MACROFOUNDATIONS

RESEARCH IN THE SOCIOLOGY OF ORGANIZATIONS

Series Editor: Michael Lounsbury

MACROFOUNDATIONS: EXPLORING THE INSTITUTIONALLY SITUATED NATURE OF ACTIVITY

EDITED BY

CHRISTOPHER W. J. STEELE

University of Alberta, Canada

TIMOTHY R. HANNIGAN

University of Alberta, Canada

VERN L. GLASER

University of Alberta, Canada

MADELINE TOUBIANA

University of Alberta, Canada

AND

JOEL GEHMAN

University of Alberta, Canada

emerald
PUBLISHING

Reprints and permissions service
Contact: permissions@emeraldinsight.com

ISOQAR certified
Management System,
awarded to Emerald
for adherence to
Environmental
standard
ISO 14001:2004.

ISOQAR
REGISTERED

Certificate Number 1985
ISO 14001

INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

CONTENTS

SECTION 1.
INTRODUCTION

SECTION 2.
DEFINITIONS AND PONTIFICATIONS

SECTION 3.
MACROFOUNDING THE LOCAL

SECTION 4.
LOCALIZING THE MACROFOUNDATIONAL

SECTION 5.
REFLECTIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

CONTRIBUTOR BIOGRAPHIES

Mhamed Biygautane is a Lecturer in Public Policy at the School of Social and Political Sciences at the University of Melbourne. His primary research interests revolve around how the institutional context affects the implementation of public sector reform initiatives such as public–private partnerships, privatization and downsizing public sector organizations, with particular emphasis on the Gulf and Middle Eastern countries.

Isabel Brüggemann is a Research Associate at Cambridge Judge Business School. Her research interests lie in the study of institutions and social change, with a particular focus on social innovation. She received her PhD in organization theory from the University of Cambridge.

Giulia Cappellaro is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Social and Political Sciences at Bocconi University in Milan, Italy. Her research adopts qualitative methodologies to study dynamics of organizational and policy change in sectors of public interest, employing both ethnographic and historical analysis approaches.

Guillermo Casasnovas is a Postdoctoral Fellow at Esade Business School and holds a PhD from the University of Oxford, Saïd Business School. His research is focused on the early moments of new markets and fields, with special emphasis on empirical contexts at the intersection of social, business, and public sectors.

Brett Crawford is an Assistant Professor of Management at the Seidman College of Business at Grand Valley State University. His research explores how organizations shape social and institutional meaning over time, specifically relating to the natural environment and stigmatized issues. He earned his PhD from Copenhagen Business School.

M. Tina Dacin is a Professor and the Stephen J. R. Smith Chair of Strategy and Organisational Behaviour at the Smith School of Business at Queen's University, Canada. Her research interests include custodianship, traditions and place-making, social entrepreneurship, and strategic collaboration. She received her PhD from the University of Toronto.

Claudia Gabbioneta is a Senior Lecturer at Newcastle University (UK). She is particularly interested in organizational wrongdoing and the role that professions play in it. She has also investigated other aspects of professions, including status and reputation. She has recently contributed to the RSO volume on the Microfoundations of Institutional Theory.

Joel Gehman is Professor of Strategy, Entrepreneurship & Management and Alberta School of Business Chair in Free Enterprise at the University of Alberta. His research investigates the strategies and innovations organizations pursue in response to grand challenges and how institutional arrangements shape organizational responses to such concerns. His published research has dealt with topics such as values work, robust action strategies, sustainability journeys, contextual distinctiveness, and technological exaptation, among others. He received his PhD from the Pennsylvania State University.

Vern L. Glaser is an Assistant Professor at the Alberta School of Business, University of Alberta. His research investigates how organizations strategically change practices and culture. His research has been published in the *Academy of Management Journal*, *Academy of Management Review*, *Organization Science*, *Academy of Management Annals*, *Journal of Management Inquiry*, and *Research in the Sociology of Organizations*. He received his PhD from the University of Southern California (2014).

Mary Ann Glynn is the Joseph F. Cotter Professor of Management & Organisation at Boston College. She investigates micro-level cognitive processes (learning and creativity) and macro-level cultural influences (social norms and institutional arrangements) as well as their interaction. She is a Fellow and Past President of the Academy of Management.

Timothy R. Hannigan is an Assistant Professor of Organization Theory and Entrepreneurship at the University of Alberta, School of Business. His research is oriented around the early moments of markets, fields, ecosystems, and organizational wrongdoing. In particular, he focuses on institutional dynamics in contexts characterized by ambiguity; this includes computationally mapping processes and representations of provisional meanings and knowledge. He holds a PhD from the University of Oxford, Saïd Business School. His work has been published in the *Academy of Management Review, Academy of Management Annals, Research Policy, Behavioral Science & Policy, and Big Data & Society*.

Markus A. Höllerer is a Professor in Organisation and Management at UNSW Sydney. He is also affiliated with the Research Institute for Urban Management and Governance at WU Vienna University of Economics and Business. His scholarly work has been focused on the study of institutions, meaning, and novel forms of organization and governance. Research interests include, among others, issues of collaborative governance at the interface of the private sector, public administration, and civil society.

Gemma L. Irving is a Lecturer in Strategy at the University of Queensland. She received her PhD in management from the University of Queensland and her research has been published in *Organization Studies*, *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, and *Management Learning*. Her research focusses on organizational space, professional work, and collaboration.

