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Introduction

In the passage I have just read from Tolstoy, the young second lieutenant Boris Bubretskow discovers that there exists in the army two different systems or hierarchies. The one is printed in some little red book and anyone can easily read it up. It also remains constant. A general is always superior to a colonel, and a colonel to a captain. The other is not printed anywhere. Nor is it even a formally organised secret society with officers and rules which you would be told after you had been admitted. You are never formally and explicitly admitted by anyone. You discover gradually, in almost indefinable ways, that it exists and that you are outside it; and then later, perhaps, that you are inside it.

(Lewis, 1944)

This passage by C. S. Lewis, from his memorial speech at London University, reflects the complexity of social networks and the powerful role they can play in socially constructing knowledge. Nonetheless, despite the passage of years, the dominant positivist perspective from which a large proportion of knowledge creation in the management discipline flows (Burrell and Morgan, 1979) still tends to privilege the objective, methodical discovery of facts and truth over knowledge production as a socially influenced process.

In recent years two important trends within management and organization studies (MOS) have served to focus attention on the socially constructed nature of knowledge and its relationship to social networks. The first trend has developed with, and out of, the call for an ‘historic turn’ in MOS (Booth and Rowlinson, 2006). A number of scholars have sought to draw attention to historical context in shaping how extant studies of management and organization are influenced by the context in which they are developed. Acker and van Houten (1974), for example, showed how the socio-economic conditions of Chicago in the 1920s influenced gendered attitudes to the study of female employees in the Hawthorne Studies. Similarly Bill Cooke
(1999) contended that the Cold War context in which management theory developed in the United States led to a marginalization of radical approaches to managing and organizing. The second trend is the increasing use of Actor-Network Theory (ANT), which, drawing on the sociology of knowledge, sets out to reveal how knowledge is an outcome of sets of relationships between human and non-human (e.g. computers, written histories, textbooks) actors involved in complex networks (Latour, 2005a).

More recently there have been several moves to draw these two trends together in the development of studies that examine the role of history and the past in network formation and persistence (Durepos and Mills, 2012a), including the development of organizational histories (Durepos, Helms Mills, and Mills, 2008). These studies critically draw on ANT to argue for an account – ‘ANTi-History’ (Durepos and Mills, 2012b) – that problematizes history and the past as socially constructed outcomes of actor networks.

Drawing on ANTi-History, we set out to study the contribution of Canadian scholars to the development of the field of MOS, with a specific focus on New Institution Theory (NIT). Our aim is twofold. First, and foremost, our study is part of a broader project to raise questions about the largely absent history of management thought in Canada (Austin, 2000b; Boothman, 2000). Second, the case study is designed to contribute to a (hopefully) emergent study of the history of management thought in Canada.

Towards the study of management theory and the Canadian context

More than a decade ago Austin (2000c: 3) contended that while there has been considerable growth in management education in Canada since the Second World War Canadian historians “have displayed scant interest in management as an academic subject”. Similarly, Boothman (2000: 12) argues that, in Canada “the content, pedagogy, and academic status of [the nature of management] … have received limited analysis.” Despite Austin’s (2000) edited collection of “essays on the history of business education in Canada” (book subtitle) there has been little or no attempt since to grapple with the issue of a history or histories of management thought in Canada. There has, however, been a number of studies of the Administrative Sciences Association of Canada (ASAC – Austin, 1994, 1995, 1998, 2000a; McLaren and Mills, 2013) and the regional Atlantic Schools of Business (ASB – Barragan and Mills, 2008; MacNeil and Mills, 2012; Genoe McLaren and Mills, 2008). These studies of ASAC and ASB have, arguably, provided useful traces of contributions to management thought in Canada, but have not centrally addressed the issue of a Canadian contribution to the development of management thought: the foci have been on the scholarly organizations themselves rather than on the development of management thought that may have been evidenced at those conferences.

Using ANTi-History to explore the development of New Institution Theory (NIT) research in Canada, this chapter serves as a starting point to unearthing and recognizing Canadian contributions to management knowledge (see also Chapter 22 in this volume).

Towards a Canadian history of management thought

In North America in particular, but also to some extent in parts of Northern Europe, the history of management thought is a well-established history and is generally accepted as a straightforward account of the development of management theory through the years. It is accepted as if it is the inevitable outcome of over a century of management thinkers (Durepos and Mills, 2012b), starting with Taylor and Scientific Management, followed by other well-known schools
of thought including: Human Relations, Systems Approach, Contingency Approach, and so on (Wren and Bedeian, 2009; Wren, 2005). Nonetheless, there have been challenges to this dominant strain of thought. It has, for example, been argued that many important contributions appear to have been left out of the dominant history (or histories). Cooke (1999), for example, points to the exclusion of leftist-thinking scholars, while Tonn (1996) focuses on the exclusion of women writers, particularly Mary Parker Follett. While Cooke (1999) uses his critique to reveal the problematic of existing histories, Tonn (1996) focuses on ‘writing in’ selected female researchers into existing histories.

