



ROUTLEDGE
COMPANIONS



The Routledge Companion to Management and Organizational History

Edited by Patricia Genoe McLaren, Albert J. Mills,
and Terrance G. Weatherbee



The Routledge Companion to Management and Organizational History

The field of management and organizational history has reached a level of maturity that means an overview is long overdue.

Written by a team of globally renowned scholars, this comprehensive companion analyses management and organizational history, reflecting on the most influential periods and highlighting gaps for future research. From the impact of the Cold War to global warming, it examines the field from a wide array of perspectives from the humanities to the social sciences.

Covering the entire spectrum of the field, this volume provides an essential resource for researchers of business and management.

Patricia Genoe McLaren is an Associate Professor in the School of Business & Economics, Wilfrid Laurier University, Ontario, Canada.

Albert J. Mills is Professor of Management at Saint Mary's University, Canada and co-chair of the International Board for Critical Management Studies.

Terrance G. Weatherbee is Professor of Management at Acadia University, Canada.

Routledge Companions in Business, Management and Accounting

Routledge Companions in Business, Management and Accounting are prestige reference works providing an overview of a whole subject area or sub-discipline. These books survey the state of the discipline including emerging and cutting edge areas. Providing a comprehensive, up to date, definitive work of reference, Routledge Companions can be cited as an authoritative source on the subject.

A key aspect of these Routledge Companions is their international scope and relevance. Edited by an array of highly regarded scholars, these volumes also benefit from teams of contributors which reflect an international range of perspectives.

Individually, Routledge Companions in Business, Management and Accounting provide an impactful one-stop-shop resource for each theme covered. Collectively, they represent a comprehensive learning and research resource for researchers, postgraduate students and practitioners.

Published titles in this series include:

The Routledge Companion to Fair Value and Financial Reporting

Edited by Peter Walton

The Routledge Companion to Nonprofit Marketing

Edited by Adrian Sargeant & Walter Wymer Jr

The Routledge Companion to Accounting History

Edited by John Richard Edwards, Stephen P. Walker

The Routledge Companion to Creativity

Edited by Tudor Rickards, Mark A. Runco, Susan Moger

The Routledge Companion to Strategic Human Resource Management

Edited by John Storey, Patrick M. Wright, David Ulrich

The Routledge Companion to International Business Coaching

Edited by Michel Moral, Geoffrey Abbott

The Routledge Companion to Organizational Change

Edited by David M. Boje, Bernard Burnes and John Hassard

The Routledge Companion to Cost Management

Edited by Falconer Mitchell, Hanne Nørreklit and Morten Jakobsen

The Routledge Companion to Digital Consumption

Edited by Russell W. Belk and Rosa Llamas

The Routledge Companion to Identity and Consumption

Edited by Ayalla A. Ruvinio and Russell W. Belk

The Routledge Companion to Public-Private Partnerships

Edited by Piet de Vries and Etienne B. Yehoue

The Routledge Companion to Accounting, Reporting and Regulation

Edited by Carien van Mourik and Peter Walton

The Routledge Companion to Management Education

Edited by Denise Tse H. Kazeroony and G

The Routledge Companion to Communication

Edited by Lisa Jack, J Russell Craig

The Routledge Companion to Organization

Edited by Emma Bel and Samantha Warre

The Routledge Companion to Marketing

Edited by Daragh O

and Theresa Kirchner

The Routledge Companion to Organization

Edited by Martin Pa Valerie Fournier and

The Routledge Companion to Marketing

Edited by Luiz Mou Ajay K. Manrai

The Routledge Companion to Education

Edited by Richard N

The Routledge Companion to Development

Edited by Rob F. Pe Gene L. Roth

The Routledge Companion to Accounting, Reporting and Regulation

Edited by David Ha Marleen Willekens

and Accounting

ge reference works pro-
vey the state of the dis-
ve, up to date, definitive
ource on the subject.
l scope and relevance.
fit from teams of con-

Accounting provide an
ey represent a compre-
nts and practitioners.

n to

je, Bernard Burnes

n to Cost Management
chell, Hanne
akobsen

n to Digital

lk and Rosa Llamas

n to Identity and

io and Russell

n to Public-Private

ind Etienne

n to Accounting,

urik and Peter Walton

*The Routledge Companion to International
Management Education*
Edited by Denise Tsang, Hamid
H. Kazeroony and Guy Ellis

*The Routledge Companion to Accounting
Communication*
Edited by Lisa Jack, Jane Davison and
Russell Craig

*The Routledge Companion to Visual
Organization*
Edited by Emma Bell, Jonathan Schroeder
and Samantha Warren

The Routledge Companion to Arts Marketing
Edited by Daragh O'Reilly, Ruth Rentschler
and Theresa Kirchner

*The Routledge Companion to Alternative
Organization*
Edited by Martin Parker, George Cheney,
Valerie Fournier and Chris Land

*The Routledge Companion to the Future of
Marketing*
Edited by Luiz Moutinho, Enrique Bigne and
Ajay K. Manrai

*The Routledge Companion to Accounting
Education*
Edited by Richard M. S. Wilson

The Routledge Companion to Business in Africa
Edited by Sonny Nwankwo and Kevin Ibeh

*The Routledge Companion to Human Resource
Development*
Edited by Rob F. Poell, Tonette S. Rocco and
Gene L. Roth

The Routledge Companion to Auditing
Edited by David Hay, W. Robert Knechel and
Marleen Willekens

The Routledge Companion to Entrepreneurship
Edited by Ted Baker and Friederike Welter

*The Routledge Companion to International
Human Resource Management*
Edited by David G. Collings, Geoffrey
T. Wood and Paula Caligiuri

*The Routledge Companion to Financial Services
Marketing*
Edited by Tina Harrison and Hooman
Estelami

*The Routledge Companion to International
Entrepreneurship*
Edited by Stephanie A. Fernhaber and
Shameen Prashantham

*The Routledge Companion to Non-Market
Strategy*
Edited by Thomas C. Lawton and Tazeeb
S. Rajwani

*The Routledge Companion to Cross-Cultural
Management*
Edited by Nigel Holden, Snejina and
Susanne Tietze

*The Routledge Companion to Financial
Accounting Theory*
Edited by Stewart Jones

*The Routledge Companion to Ethics, Politics and
Organizations*
Edited by Alison Pullen and Carl Rhodes

*The Routledge Companion to Management and
Organizational History*
Edited by Patricia Genoe McLaren, Albert
J. Mills and Terrance G. Weatherbee

This book provides a much-needed critique of how we do management history and why. It offers a wide variety of perspectives on the subject, critiques existing methodologies and stimulates much-needed debate about historical purpose and practice. Scholars will argue over some of the views presented here for years to come; and that is a very good thing.

Morgen Witzel, *Fellow, Centre for Leadership Studies, University of Exeter, UK*
and author of *A History of Management Thought*

The editors and authors fulfilled a difficult task: tracing an arc on this topic to represent the ongoing process of thinking "history" in management and organization studies, as well as the intimate connection of history with thinking in our field altogether. An extraordinary collection and "must read" for anyone in management and organizational studies.

Marta B. Calás, *Professor, University of Massachusetts Amherst, USA*

This much-needed volume provides a critical foundation for the new historical turn in management research and scholarship. The authors have assembled a series of writers who provide both a substantive review of organizational theory through a historical lens but also provide a programmatic roadmap for the field.

Rakesh Khurana, *Professor, Harvard Business School, USA*

Th

Ec

First published 2015
by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN
and by Routledge
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 2015 Patricia Genoe McLaren, Albert J. Mills and Terrance G. Weatherbee

The right of the editors to be identified as the authors of the editorial material, and of the authors for their individual chapters, has been asserted in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Trademark notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data

The Routledge companion to management and organizational history / edited by Patricia Genoe McLaren, Albert J. Mills, and Terrance G. Weatherbee.

pages cm. – (Routledge companions in business, management and accounting)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

1. Management–History. 2. Organizational behavior–History. I. McLaren, Patricia Genoe. II. Mills, Albert J., III. Weatherbee, Terrance G.

HD30.5.R683 2015

658–dc23

2014045587

ISBN: 978-0-415-82371-5 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-0-203-55027-4 (ebk)

Typeset in Bembo
by Out of House Publishing



Printed and bound in Great Britain by
TJ International Ltd, Padstow, Cornwall

To Murr:
and acad
Canada?"

To Deans
Sobey Ph

To my M.
always rer

Contents

<i>List of figures</i>	xiii
<i>List of tables</i>	xiv
<i>List of editors and contributors</i>	xv
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	xxii

PART I

The historic turn in management and organization studies: critical responses 1

1	Introduction: the historic turn in management and organizational studies: a companion reading <i>Terrance G. Weatherbee, Patricia Genoe McLaren, and Albert J. Mills</i>	3
2	Decentering Wren's <i>Evolution of Management Thought</i> <i>Milorad M. Novovic, J. Logan Jones, and Shawn Carraher</i>	11
3	Why organization theory needs historical analyses – and how this should be performed <i>Alfred Kieser</i>	31
4	Twenty years after: why organization theory needs historical analyses <i>Alfred Kieser</i>	47
5	Management and organizational history: prospects <i>Charles Booth and Michael Rowlinson</i>	49
6	Revisiting the historic turn: a personal reflection <i>Michael Rowlinson</i>	70

Contents

PART II			PART IV
Debates in management and organizational history	81		Rewriting
7 He who may not be mentioned: Marx, history, and American business schools <i>Richard Marens</i>	83		17 History Mayo in <i>Tuomo I</i>
8 A history of management histories: does the story of our past and the way we tell it matter? <i>Roy Jacques and Gabrielle Durepos</i>	96		18 Re-exam <i>Ali Mir</i>
9 History in management textbooks: adding, transforming, or more? <i>Terrance G. Weatherbee</i>	112		19 The Ne lessons, : <i>Albert J.</i>
PART III			20 Capitalis men's m <i>Bert Spe</i>
Methods: doing management and organizational history	127		21 A critica an ahiste <i>Amy Thu</i>
10 Managing the past <i>Alun Munslow</i>	129		
11 Critical hermeneutics for critical organizational history <i>Scott Taylor</i>	143		PART V
12 ANTi-History: toward amodern histories <i>Gabrielle Durepos</i>	153		Managem
13 Avec frontières: the discourse of humanitarianism <i>Adam Rostis</i>	181		22 History : <i>Patricia C</i>
14 The future of history: posthumanist entrepreneurial storytelling, global warming, and global capitalism <i>David M. Boje and Rohny Saylor</i>	197		23 Is there a Moving <i>Eduardo</i>
15 Varieties of history in organization studies <i>Diego M. Coraiola, William M. Foster, and Roy Suddaby</i>	206		24 Rememl <i>Nidhi Sri</i>
16 Mothership reconnection: microhistory and institutional work compared <i>Stephanie Decker</i>	222		25 The inne Canadian <i>Kristene I</i>

81	PART IV		
	Rewriting management and organizational history	239	
83	17 History of management thought in context: the case of Elton Mayo in Australia <i>Tuomo Peltonen</i>	241	
96	18 Re-examining 'flexibility' <i>Ali Mir and Raza Mir</i>	253	
112	19 The New Deal for management and organizational studies: lessons, insights, and reflections <i>Albert J. Mills, Terrance G. Weatherbee, Jason Foster, and Jean Helms Mills</i>	265	
127	20 Capitalist ideologues and the Cold War "struggle for men's minds" <i>Bert Spector</i>	285	
129	21 A critical historiography of public relations in Canada: rethinking an ahistorical symmetry <i>Amy Thurlow</i>	302	
143			
153	PART V		
	Management and organizational history at the margins	317	
181	22 History and the absence of Canadian management theory <i>Patricia Genoe McLaren and Albert J. Mills</i>	319	
197	23 Is there any future for critical management studies in Latin America? Moving from epistemic coloniality to 'trans-discipline' <i>Eduardo Ibarra-Colado</i>	332	
206	24 Remembering Eduardo Ibarra-Colado <i>Nidhi Srinivas, Ana Guedes, and Alex Faria</i>	335	
pared 222	25 The inner circle: towards a 'Canadian' management history – key Canadian contributors to new institution theory <i>Kristene E. Collier, Corinne McNally, and Albert J. Mills</i>	342	

Contents

PART VI	
Commentaries on the future of management and organizational history: does it have a past?	361
26 Processing history: bringing process-oriented research to management and organizational history <i>William M. Foster and Roy Suddaby</i>	363
27 Turning how and where? The potential for history in management and organizational studies <i>Matthias Kipping and Behlül Üsdiken</i>	372
28 Actors, networks, theory, and history – what are we producing? <i>Albert J. Mills, Terrance G. Weatherbee, and Patricia Genoe McLaren</i>	380
PART VII	
Endnote	385
29 Essaying history and management <i>Stewart Clegg</i>	387
<i>Index</i>	402

2.1 Acader
12.1 Singul
12.2 Plural
12.3 Multip
15.1 Three

Tables

2.1 Daniel Wren's research and service	16
2.2 Journal subject groupings	19
2.3 Most cited publications referencing <i>The Evolution of Management Thought</i>	20
3.1 Simple efficiency properties of the putting-out and factory systems	40
12.1 Modes for doing management and organization history	155
15.1 Synthesis of the ontological perspectives on history	212
15.2 Institutional research understanding of history	213
16.1 Comparing the research objectives of institutional work and microhistory	225
19.1 Selected New Deal agencies and organizational contribution	270
19.2 Timelines of the New Deal, selected MOS events, socio-political and cultural contexts	273
25.1 Key Canadian actors and their formative works	347
25.2 Editorial appointments of key actors	351

Patricia Genovese
Technology Management
University, Ontario
education, management
critical hermeneutics
SSHRC funded research
interest in displacement
Management

Albert J. Mills
of Business, Society,
and Technology, including
Organization Studies
and J. Neal-Schuman
R. Bendl, I. Bendl
Studies (with Patricia
Organization, Culture
and the International
Organizational

Terrance G. Waddock
at Acadia University
region of Nova Scotia
a very safe and secure
pus affords him a
at the intersection
investigating theory
ory. His current
influence how
linary canon as

David M. Boje
Professor of Management
Mexico State University
book chapters, articles
citations since 1980

16
19

20
40
155
212
213

225
270

273
347
351

Patricia Genoe McLaren is an Associate Professor and Area Coordinator of the Business Technology Management Program in the School of Business & Economics at Wilfrid Laurier University, Ontario, Canada. Her work focuses on the development of management theory and education, management theory in Canada, and technology and innovation in Canada, using critical hermeneutic analysis and critical discourse analysis. Patricia is a co-investigator on an SSHRC funded project focused on *Reassembling Canadian Management Knowledge* with a special interest in dispersion, equity, identity, and history, and is a founding member of the Sociology of Management Knowledge Network (sociologyofmanagementknowledge.com).

