Article Introduction: One of earliest ASB papers dealing with the history of the association was written by Gabrielle Durepos and presented at the 2006 conference, hosted that year by Mount Allison University in Sackville, New Brunswick. Gabie, at this point, was in her second year as a PhD student on the Sobey School of Business, PhD program and was grappling with the potential theoretical intersections between postmodernist historiography and actor-network theory. At the conference Gabie was awarded the Best Student Paper and went on in 2009 to develop a thesis on "ANTi-History" as a fusion of historiography and actor-network. In the ASB paper she set out to understand the human (e.g., business educators) and materiel (e.g., the production of conference programs) factors that came together to influence the character and continuance of the Atlantic Schools of Business.

FLEETING THOUGHTS ON ENDURING NETWORKS: CONCEPTUALIZING THE ATLANTIC SCHOOLS OF BUSINESS CONFERENCE[6]

Gabrielle Durepos

Student
Sobey School of Business
PhD (Management) Program

Abstract

This paper sets out to analyze the (enduring) character of the Atlantic Schools of Business through application of an Actor-Network Theory (ANT) approach. Drawing on selected developments that occurred since 2000, the paper attempts to disturb the "black-boxed" character of ASB and reveal it as a series of inscribed processes that constitute its continuance.

…Opening Thoughts

It seems as though few have been able to resist the all-encompassing and powerful nature of the modernist discourse in which social entities are assumed to operate independently of our mental cognition (Chia, 1996; Latour, 1997; Prasad, 2005, p. 215). And we as researchers, having been trained to 'see' or 'look' for the 'truth' have been able to discern it, and in mirror like ways, portray it accurately for engaged audiences (Chia, 1995; 1996; Latour, 1997). It has been said that this single great modern episteme "sets limits to the conditions of possibility" (Law, 2001, p. 6). Like water spiraling down a drain, it seems that many academics and non-academics alike, through conventional speech, text and the shared common sense of the social, have been or are being sucked into adopting and enabling this powerful modernist gaze to guide their everyday social perceptions and conceptualizations. In an effort to resist what seems to be an ever-present inclination of falling into and being trapped by an ill-equipped manner of explaining social phenomena, the modernist tendency of explaining the social without accounting for the a priori assumptions which make it up must be disturbed. This has proven to be quite a difficult task.

The omnipresent nature of the modernist discourse haunts us in all aspects of our lives. The concreteness and static-ness which we ascribe to what we refer to as entities, organizations, workplaces, conferences or even concerts are very much part of the way we order our social fabric. In our speech, discussions and conversations about our work, social activities and in many facets of our daily existence, we ascribe fixity to effects of social processes which enable us to draw on reductionist simplistic accounts of what otherwise would be chaos to order our existence (Chia, 1996; Law, 1994). What fuels this paper is the need to describe the process in which we have come to speak of, refer to and conceptualize of the Atlantic Schools of Business (henceforth ASB) conference held annually for the past 36 years as an ontologically 'real' entity (Burrell and Morgan, 1979) with assumed natural-like properties. How is it that in the order of things, in the patterning of the social, this annual academic conference has assumed ontological status, entity-like properties that enable us to speak of it as a unified monolith, to draw on the term 'ASB' when we wish to engage in discussion concerning its nature? How is it that when we speak of ASB, we do not describe the endless bits and pieces of the social, material and technical (Law, 1999) that make it up but instead use the words 'Atlantic Schools of Business' conference and are confident that these words have come to stand for, that is, represent endless relationships and networks of social engineering (Law, 1992)? Finally, as actors consciously aware of and speaking of 'ASB' we are involved in its dispersion but how can we be confident that through the use of these words we elicit a shared notion of 'ASB'? Are we aware that as actors engaging in speech about ASB we assume responsibility for its dispersion?