Recently this conventional wisdom about the history of management thought has been challenged, with a growing number of management history scholars arguing that extant histories of management thought reflect certain historiographical processes (Booth and Rowlinson, 2006; Cooke, 1999), rooted initially in Cold War influences (Kelley, Mills, and Cooke, 2006). Grant and Mills (2006), for example, argue that what has come to stand as the history of management thought today was heavily influenced during the Cold War period by dominant social and cultural themes such as anti-communism, military-based hierarchy, behaviouralism, and positivism. Written during the era of the Cold War, management histories were a form of retrospective thinking that was influenced by the context of the authors of the time. Arguably, this discourse continues to determine what knowledge is privileged and marginalized in management thought today. As Cooke (1999) points out, while Kurt Lewin is well recognized for his three phases of change model (unfreeze/change/refreeze) his contributions from the left have been written out, just as other leftist theorists have been. Their contributions are not accepted by the dominant managerialist ideology, and are therefore not recognized in the history of management thought.

From a Canadian perspective, the lack of representation of Canadian management thought should be an obvious omission yet it appears to go unnoticed, even by Canadian scholars (as evidenced in Boothman’s 2000 account). In the absence of Canadian management history Canadian scholars often rely on American content for both history and management thought. In the meantime, for various reasons, we have chosen to begin our exploration at a point much closer in time to the present. Our primary aim was to focus on an area where we are aware that Canadian scholars have/are making a contribution and then to ‘follow the actors’ to make sense of how that work was developed and disseminated. To that end, we adopted a historiographical approach to the study of actor networks; specifically ANTi-History (Durepos and Mills, 2012b), which focuses on understanding how knowledge of the past is produced as an effect of actor networks.

ANTi-History

ANTi-History has been detailed at great length elsewhere (Durepos and Mills, 2012b; Mills and Durepos, 2010, Durepos, Mills, and Weatherbee, 2012). Its central focus is drawn from the sociology of knowledge literature, including Marx (Marx and Engels, 1940) and Mannheim (1968), and particularly the work of Latour (1987, 2005a, 2005b), Law (1986, 1992, 1994) and Callon (1986) in the development of Actor-Network Theory. While ANT sets out to ‘re-assemble’ knowledge by following the actors as they engage in the socio-politics of enrolment (i.e. drawing other actors into a joint set of activities and beliefs), translation (i.e. the process of making sense of joint activities and beliefs), and black-boxing (i.e. fixing a set of activities and beliefs as a form of truth or knowledge), it has failed up to now to problematize history and the past – vaguely seeing them as given, contextual factors (Durepos and Mills, 2012b). ANTi-History draws on
ANT to reassemble knowledge but goes beyond ANT in simultaneously setting out to reassemble history and the past and their relationship to knowledge effects (i.e. how we come to believe in something as knowledge).

**ANT**

ANT can be applied as a methodology that offers insight into the construction of knowledge. ANT assumes that knowledge is a result of social ordering; it presents knowledge creation as an effect of heterogeneous actor-networks. Heterogeneous actor-networks involve both humans and objects as actors (Law, 1992).

In fact, ANT originates from work in laboratories (Latour, 1983) where many materials such as chemicals, equipment, papers, and pencils come together with people to be transformed into reports, which contain accepted truth and facts (Godfrey-Smith, 2003). Such reports appear to hide human participation altogether. The purpose of the ANT lab studies was to expose the subjectivity of scientific knowledge by illustrating its socially created nature. In this sense, ANT aims to demonstrate scientific knowledge as a socio-cultural product (Pickering, 1992).

Instead of seeking the contributions of a single actor, we will view knowledge as socially constructed. We will take ANT’s relational approach to focus on what has happened between actors to understand how one is altered by interacting with another and, as a result, what their contribution has been. As such ANT does not take a realist approach. It does not aim to seek truth and falsity. Its epistemological assumptions are anti-positivist and influenced by social constructivism (Latour, 2005a).

Analyses in ANT treat actors symmetrically, meaning that one actor is not privileged over another. Actors considered ‘important’, socially or culturally, are not included to the neglect of other ‘less important’ actors (Law, 1991). Rather than basing their analyses on assumptions, ANT theorists begin their analysis with a blank slate, allowing actors to emerge and speak for themselves (Latour, 2005a).

We do not begin our analysis with the assumption that there is an important contribution in NIT waiting to be uncovered. Instead, we investigate NIT’s actor network, recognizing the socially constructed nature of knowledge. We are seeking to understand what, if any, contribution has been made by NIT’s actor network and the social processes by which it has evolved and been constructed.

**Our approach**

To a certain extent, this endeavour reflects our own interests as Canadian management scholars with a curiosity in understanding the identity and contribution of Canadian management research to the discipline as a whole. The first author’s research background is focused on radical organizational change, which is heavily influenced and informed by NIT. This connection, along with NIT being a strongly established theoretical perspective which is popular and relevant today, influenced our decision to deploy the NIT actor network as a starting point to unearthing Canada’s contribution to management thought. We also noted that the University of Alberta and the University of Toronto appear to be producing significant work in this area.