Albert J. Mills is Professor of Management and Director of the PhD program at the Sobey School of Business, Saint Mary's University, Canada. He is the author of 35 books and edited collections, including *ANTI-History: Theorizing the Past, History, and Historiography in Management and Organization Studies* (with G. Durepos), *Absent Aviators: Gender Issues in Aviation* (with D. Bridges and J. Neal-Smith), and the forthcoming *Oxford Handbook of Diversity in Organizations* (with R. Bendl, I. Bleijenbergh, and I. Henttonen) and *The Routledge Companion to Critical Management Studies* (with A. & P. Prasad and J. Helms Mills). He currently serves as an Associate Editor of *Organization; Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management; Gender, Work & Organization*; and the *International Journal of Work Innovation*. He is also on the editorial board *Management & Organizational History* and several other journals.

Terrance G. Weatherbee is Professor of Management in the E.C. Manning School of Business at Acadia University. The university is located in Wolfville, a small town in the Annapolis Valley region of Nova Scotia on the east coast of Canada. In geographic terms he is quite content as it is a very safe and pleasant place to raise his two young sons and because in between classes the campus affords him an excellent view of the bay. His research interest finds itself presently encamped at the intersection of management and organization studies and history. It is here where he is investigating the historiographic dimensions of the evolution of management thought and theory. His current focus is centered on investigating the processes, historical and otherwise, which influence how disciplinary histories are written and the relationship these have with the disciplinary canon as located in journals, texts, and textbooks.

David M. Boje is Professor and past Bill Daniels Ethics Fellow, a past endowed Bank of America Professor of Management, and present endowed Wells Fargo Professor of Management at New Mexico State University (NMSU) in Las Cruces. He has published over 200 journal articles and book chapters, and over 20 books. He has over 8,000 citations in Google scholar and over 4,000 citations since 2009. He is known for his 1991 *Administrative Science Quarterly* and 1995 *Academy*

List of editors and contributors

of *Management Journal* articles on the 'storytelling organization'. He is also founder of the *Tamara Journal for Critical Organization Inquiry*.

Charles Booth is Associate Professor at Bristol Business School, University of the West of England. He is one of the founding editors of the journal *Management & Organizational History*.

Shawn Carraher (PhD) is Oxford Journal Distinguished Research Professor and Visiting Clinical Professor at the University of Texas at Dallas where he serves as the coordinator for International Business. He has his PhD from the University of Oklahoma and studied Management History from Daniel A. Wren. He is the editor of the *Journal of Management*, the *Journal of Technology Management in China*, the *Academy of Strategic Management Journal*, the *Academy of Health Care Management*, the *International Journal of Family Business*, and the *Cambridge Case Studies Journal*. He is a past Division Chair of the Management History Division of the Academy of Management as well as the Technology & Innovation Management Division and past President of the South West Academy of Management and the Small Business Institute. He has also served as a board member for the Southern Management Association, the MidWest Academy of Management, the Careers Division of the Academy of Management, and six divisions of the US Association for Small Business & Entrepreneurship.

Stewart Clegg has had a career that started in Yorkshire but, apart from a short sojourn in Scotland in the early 1990s, has been spent mostly in Australia from where he now travels frequently to Europe, where he is a Visiting Professor at EMLYON, France; Nova School of Business and Economics in Lisbon, Portugal; and Strategic Research Advisor, Newcastle University Business School in the UK. Widely acknowledged as one of the most significant contemporary theorists of power relations he is also one of the most influential contributors to organization studies, in which his theoretical interests in power connect with many substantive issues, recently ranging across food, gossip, teams, death camps, bullying, suicide, the collapse of the Soviet Communist Party, and Frank Ghery's model making, amongst many other topics. He has published a great deal about many things, given the ubiquity of power relations, his particular interest.

Kristene E. Coller is a PhD candidate at the Sobey School of Business (Saint Mary's University) currently studying the neglect of Canadian management thought. In addition to pursuing a PhD at Saint Mary's University, she has been a lecturer for the University of Lethbridge at the Calgary, Alberta campus over the past five years. In addition to research interests in management history, she has also written on topics including health care, workplace health promotion, and the impostor syndrome.

Diego M. Coraiola is Professor of Management and Organizations at Positivo University, Brazil. He has done research on institutional change and organizational practices. His current research is focused on issues of collective memory, rhetorical history, and symbolism in organizations.

Stephanie Decker is Professor of Organization Studies and History at Aston Business School, UK. As a historian working at a business school, most of her work is concerned with the relation between organization theory and history. She is co-editor of *Business History*, the recipient of the Leverhulme Trust Research Fellowship 2014–15, and the principal organizer of a seminar series on organizational history funded by the Economic and Social Science Research Council (UK). Her most recent publication was 'Research Strategies for Organizational History' (*Academy of Management Review*, 2014, co-authored with Michael Rowlinson and John Hassard).

Gabrielle Di
Her co-auth
and Organiz
the SAGE I
Methods in Bi
Journal of Ma
a co-investig
Knowledge wi
of the Atlant
Management
organizationa

Alex Faria of
He is Associ
Vargas Found
Council in B
FGV and has
well as critica

Jason Foster
Canada. His r
tional history
temporary, are
century. His r
Work Program

William M. Fo
Augustana Car
social memory
ual and how h
subjectivity.

Ana Guedes c
Economics and
Public and Busi
tor of Cadernos
chairs the Inter
and has publish
international m

Jean Helms Mii
University, Can
the editorial bo
Change (Routle
forthcoming Ro

Eduardo Ibarra
University (Cuaj

Gabrielle Durepos is an assistant professor at Mount Saint Vincent University in Halifax, Canada. Her co-authored book, *ANTI-History: Theorizing the Past, History, and Historiography in Management and Organization Studies*, seeks to address the call for an historic turn. She is a co-editor of both the *SAGE Encyclopaedia of Case Study Research*, as well as the *SAGE Major Work on Case Study Methods in Business Research*. Her recent publications appear in *Management & Organizational History*, *Journal of Management History*, *Critical Perspectives on International Business*, and *Organization*. She is a co-investigator on an SSHRC funded project focused on *Reassembling Canadian Management Knowledge* with a special interest in dispersion, equity, identity, and history. She is the past-president of the Atlantic Schools of Business Conference as well as the newsletter editor of the Critical Management Studies Division of the Academy of Management. She is currently engaged in an organizational history of a provincial museum complex in Canada.

Alex Faria obtained his doctorate in Business Administration from the University of Warwick. He is Associate Professor at the Brazilian School of Public and Business Administration, Getulio Vargas Foundation (EBAPE/FGV), Rio de Janeiro and a Researcher of the National Research Council in Brazil (CNPq). He chairs the Strategy & Marketing Research Group at EBAPE/FGV and has contributed in the fields of strategy, marketing, and international management as well as critical studies in management in Brazil and abroad.

Jason Foster is Academic Coordinator, Industrial Relations at Athabasca University in Alberta, Canada. His research interests include critical re-examinations of management and organizational history and the history of management education in North America. Other, more contemporary, areas of interest include migrant workers and union revitalization in the twenty-first century. His recent publications include numerous articles examining the Temporary Foreign Work Program, Canada's migrant labor program.

William M. Foster (PhD, University of Alberta) is an associate professor of Management at the Augustana Campus of the University of Alberta. His research interests include rhetorical history, social memory studies, and business ethics. His current research interests focus on the individual and how history and social memory contribute to the construction and change of personal subjectivity.

Ana Guedes obtained her doctorate in International Relations from the London School of Economics and Political Science, UK. She was Associate Professor at the Brazilian School of Public and Business Administration, Getulio Vargas Foundation (EBAPE/FGV), and former editor of *Cadernos EBAPE.BR*. Researcher of the National Research Council in Brazil (CNPq), she chairs the International Studies in Administration Research Group at PPGA/UNIGRANRIO and has published in the fields of international political economy, international business, and international management.

Jean Helms Mills is a professor of Management at the Sobey School of Business, Saint Mary's University, Canada. She is an associate editor of *Gender, Work and Organization* and serves on the editorial boards of several other journals. Her books include *Making Sense of Organizational Change* (Routledge, 2003), *Understanding Organizational Change* (Routledge, 2009), and the forthcoming *Routledge Companion to Critical Management Studies*.

Eduardo Ibarra-Colado was, at the time of his death, Professor at the Autonomous Metropolitan University (Cuajimalpa Campus). He will no doubt be most fondly remembered for his strident

yet sparkling works of critique that tackled the neoliberal university and the epistemic domination of 'the rest' by North Atlantic theories of organization. Compelling and forthright in print, Eduardo was, in person, a man of compassion and warmth as well as being active in the organizational politics of his own institution. He was a contributing author and associate editor of *Organization*, contributed to the development of LAEMOS and, over the years, to the Critical Management Studies Community through both the CMS division at the Academy of Management and at Critical Management Studies Conferences. Above all he was in the full sense of the term *a scholar*: a man of tremendous learning, whose writing forms a unique archive in its own right, but whose political sensitivities were always with the lives of people.

J. Logan Jones is a doctoral candidate from the University of Mississippi. He has an MBA from Arkansas State University. His research interests lie in the areas of management history, organizational behavior, and human resource management. He is an active member of several management organizations such as the Academy of Management and Southern Management Association. Professionally, he has worked in law enforcement as a police officer and is a veteran of the United States Army. In his personal life, his hobbies include reading, food, and spending time with his wife and family.

Matthias Kipping is Professor of Policy and Chair in Business History at the Schulich School of Business of York University in Toronto, Canada. He has degrees from the Sorbonne in Paris as well as Harvard's John F. Kennedy School of Government and a doctorate from the University of Munich in Germany. He held previous appointments at the University of Reading in the UK and Universitat Pompeu Fabra in Barcelona. His main research interest has been the international dissemination of management ideas and fashions, with a particular focus on the role of management consultants and management education. He has published widely on these topics

Milorad M. Novak
at the University
the Academy of
cation, and inter
peer-reviewed jo
Decision Processes,
Management & C
Business Horizons,
Ethics, International
and *Journal of Voca*

in business history as well as management journals and edited volumes. He edited (together with Timothy Clark) *The Oxford Handbook of Management Consulting* and is currently finalizing a manuscript (with Lars Engwall and Behlül Üsdiken) entitled *Authorities on Management: Business Schools, Consultants, Media*. His most recent project studies the worldwide transformation of the financial services sector by management consultants since the 1960s.

Corinne McNally is a PhD candidate at the Sobey School of Business at Saint Mary's University in Halifax, Nova Scotia. In addition to Canadian management thought, her research interests include leadership in groups and teams and employee well-being.

Richard Marens is a professor of Management at the California State University, Sacramento. He earned both a JD and a PhD from the University of Washington and has published in a number of management and ethics journals as well as chapters in books. His research interests include: the emergence of labor unions as financial activists, employee ownership, the evolution of the construct of Corporate Social Responsibility within the context of American social and economic history, and the rise and decline of middle management.

Ali Mir is a professor of Management at William Paterson University. He has published on a range of topics including the changing nature of work in late capitalism, the international division of labor, knowledge transfer, postcolonialism, secularism, radical poetry, and Indian cinema.