Instead of starting by "assuming what we wish to explain" (Law, 1992, p. 2); that is, instead of assuming ASB as an ontologically 'real' entity or organization which acts according to natural law-like tendencies, this paper begins with a "clean slate" (Law, 1992, p. 2). It is only in this manner which we can foster an understanding of orderings of the various bits and pieces of the social, the mechanics of power of organization which have in this case been so successful in becoming durable aligned actants, that they have subsequently erased themselves and their chaotic tendencies from view. Through the interaction of the various heterogeneous materials of the social and their subsequent alignment in forming what we call 'ASB', a complex mode of ordering (Law, 1994; 2001) has emerged which both enables and constrains the actions of the various actants

involved. It is this social pattern of orderings which has produced the effect we have come to refer to as ASB. It is the dispersion of this patterned network that constrains us in perceiving of ASB in any other way; thus, forming a "false necessity" (Unger, 2004) within our social orchestrations. This paper draws on Actor Network Theory (henceforth ANT) in putting forth an emergent and processual explanation of ASB as a patterned network of the social, made of heterogeneous bits and pieces which through their alignment have erased themselves from view, and thus created a "fallacy of misplaced concreteness" (Whitehead, 1985 as quoted in Chia, 1996, p. 33). It is this erroneous belief; that which assumes and perceives of ASB as a static entity, which this paper wishes to deconstruct. Instead, ASB is described and conceptualized of as an effect of a pattern of social ordering (Law, 1994), as an emergent process which is in a state of constant flux that is, a state of becoming (Chia, 1996; 1995). It is proposed that ASB not be understood as a noun, not as an organization but instead as a verb that is as a mode of organizing (Law, 1994; 2001).

Simply put, this paper describes the process in which ASB as an academic conference has become "black boxed" (Latour, 1987; Akrich, 1992), that is, how it has come to act as a single point actor, thus "standing for" (Law, 1992) the endless complexity which it has come to represent. The paper begins with a brief overview of ANT while fully acknowledging that attempts at accurately "representing" or "mirroring" (Chia, 1996, p. 38) that which the theory entails is entirely futile (Law, 1999). Secondly, ASB is described in ANT parlance that is, as a mode of ordering in which the heterogeneous materials of the social are organized as to reproduce year after year, an effect which we name the 'ASB' conference. Of particular interest for this analysis, are the ways in which certain actors within the ASB network who span multiple networks can be understood as enrolling other actants into alignment thus rendering the ASB network more durable. Specifically, the ASB call for papers will be discussed as a "material delegation" (Law, 2001) capable of "acting at a distance" (Latour, 1988). And finally, because "Writing is work, ordering work.   It is another part of the process of ordering.   It grows out of a context. It is an effect of that context. But then it goes on to hide that context." (Law, 1994, p. 31), the paper proposes some final reflexive thoughts on the process of writing and researching. It will be proposed that this text also is an effect of a process, and that it too has the potential for assuming a concrete status, thus becoming 'black boxed'; that is, concealing its politicized process of creation from view (Latour, 1987). Lastly, the paper will propose that this new "inscription device" (Latour and Woolgar, 1979) has potential for contributing to the durability of the ASB network. But ultimately, the final conclusions of this paper are yours to make, as only you, the reader can assess the potential of this new inscription device; will I be successful in aligning your interests with that of this paper?

Notes on Actor-Network Theory

Crucial to any analysis using actor network theory is an understanding of the social as emergent and processual (Law, 1994; 2001), best conceptualized as a verb as opposed to a noun. As Chia (1995; 1996) notes, social ordering is best understood as in a constant state of becoming as opposed to one of being. As this paper takes an ANT approach to understanding the social constitution of ASB, this section of the paper briefly describes its relevant inherent methodological implications. Specifically, ANT is described as an approach focusing on relations between materially heterogeneous actants. It is articulated as symmetrical in its analysis

of the social while not only appreciating but celebrating the complexity and multiplicity of precarious modes of ordering.