Our relational involvement in the analysis inevitably influences the outcome. As researchers we are not separate from the social processes of NIT that we are studying. In our involvement we are not neutral but instead we are actors seeking to expose the social processes which we are simultaneously influencing (Law, 1994).
Methodology

Our investigation of NIT begins in 1980 and continues into the present. Limiting our investigation to this time period is particularly interesting as a renewed interest in Institutional Theory began in the 1980s (Greenwood, Oliver, and Suddaby, 2008) and business schools and research in Canada were well established by this time (Austin, 1998). While a 30-year period ensures a sufficient amount of work was produced for the purpose of this analysis, it is in no way an exhaustive timeframe. As Kieser (1994) notes, selection is unavoidable and in limiting our analysis to a certain time period we are choosing to exclude certain contributions and include others based on their years of publication. Of course, exploring the origins of NIT and its evolution from Institutional Theory could have provided insight into the micro processes involved in the emergence of new theories, their development and application to the mainstream discourse. However, this is beyond the scope of our analysis.

We will limit our analysis to include only Canadian scholars. For the purpose of clarity only (i.e. what or who it is we are talking about) we consider Canadian scholars to be individuals who were living and working in Canada during the period in which his or her formative works were published. This establishes their ‘solid connection to Canada’ (Mandelbaum and Hlynka, 2009). Babe (2000) makes a similar distinction in his book Canadian Communication Thought: Ten Foundational Writers, where he indicates that while the ten authors identified may not necessarily have been born in Canada, they did live and work in Canada during the time that their formative works were published.

Locating Canadian scholars and their contributions is much like that of a private investigator. It requires in-depth knowledge of the individual and his/her affiliations, publications, co-workers, and detailed elements of their career. As a starting point, Google Scholar was used to uncover individuals who have identified themselves as having an interest in NIT. Google Scholar was chosen because of its widespread accessibility worldwide and inclusion of journal articles, theses, books, and institutional repositories (2013). It provided an effective means of identifying relevant work produced by actors by identifying citation counts for articles. This allowed us to avoid searching multiple databases. Although Google Scholar proved to be an efficient way of identifying and evaluating actors in the network, the use of Google Scholar has inherent flaws. Not all academics subscribe to Google Scholar and as such it can be challenging to identify the number of citations an author has received over the course of his/her career. This limited our ability to accurately assess the impact an individual has had on the field. The publication process takes time, as does citation by other authors. As a result, significant contributions to the field may not be fully recognized for decades. As we shall show below, our focus on self-identification (as an NIT scholar) proved to be highly problematic and we had to use other search tools to overcome this.

We started off our Google search with four criteria – self-identification (i.e. the author views their work as being in the field of NIT), timespan (we limited the search to those publishing in NIT since 1980 – see above), being based at a Canadian university (see above), and the number of citations per article. In the latter case we took an arbitrary figure of 500 citations or more per article. The figure was arrived at as an outcome of our search, which revealed a large number of papers had greatly less than 500 citations and a number also had substantially more than 500. As we wanted to identify ‘key contributors’ (based on citation counts) we tried to find a number that would be sizeable (e.g. indicative of academic interest and attention) for the contributors in a given field, namely NIT.