Raza Mir is a professor of Management in the College of Business at William Paterson University. His research mainly focuses on the transfer of knowledge across national boundaries in multinational corporations, and issues relating to power and resistance in organizations. He currently serves as the Chair of the Critical Management Studies Division of the Academy of Management.

Alun Munslow is Visiting Research Professor at St Mary's University, Twickenham, London, UK, Professor of History and Historical Theory at the University of Chichester, UK, and Emeritus Professor of History and Historical Theory, Staffordshire University, Stoke-on-Trent, UK. He is the author of *Discourse and Culture: The Creation of America, 1870–1920* (1992), *Our American Cousins: Henry Demarest Lloyd's Critiques of American Capitalism, 1881–1903* (1992), *Deconstructing History* (1997), *The Routledge Companion to Historical Studies* (2000), *The Nature of History Reader* (with Keith Jenkins) (2004), *Experiments in Rethinking History* (with Robert A. Rosenstone) (2004), *The New History* (2005), *Narrative and History* (2007), *Manifestos for Historians* (with Keith Jenkins and Sue Morgan) (2007), *The Future of History* (2010), *A History of History* (2012), and *Authoring the Past* (2012). He is (with Robert A. Rosenstone) the Founding and UK Editor of *Rethinking History: The Journal of Theory and Practice*.

Milorad M. Novacic (PhD, University of Oklahoma) is an associate professor of Management at the University of Mississippi and the Past Chair of the Management History division of the Academy of Management. His research focuses on management history, management education, and international management. He has published more than 100 articles in various peer-reviewed journals including the *Leadership Quarterly*, *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, *Journal of Management History*, *Management & Organizational History*, *Human Resource Management*, *Journal of World Business*, *Business Horizons*, *Organizational Dynamics*, *Business Ethics: A European Review*, *Journal of Business Ethics*, *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, *Human Resource Management Review*, and *Journal of Vocational Behavior*.

List of editors and contributors

Tuomo Peltonen is Professor of Management and Organization at Turku School of Economics, University of Turku, Finland. He received his PhD from Helsinki School of Economics. His research interests include philosophy, methodology and history of organizational behavior, as well as the study of internationalization, the societal role of business schools, organizational architecture, and workplace spirituality. He has edited a special issue of *Academy of Management Review* on critical approaches to international management and published several articles and book chapters in outlets such as *Higher Education*, *Ethnography*, *International Journal of Work Organisation and Emotion*, and *Journal of Organizational Change Management*. Dr Peltonen is currently on the Editorial Board of *the International Journal of Human Resource Management*.

Adam Rostis obtained his PhD from Saint Mary's University in Halifax, Nova Scotia. His management research interests include humanitarianism, genealogy, critical management, organizational behavior, disaster and crisis in organizations, and how individuals and organizations perceive, construct, utilize, interpret, and remember these concepts. His doctoral research involved the development of a genealogy of humanitarianism through a critical historical examination of the Red Cross and Doctors Without Borders. His work has been informed by his time as a delegate for the International Red Cross in Zimbabwe and as Senior Policy Advisor for the Government of Nova Scotia's Emergency Management Office. Over the long term, he hopes to develop a critical mass of researchers with similar interests while maintaining a connection with those who experience disaster and crisis in government, communities, and business. He is currently completing his MD at Dalhousie University in Halifax, Nova Scotia.

Michael Rowlinson is Professor of Management and Organizational History in the School of Business and Management, Queen Mary University of London. He has published widely on the relationship between history and organization theory in journals such as the *Academy of Management Review*, *Business History*, *Human Relations*, *Organization*, and *Organization Studies*. His research on corporate history concerns the representation of history by organizations, especially the dark side of their involvement in war, slavery, and racism. This has been published in journals such as *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, and *Labour History Review*. His current interests include the methodology of interpretive historical research in organization studies. He edited the journal *Management & Organizational History* from 2008 to 2013 and is now a Senior Editor for *Organization Studies* and a co-editor for the Special Topic Forum of the *Academy of Management Review* on 'History and Organization Theory'.

Rohny Saylor holds a PhD from New Mexico State University. He has been published in the journal *Organizational Research Methods*. His passion is the advancement of human creativity, hope, and authentic compassion through, and within, organizational scholarship. His research is focused on entrepreneurial storytelling processes and methods.

Bert Spector is an associate professor of International Business and Strategy at Northeastern University's D'Amore-McKim School of Business in Boston. He is a frequent contributor to *Management & Organizational History* and has also published articles on management history in *Enterprise and Society*, *Leadership*, and the *Journal of Management History*. He is currently completing a manuscript, *Leadership: Discourse and Meaning*, scheduled for a 2015 publication by Cambridge University Press.

Nidhi Srinivas obtained his doctorate in strategic management at McGill University in Montreal, Canada. He is an associate professor of nonprofit management at the New School in New York City. His research centers on critical theory and is concerned with generating

a reflective
'indigenou:
ialism with

Roy Sudda
Business, U
Review. His

Scott Taylor
the English
and has rece
and Jackie F
issues relatin
collections.
History and i
marriage bar
Management

Amy Thurlow
where she te
Studies. Her
*The Scandina
Communicatio
Canadian Ma
She is a mem
and the Inter*

Behlül Üsdik
Turkey; previ
journals as w
Studies from 1
2012. His cur
education, and

a reflective and emancipatory praxis within and around organizations. He has published on 'indigenous' theories of management, the professional projects of management, and managerialism within civil society.

Roy Suddaby is the Winspear Chair of Management at the Peter B. Gustavson School of Business, University of Victoria, Canada. He is the outgoing editor of *Academy of Management Review*. His research focuses on profound change in organizations and society.

Scott Taylor is Reader in Leadership and Organization Studies at University of Birmingham in the English Midlands. He teaches leadership development and organizational behaviour there, and has recently been working on a co-edited leadership studies textbook with Brigid Carroll and Jackie Ford (Sage, 2015). His research is always qualitative and interpretive, often focuses on issues relating to the meaning of work, and has been published in a range of journals and edited collections. He has written about historical methodologies in *Management & Organizational History* and is currently analysing a mixture of archival and life history interview data about the marriage bar. In 2012 he was elected with Emma Bell to the Academy of Management Critical Management Studies division executive.

Amy Thurlow is an associate professor at Mount Saint Vincent University in Halifax, Canada where she teaches public relations and communication in the Department of Communication Studies. Her recent publications appear in *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management*, *The Scandinavian Journal of Management*, *Journal of Change Management*, and the *Canadian Journal of Communication*. She is a co-investigator on an SSHRC funded project focused on *Reassembling Canadian Management Knowledge* with a special interest in dispersion, equity, identity, and history. She is a member of the National Education Council of the Canadian Public Relations Society and the International Commission on Public Relations Education.

Behlül Üsdiken is Professor of Management and Organization at Sabanci University, Istanbul, Turkey; previously, he was a professor at Bogazici University. He has contributed to numerous journals as well as a variety of edited collections. He has served as a co-editor of *Organization Studies* from 1996 to 2001 and a section editor of the *Journal of Management Inquiry* from 2007 to 2012. His current research focuses upon the role of history in organization studies, management education, and universities.

Acknowledgements

We gratefully acknowledge the commitment of all of our contributors to building this wonderful volume of work. We know that each of you took time out of your busy schedules to support the field of management and organizational history, and we are thrilled with the result. We'd also like to thank Sinead Waldron and Terry Clague at Routledge: Terry for coming to us with the idea in the first place, and Sinead for her support in getting us through the process.

Acknowledgement is given for permission to use the following copyright material from other sources:

Charles Booth and Michael Rowlinson, Management and organizational history: Prospects, *Management & Organizational History*, 1(1): 5–30, copyright © 2006 Taylor & Francis Ltd, all rights reserved. See www.tandfonline.com.

Eduardo Ibarra-Colado, Is there any future for critical management studies in Latin America? Moving from epistemic coloniality to 'trans-discipline', *Organization*, 15(6): 932–35, copyright © 2008. Reprinted by permission of SAGE.

Alfred Kieser, Why organization theory needs historical analyses – and how this should be performed, *Organization Science*, 5(4): 608–20, copyright © 1994 INFORMS. Reproduced with permission, <http://www.informs.org>.

Trish, Albert and Terry

The

Introduction

The historic turn in management and organizational studies: a companion reading

*Terrance G. Weatherbee, Patricia Genoe McLaren,
and Albert J. Mills*

Whether the beginning of the 'historic turn' in management and organizational studies (MOS) is marked at 1994 (Kieser, 1994), 2004 (Clark & Rowlinson, 2004), or earlier (Zald, 1993) is more a matter of choice in the tropics of narrative emplotment (White, 1985, 1987) than any signal of the primacy of a particular event. However, the benefit of two decades of hindsight does permit us to say – and without worry of compromise – that in the intervening period we have seen a veritable explosion of interest in history-work undertaken in MOS. Engagements with history in MOS have since spread from few to many, from the margins to the mainstream and back again, and are now established throughout a wide range of conference activities and journals, and in a growing number of texts. All of this work stems from, and is constitutive of, a deep richness to be found in the debates surrounding the various approaches used to interrogate where and how history is to be used (or not) for the study of organizations (Rowlinson, Stager Jacques & Booth, 2009; Weatherbee *et al.*, 2012). From our own position within the turn we now assess this sub-field as having matured sufficiently to warrant a survey of its state. Our survey is designed to provide management scholars and students an opportunity to familiarize themselves with the leading-edge and emergent thinking of scholars working within the turn as they engage in discussion and debate which collectively focuses on the problems, challenges, and potentials associated with doing history-work in MOS.

While we are collectively embedded within the varied interests and efforts comprising the historic turn, the story of this particular project starts with one of us. In 2012 Routledge decided that it was time for a *Routledge Companion to Management and Organizational History*. Our editor contacted Patricia Genoe McLaren and invited her to edit the companion. Trish immediately contacted Albert (Mills), who jumped at the opportunity to be involved, and Albert recommended bringing Terrance (Weatherbee) on board as well. Albert quickly drafted the first version of the proposal for this volume he had been thinking about for years, and after input from Trish and Terry the proposal was sent to Routledge, where it was quickly accepted. With the publisher having successfully enrolled the editors, it became time to put into practice what we had been preaching to ourselves in the proposal.

In order to publish a quality work that would capture our belief in the importance of history to MOS and engage a broad and diverse group of scholars, our small network needed to grow

substantially. We needed scholars whose work in MOS is emblematic of the 'historic turn' and whose thinking could further inform us as to the many potentials to be found across the wide span of approaches to theory, methods, and purposes for doing history-work. Fortunately, each of us knew several like minded researchers, some personally and others only by their scholarly reputation, whom we hoped would be interested enough in the project that they would be willing to commit the time and effort to work with us and create this companion.

As in all complex endeavours some of these efforts at enrolment into the project were successful on the first attempt, some on the second, and some not at all. However, between the merits of the idea and the persistence of our appeals – and with due accord given to the roles and effects of contingency, happenstance, and the odd dose of luck (of both kinds) – over the span of a year the network took shape. While its formation was to wax and wane through a series of welcome 'yes's' and regretfully accepted and usually apologetic 'no's', we endeavoured to remain true to our original aims. We envisioned our text as a somewhat authoritative reference that would be considered relevant to a wide audience across a number of overlapping academic areas (e.g. general management, organizational behaviour, organizational theory, organizational communication, international management, sociology of organizations, and the sociology of work, as well as business history, historiography, and business research methods). Our companion would be inclusive of multiple paradigmatic perspectives representative of the wealth of effort(s) taken and under way in the area (e.g. positivist, Marxist, poststructuralist postcolonial, etc.), reflecting the widest set of scholarly geographies possible (east, west, north, and south), and possessing a variety of ends, ways, and means in the doing of history-work (theoretical, methodological, historiographic).

While we believe that we have been faithful to our intent and remain hopeful that readers will agree with us, we also know that the true utility and value of the companion can only be found in its use. Value is located in the relationships to be established between the reader and the works of the individual contributors. Value is located within the interstitial spaces created by the act of assemblage of such a diverse array of work. Value is to be found in the questions raised and the reflexivity invoked in the space between each reader's historiographic position and those of each contribution or the collection as a whole. So rather than engaging in obligatory convention for texts of this form – that is, a summary introduction of the chapters or sections accompanied by an appropriately sagacious and instructive detailing of how the various contributions interrelate to form a coherent whole – we thought it would be of more interest to briefly present some of our own thoughts and reactions (surprises, lessons learned, reminders, etc.) to our reading(s).

In the first contribution we see a unique blend of citation analysis and biography, sourced through both academic (journal articles) and personal accounts (letters) as method. Milorad M. Novicevic, J. Logan Jones, and Shawn Carraher provide us with an intellectual portrait of Daniel Wren and his signature work *The Evolution of Management Thought* (Wren, 1972; Wren & Bedeian, 2009). While they rightfully acknowledge Wren's role as one of the first progenitors of a canonical history of MOS and showcase the significant contribution he has made, through their decentring they also reveal to us how orthodox representations of the past may constrain our efforts to understand our discipline and the management and organizational phenomenon. We see their post-foundational surfacing of the construction of the disciplinary frames used in the dominant canonical history creating a space to displace the orthodox and the freedom to revise our history under different terms.