The focus of ANT as an approach to the social is primarily on the diverse relations that constitute processes of ordering, in which various effects are produced (Law, 1997). ANT takes a symmetrical stance in that it is committed "to explaining competing viewpoints in the same terms" (Callon, 1986, p.196). As a result, modernist dualisms are collapsed and treated as effects given through the discursive nature of the social (Law and Mol 1995; Law, 1997). Actor-network theorists look relationally and transitionally, such that they are concerned with the strategic displacement, movement, translation, alignment, and enrollment of the parts making up the social; that is, how it is coordinated (Law, 1992; 1997; 2001; Callon, 1991; 1986). The emphasis is on understanding the constitution of durable and non-durable networks, their materials, the trials of the implicated actors, their negotiations, failures, political acts, and persuasions. Actor-network theorists tell stories of entities; that is, how entities take their form and attain specific traits as a result of "their relations with other entities" (Law, 1997, p. 2; Callon, 1997). Comparable to many mini discourses (Fox, 2000), the social is understood as shaping and shaped by the complex relations among the heterogeneous materials that make up networks (Collins and Yearley, 1992; Law, 1991; 1992; 1994; 1997; 2001). It looks at actors as products of diverse sets of forces, who engage in political acts to enlist other actors in furthering their cause (Callon, 1997). But networks or actors are never "tied up", that is they never reach that comparable to an 'end' state but are ever changing as they are effects of patterns which are translated in becoming part of other ongoing patterns (Law, 1991; 2001; Latour, 1992). In this sense, the most mundane and taken for granted aspects of the social are exposed as composed of complicated webs of relationships (Akrich, 1992). But I cannot 'represent' ANT truthfully or be faithful to its accurate translation as any sanitized, mirror like 'representation' which does not account for the effect of the writer on the written is bound for failure. Perhaps the only opportunity in which a researcher can represent ANT is by "**performing** it rather than **summarizing** it" (Law, 1999, p. 1; original emphasis). The next section of this paper will perform an exploration of the ASB conference as a precarious process while also as a durable network of the social.

Opening the Black Box of ASB

The ASB conference is an annual Atlantic Canadian conference. Drawing primarily small attendances made of a mixture of junior and senior researchers, the conference has miraculously maintained its annual reproduction for the past thirty-five years. The idea of the continuous survival of the conference is mostly taken for granted by those researchers who attend it. But once the black box (Latour, 1987) of ASB is opened, once we start exposing the complexity of the relationships making up the social ordering of ASB and following its network of associations, the mundane becomes exciting and our modernist tendencies of imposing order and simplicity on complexity are exposed (Chia, 1995; 1996; Law, 1994).

The first step in opening black boxes is a thorough disturbing of the comforting idea of ASB as a static entity. Instead, and as this section of the paper will show, it is proposed that ASB be thought of as a relational effect of the ordering of materially heterogeneous actors. Specifically, the section begins with a brief explanation of the effect of 'naming' and the process by which effects of the

social become black boxed. Although the ASB network has proven itself durable for the past 35 years, this paper will focus on the years 2000 – 2006 in outlining an important series of strategic translations in which the trials and successes of actors performing interest work, enrolling and translating other actors, have been instrumental in rendering durable the ASB network. In describing this complicated non-linear process of alignment, translation and enrollment, the relationships among technological as well as human actors will be mapped to determine how their precarious orderings have punctualised (Callon, 1991). Specifically, three material delegations which have come into being and have grown as powerful actors within the ASB network will be discussed to outline the heterogeneity of the ASB network. These heuristics are the newly developed ASB web site (http://asb.acadiau.ca/index.html), the call for papers published by the ASB 2006 hosting university: Mount Allison University (http://www.cira-acri.ca/docs/ASBcallfor%20papers2006.doc) and the ASB proceedings. Finally, the paper will focus specifically on the call for papers to discuss the potential for this actor in "shifting action around itself" (Akrich & Latour, 1992, p. 259).