Our initial Google Scholar search generated a list of 35 scholars worldwide who self-identified themselves as having an interest in NIT, five of whom were associated with Canadian universities. However, only one of these scholars, namely Joel A. C. Baum, had citation counts over 500.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Article</th>
<th>Co-authors</th>
<th>Year published</th>
<th>Number of citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C. R. (Bob) Hinings</td>
<td>Understanding radical organizational change: Bringing together the old and the new institutionalism</td>
<td>R. Greenwood</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1,691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theorizing change: The role of professional associations in the transformation of institutionalized fields</td>
<td>R. Greenwood</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Configurational approaches to organizational analysis</td>
<td>A. D. Meyer</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The structuring of organizational structures</td>
<td>S. Ranson</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understanding strategic change: the contribution of archetypes</td>
<td>R. Greenwood</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy Suddaby</td>
<td>Understanding radical organizational change: Bringing together the old and the new institutionalism</td>
<td>C. R. Hinings</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1,691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theorizing change: The role of professional associations in the transformation of institutionalized fields</td>
<td>C. R. Hinings</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The structuring of organizational structures</td>
<td>S. Ranson</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rhetorical strategies of legitimacy</td>
<td>R. Suddaby</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understanding strategic change: The contribution of archetypes</td>
<td>C. R. Hinings</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rhetorical strategies of legitimacy</td>
<td>R. Greenwood</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>From the editors: What grounded theory is not</td>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Co-authors</td>
<td>Year published</td>
<td>Number of citations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University of Toronto</strong>&lt;br&gt;Joel A. C. Baum&lt;br&gt;PhD, University of Toronto</td>
<td>Don’t go it alone: Alliance network composition and startups’ performance in Canadian biotechnology</td>
<td>T. Calabrese&lt;br&gt;B. S. Silverman</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1,455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional linkages and organizational mortality</td>
<td>C. Oliver</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational ecology</td>
<td></td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Localized competition and organizational failure in the Manhattan hotel industry, 1898–1990</td>
<td>S. J. Mezias</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Survival-enhancing learning in the Manhattan hotel industry, 1898–1980</td>
<td>P. Ingram</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional embeddedness and the dynamics of organizational populations</td>
<td>C. Oliver</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brian S. Silverman</strong>&lt;br&gt;PhD, University of California at Berkeley</td>
<td>Strategic alliances and interfirm knowledge transfer</td>
<td>D. C. Mowery&lt;br&gt;J. E. Oxley</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>2,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Simon Fraser</strong>&lt;br&gt;Thomas B. Lawrence&lt;br&gt;PhD, University of Alberta</td>
<td>Discourse and institutions</td>
<td>N. Phillips&lt;br&gt;C. Hardy</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional entrepreneurship in emerging fields: HIV/AIDS treatment advocacy in Canada</td>
<td>S. Maguire&lt;br&gt;C. Hardy</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>York University</strong>&lt;br&gt;Christine Oliver&lt;br&gt;PhD, University of Toronto, 1988</td>
<td>Strategic responses to institutional processes</td>
<td></td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>3,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Determinants of interorganizational relationships: Integration and future directions</td>
<td></td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sustainable competitive advantage: Combining institutional and resource-based views</td>
<td></td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional linkages and organizational mortality</td>
<td>J. A. C. Baum</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The antecedents of deinstitutionalization</td>
<td></td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional embeddedness and the dynamics of organizational populations</td>
<td>J. A. C. Baum</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>521</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Was affiliated with the University of Iowa at the time of publication.
We could have stuck with this outcome and focused on the work of Baum but we knew that other NIT scholars in a Canadian context existed, in particular Christine Oliver at York University. So we decided to use Google Scholar to ‘follow’ both Oliver and Baum through their work and co-authors to uncover additional Canadian NIT scholars who did not self-identify with NIT on our initial search. 3

The next step involved searching for each of Oliver and Baum’s co-authors to determine their institutional affiliations and research interests. Using our selection criteria of the 30-year time period starting in 1980, authors writing their formative works in Canada, and citation counts greater than 500, additional individuals were identified and included in the final analysis (Table 25.1).

To ensure other scholars were not overlooked for their contribution to NIT, faculty members at the institutions of each of the identified actors were reviewed to determine if they had published on NIT. Interest in NIT was determined by taking a cursory review of publications on their faculty home page and by searching for their name on Google Scholar. When this process uncovered no new names we felt satisfied that key contributors to NIT within Canada had been identified. See Table 25.1 for a summary of these results.

Once key contributors had been identified, it was important to establish any connections that may or may not exist between actors in our network. Résumés or curriculum vitae (CVs) were downloaded and used to determine detailed work history, affiliations, editorial positions, publications, positions held, research chairs, etc. Although many of the CVs were detailed and provided vital information about our ‘key contributors’, it is important to recognize that they do not necessarily provide a complete picture of an individual and his or her personal relationships. However, they did provide useful information for our analysis. For example, while article citations were useful in identifying NIT scholars for the present analysis, a closer look at other publications such as edited books and book chapters, editorial appointments and other service responsibilities (i.e. student supervision) were all essential in determining the connectivity between actors that were identified in Table 25.1.

As Lawrence and Suddaby (2006) suggest, it is particularly important to address actors’ work within organizations to determine how the field and/or institutions have been influenced through implicit and explicit activities. Given institutional requirements to meet specific publishing, service and teaching requirements, CVs are a useful repository where scholars are able to document participation in each of these areas.

Analysis

Seven key actors were identified in our NIT network; three affiliated with the University of Alberta, two with the University of Toronto, and one each at Simon Fraser, and York University. Our analysis focuses on the relationships between the seven key actors identified in Table 25.1. While our analysis below will progress in a linear fashion, outlining accomplishments, roles, and contributions, we are not denoting an order of importance among our key actors. We have arbitrarily selected an order in which to present the actors.

Although the order of actors listed is arbitrary, it became apparent that some of the actors were connected more or less strongly to one another as the analysis progressed. Co-editing books, editorial appointments, and even PhD student committees appear to have fostered relationships between specific actors of the network and led to the creation of what we have called the inner, bridging, and outer circles. The inner circle is comprised of individuals who have co-authored journal articles together, sat on the same editorial boards, and may even have sat on PhD student committees with one another. Members of the inner circle also appear to
have enacted other members into the Canadian NIT network differentiating them from the other actors and making them powerful influencers of the NIT network. The bridging circle, comprised of one individual, has involvement with some of the actors in the inner circle and sat on similar editorial boards but also appears to be enacting members of the outer circle into the Canadian NIT field. The bridging circle therefore connects the two groups to each other; however, despite academic success and contributions to Canadian NIT, lacks the same level of connectivity to other members of the Canadian NIT field in a comparable way.

