Constructing participation practice: an ANT account. *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal*, 3(3), 215-230.
- Perriton, L. (2001). Sleeping with the enemy? Exploiting the textual turn in management research. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 4(1), 35-50.
- Pickersgill, J. W. (1994). *Seeing Canada whole: A memoir*. Markham, ON: Fitzhenry & Whiteside.

- Pigott, P. (2001). *National treasure: The history of Trans Canada Airlines*. Madeira Park, BC: Harbour Publishing.
- Pigott, P. (2014). *Air Canada: The history*. Toronto: Dundurn.
- Plamondon, B. (2017). *The Shawinigan fox: How Jean Chrétien defied the elites and reshaped Canada*. Ottawa: Great River Media.
- Prasad, A. (2005). *Crafting qualitative research: Working in the postpositivist traditions*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Pratt, M. G. (2009). From the editors: For the lack of a boilerplate: Tips on writing up (and reviewing) qualitative research. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52(5), 856-862.
- Putnam, L. (2006). To study the fragments/whole: Microhistory and the Atlantic world. *Journal of Social History*, 39(3), 615-630.
- Quinn, S. (2001). The Glorious Revolution's effect on English private finance: a microhistory, 1680–1705. *The Journal of Economic History*, 61(3), 593-615.
- Rabinow, P. (1991). *The Foucault reader: An introduction to Foucault's thought*. London: Penguin Books.
- Reid, D. M. (1984). The symbolism of postage stamps: a source for the historian. *Journal of Contemporary History*, 19(2), 223-249.
- Renders, H. (2014). The limits of representativeness: Biography, life writing, and microhistory. In H. Renders & B. De Haan (Eds.), *Theoretical Discussions of Biography* (pp. 129-138). Boston: Brill.
- Renders, H., & De Haan, B. (Eds.). (2014). *Theoretical discussions of biography: approaches from history, microhistory, and life writing*. Boston: Brill.
- Revel, J. (1995) Microanalysis and the construction of the social. In J. Revel & L. Hunt (Eds.), *Histories: French constructions of the past* (pp. 493-502). New York: The New Press.
- Richman, M. H. (2002). *Sacred revolutions: Durkheim and the College de Sociologie*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Ricoeur, P. (1988). *Time and narrative* (Vol. 3). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Roberts, B. (2006). *Micro social theory*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Roberts, L. (1957). *C.D.: The life and times of Clarence Decatur Howe*. Toronto: Clarke, Irwin, & Company Limited.

- Robisheaux, T. (2017). Microhistory today: A roundtable discussion. *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, 47(1), 7-52.
- Rosenberg, A. (2018). *Philosophy of social science*. New York: Routledge.
- Rowlinson, M. (2004). Historical analysis of company documents. In C. Cassell & G. Symon (Eds.), *Essential guide to qualitative methods in organizational research* (pp. 301-311). London: Sage.
- 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.
- Russell, J. (2019). Finding a turn in Canadian management through archival sources. *Journal of Management History*, 25(4), 550-564.
- Sampson, A. (1984). *Empires of the sky: The politics, contests and cartels of world airlines*. New York: Random House.
- Sarvimäki, M. (2019, May). ANTi-History in design research: New applications and interpretations. In *ARCC 2019 International Conference: Future Praxis: Applied Research as a Bridge Between Theory and Practice* (pp. 179-187). Architectural Research Centers Consortium.
- Shaffner, E. C., Mills, A. J., & Helms Mills, J. (2019). Intersectional history: exploring intersectionality over time. *Journal of Management History*, 25(4), 444-463.
- Shahbazi, S. (2019). Microhistory narratives, alternative epistemologies and epistemic credibility: A comparative study of Haifa Zangana's city of widows and Leilah Nadir's orange trees of Baghdad. *Life Writing*, 16(4), 567-582.
- Shanley, D. (2021) Imagining the future through revisiting the past: The value of history in thinking about R(R)I's possible future(s). *Journal of Responsible Innovation*, 8(2), 234-253.
- Shapiro, J. (2005). *A year in the life of William Shakespeare, 1599*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Silverman, D. (2015). *Interpreting qualitative data*. London: Sage.
- Smith, P. (1986). *It seems like only yesterday: Air Canada – The first 50 years*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Limited.
- Staniland, M. (2003). *Government birds: Air transport and the state in Western Europe*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Stern, F. R. (Ed.). (1973). *The varieties of history: From Voltaire to the present*. New York: Vintage.