As previously mentioned, ASB has been assumed as a concrete entity, and through this assumption has been given ontological status (Chia, 1995: 1996). When we speak of ASB, we do not describe the process of alignment of its various actors; we do not describe how they have come to act in a unified manner but rather assume that through the order of things, they have. Naming is both enabling and/but deceiving. It enables us to draw on (in this case) an acronym to refer to a set of relational practices, thus allowing for the easy transportability of the term. In another sense, it is deceiving as complexities "are lost in the process of labeling" (Law, 1997, p. 6). We draw on the 'tidy' term 'ASB' assuming its coherence and neatness; a word which represents while simultaneously hiding its chaotic nature (Law, 1994; 2001). By disturbing this notion, we are able to recover the complexities that have until now been concealed from view.

The ASB network is an effect produced through the heterogeneous ordering of its aligned actors (Law, 1994). Ironically, what seems at first a simple network is a complicated precarious mode of ordering and organizing. It is composed of interacting actors and inscriptions who engage in political work to interest other actors in engaging in their cause (Law, 1992). Once a multitude of heterogeneous actors have come to act as one; that is, to engage in same causes, act in unison towards the same goals, share a program of action, they become known as "punctualised actors" (Callon, 1991). Since a multitude of actors engaged in a cause, come to act in unison and represent that cause, the network they represent can actually be understood as an actor or a "punctualised actor". The process of punctualisation converts an entire network into a single point or actor into another network (Callon, 1991, p. 153). It is in this sense that we can understand actors as networks and networks as actors (Callon 1997; Latour, 1997). But to understand this process of punctualisation or alignment of interests which is crucial in network formation, we must go back and forth continuously between the heterogeneous materials making up a particular chain of association of ASB because it is through this "incessant variation that we obtain access to the crucial relationships" (Akrich, 1992, p. 209; Law, 1997). As such, we must follow the trail or the chain of inscription to illuminate or describe the process by which the actors of ASB have become ordered (Akrich and Latour, 1992; Latour, 1987).

ASB is made of actors but if we dig deeper, we see that ASB is actually made of a series of punctualised actors or as we will come to understand: ASB is itself a network made of a series of

networks. ASB as a network has enrolled academics mostly from the Atlantic Provinces into attending and thus reproducing the conference for the past 35 years. Some of these enrolled actors more dedicated than others, have attended the conference almost yearly with their papers frequently appearing in the conference proceedings while other actors have not proven to be as successfully enrolled. It is this series of translations among actors, enrollments and counter-enrollments which make up and give ASB its distinctness as a network (Law and Mol, 1995). But these enrolled academics can also each be understood as networks, for they stand for an endless series of ideas, thoughts, and research agendas as well as all the relationships in which they engage daily and are shaped through. The academic is a relational effect of the heterogeneous bits and pieces of the material and the social (Law and Mol, 1995). The academic can be understood as standing for a network but since all of the actors making up this network are aligned into acting as one, the academic is a punctualised actor. Since actors are networks and network actors, it is important to recognize that actors in various stages of their existence simultaneously enact and contribute to differing memberships in multiple networks (Leigh Star, 1991, p. 30; Callon 1997; Latour, 1997; Law and Mol, 1995; Akrich, 1992).

The network of ASB undertook a series of crucial translations beginning in the year 2000, influenced primarily by actors enacting differing memberships in various networks. The year 2000 marked the beginning of Saint Mary's University's (henceforth SMU) PhD program in management, the only of its nature in the Atlantic Provinces of Canada. Some SMU faculty members, who were simultaneously enrolled in the ASB network, played a role in constructing the PhD program at SMU. Because the SMU faculty members who were enrolled in the ASB network saw ASB as a valuable venue for junior researchers, three of the six individuals making up the first cohort of the SMU PhD became interested in the notion of the ASB conference and its non-threatening atmosphere to present a first paper (ASB Proceedings, 2000). Their interest in ASB as a conference to present research was very much a "consequence of the relations in which" (Law, 1997, pp. 2-3) these students were located. Because the SMU students were themselves becoming indoctrinated into a "thought collective" (Fleck, 1935) whose principal actors were already enrolled into the ASB network, they too became successfully enrolled in attending the ASB conference. The various ASB enrolled faculty members at SMU continued to perform interest work on behalf of the ASB network, sharing their thoughts on the valuable nature of a small and local conference which could provide incoming PhD students a great venue to gain experience on presenting research.