A canonical text of a different kind is the 1994 *Organizational Science* piece by Alfred Kieser that we have reprinted as a testament to our belief in its value – namely its oft-cited call for the launch of the historic turn in MOS and its contribution to the growth of management and organizational history (MOH) as a field. To that end, it is an understatement to say that we were

surprised by the Kieser's retrospection of historian Keit history' (Jenkins, what ironic lament. The lament comes [in organization] historical turn we turn in MOS, it MOS has taken the historical analyses. That is always the

The second rephorically as well canonical in the. If there are any such a renewed call for: Mick Rowlinson logical and philosophical. Rowlinson had e.

Mick undertakes is one that emotive title of the article instructive in several humanness of knowledge co-creation. It serves comprised of author publishing, author in our individual individual one. Mick revealing a case of the right time, they cry (a claim which

Richard Mare derived from his and management approaches to the from the practices as does he, that while they have failed to large body of work knowledge that we

We read Roy ment used by text the overall arc of in chapter 2 (where both historical and that they collapse

surprised by the retrospective that he contributed to this edited collection. In our reading of Kieser's retrospective we are vaguely reminded (albeit for very different reasons) of the work of historian Keith Jenkins who began by 're-thinking history' (1991) and ended by 'rejecting history' (Jenkins, 2009). Kieser presents not so much a walking away from history as a somewhat ironic lament on the evolving homogeny of explanation in organizational theorizing. The lament comes at the beginning, where he states, "a historical turn is still not identifiable [in organization theory] and likely never will." He goes on to suggest that perhaps his call for a historical turn was "naïve". While this may be read as a rejection of his earlier call for a historic turn in MOS, it seems to us that there is an underlying disappointment in the direction that MOS has taken that makes its scholars less likely to be attracted to (or enrolled by) the need for historical analyses. That, at least, is our translation. Other readers may take something else away. That is always the issue of textual analysis.

The second reprinted article – by Charles Booth and Michael Rowlinson (2006) – is, metaphorically as well as literally, our reproduction of another work that has been widely cited as canonical in the field of MOH (see the many chapters throughout this collection that cite it). If there are any surprises here it is that (a) it continues to be cited as a critical starting point for a renewed call for the historical turn – despite the fact that in an earlier article Peter Clark and Mick Rowlinson (2004) made a much more explicit call – and (b) the call for greater methodological and philosophical debates inadvertently served to freeze debates around what Clark and Rowlinson had earlier problematized as a 'historic turn'.

Mick undertakes a personal reflection in relation to the way the historic turn unfolded. It is one that emotively resonates with us and his accounting of the circumstances by which the title of the article he co-authored with Peter Clarke (2004) became constructed strikes us as instructive in several ways. The use of his(own)story emphasizes for us the importance of the humanness of knowledge of the past and of the process nature of the interactions that lead to its co-creation. It sensitizes us to the networked nature of knowledge work and disciplinary projects comprised of authors, editors, and reviewers. In an academic world wracked by the pressures of publishing, author order, and evaluation exercises, this is sometimes easy to forget, as quite often in our individual life projects we forget that ours is a collective discipline rather than an individual one. Mick's recounting also highlights the oftentimes contingent nature of this process, revealing a case of the power of words. Power that was located in what was the right phrase at the right time, that is, the 'historic turn' – an ironic expression that became a symbolic rallying cry (a claim which is easily substantiated with citations).

Richard Marens' somewhat subdued polemic on how Marx and the intellectual corpus derived from his work has been marginalized, written out, and largely ignored by business and management scholars served us with notice that there are many differences between the approaches to the construction of history. These differences have historicity, arising as they do from the practices underwritten by politics, ideology, and geography over time. We find it ironic, as does he, that while the Marxian traditions have extensively informed the discipline of history, they have failed to do so for MOS. We agree that this is an unusual circumstance given that the large body of work on business and capitalism from a Marxian perspective represents a wealth of knowledge that we have eschewed for political rather than empirical reasons.

We read Roy Jacques and Gabrielle Durepos' review of textbook histories and the emplotment used by textbook authors as a clarion call that there is still much to be accomplished within the overall arc of the historic turn. The simplistic narratives of the historical orthodoxies found in chapter 2 (when there is one!) of our general and introductory texts are counted as failures in both historical and pedagogical terms. In historical terms they are so partial in their construction that they collapse into bowdlerized stories of the past that have little to no educational purpose.

This is a point Terrance Weatherbee also takes up in his chapter where he argues that simply adding in or transforming the form(s) of history in textbooks, though necessary, is insufficient if we wish to rid ourselves of the pedagogical history deficit. The work of all three – Jacques & Durepos and Weatherbee – reminds us that much of our pedagogical responsibility suffers from being ahistorical. Despite over a decade and a half of collective observations we still cannot seem to get it right in our teaching. The intersection of history and management pedagogy as pointed out almost a decade ago (Stager Jacques, 2006) seems to us to be rich with still untapped potential. Perhaps there is something in Alfred Kieser's lament after all!

Alun Munslow's observation that we all use and construct histories in our day-to-day practices stresses for us that our sense of the past is constructed in many ways – in speech, in writing, and in our use of other sense-making tools such as spreadsheets and PowerPoint slides. His perspicacious view reveals for us that it is history, rather than the past, which inheres strongly with our lived experiences. The relationship between organizing, business, and the past is an intimate one actively expressed in history-work. This reminds us that those working in organizations reconstruct history anew each day and that the continuity of action seen within them is a constructed one – a sense of pastness constructed on the basis of interpretation and meaning when articulated as histories (not the past!).

Scott Taylor exposed for us how hermeneutic approaches have moved far beyond their truth-in-text purposes and now represent a neglected method of interpretation of the past. He positions critical hermeneutics as an approach and method that, while underutilized, has significant potential for understanding the creation of historical narratives in the present. Given the textual nature of much of history in MOS (not to discount text in the broader sense, but used here in the sense of the textual presentation of history in journals and books), his observations draw our attention to different ways of seeing the textual and understanding its production.

Gabrielle Durepos' project, while still nascent, we see as being ripe with fruitful potential. She maps a way out of the divisive and intellectually sticky trap represented by the modern-postmodern duality that has consumed much effort in MOS over the last decades. Her explication of the dynamics of each of these positions with regard to history not only serves as a map of the intellectual terrain for each, but it provides a peek over the horizon of the possible. We are intellectually attracted to a way of seeing history as process, practice, and enactment, and her carefully constructed notions of 'amodern' historical approaches resolve to some extent the tensions we see in the either/or nature of singular and relational or unitary and relative. We can see openings for investigating and understanding how we can approach the historical as co-participants in the history we produce.

Somewhat shockingly, and wholly naively for us, Adam Rostis' powerful argument for a second look at humanitarianism has overturned our taken-for-granted conceptualizations of what we see as the 'good' in the humanitarian impulse. His use of Foucauldian genealogy uncovers the logics and orderings of organized humanitarianism and positions them as a colonizing discourse, a discourse which privileges a managerial ethos of efficiency and which treats the individual in economic terms. Humanitarianism has now become for us a history-laden and potentially repressive instrument that, when engaged in the recovery from hazard and disaster in failed/failing states, operates in the absence of countervailing factors. So when working in concert with private enterprise, humanitarianism can privilege the economic under the guise of doing good. It has, for us, radically signalled the need for expanding our attention to the intersection of history and organizing beyond simply the economic affairs of just business.

David Boje and Rohny Saylor have rewritten the story of the end of history. Their chapter crafts for us another potential ending – an ending heralded by the destruction

of humanity. Actions of the course in its longue durée, the dominant group move beyond the rewrite and recreate non-human-centered in an historically

Diego M. Coahistorical MOS the approach to history reveals that recording that work : they also observe relationship between not *unhistorical*, : and methodological also a form of his

While we saw us that the 'small' and those engage different scales. Co reminds us that the discipline of history

Tuomo Pelton Similar to the decade in changing how we and renews Mayo dangers of unitary historiographic the effects of the social

Using Fordism of taking a longer ally cyclical naturalism surfaces the search for solution be the result of unit For us this signals a general practice as

In a similar vein provide a rebuke. They reveal for us know as the New of MOS, their image and not unsurprising for us. Any selection to exclude. Once the course which sign

of humanity. A self-imposed ending and concluding narrative brought about through the actions of the capitalist project(s) writ in its largest sense. A project that has become so vast in its *longue durée* that it may yet lay waste to our planet as it has made humanity a, if not the, dominant geologic force upon it. There is a manifesto which we see as urging us to move beyond the modern and into a posthumanist historical space. A reminder that we can rewrite and recraft histories that do not artificially separate out human-centred histories from non-human-centred ones and which can refocus our attention upon our own selves living in an historically based world.

Diego M. Coraiola, William M. Foster, and Roy Suddaby resituate for us the critique of an ahistorical MOS. Drawing upon the work of Alun Munslow they investigate and categorize the approach to history in their analysis of the work of New Institutional scholars. Their study reveals that reconstructionist and constructionist approaches to historical understanding dominate that work and that rather than ignoring history, history is very much present. However, they also observe that this use of history is neither acknowledged nor problematized, nor is the relationship between the past and history questioned. They reinforce that MOS is ahistorical and not *un*historical, a lesson which informs us that we must be cognizant that our own theoretical and methodological choices commit us to a particular worldview and our disciplinary work is also a form of history-work (Weatherbee & Durepos, 2010).

While we saw Boje and Saylor's work as vast in both scale and scope, Stephanie Decker shows us that the 'small' is just as important in history-work as well. She reveals how microhistorians and those engaged in institutional perspectives often interrogate the same subjects – just from different scales. Consequently, her call for a more historiographic turn rather than a historic turn reminds us that there are many intellectual and methodological resources available to us in the discipline of history, an untapped stock of insight for doing history-work in MOS.

Tuomo Peltonen has abruptly shifted our own understanding of a canonical figure in MOS. Similar to the decentring of Wren's work by Novicevic, Jones, and Carraher, Peltonen has succeeded in changing how we now interpret the contributions of Elton Mayo as Peltonen's work both displaces and renews Mayo and his contributions in historical terms. This draws our attention to the tripartite dangers of unitary historical representations: histories which portray persons as one-dimensional in historiographic terms, that are essentialist in their treatments of persons, and which write-out the effects of the socio-political upon ourselves as scholars in the world (Cooke, 1999).

Using Fordism as their analytic framework, Ali Mir and Raza Mir reinforce for us the benefits of taking a longer historical view of management as practice. Their highlighting of the historically cyclical nature of managerial practices within the broader domain of the evolution of capitalism surfaces the strains experienced by management practices when engaged in the perennial search for solutions. It suggests to us that the dynamism of management and organizations may be the result of unreflexive practices passed on from one 'generation' of management to the next. For us this signals the trap of reading capitalism as a homogeneous economic form and managerial practice as tradition.

In a similar vein, Albert J. Mills, Terrance Weatherbee, Jason Foster, and Jean Helms Mills provide a rebuke to the way(s) in which we have constructed our own disciplinary history. They reveal for us that while socio-political activities operating within the contexts of what we know as the New Deal and the Cold War worked in tension to set the disciplinary boundaries of MOS, their import is conventionally absented from our renderings of our own past. Indeed, and not unsurprisingly, we are very much sympathetic to the problematic which they highlight for us. Any selections of what to include in representations of the past are also choices of what to exclude. Once taken and rendered into history these choices may become the normative discourse which signals what is a permissive activity within a disciplinary domain. Thus, for us, the

revisiting of our disciplinary history permits new insights, new questions to be asked, and new frames for interpreting where our discipline has been and is or could be going.

Bert Spector's analysis of over 500 articles in the *Harvard Business Review* during the first two decades of the Cold War serves as a poke in our collective (and parochial) scholarly eye. His study re-emphasizes for us that the phenomenon we study is as much the result of practice as it is of scholarly study. His observation that the polishing of the foundations of a uniquely American notion of Liberal Market Capitalism was developed as a counter-ideology expressed in the pages of the business press brings new insights into stark relief, not only the heretofore unknown element of our collective past, but also the interrelationship between the formation of ideology and history-work by management in organizations. His study also drew our attention to the inherently dialectical nature of management development in the Cold War and raised for us a question of what was the dialectic that followed and what is it now?

Amy Thurlow's use of critical discourse analysis in her historical investigation into the development of public relations (PR) draws for us some stark similarities and parallels between the professionalization of both PR and MOS as academic fields. Her work reveals that the development of PR was subject to many of the same processes which have been observed in the formation of MOS. For us in particular, her observations of the unitary and US-centric origin from which PR developed its historiography are particularly germane. These saw a process of development which totalized the theoretical dimensions in that academic field from an American standpoint. A standpoint from which non-American – in her case Canadian – scholars find themselves just now debating in historiographic terms.