Finally, the outer circle, comprised of accomplished academics, has in most cases been enacted into the network by members of the inner and bridging circles. While they have co-authored informative articles with other influential NIT scholars, many of whom reside outside of Canada, this group did not work with the highly connected Canadian scholars that comprise the inner circle. Given that the primary interest of the present chapter was to identify Canadian contributors to NIT, we differentiated between the groups and their levels of connectivity; however, we wanted to retain the members of the network in an effort to build on Canadians contributing to the field of NIT and management thought.

These connections reflect the capacity of actors to act upon one another (Law, 1986) and demonstrate the continuous participation in political work by engaging other actors’ interests to eventually enrol them in a cause such as research in NIT, thus strengthening the cause (Law, 1992). This process is demonstrated in our analysis.

The inner circle

Our analysis reveals the University of Alberta and the University of Toronto as the apparent centres of NIT; however, the strongest relationships appear to be between C. R. (Bob) Hinings (University of Alberta), Royston Greenwood (University of Alberta), Roy Suddaby (University of Alberta), and Christine Oliver (York University). Given the strength of the relationships between these four actors (Tables 25.1 and 25.2) and their strong ties to Canada, they define our inner circle.

C. R. Hinings and R. Greenwood are the most strongly connected of our actors. Greenwood and Hinings began their relationship in the United Kingdom and came to the University of Alberta at similar times in 1979. As a result, Greenwood and Hinings have worked and published together for more than 30 years and have both been active members of developing and contributing to NIT in Canada. Greenwood and Hinings continue to work together with two books forthcoming, numerous journal articles, and have written 11 book chapters between 1980 and 2012 with one another (Greenwood, 2011). Much of their early work focused on the structure and characteristics of organizations and the processes involved in shifting between archetypes (Greenwood and Hinings, 1993, 1996; Ranson, Hinings, and Greenwood, 1980). Although this continues to be of interest based on recent publications, later work has shifted to focus on radical change in organizations and building theory (Greenwood, Miller, and Hinings, in preparation) and has included contributions by other members of the inner circle, other established and emergent scholars, and PhD students interested in NIT – most notably Roy Suddaby, another member of the inner circle. The remainder of this section will highlight the connections between each of the actors in the inner circle.

C. R. Hinings. A founding member of the Aston School (Clegg, Ibarra-Colado, and Bueno-Rodriquez, 1999), Hinings has spent the bulk of his career at the University of Alberta, continuing to be a leader in NIT. Although Hinings’ publication record speaks for itself, the University of Alberta website reinforces Hinings’ scholarly prominence:
The contributions of Professor Bob Hinings were recognized when he became the first faculty member from the Alberta School of Business to be elected to the Royal Society of Canada. He also was named a Distinguished Scholar of the Academy of Management, the world's largest association of management academics.

(20 September 2012)

In addition to his publication record, or perhaps because of it, Hinings has supervised ten PhD students at the University of Alberta (Document search, 29 September 2012) and has sat on the committees of other PhD students including Roy Suddaby who will be discussed below. Much like their journal and book publication record, Greenwood appears on five of the PhD committees supervised by Hinings and sits on a number of boards including the college of reviews for the Canada research chair (Hinings, 2011).

Royston Greenwood. With an established career at the University of Alberta, Greenwood has been an active member of academia, publishing extensively, sitting on a number of editorial
boards (Table 25.2), and doing professional service in positions such as chair designate at the Academy of Management and professor of strategic management (Greenwood, 2011).

In addition to working extensively with Hinings, Greenwood has worked with the two other members of our inner circle, Christine Oliver and Roy Suddaby. Having sat on a number of editorial boards together (Table 25.2), Greenwood and Oliver have co-edited two books and authored one book chapter together and continue to work together with one book forthcoming (Greenwood, Oliver, and Sahlin, forthcoming; Greenwood et al., 2008) thereby enacting Oliver into the growing Canadian NIT network.

Greenwood has also been active in attracting emerging academics with an interest in institution theory. He has supervised two PhD students (ProQuest, 29 September 2012), the most notable being Roy Suddaby (Suddaby, 2001), another member of our inner circle. Following their supervisor–student relationship, Greenwood and Suddaby went on to write a number of articles together on organizational change and institutional entrepreneurship and have sat on similar editorial boards (Table 25.2).

Roy Suddaby. Although Suddaby is in the comparatively earlier stages of his academic career he has made significant contributions to the field of NIT, thus solidifying his position in the inner circle. Suddaby has strong ties to the University of Alberta, having received his PhD (2001) there under the supervision of Greenwood and with Hinings as a committee member (Suddaby, 2001). Suddaby maintained the relationship with Greenwood following the completion of his PhD and they co-authored a paper (Suddaby and Greenwood, 2005) while Suddaby was working at the University of Iowa. Suddaby and Greenwood have since co-authored a total of nine journal articles, one book, two book chapters, and edited for three of the same journals (Greenwood, 2011). Suddaby has maintained his relationship with Greenwood, and established a working relationship with Oliver and Lawrence, a member of our outer circle.