As we have begun to see, understanding the network of ASB means to focus on actors, their relations and associations, which inscribe, impute and shape the make-up of all other actors involved; the way they translate others interests to that of their own (Callon, 1991; Latour; 1986). The ASB network in 2000 had successfully enrolled three actors (ASB Proceedings, 2000) due to the strategic work of ASB enrolled SMU faculty members who through engaging in political work had been successful in showing the value of a local conference for incoming PhD students (Callon, 1991). Through their enrollment into the ASB network, the SMU PhD actor's interests had been altered in a manner consistent with that of the ASB network, potentially making future translations easier. Ultimately, through the affiliation of the enrolled SMU faculty as well as the three enrolled SMU PhD actors a powerful connection was established. In 2001, the ASB network was successful in aligning another SMU PhD actor (ASB Proceedings, 2001) while in 2002 four SMU PhD actors were enrolled into the ASB network (ASB Proceedings, 2002). Interestingly, three of the four

SMU PhD actors enrolled in 2002 had begun their PhD earlier that year hinting to the previously mentioned notion of indoctrination into a "thought collective" (Fleck, 1935). As the PhD program continued to grow and enlist incoming students, these incoming students began simultaneously spanning the ASB network. In 2003, eight SMU PhD actors' interests were aligned and enrolled into the ASB network thus contributing to its annual reproduction (ASB Proceedings, 2003). In 2005, at least seven SMU PhD actors were successfully enrolled in rendering the durability of the ASB network (ASB Proceedings, 2005). This steady accumulation of translations of SMU PhD actors was extremely powerful in influencing future translations. Within the SMU PhD network, it became commonplace to speak of the ASB conference as a 'thing' or 'place where we catch up on what our colleagues are up to' thus reinforcing the notion of its unproblematic reproduction and entity-like status. The ASB network among SMU PhD actors as well as SMU faculty actors took on an air of permanence partially due to its perceived value which none wished to disturb. But while all of these actors contributed to the reproduction of the ASB network, some SMU PhD actors began to do so in a remarkably durable manner.

As has previously been mentioned, the ASB network is rendered durable when its various actors are able to punctualise; that is, act in alignment. But also contributing to the durability of a network is its ability in enlisting durable actors. Beginning in 2002, four SMU PhD actors took part in reviewing papers submitted for the conference (ASB Proceedings, 2002). Even more remarkable was the year 2005, where ASB's network enrolled four dedicated SMU PhD students as area chairs (ASB Proceedings, 2005). In the same year, two SMU PhD students enrolled in the ASB network took part in its executive council while at least another ASB enrolled actor who also part of the SMU PhD became active as a reviewer for the conference (ASB Proceedings, 2005). By contributing and participating in various processes that are crucial to the reproduction of the conference, these actors become vital to the reproduction of the ASB network.

Until this point, our analysis has focused on the enrollment of human actors into the ASB network and their contribution to its durability as well as yearly reproduction. But as has been previously articulated, ASB is a heterogeneous network of the social, made of actors of all kinds, social natural and technical who interact: ASB is an effect of this process (Law, 1999, p. 3; Latour, 1997; Law and Mol, 1995). What is fascinating about ASB and its durability is that until 2005 the network had little or no 'formal organization', that is little physical trace of ASB was left from year to year. Little or no material actors were enrolled in the ASB network in a durable manner such that the network had little trace of inscriptions, no written instructions for organizing the conference, formal e-mails describing the 'way the conference should occur' or the 'way resources should be allocated'. Rather ironically, as academics attending the conference, as actors' part of the ASB network, we unproblematically assumed its annual reproduction.