This is a condition observed throughout many of the works in this companion, and in particular in the efforts of Patricia Genoe McLaren and Albert J. Mills in their exploration of Canadian management theory. Similar to the observations Thurlow has made concerning the default Americanization of the PR field, they argue that the history of MOS has never been Canadian either. This has, of course, a great deal of resonance for us, not just in terms of our professional interest in historiography and history-work in MOS, but also personally as situated Canadian scholars.

These concerns are also shared by Kristene E. Coller, Corinne McNally, and Albert J. Mills who surface a demonstrably Canadian contribution to management theory. Their study of the scholarly contributions and theoretical influence of Canadians working in New Institutional Theory reiterates for us that the conjunction of theory development with history as written in our journals and texts does tend to assume the universal. If the Americanization of Canadian management theory could be explained solely as a function of the geographic, cultural, and political proximities shared between Canada and the United States it would be far less worrisome to us as Canadians. However, for us as scholars the evidence which is accumulating to the contrary would seem to suggest otherwise.

Our third reprinted article is by Eduardo Ibarra-Colado. Originally, Eduardo had agreed to contribute a new piece written especially for this edited collection. Sadly his untimely death left us with an important intellectual void in the book. We wanted to bring his very different perspective and challenging voice to the debate because it held the promise of a rethink of – rather than an extension to – the historic turn by reminding/informing us of the embedded (Western) knowledge work contained within our attempts to make that historic turn happen. To retain his voice and the challenge he posed to us we chose to reprint one of his earlier works where he first develops this argument. As we wanted to do more than simply add this as a chapter we asked several like-minded scholars and friends – Nidhi Srinivas, Ana Guedes, and Alex Faria – to reflect on the contributions made by Eduardo Ibarra-Colado. Eduardo's contributions problematizes our understanding of the practices of management knowledge in terms of research and

education across of the so-called 'tor, and friend, t good part of the

Beyond the ri turn has been an Suddaby and Ma tions to this comp MOS. We find a tr notions of the pas tary and universal at relational amoc variety of theoreti and choice as free study, we need to

Finally, in ciosi viduals: Alun Mu responded to an u would be intereste a discipline that w and as many of us graciously accepte an éminence grise mentor, and schola asking of his time, also appreciative th of critical observati Ibarra-Colado who

References

- Booth, C. and Rowli: *Organizational Hist*
- Clark, P. and Rowlin: *turn? Business Hist*
- Cooke, B. (1999) Writ change, *Organizatio*
- Jenkins, K. (1991) *Re-*
- Jenkins, K. (2009) *At ti*
- Kieser, A. (1994) Why *Organization Science*
- Rowlinson, M., Stager in M. Alvesson, T. B (pp. 286–303). New
- Stager Jacques, R. (2006) *Management and Org*
- Weatherbee, T. and Dur of epistemology for 8–9 August.
- Weatherbee, T., Durepo: *ments, Management &*

education across national and cultural boundaries; especially when embedded in the knowledges of the so-called Other and the spaces in between. In their tribute to Eduardo as colleague, mentor, and friend, they reproblematicize for us his project on epistemic coloniality and question a good part of the (Western/Northern) history project on which we are all embarked

Beyond the richly detailed and highly informative discussions concerning where the historic turn has been and where it is going found in the contributions of William M. Foster and Roy Suddaby and Matthias Kipping and Behlül Üsdiken, our own reading of the collective contributions to this companion has allowed us to sketch for ourselves a 'historical' arc of history-work in MOS. We find a trajectory which has seen movement(s) away from our singular and common-sense notions of the past – notions founded on a pragmatic realism where history was conceived as unitary and universal. We see movement towards multiple forms of history and history-work to arrive at relational amodern forms of co-construction. The in-between has, and still is, composed of a variety of theoretical and methodological choice. In this respect we see 'fragmentation' as richness and choice as freedom from the orthodox. If we are to grow our knowledge of that which we study, we need to continue to revisit what we know and how we have come to know it.

Finally, in closing this introduction, we would like to make especial mention of three individuals: Alun Munslow, Stewart Clegg, and Eduardo Ibarra-Colado. Alun Munslow very kindly responded to an unsolicited email from someone he had never met; one which asked him if he would be interested in bringing his unique perspective to a companion text to be published in a discipline that was not his own. Alun's theorizing in his own discipline is of world renown, and as many of us have drawn inspiration from his work we were more than pleased when he graciously accepted. To Alun, our most grateful thanks. As many of you know, Stewart Clegg is an éminence grise in MOS, and his stature and reputation keep him extremely busy as teacher, mentor, and scholar. With many persons and projects around the world seeking his attention and asking of his time, we were very pleased he agreed to provide our closing commentary. We are also appreciative that he has indeed held our individual and collective intellectual feet to the fires of critical observation. Thank you. Finally, and most sadly, we would like to remember Eduardo Ibarra-Colado who wished to contribute anew to our discussion and debate. You are missed.

References

- Booth, C. and Rowlinson, M. (2006) Management and organizational history: Prospects, *Management & Organizational History*, 1(1): 5–30.
- Clark, P. and Rowlinson, M. (2004) The treatment of history in organisation studies: Towards an 'historic turn?' *Business History*, 46(3): 331–52.
- Cooke, B. (1999) Writing the left out of management theory: The historiography of the management of change, *Organization*, 6(1): 81–105.
- Jenkins, K. (1991) *Re-Thinking History*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Jenkins, K. (2009) *At the Limits of History: Essays on Theory and Practice*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Kieser, A. (1994) Why organization theory needs historical analyses – and how this should be performed, *Organization Science*, 5(4): 608–20.
- Rowlinson, M., Stager Jacques, R., and Booth, C. (2009) Critical management and organizational history, in M. Alvesson, T. Bridgman, and H. Wilmott (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Critical Management Studies* (pp. 286–303). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Stager Jacques, R. (2006) History, historiography and organization studies: The challenge and the potential, *Management and Organizational History*, 1(1): 31–49.
- Weatherbee, T. and Durepos, G. (2010) Dar'Wren'ian evolution in management: Implications of the ethics of epistemology for the scholar. Paper presented at the Academy of Management, Montreal, Quebec, 8–9 August.
- Weatherbee, T., Durepos, G., Mills, A. J., and Helms Mills, J. (2012) Theorizing the past: Critical engagements, *Management & Organizational History*, 7(3): 193–202.

Terrance G. Weatherbee *et al.*

- White, H. (1985) *Tropics of Discourse. Essays in Cultural Criticism*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- White, H. (1987) *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Wren, D. (1972) *The Evolution of Management Thought*. New York: Ronald Press Co.
- Wren, D. and Bedeian, A. (2009) *The Evolution of Management Thought* (6th edn.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley.
- 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): 513–28.

De

Today is not
our yesterday
agement schc

Introduction

Throughout the inquiry with the & Carson, 1998: cant part of the in the twenty-first ment thought ha history has gener slowly gaining leg

Buchelli & Wadh approach to the h that the only pre synthesizing, and manner (Mills &

This 'historic Canadian research historians have re traditional appoa lution of manage: base does not co ing examples fro reevaluating the fashions (Kieser, 1

Stewart Clegg

Introduction

Students new to management might assume that it has a brief but glorious history, one in which the initial ideas of foundational thinkers such as F. W. Taylor, were slowly amended and corrected, in which ideas evolved in a Whiggish way, mounting up to the truths of today – or at least those embraced in the last few years' issues of the key journals that impact factors dictate.

In terms of the caricature, which accentuates elements of an all too pervasive reality, history, where it enters the textbook frame, usually consists of chronological studies in an evolutionary mode; a scientific parceling out of history's errors; the occasional retrieval of forgotten voices from the past, such as Follett or Deming; studies uncovering examples from the past to serve as benchmarks for the future along with studies aimed at distinguishing the eternal hard core of knowledge from the flotsam and jetsam of the moment. It should be evident from the outset that the present volume sets itself against such caricatures and is to be regarded as a contribution to the emerging turn to history in management and organization studies. I shall concentrate in what follows on the historiographical element of the various contributions that make up this *Companion to Management and Organizational History*.

The historic turn in management and organizational studies

The rather mundane ideas of Taylor, popularizer of popular mechanics, have played a disproportional and dismal role in management history, as Noveckovic, Jones, and Carraher's critical analysis of Wren's foundational history discusses. Whatever the canon of management history it is a safe bet that Taylor will play a celebrated role in it – either as hero, or less often, as in Braverman (1974), villain. This celebratory individuation dismisses the extent to which figures such as Taylor were more or less emblematic of deep-seated currents of social thought and functioned in the role of a public intellectual in advocating them. The constitution of canonical texts always privileges the individual and the text to such an extent that the wider structural factors at play are written out of the history at worst, or, at best marginalized (Clegg and Dunkerley 1980).

These factors were not neglected in the 1970s renaissance of Marx's labor process theory occasioned by the success of Braverman's (1974) book and the many labor process studies that

ensued. However, as Kieser notes, the enthusiasm for labor process theory had very little impact outside of the converted – by and large, mainstream organization theory simply ignored its existence. Its Marxist auspices did not fit well in the Business School frame nor, perversely, despite its avowed historical perspective, did its historical lack of specificity endear it to non-Marxist historically inclined scholars. General histories make abstract patterns into which many diverse histories have to be molded, doing violence to specific forms of variation and local patterning, industrially, regionally, nationally and cross-nationally, a point that Kieser makes clearly. He also makes the point that the very notion of a national culture or an organizational culture, in the singular, must always be an ideological gambit because its construction depends on suppression of difference. Hence, in looking at the development of management practices across nations it is far better to focus on some middle range empirical indicators, he suggests.

Historical analysis is antithetical to parodies of covering law-like explanations whether these derive from Marxist or positivist ambitions. Such ‘explanations’ cover more than they reveal and must always downplay the circumstances in which people make choices, albeit not often those of their choosing, in order to make those elegant patterns that straddle and shape specific histories. Of course, this does not mean that there can be no history other than the infinitesimal compilation of narratives; these must always be arranged in patterns if understanding is to flourish. But the patterns are neither invariant nor eternal: as Kieser writes, there is evolution of evolutionary mechanisms. Several of these are put to the test in explaining the development of the German putting-out system and all are found wanting when confronted with the specificities of the historical record. As Kieser states “it is probably always possible to select historical facts that fit any general model, but one can never be sure that the researcher is not leaving out important facts that contradict it.” Following an inductive strategy in regard to the known historical data is, he suggests, the best way to increase, if never complete, surety. Twenty years after writing the article that is reproduced as a chapter, Kieser has little to add, except irony.

Manifestos of historical purpose are not unknown amongst those who would write (and sometimes make) history and Booth and Rowlinson offer us a ten-point example of the genre, styled as an agenda. The agenda is wide ranging: it traverses orientations to history and organization studies stretching from perspectives that would supplement the latter with the former; integrate them or reorient them through a reformation of the basis for inquiry as is called for by critical management studies. The latter, however, seems particularly susceptible to the ideology critique that was made by Kieser twenty years ago: critique demands a viewpoint and that viewpoint is necessarily transcendental and a priori, wherever it seeks to articulate a specific interest as the basis of its critique. Such questions overlap with the practice of writing history: is the interest in seamless narrative or in its interruption? While the latter has become increasingly popular under the influence of Foucault’s histories of ideas the latter constitute the more mainstream approach. Historians are not the only practitioners to register history; organizations also do so in terms of their branding, promotions, symbolic posturing, and collective representations of memory and a moot point is the politics of their representation, the genealogical principles followed and repressed, the symbols valorized and glossed over. How they do these things is grist for the historical grind, which, in future, the authors hope to see being fashioned by instruments other than those purely of economic history. Ethics, as they note, are clearly one important compass through which to view the past but whether the past can be studied in terms of contemporary insights and dilemmas or whether it should be judged by the standards that were acknowledged to have prevailed then is a moot point. On the basis of the latter, considerable contemporary calumny can be avoided, whether rightfully or not; on the basis of the former many a fortune and the organizations on which such wealth was based would be de-legitimated by association with past misdemeanors and crimes such as slavery, plunder, conquest, and extermination.

Rowlinson also under-appreciated what Clarke was making. Clarke was obviously – very much – significant.

Debates in n

There are pertinent overarching historical issues without making and society, as v Likewise, without grew out of systems of modern organizationally continuing the School’s continuing shrink through have with individual the twenty-first complex supply important and factually, if this been accorded stress was already

Discipline, in rounding out of Sweezy are an efficient, fluid, and still typically technical has developed built on core of formidable: But also a consistent Lash and Urry, resources for re-

It is not only ledged in those than that: their influenced by consciousness: device this system is linear and p blind to power bizarre scientific seem absent. T it were news of and practices; l

Rowlinson also contributes a personal history of the history turn in which the significant and under-appreciated role of Peter Clarke as a crucible for fostering historical thinking is nicely made. Clarke was one of the very few people in 1970s business schools who read history seriously – very much a Braudel man in those days – and a figure whose contributions have been significant.