- Stevenson, G. (1987). *The politics of Canada's airlines: From Diefenbaker to Mulroney*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Steyaert, C., Marti, L., & Michels, C. (2012). Multiplicity and reflexivity in organizational research: Towards a performative approach to the visual. *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal*, 7(1), 34-53.
- Stursberg, P. (1978). *Lester Pearson and the dream of unity*. Toronto: Doubleday Canada.
- Suddaby, R. (2016). Toward a historical consciousness: Following the historic turn in management thought. *M@n@gement*, 19(1), 46-60.
- Suddaby, R., Foster, W. M., & Mills, A. J. (2014). Historical institutionalism. In M. Bucheli & R. D. Wadhvani (Eds.), *Organizations in time: History, theory, methods* (pp.100-123). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Suddaby, R., Foster, W. M., & Quinn Trank, C. (2010). Rhetorical history as a source of competitive advantage. In J. A. C. Baum & J. Lampel (Ed.), *The globalization of strategy research* (pp. 147-173). London: Emerald.
- Swartz, D. (1997). *Culture and power: The sociology of Pierre Bourdieu*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Szijártó, I. M. (2002). Four arguments for microhistory. *Rethinking History*, 6(2), 209-215.
- Szijártó, I. M. (2017). Probing the limits of microhistory. *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, 47(1), 193-198.
- Taylor, S., Bell, E., & Cooke, B. (2009). Business history and the historiographical operation. *Management & Organizational History*, 4(2), 151-166.
- Tennent, K. D., Gillett, A. G., & Foster, W. M. (2020). Developing historical consciousness in management learners. *Management Learning*, 51(1), 73-88.
- Thibault, P. J. (2013). *Re-reading Saussure: The dynamics of signs in social life*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Tinker, T., & Neimark, M. (1987). The role of annual reports in gender and class contradictions at General Motors: 1917–1976. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 12(1), 71-88.
- Toms, S., & Wilson, J. (2010). In defence of business history: a reply to Taylor, Bell and Cooke. *Management & Organizational History*, 5(1), 109-120.
- Tristano, R. M. (1996). Microhistory and Holy Family Parish: Some Methodological Considerations. *US Catholic Historian*, 14(3), 23-30.

- Trivellato, F. (2011). Is there a future for Italian microhistory in the age of global history? *California Italian Studies*, 2(1). <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/0z94n9hq#>
- Trivellato, F. (2015). Microstoria/microhistoire/microhistory. *French Politics, Culture & Society*, 33(1), 122-134.
- Tsekeris, C. (2010). Relationalism in sociology: Theoretical and methodological elaborations. *Philosophy, Sociology, Psychology and History*, 9(1), 139-148.
- Tureta, C., Américo, B. L., & Clegg, S. R. (2021). Controversies as method for ANTi-History: An inquiry into public administration practices. *Organization*, 28(6), 1018-1035.
- Unger, R. M. (1987). *False necessity: Anti-necessitarian social theory in the service of radical democracy*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Üsdiken, B., & Kieser, A. (2004). Introduction: History in organisation studies. *Business History*, 46(3), 321-330.
- Üsdiken, B., & Kipping, M. (2014). History and organization studies: A long-term view. In M. Bucheli & R. D. Wadhvani (Eds.), *Organizations in time: History, theory, methods* (pp. 33-55). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Vaara, E., & Lamberg, J. A. (2016). Taking historical embeddedness seriously: Three historical approaches to advance strategy process and practice research. *Academy of Management Review*, 41(4), 633-657.
- Van Lent, W., & Durepos, G. (2019). Nurturing the historic turn: “History as theory” versus “history as method”. *Journal of Management History*, 25(4), 429-443.
- Venn, C. (1984). The subject of psychology. In J. Henriques (Ed.), *Changing the subject* (pp. 115-147). London: Routledge.
- Ventresca, M. J., & Mohr, J. W. (2017). Archival research methods. In J. Baum (Ed.), *The Blackwell companion to organizations* (pp. 805-828). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Wajcman, J. (2000). Reflections on gender and technology studies: In what state is the art? *Social Studies of Science*, 30(3), 447-464.
- Wajcman, J. (2010). Feminist theories of technology. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 34(1), 143-152.
- Wanderley, S., Alcadipani, R., & Barros, A. (2021). Recentring the Global South in the Making of Business School Histories: Dependency Ambiguity in Action. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 20(3), 361-381.

- Wearing, J. (1981). *The L-shaped party: The Liberal Party of Canada, 1958–1980*. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson.
- Weick, K. E. (1995). *Sensemaking in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Whitaker, R. (1977). *The government party: Organizing and financing the Liberal Party of Canada, 1930-1958*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- White, H. (1973). *Metahistory*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
- White, H. (1982). The politics of historical interpretation: discipline and de-sublimation. *Critical Inquiry*, 9(1), 113-137.
- White, H. (1985). *Tropics of discourse: Essays in cultural criticism*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press
- Williams, K. S., & Mills, A. J. (2017). Frances Perkins: Gender, context and history in the neglect of a management theorist. *Journal of Management History*, 23(1), 32-50.
- Williams, K. S., & Mills, A. J. (2018). Hallie Flanagan and the federal theater project: a critical undoing of management history. *Journal of Management History*, 24(3), 282-299.
- Wilson, S. (2008). *Research is ceremony: Indigenous research methods*. Winnipeg: Fernwood.
- Wren, D. A. (1972). *The evolution of management thought*. New York: Ronald Press.
- Wren, D. A., & Bedeian, A. G. (2020). *The evolution of management thought* (8th ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Wrethed, J. (2020). The postmodern genre. In C. Bloom (Ed.), *The Palgrave handbook of contemporary gothic* (pp. 1123-1136). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Yin, R. K. (1981). The case study crisis: Some answers. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 26(1), 58-65.
- Yu, T., & Mills, A. J. (2021). Cultural learning process: lesson from microhistory. *Journal of Management History*, 27(4), 440-463.
- Zald, M. N. (1993). Organization studies as a scientific and humanistic enterprise: Toward a reconceptualization of the foundations of the field. *Organization Science*, 4(4), 513-528.
- Zhao, E. Y., Fisher, G., Lounsbury, M., & Miller, D. (2017). Optimal distinctiveness: Broadening the interface between institutional theory and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 38(1), 93-113.