Upon inspection, only three inscribed material effects of ASB in which 'descriptions' of certain processes have been 'inscribed' in a durable manner come to mind (Akrich, 1992; Akrich & Latour, 1992; 1991). First, the conference proceedings which are published yearly after each meeting, second, the call for papers, put out by the hosting university and third, a newly formulated ASB website. These inscribed materials are effects produced through the network of ASB; they are actors which in part form the ASB network. But when we focus on these three material effects of ASB, we can also understand them as networks as they represent their specific lists of trials, competencies (Latour, 1991), efforts and political acts giving them their distinctness (Law and

Mol, 1995). The ASB website for example was formed by a group of enrolled ASB actors, of which at least two spanned the SMU PhD network. Through their commitment to the durability of the ASB network, these actors felt that such a site would "more formally bring together" its members (http://asb.acadiau.ca/index.html), that is allow for an easier process of "intéressement" and possibly enrollment into the ASB network (Callon and Law, 1982). Focusing specifically on the call for papers, the next paragraphs describe this inscription device as a "material delegation" (Law, 2001) capable of interest work and possible enrollment of academics.

The call for papers is an example of a particular mode of ordering which has been delegated to nonhuman materials, thus a "material delegation" (Law, 2001). Reflect on the role of the call for papers: it is a public notice distributed by the ASB hosting university facilitating the effective dispersion of crucial information in hopes of enrolling actors onto its network (http://www.cira-acri.ca/docs/ASBcallfor%20papers2006.doc). The call for papers is noteworthy in at least two respects. First, the call for papers has the capacity to act in a durable manner as it is inscribed. This inscription in turn renders durable the network of ASB, as effortlessly, it spans spatially reaching a wide readership (Latour, 1991; 1992). Second, it stands for, speaks on the behalf, and thus replaces the actors who have created and are responsible for its initial dispersion. It has become a punctualised actor, representing the aims of its aligned actors. It begins a process of "intéressement" (Callon, 1997) followed by a very political process of enrollment where other actors' interests (Callon and Law, 1982) will be bent and reshaped in alignment with that of the call for papers. In this sense, the call for papers does not "have power" but instead powerful relations are produced through its effective dispersion (Calas and Smircich, 1999, p. 663). It has the capacity to get other actors "whether they be human beings, institutions or natural entities – to comply with" it (Callon, 1986, p. 201). In this way, the call for papers can be understood as shifting "actions around itself" (Akrich & Latour, 1992, p. 259). This materially delegated inscription assumes power through its ability to "lock in" other actors in the conference's program and plan of action (Callon, 1986). The various academics who received the call for papers now have a choice: they can either be enrolled into the ASB network or refuse enrollment (Callon and Law, 1982; Callon, 1986). But it must be remembered that enrollment into the ASB network is done within the ASB networks strict guidelines, always on their terms. Thus, the power of the ASB network is maintained through its actor's relations and translations.

As has been illustrated, actors are made of a series of translations that "shape and determines subsequent translations" (Callon, 1991, p. 150). In this sense, actors can be understood as effects of those translations. But as networks are built and torn through a series of actors engaging in interest work, enrollment, alignment and translations (Law, 1992), two noteworthy points are in order: first, it is important to remember that the patchwork of the social is made both of cohesive and non-cohesive networks (Law and Mol, 1995), and second these networks can never be understood as 'last instances' but rather understood as emergent "circuits that tend to reproduce themselves" in variations (Law, 1991, p. 18; Law & Mol, 1995; Callon, 1991). But this re-production is precarious, dependent on a multitude of relationships becoming stabilized (Law & Mol, 1995). The thirty-five years of ASB's reproduction are achievements in which a network has been successful in interesting, enrolling, and translating interests. Its reproduction enables us to tell tales of alignment of interests, enrollment and translations of many actors, SMU PhD students, SMU faculty and other durable material delegations. Its apparent capacity to translate all its actors

to act in unison tempts us to assume its unproblematic reproduction. Finally, it provokes us to assume ASB as a unified monolith or concrete entity.