Debates in management and organizational history

There are pertinent questions to be addressed about the relation between business history and overarching history. For instance, it is difficult to inscribe the history of a firm and industry without making connections to the changing fortunes of national economies, politics, culture, and society, as well as the supranational events and institutions in which these are embedded. Likewise, without an understanding of how approaches such as structural contingency theory grew out of systematic accounts of management ideas at a particular moment in the evolution of modern organizations one could easily mistake their dimensions as eternal rather than historically contingent. Size, for instance, the most important explanatory variable in the Aston School's contingency theory, relies on the tacit assumption that organizations only grow or shrink through extending or diminishing the number of contracts of employment that they have with individual persons. In the early 1960s this was a reasonable assumption to make; in the twenty-first century, after a decade or more of outsourcing, external subcontracting, and complex supply chains, we now know that employment contracts are not necessarily the most important and that their scope does not necessarily delimit capabilities and size. Also, counterfactually, if this history had been read after Foucault, would not Weber's stress on discipline have been accorded a conceptual significance that the Aston scholars failed to see? Perhaps not, for the stress was already evidently there in Weber and was not amplified, conceptually.

Discipline, in its changing modes, did enter into the canon through Diaverman's (1974) rounding out of Baran and Sweezy's (1966) theses concerning *Monopoly Capitalism*. Baran and Sweezy are an example of one field in which, as Marens argues, Marxist historiography has been fluent, fluid, and open to historical evidence and that is economic history. While business schools still typically tend to teach economic history in either an institutional or great men mode there has developed a robust and highly respected set of approaches to economic history that have built on core elements of the agenda that Marx sketched in *Capital*. The roll call of honor is formidable: Baran and Sweezy but also Hobsbawm, Arrighi, and Brenner amongst historians but also a considerable number of sociologists who have done fine work, such as Usselman, Roy, Lash and Urry, and Fligstein, to name a few. These are remarkably insightful and empirically rich resources for management and organization theorists but are rarely drawn on.

It is not only that they are not drawn on; they are, as Jacques and Durepos argue, unacknowledged in those canonical textbooks that introduce students to the field. Indeed, it is worse than that: there is not only an absence of decent historiography in most textbooks, whether influenced by Marxian analysis or not; there is also an absence of much in the way of historical consciousness at all, which the authors see as a result of modernist emplotment. As a narrative device this systematically downplays discontinuous change in favor of continuous evolution that is linear and progressive. The narrative style assumed is that of value neutrality and disinterest, blind to power relations in all their complexity, paying homage to physics envy that produces a bizarre scientism in which social relations, such as those of gender and other forms of identity, seem absent. The effects are all too evident: a history emptied of perspective, made to read as if it were news from nowhere in particular; a history resolutely unreflexive about its assumptions and practices; historians whose lack of reflexivity is assured.

Terrance Weatherbee nails it: "The manner in which we present management knowledge once history and historical context is written-out of the content means that our textbooks are more likely to serve as an intellectual entry point and values-based framework for managerialism than for management." Effectively, once the trade school approaches that existed prior to the Carnegie and Ford reforms that were shaping US Business Schools in the 1960s had been suspended in favor of the behavioral sciences, the new forms of knowledge eschewed historical causality in favor of cross-sectional causality between variables modeled on a presumption of experimental science, albeit in open systems impossible to close so that standing conditions could be controlled. Cold War, Big Science, and fear of failure in the wake of Sputnik drove the fetishization of these 'physics envy' (Flyvbjerg, 2001) models in US Business Schools.

Historical approaches continued in the margins. As Weatherbee notes there were a small number of researchers that persisted with historical research; some writers of monographs/textbooks such as Clegg and Dunkerley (1980) also conceived of the field in historical terms but these were to prove less popular than approaches that raised Platonic forms to the level of mutually incomprehensible paradigms or metaphors (Burrell and Morgan, 1979; Morgan, 1985). The historical turn of recent times, suggests Weatherbee, can be consigned to one or other camp of either an additive or transformative use of history in relationship with management.

The additive program, calling for more history to be incorporated in management education, is a failing project in terms of the numbers of those enrolled to it, suggests Weatherbee. By contrast, the transformative approach is emergent and its wave may still be cresting or merging with other undercurrents such as 'critical' management studies. At this point the text takes an abrupt turn into textbooks as the bearers of 'normal' science – normally bereft of history, infused with managerialist values, stuffed with solutions, and blissfully unproblematic as their production is increasingly market focused. What the market doesn't want are history, ideology critique, and theoretical problematics.

There is an emerging problematization of specific histories in newer contributions, both of major figures and of textbook knowledge; however, this is not Weatherbee's major concern – that turns out to be a guide to theories of history as forms of cultural production. Given that it has already been established that there is insufficient history in MOS the diverse approaches have little resonance. At this point the chapter concludes, inconclusively.

Methods and madness: doing management and organizational history

Does recourse to the postmodern effect a way out of the modernist impasse? In Munslow's terms a postmodern account of historical method would see it as a narrative constructed by the historian. Such construction depends on past normative framings of observers and observations in terms of past-history ontological and epistemological underpinnings. Narratives from nowhere are simply impossible; there are no findings without narration. Inasmuch as the objects of analysis are documents created in the past then any subsequent narration is necessarily dependent on the narrations that created that past documentation; not only the subjectivities of the historian-narrator but also the recorder-narrators enter the frame. Adapting Hayden White's terms 'historical imagination' consists of already constituted narrative fragments of evidence of various kinds, arranged in part by design and often more by accident, that are configured by the four major tropes of figurative language: metaphor, metonymy, synecdoche, and irony, each of which is as likely to be chosen through habit as reflexive awareness. Empiricism is blind without conceptualization, argument, ideology, and emplotment; which is to say that there is no such thing as a purely empirical history because past events have no historical meaning until they are narrated as history, albeit that they might have many other meanings in various non-historical

imaginations. Here there are available ongoing retrospection doing at some time the nature of history requirements.

One major address. Herm chosen as found and Mir (2002). well as in the optical epistemology theory, producing

Key ideas in eutic horizon'),

The hermeneutic of 'parts interpreter engaged is deconstructed this can only exist as authorizing the presumed understanding in which many chosen, designed events and other who produced meneuticians with subsequent generation

Once the auspices of the representation of past become production of legitim assumptions of in a causal sequence of the past picture slightly turbed by the scholarship reviews rather than interests, and find in text and context

Durepos are derived from the modern are overcoming the conceptions of

imaginations. History is what it is written to be and it can be written in as many genres as there are available. Historians are Weickian sensemakers (Weick, 1995): they are engaged in the ongoing retrospective development of plausible narratives that rationalize what people were doing at some time documented and otherwise indexed as being in the past. The fundamental nature of history consists of producing likely stories that can be legitimated according to genre requirements.

One major genre of historical understanding remains hermeneutics, which Scott Taylor addresses. Hermeneutics has many precursors but it is the work of Ricoeur that is most often chosen as foundational by contemporary scholars such as Phillips and Brown (1993) and Prasad and Mir (2002). The latter analyze both the mode of representation in the texts they address as well as in the objective text their hermeneutic analysis produces. They acknowledge the dialectical epistemological and aesthetic aspects of hermeneutics to create a relation between text and theory, producing both narrative and explanatory intelligibility and plot as well as style.

Key ideas in hermeneutics are the hermeneutic circle, historicity (including the 'hermeneutic horizon'), dialogical understanding, the role of the author-as-interpreter, and critique.

The hermeneutic circle entails that any understanding of textual meaning requires consideration of 'parts' in the 'context' of the 'whole' and a process of interplay between the two. The interpreter engages the text in reflexive inquiry in which the possibility of the text as that text is deconstructed. Part of that possibility might be constituted by authorial intention, although this can only ever be assumed and never known for sure, nor can authorial intention be seen as authorizing whatever interpretation is made: legitimate interpretation does not kowtow to the presumed intentions of the author in authoring some text. As a stricture on interpretative understanding this is particularly important in the field of management and organization history, in which many of the historical traces that are left for the analysts to consider have been carefully chosen, designed, and fabricated by organizational elites with a very definite interpretation of events and other phenomena that they seek to advance. We must never forget that the subjects who produced the texts and contexts that we, as analysts, attend to, are themselves practical hermeneuticians with a range of interests in play in their social construction of the traces to which subsequent generations might attend.

Once the hermeneutic researcher begins to question the presumed or expressed intentional auspices of the texts under analysis then modernist stipulations that entail assumptions about the representation in an historical account of the true nature of events in and phenomena from the past become precarious. Such ontological realism is naïve and usually fulfills an ideological function of legitimating a particular historical gloss. More often than not it will do so through the assumptions of a linear narrative that recovers the facts and arranges them without adornment in a causal sequence. In this kind of history an accurate, complete, and uncontested representation of the past is presumed to be possible, at least in principle: more or new data may revise the picture slightly but the essential contours of the past, once uncovered, remain as they are, undisturbed by the authorial voice of the narrator whose sole concern is with the facts. Postmodern scholarship reverses each modernist assumption as we have seen in Munslow: it licenses histories rather than a singular history. Different historians will ask different questions, with different interests, and focus on different aspects of the possible historical traces that they make evident in text and context.

Durepos argues for neither a modern nor a postmodern history but one that is amodern, derived from the French sociologist, Latour (1993), in his attempt to overcome the binaries of the modern and the postmodern through his argument that *We Have Never Been Modern*. Key to overcoming the representational and relativist dualism cleaving the modern and the postmodern conceptions of what is knowledge is a turn to conceiving of it as a practice. Historians inevitably

interfere with the object of analysis if only because in their doing of history they constitute it on each occasion of its invocation. Different versions of the past are enacted through different histories, each of which inscribes that which it attends to – and differences will be evident in the phenomena attended to – differently, specifically in terms of differing relevancies. What is of significance are the relations between different enactments of the past as history, as well as the relations within which any enactment comes into being. What is significant is not the status of any particular history compared to another but the relations between these histories: how are they constituted, how are they possible?

These views are all well and good but they do presume a rather crowded interpretative landscape; in those areas of the field more sparsely populated than yet another Taylor interpretation or account of what Hawthorne really meant, in say the ranks of business histories, the plurality presumed is most unlikely to exist. Hence, the advice given is of limited value to the researcher who wants to try and get their one-shot at history 'right.' If, as Rostis suggests, it is through "an examination of the descent, emergence, and trajectory of events" that genealogically influenced histories attempt "to uncover other explanations that have been hidden in the construction of a logical narrative or explanation of how the past occurred," then there is a reliance on other accounts as a foil.

Genealogical histories are, of course, influenced by Foucault's work. What is entailed in this particular form of a modern history, to use Durepos' phrase, is to first question the possibility of what is in the archive under inspection: why this knowledge, these facts, that interpretation? What role does context play in framing the text in question? What continuities and discontinuities are embedded in the sense being made in that context? How is this sense related to other discourses implicit in and around that context? What are the subjects and objects that are specified in and through these discourses? Using these sorts of questions as a guide Rostis provides a compelling analysis of the emergence of the Red Cross and Médecins sans Frontières as responses to seemingly quite similar but actually dissimilar political contexts. The assumed meaning of humanitarian NGOs is questioned and new insights generated.

In a characteristically Bojean piece Boje, together with Saylor, brings history down to the philosophically posthumanist salon where entrepreneurial storytelling reigns supreme. The story this time concerns climate change. What follows is a posthumanist manifesto, albeit modeled in part on earlier famous 'Theses.' If the point of the famous thesis eleven is to change the world, not philosophize it, then the future, if we are to have one in the long term, from the perspective of the posthumanist manifesto entails seven basic steps to environmental rehistory. Entrepreneurial storytelling indeed: follow these steps and the "firm can be re-historicized as though a fundamental part of its ethos is sustainability."

Coraiola, Foster, and Suddaby begin by reiterating Munslow's (2006a, 2006b) distinctions between three perspectives on the nature of historical reality: these are generated by the extent to which historians consider history to be equivalent to the past, and the extent to which they recognize historical sources as being already a narrative. The three approaches are differing versions of ontology: the reconstructivist, constructivist, and deconstructivist. Reconstructivist historians seek to arrive at a truth about history based on correspondence theory that stresses verification, comparison, and colligation. Historical processes of interpretative understanding, which in the German tradition we know as *Verstehende*, from Weber (1978), are central devices. Faithfulness to sources, commitment to value freedom in their interpretation, and a dedication to getting the facts right, characterize this approach. The reality of the past can be captured in narrative accounts based on inductive processes of impartial selection and critical evaluation of documentary sources. The approach is essentially one of using fragments of data from the past to create a plausible evolutionary history as faithful to sources as possible. The more adventurous reconstructivists would admit that the creation of historical meaning is a product of the

interaction between simply speak for

Constructivist to history as it h place, according to historian, but wh the questions the cannot exist wit researcher.

Deconstructiv inter-textual. The historian produc may have produc that historians p texts, both histor sent. In a sense, c cies that one bri irredeemably the tional theory inf

Decker also c of warding off fields, and institu but also some si short timespans methods that re and interviewing; works are likely the structural m seem overly stru

Magnússon a and small in scal formulated as m tain a central ro early market tra kin or non-kin anomaly, perhap a *Sixteenth Cent* guiding human easy to navigate logic. Microhist through its scal and conflicting dom to act as o

Rewriting m

Peltonen provic is quite partial i

interaction between the historian's knowledge and the content of the sources; the facts do not simply speak for themselves.