Suddaby and Oliver, in addition to both sitting on the editorial board for the Academy of Management Review and Journal of Management Studies, have co-edited at least one book together. Suddaby has also established a working relationship with Lawrence, a member of the outer circle who also obtained his PhD at the University of Alberta. The relationship between the two scholars has resulted in at least two journal articles together and according to Dobbin (2010: 673): “Lawrence and Suddaby (2006) coined the term ‘institutional work’ to describe the range of ways that people build, sustain and change institutions.” The relationship between the two scholars could become more prominent as Suddaby has recently accepted a new position at the University of Victoria.

Aside from Suddaby’s apparent ability to build and maintain relationships, he is a notable academic in his own right. Eight years after receiving his PhD, Suddaby was promoted to full professor status and was appointed as Director of the Canadian Centre of Corporate Social Responsibility and Social Entrepreneurship in 2010 and has been the recipient of numerous awards (Suddaby, 2011). Suddaby is also the outgoing editor of the Academy of Management Review and sits on a number of editorial boards (Table 25.2) (Suddaby, 2011).

Christine Oliver. Christine Oliver is the face of Institution Theory in Canada with more citations on a single article than any other Canadian scholar and five articles with more than 800 citations (Table 25.1). While many of Oliver’s formative journal articles have been written independently, this could be a reflection of the publication guidelines and standards established by the University of Toronto, where she was formerly affiliated. Although many of her formative works were written independently, she has established relationships with the other members of the inner circle as well as members of the outer circle. Oliver has co-edited two books and journal articles with both Greenwood and Suddaby and has co-authored four journal articles with Baum, the sole contributor to the bridging circle.
Co-editing books and appointments on editorial boards with members of our inner and outer circle have made Oliver an influential NIT scholar in Canada. Oliver’s position on the editorial board at the Academy of Management, alongside Greenwood and Suddaby also give them international acclaim for their contributions to NIT. Oliver’s contributions specifically have been recognized at international venues including the Academy of Management where she was named as a distinguished speaker for the Management Organization Theory and Management Division (Oliver, 2011).

Oliver has written extensively on Institution Theory and the dynamics of institutionalism (Oliver, 2011) and has been referenced widely throughout NIT literature. From the articles on our list alone (Table 25.1), Oliver’s work has been cited more than 8,500 times. In addition to her extensive publication record, which includes one book and more than 25 journal articles and book chapters, Oliver has been the recipient of numerous academic awards, sat on a number of editorial boards (Table 25.2), and has sat on various university committees (Oliver, 2011).

Her contributions don’t stop at the number of publications to her name. Accolades and service on university and academic based committees (2011) have also been prominent. Oliver has supervised 16 PhD Students (Oliver, 2011) and sat on the committee of 20 other students throughout her career. Three of the committees Oliver has sat on were for students at the University of Alberta, an institutional actor that appears to be influential in developing scholars with an interest in NIT. An additional two students from the University of Toronto, another institutional actor identified in the network, had Oliver as a committee member.

Bridging circle

An accomplished academic, Baum has published a number of journal articles on NIT and has more than 11,436 citations to his name (Google Scholar, 29 September 2012) when all of his published work is considered. He has co-authored three articles with B. S. Silverman, one of which makes our list of formative works (Baum, Calabrese, and Silverman, 2000). Baum received his PhD at the University of Toronto, continues to build on his relationship with Silverman and has since developed ties with Oliver and other scholars now at the University of Toronto with interests in NIT (i.e. Joanne Oxley and Bill McEvily).

In addition to a strong research background and affiliations with organizations such as the Academy of Management and the Administrative Sciences Association of Canada, Baum was the founding editor of Strategic Organization where he continues to sit on the editorial board. Baum enacted Greenwood as a co-editor as well as Suddaby and Silverman who have both sat on the editorial board of Strategic Organization (Table 25.2). Although it is clear that Baum has affiliations with members of the inner circle, he resides in between the inner and outer circles since he doesn’t have the same level of connectivity through the co-authorship of journal articles, book chapters, and editorial appointments as Greenwood, Hinings, Suddaby, and Oliver.

Although he doesn’t have the same level of connectivity that members of the inner circle have, Baum has demonstrated strong skills in academia and is developing relationships with other individuals now at the University of Toronto (i.e. B. S. Silverman) with NIT interests as well as with other established and emergent scholars.

Outer circle

The outer circle consists of two key actors: Thomas B. Lawrence and B. S. Silverman who were both brought into the NIT network through members identified in the inner and bridging circles. These individuals, proven academics with an established track record in NIT reside in the
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outer circle because, despite their connections and affiliations, they have not been fully enacted into the NIT network.