Closing Thoughts…

As previously noted, this paper cannot simply end with a conclusion of ASB as black boxed. This paper must instead close with some thoughts on the process in which an order was imposed on a multiplicity of events, data, and information about ASB to produce what appears now as a linear and ordered account. Some reflexive thoughts are needed to comment on how this account; that is, the explanations provided in this paper, have or will contribute to the black boxing of ASB. How will this story of ASB contribute to the durability and dispersion of the network? By stopping my account after the explanation of ASB as a black box, and not reflecting on the way in which this text, this explanation was socially constructed, the bits and pieces of the social which have rendered it possible would be hidden from view. Without reflexivity, a text taking into account its own production and the "researcher/theoretician's complicity in the constitution of their objects of study" (Calas & Smircich, 1999, p. 651; Latour, 1988; Kuhn, 1969), this text too would appear fictitiously as a black box.

This text is a product of a particular mode of ordering. The idea of crafting a history for ASB was fueled by the interests brewed in a particular PhD cohort's qualitative methods course. As many PhD students are continually enrolled into the ASB network, the idea of this assumed entity as having no formal history appealed to the facilitator of the course. An undergraduate was enrolled onto the project and began a process of gathering ASB proceedings and transcribing information about the conference into a database. Because the SMU faculty member who facilitated the qualitative methods course is a strongly enrolled ASB actor, he saw much value in engaging each of his students in crafting a text; that is, inscribing multiple versions of an ASB history in an attempt to begin unearthing its particularities. As it has been agreed upon that these texts be presented at the annual ASB meeting in September of 2006, this SMU faculty member was successful in translating the interests of those in the course and enrolling them once again into the ASB network. Finally, it should be noted that the actors which have been enrolled into the ASB network as part of researching its past are now engaged in contributing to its durability.

As such, this text is a network; it is a durable network which represents thoughts, ideas, inscriptions such as the call for papers, ordering, ASB proceedings, colleagues, advice, and qualitative methods of the social with pre-fabricated social categories (Law, 1994). The list goes on. The text is a relational effect of the strategic and instrumental alignment of the listed actors (Callon, 1991; Law & Mol, 1995). But these actors had to be drawn together in what Law calls a "centre of calculation" (Law, 2001, p. 8). Information was collected, gathered, assembled, and transcribed in one location where all that was relevant could be seen in order to calculate which bits would fit with other pieces. If we were to trace the network of this text, we would find a whole set of events and processes and other texts which were drawn together; that is, were translated into this text. This text has become a material delegation for telling the ASB story.

But as you read this text, those bits and pieces which have contributed to the creation of a linear story have concealed themselves from view. The order which I ascribe to the fleeting ideas and

thoughts which make it up appear static as they are "inscribed" (Latour & Woolgar, 1979) on the page. Their static appearance is fictitious as they have already changed since I have written them, having been read by you the reader, who with a head full of other competing thoughts will have interpreted them in a way not entirely consistent with mine. It is in this way that knowledge and words can only be understood as 'emergent' (Law, 1991). This imposed order has created a story which is one of many competing narratives about ASB. It is hoped that the reader will be 'interested' (Callon & Law, 1982) in this account of ASB, it is hoped that the reader will be enticed by my 'explanations' (Latour, 1988) and maybe 'enrolled' (Callon & Law, 1982) into the ASB network. This punctualised actor has potential for dispersion (Callon, 1997) though its reader. Will you be responsible for its dispersion?

References

Akrich, M. (1992). The De-Scription of technical objects. In W. Bijker & J. Law (Eds.), *Shaping technology/building society: Studies in sociotechnical change*, pp.205-224. MIT Press.

Akrich, M., & Latour, B. (1992). A summary of a convenient vocabulary for the semiotics of human and nonhuman assemblies. In W. Bijker & J. Law (Eds.), *Shaping technology/building society: Studies in sociotechnical change*, pp.259-264. MIT Press.

ASB proceedings, 2000 – 2003; ASB proceedings 2005.

Burrell, G., & Morgan, G. (1979). *Sociological paradigms and organisational analysis*. Ashgate.

Calas, M, & Smircich, L. (1999). Past postmodernism? Reflections and tentative directions. *Academy of Management Review, 24*(4), 649-671.