Constructivists do not accept that the past can be retrieved in its entirety. They are not witness to history as it happens but as fragments, themselves socially constructed at another time and place, according to interests and prejudices that are not wholly intelligible to the contemporary historian, but which can be imaginatively divined. Knowledge of the past is always bounded by the questions they are able to formulate and the answers available sources can provide. History cannot exist without theory – it is this that frames what is relevant and interesting for the researcher.

Deconstructivism, influenced by French scholars such as Derrida and Foucault, is highly inter-textual. There are texts from the past that the historian consults; there are the texts that the historian produces in the present; there are other texts that other people, including historians, may have produced in the past. History is what one makes of it through the narrative accounts that historians produce. What are central are the forms of representation that constitute these texts, both historical (as having been produced in the past), and as histories produced in the present. In a sense, one can thus only ever write histories of the present if only because the relevancies that one brings to bear on the past, and its archaeology of relevancies, are necessarily and irredeemably those of the present, as the authors demonstrate in their analysis of recent institutional theory influenced by historical methods or focused on history topics.

Decker also discusses institutional theory, joining it to recent Italian microhistory, as a way of warding off the overly deterministic currents of institutional isomorphism, organizational fields, and institutional logics. There are evident similarities in focus as her tabulation makes clear but also some significant differences. Mostly, institutional work approaches are focused on very short timespans compared to the typical periodicity of historical research. The focus is driven by methods that require presentism, such as audio and video recording, or participant observation and interviewing. As Decker points out, most significant transformations of institutional frameworks are likely to occur in the medium-term not a relatively brief timespan. Moreover, some of the structural mechanisms deployed by institutional theories, such as 'institutional logics,' would seem overly structural to most microhistorians.

Magnússon and Szijártó (2013) define microhistory in terms of an approach that is precise and small in scale, using a focal point for investigation while still trying to address what have been formulated as major historical questions in extant scholarship. Doing this enables them to maintain a central role for human agency in their analysis, such as being able to see how seemingly early market transactions were in fact systematically skewed by whether or not they were with kin or non-kin (Levi, 1991). In terms of case selection the microhistorians favor the exemplary anomaly, perhaps best seen in Ginsburg's (1980) classic *The Cheese and the Worms: The Cosmos of a Sixteenth Century Miller*. Indeed, this work is prototypical in demonstrating that social norms guiding human behavior are always multiple, inconsistent, conflicting; not homogeneous and easy to navigate, not handed down by institutional isomorphism or embedded in an institutional logic. Microhistory seeks to integrate and elucidate the particular and the general concurrently through its scaled-down focus on particular events and agencies, emphasizing the overlapping and conflicting nature of social structures, within the interstices of which individuals have freedom to act as other than the ciphers of institutions.

Rewriting management history

Peltonen provides an account of Mayo in his early Australian context – but it is a context that is quite partial inasmuch as the focus is on the history of ideas context for Mayo's early thought.

Much is made of Mayo's fidelity to ideas derived from British Liberal Idealism; however, there is no reference to the context in which he developed these ideas. Brisbane in the immediate post-First World War was a contested city. The Workers' Educational Association in Brisbane, with which Mayo was associated, saw a split after the First World War. The more militant members founded the Workers' School of Social Science in Brisbane. They were characterized by a distinct lack of neutrality on the educational front of the class war (unlike the Workers' Educational Association, from whom they had broken away) by standing for industrial democracy. What they meant, however, as can be seen in their series of lectures on job control, was direct action by revolutionary unions (*Syllabus of the Workers' School of Social Science*, 1919).

For the radicals, industrial democracy meant the same as socialism and the revolutionary method for attaining it. As Irving (no date) says, "[i]t was a usage that responded to the growing democratic mood while at the same time rejecting the initiatives by governments and employers to open up new avenues for dialogue with workers." In Queensland, unions in the railways and meatworks were militant and increasingly 'industrial,' as can be seen in a pamphlet called *Who Shall Control Industry?* The pamphlet was written by T. C. Witherby, who was Director of Tutorial Classes at the University of Queensland, where Mayo held the first chair of philosophy between 1919 and 1923:

Here in Queensland, because we are in Australia, and because we are under a Labor government, the wage-earners' position has elements of strength not known in Europe. And this for three reasons. These reasons I owe to a pamphlet by Mr Childe. They are that the politician is more under the control of the industrialist [i.e. the radical unionist] than in other countries; the permanent official is not so far apart from the ordinary man as in the bureaucracy of Europe; and more consumers in this country are producers. However autocratic therefore State enterprises may appear to the worker in Queensland, there is here the possibility scarcely existing in Europe of a large share of workers' control. It is only because of the indifference of the wage-earners on this matter that no advances have yet been made. (Witherby 1919)

These were anathema to Mayo's ideas.

Observing the disturbing level of industrial strife and political conflict in Australia, Mayo formulated an analogy between war neurosis and the psychological causes of industrial unrest. Drawing on social anthropology, he argued that the worker's morale, or mental health, depended on his perception of the social function of his work. He saw the solution to industrial unrest in sociological research and industrial management rather than in radical politics. (Bourke 1986)

It should be evident that we cannot recover the context in which ideas developed simply by looking at the history of ideas. We need also to see, as an important part of the context, what gave these ideas life, vitality, which is to say how and in what ways were these ideas contesting other ideas? When we do this we can recover a more enveloping set of dynamics. The war legacy is crucial as it was the returning soldiers and sailors, especially, who had been most radicalized by the appalling experiences and who were well aware of what was happening in Russia. As Clegg, Courpasson, and Phillips (2006: 79) stated:

The interpretations that Mayo (1933) made of the Hawthorne Studies were in large part already well rehearsed and accorded with views that he had formed in Brisbane in the

aftermath
sunny Qu
Mayo's ear
cialist, wh
psycholog
was a sma
mere diss
dissatisfact
1922: 64;
shift, to re
unrest. Th
involvement

Idealist liberali
tagonist in the

Guild soc
from the
empower
conflict i
socialists
action' ar
osophies
common
recognise
it as resol
guild soc
act as tru
consume
set up by
experts, &
with wor

It is against thi
out his Ameri
cursive contex
context in wh

Mir and M
economic his
Fordism from
tion was to c
tion patterns;
diminished un
enhancing spa
component o
as a relatively
roots to the p

aftermath of the First World War, in his work with 'shell-shocked' soldiers returning to sunny Queensland from the dark horrors of trench warfare in the European theater. It was Mayo's early and incomplete training as a doctor, and his collaboration with a Brisbane specialist, which provided the occasion for the formation of his ideas about the importance of psychological subjectivity. From the treatment of maladjustment on the part of veterans, it was a small step to the treatment of industrial malaises: 'Industrial unrest is not caused by mere dissatisfaction with wages and working conditions but by the fact that a conscious dissatisfaction serves to "light up" as it were the hidden fires of mental uncontrol' (Mayo 1922: 64; cited in Bourke 1982: 226). Elton Mayo prescribed several short rest breaks per shift, to relieve physiological strain and to disrupt the negative feelings that led to industrial unrest. These ideas were subsequently to develop much further, as a result of his research involvements during the Second World War.

Idealist liberalism did not exist in a void: it was a part of class struggle and Mayo was a keen protagonist in these struggles, waged against Guild Socialism:

Guild socialists were centrally concerned with democracy, differentiating themselves from the Fabians who failed to appreciate the aspirations of ordinary people for empowerment, and from the syndicalists who ignored the potential for selfishness and conflict in their schemes for industries to be owned by the workers in them. Guild socialists wanted to rise above the conflict in the movement between Fabian 'political action' and syndicalist 'industrial action' by drawing on pluralist and distributivist philosophies that recognised differences (local and occupational, for example) but assumed a common interest of all citizens as consumers. They were not Marxists, for although they recognised the class struggle, they did not, on theoretical as well as empirical grounds, see it as resolving itself in favour of the working-class. Although they disagreed on details, guild socialists in general accepted that the state would continue [-] it was needed to act as trustee for the community and provide representation in parliament for citizens as consumers - but insisted that effective control would be vested in the industrial guilds, set up by the state and consisting of representatives of the relevant industrial union, the experts, and the state managers. It was therefore a scheme to unite citizen democracy with worker democracy.

(Irving, no date)

It is against this backdrop that the formation of Mayo's early ideas and their consistency throughout his American career should be seen. A turn to history should enable attention to wider discursive contexts than just the history of ideas a key figure draws on; it should also explore the context in which they were contested.

Mir and Mir chart a narrative familiar to all scholars au fait with Marxist accounts of recent economic history in detailing the rise and contradictions of Fordism. Seeing the problem of Fordism from the late 1960s onwards as a crisis of rigidity, the institutional and managerial solution was to call for enhanced flexibility: in manufacturing systems; work practices; consumption patterns; and new patterns of flexible accumulation based on increasing financialization, diminished unionization, increased globalization of manufacturing, and increasing digitalization enhancing space-time compression. Mir and Mir elaborate these themes at length. The historical component of their essay is to point out that flexibility did not spring on the world, fully formed, as a relatively recent phenomenon but that, from a world systems perspective, there are far deeper roots to the present tendencies. Financialization is not a new phenomenon but a pattern that

can be seen in the cyclical and evolutionary phases of historical capitalism from the thirteenth century onwards. Clearly, in terms of historiographical method, Mir and Mir are interpreting the historical record through an essentially deterministic pattern, cast by the marriage of Braudel and Marx that produced the progeny of world systems theory (Wallerstein, 1974).

The focus of the chapter by Mills, Weatherbee, Foster, and Helms Mills is the New Deal era in US political economy. In this period some similar political currents that flowed through Mayo's Brisbane politics also animated the US scene. The New Deal was a large-scale national attempt to reorder relations of production and consumption on lines that were influenced by debates concerning democracy that were rooted in socialism of various kinds. Key figures are singled out for discussion. These figures, and the New Deal philosophy they embraced and exemplified, have been written out of Management and Organization Studies history: the authors seek to write them in.

The New Dealers embraced various forms of ideology in putting their programs together, not always coherently or consistently. By contrast, Spector argues, in the immediate post-Second World War era, the capitalist opponents of the New Deal were much more coherent ideologically, despite professing an antipathy to the very idea of ideology. The emergence of ideological coherence was nurtured by the Cold War, corporate opposition to the New Deal, and an uneasy and equivocal relation on the part of Americans with the new conglomerates that were shaping the business scene.

It would be surprising if there were a coherent ideology of business if it did not find systematic expression in one of the key organs of business. Hence, the frame for analysis is the *Harvard Business Review*, in which four dominant and intertwined themes are identified. First, there was an expectation of minimum government interference combined with optimum government promotion, an ideological thrust directly aimed against the New Deal. Second, there was an explicit equation of Christianity and capitalism in terms of values ranged against ungodly communism. Third, individualism was constitutive of the American psyche and, as such, an expression of a natural state that the collectivist ideals of communism abroad and unionism at home ground down. Hence, fourth, at home business should do all it could to educate the broader public that it was not unions that could improve the prosperity of workers but unfettered free enterprise in which the interest of owners of capital and those who were merely employed in it were fused on an ever-improving trajectory that rendered class warfare redundant. The best cure for global poverty was the export of this free enterprise system to the more benighted parts of the globe that did not enjoy America's benefits; as national liberation movements adopted socialist colors in countries such as Korea and Vietnam the force of words subsequently had to be joined by the force of arms.

In the 1950s and 1960s, Spector concludes, the foundations of the "end of history" argument articulated by Fukuyama (1992), which suggested that liberal market capitalism had achieved vindication and victory with the death of Soviet Communism, were laid. Yet, history has a way of not ending and ideology a way of refolding: the global financial crisis and the escalating crisis of climate change being the folds in question.

The capitalist ideologies of the 1950s engaged in simplification (liberal market capitalism vs. communism), contradiction (against government *interference* but for government *protection*), misdirection (*People's Capitalism*) and denial (poverty). When ideologues present the subjective as objective, advocacy as observation, and self-interest as mutuality, the result is denial, distortion, false consciousness, and the concealment of real interests.

(Spector, this volume)

Well, I would is expressed. The position of the opposed (Clegg)

Scale is reduced in Canada, a figure of progressive evolution, strategic, social ideological nor

Canadian desire to popular development called "Throughout the nation and public become identified frontier they did 1900s a few pr

The explicit in 1948, from opened. These a Discourse Analysis of symmetry functions and public Americanization profession. In the analysis of an

Management

Management McLaren and non-existent Canadian difficulties usually first in textbooks — that Australian familiar with. in US rather Canadian Business as AACSB accreditation forged on US or recruiting universal management and functional occurred: if contexts; more defined the un

Well, I would not disagree with the verdict although I would question the terms in which it is expressed. The identification of distortion, false consciousness, and real interests presumes a position of theoretical sovereignty as an a priori that is every bit as ideological as the positions opposed (Clegg, 1989).