**Thomas B. Lawrence.** Although Thomas B. Lawrence currently works at Simon Fraser University, he has strong ties to the University of Alberta. Having received his PhD there, he has contributed a chapter in a book edited by two members of our inner circle (Lawrence, 2011); despite his strong ties to the University of Alberta, Lawrence has not co-authored any journal articles with members of our inner circle and does not list any editorial appointments on his CV (Lawrence, 2011). As a result, his connections to the members of the inner circle are in part attributed to where he obtained his PhD and not as a result of continued and active enrolment into the network. Despite the lack of explicit connectivity to other members of the NIT network, Lawrence has co-authored numerous journal articles with other established NIT scholars as well as one book and two book chapters and is therefore establishing a presence in the field of NIT.

**B. S. Silverman.** Silverman received his PhD at the University of California at Berkeley (Silverman, 2011). Although he has two articles with more than one thousand citations, only one was written while in Canada (Table 25.1). Although Silverman has a single article on our list, he has been included in the outer circle given his affiliations with individuals that have since been recruited by the University of Toronto. Silverman, in addition to working with individuals who appear to have been recruited to the University of Toronto because of their interest in NIT, has worked with Baum publishing least four journal articles and book chapters with one another (Silverman, 2011). Baum and Silverman have also sat on at least one editorial board together (Table 25.2). Silverman has also sat on the editorial board for the *Academy of Management Review,* however, despite this connection with members of the inner circle, he has not co-authored or developed this connection further thus residing in the outer circle despite his academic success.

The academic institution as an actor

If a network is capable of sustaining extreme alignment of its actors, and if it is capable of acting as ‘one’, it comes to be viewed as a single actor rather than a network (Latour, 2005b). It becomes punctuated as a black box (Akrich, 1992). In this way actors can be understood as networks and networks can be understood as actors. A given actor comes to represent the complex mode of ordering which initially made up the network (Durepos and Mills, 2012b). In this sense, the academic institutions have come to be represented as actors, and represent their entire actor network. For example, we are not exploring the University of Toronto actor network, instead the University of Toronto is treated as a non-human actor in the NIT actor network. From an ANT perspective both human and non-human actors have the capacity to alter each other’s courses of action. ANT’s focus lies in understanding the relationships established between both types of actors to understand the nature of their connectedness (Durepos and Mills, 2012b). The University of Toronto and the University of Alberta are two notable non-human actors in the NIT network and we cannot overlook the role that they have played.

While the University of Alberta is the home to many strong NIT scholars, its emphasis on excellence in research and publications suggests that the university as an actor may play an important role in its development as a hub of excellence in NIT. The University of Alberta website states: “[r]ecently, our department was ranked 10th internationally with respect to the number of articles per department member placed in the *Academy of Management Journal*” (University of Alberta, 20 September 2012) and “[o]ur department is one of the most highly ranked in Canada with respect to publications in top tier journals” (University of Alberta, 20 September 2012). The University of Toronto boasts similar accomplishments such as their “stellar reputation
for groundbreaking research ... and insight into a wide range of management issues” (Rotman, September 22, 2012).

Our analysis revealed that both institutions are host to multiple NIT actors with publications having over 500 citations. The institutions (or perhaps individuals within the institutions) appear to play a role in actively enrolling individuals with research interests in NIT. For example, the University of Alberta has two additional actors who have already made significant contributions to NIT – Michael Lounsbury and David Deephouse. However, since their papers were published while affiliated with American institutions, they were not included in our analysis. The University of Alberta also appears to be recruiting promising PhD graduates with an interest in NIT. As we have seen from Suddaby and Lawrence, former University of Alberta graduates, the University of Alberta has produced at least two graduates with an emphasis on NIT.

We identified a similar pattern at the University of Toronto, which has recruited established or emerging NIT researchers. Joanne Oxley, currently affiliated with the University of Toronto, wrote her formative works while at the University of Michigan, and had co-authored a paper with Silverman. The same phenomenon appears to have occurred with Silverman, who co-authored a paper with Baum while affiliated with Harvard University prior to writing later works at the University of Toronto. Bill McEvily, at the University of Toronto, is another example of an exemplary scholar recruited from another institution with NIT interests.

Given the promising and established NIT scholars at both of these institutions, conducting this analysis again in five years would further enhance our understanding of how the network has developed and enrolled new actors.

Discussion

Our analysis brought to light several types of relationships and actors in the NIT actor network. They include actors such as editors and the institutions and relationships such as that of students and supervisors, and of co-authors.

As demonstrated by Greenwood and Suddaby, the PhD student and supervisor relationship has the potential for great influence. These mentorship relationships can facilitate the publishing process, guide the development of original research, and pave the road to future tenure track positions with target institutions (Chao, Walz, and Gardner, 1992). The role of this relationship in influencing an individual’s future professional development should not be underestimated (Ortiz-Walters, 2009; Zipp, Cahill, and Clark, 2009). Through our analysis we understand the relationship only as we can see it on CVs and the creation of publications; however, this is a very complex relationship, which can influence a student’s role and contribution to the network for many years to come.