Callon, M. (1986). Some elements of a sociology of translation: Domestication of the scallops and the fisherman of St Brieuc Bay. In J. Law (Ed.), *Power, action and belief: A new sociology of knowledge?* pp.196-233. Routledge.

Callon, M. (1991). Techno-economic networks and irreversibility. In J. Law (Ed.), *A sociology of monsters,* pp.132-161. Routledge.

Callon, M. "Actor-Network Theory – the Market Test" http://www.comp.lancs.ac.uk/sociology/papers/Callon-Market-Test.pdf. [Accessed 11 July 2006].

Callon, M., & Law, J. (1982). On interests and their transformation: Enrollment and counter enrollment. *Social Studies of Science, 12*(4), 615-625.

Chia, R. (1996). *Organizational analysis as deconstructive practice*. Walter de Gruyter.

Chia, R. (1995). From modern to postmodern organizational analysis. *Organization Studies, 16*(4), 580-605.

Collins, H. & Yearley, S. (1992). Epistemological chicken. In A. Pickering (Ed.), *Science as practice and culture:* pp. 301-326. Chicago University Press.

Fleck, L. (1979). Genesis and development of a scientific fact. University of Chicago Press.

Fox, S. (2000). Communities of practice, Foucault and ANT. *Journal of Management Studies,37*(6), 853- 868.

Kuhn, T. (1962). The structure of scientific revolutions. The University of Chicago Press.

Latour, B. (1986). The powers of association. In J. Law (Ed.), *Power, action and belief: A new sociology of knowledge*? pp.264-280. Routledge.

Latour, B. (1987). *Science in action: How to follow scientists and engineers through society*. Harvard University Press.

Latour, B. (1988). The politics of explanation: An alternative. In S. Woolgar & M. Ashmore (Eds.), *Knowledge and reflexivity: New frontiers in the sociology of knowledge:* pp.155-176. Sage.

Latour, B. (1991). Technology is society made durable. In J. Law (Ed.), *A Sociology of monsters*, pp.103-131. Routledge.

Latour, B. (1992). Where are the missing masses? The sociology of a few mundane artifacts. In W. Bijker & J. Law (Eds.), *Shaping technology/building society: Studies in sociotechnical change*, pp.225-258. MIT Press.

Latour, B. & Woolgar, S. (1979). *Laboratory life: The social construction of scientific facts.* Sage.

Law, J. (1991). Introduction: Monsters, machines and sociotechnical relations. In J. Law (Ed.), *Sociology of monsters*, pp.1-23. Routledge.

Law, J. "Notes on the Theory of the Actor Network: Ordering, Strategy and Heterogeneity" http://www.comp.lancs.ac.uk/sociology/papers/Law-Notes-on-ANT.pdf. [Accessed 11 July 2006].

Law, J. (1994). *Organizing modernity.* Blackwell.

Law, J. & Mol, A. (1995). Notes on materiality and sociality. *The Sociological Review, 43*(2), 274-294.

Law, J. "Topology and the Naming of Complexity" http://www.comp.lancs.ac.uk/ sociology/papers/Law-Topology-and-Complexity.pdf. [Accessed 11 July 2006].

Law, J. "Traduction/Trahison: Notes on ANT" http://www.comp.lancs.ac.uk/sociology/papers/ Traduction-Trahision .pdf. [Accessed 11 July 2006].

Law, J. "Ordering and Obduracy" http://www.comp.lancs.ac.uk/sociology/papers/Law-Ordering-and- Obduracy.pdf. [Accessed 11 July 2006].

Leigh Star, S. (1991). Power, technology and the phenomenology of conventions: On being allergic to onions. In J. Law (Ed.), *A sociology of monsters*, pp.26-57. Routledge.

Prasad, P. (2005). *Crafting qualitative research*. M. E. Sharpe.

Unger, R. M. (2004*). False necessity: anti-necessitarian social theory in the service of radical democracy: From Politics, a work in constructive social theory*. Verso.