Scale is reduced greatly in the other essay in this section: the focus is on public relations (PR) in Canada, a field characterized by a broadly North American (read US) narrative of the progressive evolution of more ethical practice, represented in a move away from propaganda towards strategic, socially responsible communication. The development of textbooks as paradigms of ideological normalcy was central to the process.

Canadian experience belies ideological normalcy. In Canada it was the nineteenth-century desire to populate the vast tracts of open land with settlers from Europe that occasioned the development of a particular form of propaganda that might subsequently be recognized as PR. "Throughout the early 1900s and up until the mid-1920s in Canada, government communication and publicity campaigns were by far the most significant and most common of what would become identified as public relations practice," Thurlow argues. As the railways opened up the frontier they developed rhetoric for communication that drew on the same skills. By the early 1900s a few private enterprises were developing a PR profile.

The explicit recognition of PR dates back to the foundation of a course at McGill University in 1948, from which incipient professionalization other courses and professional bodies developed. These are represented, discursively, in an archive that the author subjects to Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), demonstrating the centrality of the theory of excellence, the model of symmetry for professional practice via mutually beneficial relationships between organizations and publics, an increasing representational concern with ethics, as well as an increasing Americanization of the field and the necessity of securing a privileged space for the nascent profession. In terms of historiography, the use of CDA to explore a specific focal object through analysis of an archive is the major contribution.

Management history at the margins

Management theory was born in the USA yet it has colonized the world. Why and how? McLaren and Mills seek to answer this question through researching a determinate absence – non-existent Canadian management theory. Their argument seeks to construct a history of Canadian difference that conventional accounts gloss over. These conventional arguments are usually first encountered by those entering into a career in management in Canadianized US textbooks – often where the place names and little else is changed to Canadian – a practice that Australian (and, one suspects, many other nations) management inductees would also be familiar with. Canadian scholars, they argue, further this Americanization by seeking publication in US rather than Canadian journals because of their greater 'legitimacy' globally, especially as Canadian Business Schools become more aligned with their US models through factors such as AACSB accreditation. These business schools were largely post Second World War creations forged on US models, often hiring those Americans who did not find or want US employment or recruiting from cognate social science disciplines. Professionally, the demand grew for a universal management theory for all countries based on positivist assumptions, empiricist methods, and functionalist theories – all strongly ensconced as US orthodoxy. An unfortunate paradox occurred: if management science was universal there was no need for specifically Canadian contexts; moreover, specifically Canadian contexts were of less universal value in a domain that defined the universe as principally that of the United States.

Canada is different, note the authors. It is not the US nor is it similar to the US in important ways:

the country developed as a resource-based economy with significant amounts of foreign investment; while large in size it has a small population spread across its southern border, divided regionally by cultural, linguistic, political, and economic differences; and it is a welfare state with a history of strong activist governments and an electorally-viable social democratic political party.

(McLaren and Mills, *this volume*)

As a settler dominion Canada has far more in common with societies such as Australia and New Zealand, than it does with the United States. The history of economic protectionism and the development of social welfare have far more parallels with these dominions than the United States. Indeed, although the essay does not mention it, a distinctive Canadian political economy centered on the staples thesis and the work of Harold Innis as an explanation for how the pattern of settlement and economic development of Canada was influenced by the exploitation and export of natural resources. Unfortunately, Innis' (1930; 1940) theory seems to have had negligible influence in Canadian business schools; had it done so there would be a far better basis for understanding the specificity of Canadian experience in its foundations than is offered by the Americanized texts, something that the authors recognize as only just beginning.

The legacy of Innis has been built on by researchers such as Wallace Clement (1997; Clement and Vosko, 2002) but seems not to be recognized in the business schools. Another aspect absent from consideration must also be the question of the distinct bicultural context of Canada's predominant multiculturalism split between Quebec and other French-speaking provinces and the dominant Anglo sphere. There is a distinctive and different account, albeit still subaltern, of management in the Francophone world that does not have such a strong US character.

There are many Americas. Canada to the north is a different reality to the United States to the south. Further south still, there are the more complex realities of Latin America. Across the US border in Mexico, one of the most significant voices in Latin and world management and organization studies, Eduardo Ibarra-Colado, was recently and sadly stilled. Before his death he left a significant legacy, informed by an acute understanding of the history of Mexico, an example of which is collected in the volume.

Central to Ibarra-Colado's concerns was the condition of coloniality:

Coloniality must be understood in its institutional dimensions, as a deliberate action of power to dominate and subjugate the other. It is the hidden face of Modernity, always considered the stage made possible by the development of reason, instead of the process of invasion/destruction/invention based on the power of weapons, ideas and symbols to impose a unique civilizing process. From this point of view, power instead of reason explains the splendour of Europe and America and the prevalence of some kind of knowledge over others.

At least three institutions have been essential in the operation of colonization: the Church and evangelism to produce silence and colonize the soul; the Hacienda and mills to produce discipline and obedience at work and to colonize the body; and the University and science to produce truth and colonize the understanding of the world. The organization of knowledge and their associated practices in the modern *Universitas* has guaranteed the reproduction of disciplines as we know them and, at the same time, has obstructed different ways to live and imagine academic work, discouraging or forbidding alternative practices.

The door to a putative universal vast majority of organization studies. Government functions inducts and in write with inadequate more authentic organization science authentic and 'transversally' in the hegemony of different regime management as life through resistance.

Following the colleagues, Sri friends. I came sent a paper that tor explaining. The result is history around APPRO the best organization history control Nelson Phillip scholarly community colleagues' horror Eduardo's legacy.

Coller, McLaren privileged discourse (ANT) and these authors' works of new stipulated using scholars familiar well as an outcome of reproduction of PhDs and network analytical work in broader social

Conclusion

The history of doing of a history ripe for more journals, such

The door to a whole world of potential differences is opened that, instead of being buried by putative universalism, might be explored for innovation and productive tensions. As noted, the vast majority of Latin American intellectual production in the field of management and organization studies is mimicry: it copies Anglo-Saxon norms in all areas of intellectual reproduction. Government funding of students to do doctoral work in these centers of excellence elsewhere inducts and indoctrinates the emerging generation of scholars to learn to think, speak, and write with inauthenticity. Elsewhere, in the broader fields of history and social sciences there are more authentic voices to be found but these are both neglected by indigenous management and organization scholars and are unknown to those from the hegemonic discourse. Fusion of these authentic and indigenous sources in a 'trans-discipline' corpus of knowledge builds knowledge 'transversally' in a set of multiple dialogues and conversations. These must not be dominated by the hegemony of language and orthodoxy and they must include both scholars and the people of different regions and cultures. In this way they might learn from each other and reconstruct management and organizational knowledge that recognizes, improves, and protects local styles of life through respecting the differences that are embedded therein.

Following the contribution from Eduardo there is a remembrance and homage from three colleagues, Srinivas, Guedes, and Faria. It is moving and fitting. Eduardo was one of my best friends. I came to know him during the period when I was editor of *Organization Studies*. He sent a paper that was not, for a variety of reasons, publishable as it was. I wrote back to him as editor explaining how and why this was the case and suggested some ways that it might be revised. The result is history, as we say. Eduardo invited me to Mexico, there followed many collaborations around APROS, EGOS, and LAEMOS, and much correspondence between meetings. He was the best organization theorist; my first point of reference when writing my Foucauldian inspired history contributions to *Power and Organizations* with my colleagues David Courpasson and Nelson Phillips. As I wrote in the acknowledgments to that book he "made incisive, extended scholarly comments on a great deal of the manuscript." In the words of Brecht that open the colleagues' homage "there are those who struggle all their lives; those are the indispensable ones." Eduardo's legacy is indispensable.

Coller, McNally, and Mills explore some of the mechanism by which hegemonic forms of privileged discourse are constituted theoretically. Using the fusion of Actor Network Theory (ANT) and reconstructive history that has featured in several other chapters in the book that these authors have contributed to, the authors provide an ANTi-history of the Canadian networks of new institutional theory (NIT). A number of scholars central to these networks are stipulated using citation statistics as the basis. An inner circle, comprised, not surprisingly to scholars familiar with the field, of Hinings, Greenwood, Suddaby, and Oliver is identified, as well as an outer circle of still well-known but lesser figures. The chapter analyzes the mechanism of reproduction of these centers of excellence, stressing in particular recruitment and training of PhDs and institutional promotion. Historiographically, the authors use quite conventional network analysis and ranking methods to identify their circles, demonstrating, perhaps, that historical work need not be equipped with any specific method but can borrow freely from the broader social sciences.

Conclusion

The history turn is well represented in the volume and an eclectic range of approaches to the doing of a historical management and organization studies is well prepared. The time is certainly ripe for more such work as the recent call for papers that focus on the history turn in major journals, such as the *Academy of Management Review* and *Management and Organizational History*

suggests. Doubtless, some of the perspectives highlighted herein will find their way into these special issues. Should they do so what one might wish for would be both a more grounded and a more rounded management and organization theory, one able to appreciate the specific contours of the contexts in which inquiry is conducted, both in terms of the intellectual context of those conducting it and the contexts that are attended to empirically. It would make a change from much standard fare.

Wallerstein, I. (1984) *World-Economic History*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Weber, M. (1977) *The Social Organization of the Firm*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Weick, K. E. (1985) *Social Cognition in Organizations*. New York: Praeger.
Wetherby, T. C. (1985) *The Social Organization of the Firm*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

References

- Baran, P. A. and Sweezy, P. M. (1966) *Monopoly Capital: An Essay on the American Economic and Social Order*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Bourke, H. (1982) Industrial unrest as social pathology: The Australian writings of Elton Mayo, *Historical Studies*, 20(79): 217–33.
- Bourke, H. (1986) Mayo, George Elton (1880–1949), *Australian Dictionary of Biography*, National Centre of Biography, Australian National University, <http://adb.anu.edu.au/biography/mayo-george-elton-7541/text13155>
- Braverman, H. (1974) *Labor and Monopoly Capitalism*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Burrell G. and Morgan G. (1979) *Sociological Paradigms and Organizational Analysis*. London: Heinemann.
- Clegg, S. R. (1989) *Frameworks of Power*. London: Sage.
- Clegg, S. R. and Dunkerley D. (1980) *Organization, Class and Control*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Clegg, S. R., Courpasson, D., and Phillips, N. (2006) *Power and Organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Clement, W. (1997) *Understanding Canada: Building on the New Canadian Political Economy*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Clement, W. and Vosko, L. (2002) *Changing Canada: Political Economy as Transformation*, (edited with Leah Vosko). Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press.
- Flyvbjerg, B. (2001) *Making Social Science Matter*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fukuyama, F. (1992) *The End of History and the Last Man*. London: Hamish Hamilton.
- Ginsburg, C. (1980) *The Cheese and the Worms: The Cosmos of a Sixteenth Century Miller*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Innis, H. A. (1956 [1930]) *The Fur Trade in Canada: An Introduction to Canadian Economic History*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Innis, H. A. (1954 [1940]) *The Cod Fisheries: The History of an International Economy*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Innis, H. A. (1971) *A History of the Canadian Pacific Railway*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart.
- Irving, T. (n.d.) Early views of industrial democracy: Australia, 1914–1921. Worksite: Issues in Workplace Relations, http://worksite.econ.usyd.edu.au/early_views.html
- Latour, B. (1993) *We Have Never Been Modern*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Levi, G. (1991) On microhistory, in P. Burke (ed.), *New Perspectives on Historical Writing* (pp. 93–113). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Magnússon S. G. and Sziártó, I. M. (2013) *What is Microhistory? Theory and Methods*. London: Routledge.
- Mayo, E. (1922) Industrial unrest and nervous breakdowns, *Industrial Australian and Mining Standard*, 67: 63–64.
- Mayo, E. (1933) *The Human Problems of an Industrial Civilization*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Morgan, G. (1985) *Images of Organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Munslow, A. (2006a) *Deconstructing History*. London: Routledge.
- Munslow, A. (2006b). *The Routledge Companion to Historical Studies* (2nd edn). London and New York: Routledge.
- Phillips, N. and Brown, J. (1993) Analyzing communication in and around organizations: A critical hermeneutic approach, *Academy of Management Journal*, 36(6): 1547–76.
- Prasad, A. and Mir, R. (2002) Digging deep for meaning: A critical hermeneutic analysis of CEO letters to shareholders in the oil industry, *Journal of Business Communication*, 39(1): 92–116.
- Syllabus of the Workers' School of Social Science*, Brisbane Trades Hall, August 1919, in Merrifield Collection, State Library of Victoria, box 65; *Daily Standard*, 18 September 1919.

- Wallerstein, I. (1974) *The Modern World-System, vol. I: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-Economy in the Sixteenth Century*. New York: Atlantic Press.
- Weber, M. (1978) *Economy and Society*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Weick, K. E. (1995) *Sensemaking*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Witherby, T. C. (1919) *Who Shall Control Industry?* Workers' Educational Association, Queensland.