The relationship between Greenwood and Suddaby is perhaps the most evident example in our analysis of how a student/supervisor relationship can develop into a long-lasting, collaborative relationship. Over time, their relationship has evolved to be one of continued collaboration through publications, sitting on editorial boards together, and even a colleague relationship at the University of Alberta. Greenwood and Suddaby have been identified as members of our inner circle. They have worked together frequently over the past decade and have produced several publications, as have the other members of the inner circle. These types of long-term co-authorship and collaborative relationships have proven important in this network as they appear to have had great influence over the field of NIT.

It could be suggested that the development of these collaborative relationships is encouraged by the requirement for scholars to publish. Our analysis relied heavily on publications and CVs as we used them to track relationships. Therefore, we cannot overlook the essential role of editors in
the publication process. They have a great amount of influence on which contributions are made to the field. While many editors come in contact with the network, although not identified in our analysis, they act as gatekeepers accepting some content while rejecting others (Fogarty and Liao, 2009). These choices made by editors are not only reflected in our analysis (as we are only able to track publications accepted at some point by editors) but they also influence the direction of the field as a whole and the way it is and will be understood historically (Dye, Mills, and Weatherbee, 2005). As noted in our analysis, many of our identified actors including members of the inner circle, act as editors for various scholarly journals (Table 25.2). It could be argued that these individuals have an added level of influence in the NIT actor network. Not only do they influence the network through their own work but as editors they determine what comes to be considered knowledge in NIT by selecting certain contributions while rejecting others.

Our approach using sources such as CVs, publication records, and faculty websites provides only so much insight into the relationships within the network; particularly between the human actors and institutions as actors. We identified the University of Alberta and University of Toronto as centres of NIT excellence and they appear to be doing something different than other institutions with regard to attracting NIT scholars. While they make it clear that they prioritize top tier publications, it is not clear if they take an active role in recruiting NIT scholars, or if this process is more informal with NIT scholars being recruited by other NIT scholars within the institution. Perhaps NIT scholars are attracted to these institutions for their known excellence in NIT research. While the links of human actors to the institutions are clear, the actual level of influence of the institutions on the network is unclear. The nature of our analysis does not allow us to gain in-depth insight into this issue. To have a better understanding of it, we would need to deploy the University of Alberta and Toronto actor networks.

**Conclusion**

Supervision of doctoral students, publications and their selection by editors, and the hiring of faculty by institutions are part of the formalized practices or ‘written rules’ of academia. However, as evidenced by the strength of the actors and their relationships in our inner circle, informal and collaborative relationships play an important role in shaping the network and the field of NIT. These influential actors are truly constructing our understanding of NIT through their roles as supervisors, editors, authors, and collaborators. As C.S. Lewis highlighted in his speech, there appear to be two systems at work in the NIT network. One involves the formalized aspects of academia. The other, the inner circle, while more influential, is also more elusive.

In an attempt to identify the inner circle we began by identifying known Canadian scholars who have contributed to NIT. Our exploration of the social processes involved in the creation of the Canadian NIT actor network identifies an impressive body of work and recognizable contributions that have been made by individuals (often in collaboration) working and trained in Canada. Both Suddaby and Oliver, from the inner circle, and Lawrence and Baum are all Canadians – born, raised, and trained in Canada. Accounting for these Canadian contributions is important for emerging scholars that are looking for successful mentors close to ‘home’ to learn, grow, and cultivate expertise in NIT (and other developments in MOS).

Our analysis provides an indication that Canadians are making an impactful contribution and suggests the potential in continuing to identify distinctly Canadian content as we have done. The intent of this chapter was to deploy the NIT actor network as but one example to act as a starting point. We urge scholars interested in continuing along this line of investigation to further unearth Canadian contributions. These seemingly important insights should not, however, blind potential authors to the fact that what they are helping to create is socially constructed
knowledge. Nonetheless, a possible outcome may be the unearthing of an otherwise hidden and hopefully valuable body of work that has hitherto gone unnoticed or neglected. More importantly the study of management thought in Canada may reveal the social processes through which it has been rendered absent from histories of the field and, to the contrary, how it might be developed.

Notes
1 There is some debate around whether ANT is a theory, a method, a methodology, or an approach (Law and Hassard, 1999). We have chosen to view it as a way (i.e. methodology) of reassembling social phenomena.
2 Interest in NIT was solidified with the publication of DiMaggio and Powell’s (1983).
3 The issue of self-identification, although beyond the scope of this chapter, raises a highly interesting phenomenon when considering how certain work gets disseminated – we are thankful to Trish McLaren for this observation.
4 Other members of Suddaby’s PhD thesis committee included P. D. Jennings, H. Krahn, C. R. Hinings, D. Cooper, and L. Steir.
5 Silverman wrote this article while affiliated with Harvard University.
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