Martin Kornberger received his PhD in Philosophy from the University of Vienna in 2002. Prior to joining the University of Edinburgh as Chair in Strategy, he worked at the University of Technology Sydney as an Associate Professor in design and management, and as Research Director of the Australian Creative Industry Innovation Centre; at Copenhagen Business School as a Professor for strategy and organization; and at EM Lyon, France. Since 2011, he is also a Research Fellow at WU Vienna University of Economics and Business. With a background in the Humanities and an eclectic bookshelf behind him, his research focuses on strategies for and organization of new forms of distributed collective action. Departing from the two main forms of coordinating collective action (the visible hand of the manager (hierarchy) and the invisible hand of the market), the central question that he wants to answer is how new forms of collective action combine both goal directedness and the ability to scale.

Jochem Kroezen is a University Lecturer in international business at Cambridge Judge Business School. His research focuses on processes of institutional change, with a current focus on the resurgence of craft production. He received his PhD from Erasmus University.

Renate E. Meyer is Chair in Organisation Studies at WU Vienna University of Economics and Business and a part-time Professor of Institutional Theory at Copenhagen Business School. She is also a Visiting Fellow at UNSW Sydney, and Visiting Professorial Fellow in the Alberta School of Business. She focusses on meaning structures and has recently studied structural forms of institutional pluralism, institutions as multimodal accomplishments, novel forms of organization, collaborative governance, and collective action mostly in urban contexts. She is the current Editor-in-Chief of *Organization Studies* and Division Chair-Elect of the OMT Division of the Academy of Management.

Evelyn Micelotta is an Associate Professor of Management at Telfer School of Management at the University of Ottawa, Canada. She conducts research on institutional processes of maintenance and change and cultural dynamics in various settings, including entrepreneurial firms, family businesses, and professional service firms.

Stuart Middleton is a Senior Lecturer in Strategy at the University of Queensland. He received his PhD from the University of Tasmania and his research has been published in the *British Journal of Management*, *Journal of Management Inquiry*, and *Organizational Research Methods*. His research focusses on management education, institutional theory, and hospital management.

Marc Schneiberg is an organizational and institutional sociologist interested in the rise, contemporary fates, and economic consequences of organizational diversity and alternatives to giant, shareholder value corporations in American capitalism. Schneiberg also writes about institutional theory and methods, and about institutions, their role in regulation and self-regulation, and their relationships with social movements.

W. Richard Scott is a Professor Emeritus of Sociology at Stanford with appointments in the Graduate School of Business, Graduate School of Education, School of Engineering, and School of Medicine. He is the Author of three influential texts, *Formal Organizations* (1962) with Peter M. Blau; *Organizations and Organizing: Rational, Natural and Open System Perspectives* (1981, 1987, 1992, 1998, 2003, 2007), the last edition with Jerry Davis; and *Institutions and Organizations* (1995, 2001, 2008, 2014).

Christopher W. J. Steele is an Assistant Professor of strategic management and organization at the University of Alberta. He received his PhD from the Kellogg School of Management, Northwestern University. His research focuses on the production and consumption of facts, the rise of data analytics, the dynamics of institutions, practices, and identities, and collective intentionality.

Patricia H. Thornton is Visiting Distinguished Professor, HEC, Paris and Grand Challenge Professor of Sociology and Entrepreneurship at Texas A&M University. Her research interests focus on how institutions and organizations affect attention and strategy. She is the author with William Ocasio and Michael Lounsbury of The Institutional Logics Perspective: A New Approach to Culture, Structure and Process which received the George R. Terry award from the Academy of Management. She is currently interested in institutional analysis of three domains, innovation and entrepreneurship, inclusiveness and diversity, and solutions to grand challenges. She received her Ph.D. at Stanford University.

Madeline Toubiana is an Assistant Professor of strategic management and organization at the Alberta School of Business at the University of Alberta. Her research focuses on the role emotions, complexity, and stigmatization play in processes of social change. To understand the dynamics of social change, she examines the intersection and interaction between individuals and institutional systems. She examines these questions in a variety of contexts including the non-profit sector, the Canadian prison system, the sex trade, social entrepreneurship, social media, and in other complex organizations. Her research has been published in the *Academy of Management Journal, Academy of Management Review, Organization Studies, Journal of Management History*, *Journal of Management Learning*, *Research in the Sociology of Organizations*, among others.

Paul Tracey is a Professor of innovation and organization and Co-director of the Centre for Social Innovation at Cambridge Judge Business School. He is also a Professor of entrepreneurship in the Department of Management and Marketing, University of Melbourne. He received his PhD from Stirling University.

Milo Shaoqing Wang is a doctoral candidate at the Alberta School of Business, University of Alberta. His research examines the construction of various social evaluations, and how it socially and culturally affects organizational strategy and entrepreneurial activity.

April L. Wright is an Associate Professor at the University of Queensland. She received her PhD from the University of Queensland. Her research has been published in the *Academy of Management Journal*, *Administrative Sciences Quarterly, Organizational Research Methods,* and *Journal of Business Venturing*. Her research focusses on professional work and processes of institutional change and maintenance.

Charlene Zietsma is Associate Professor, Smeal College of Business, Pennsylvania State University, United States. She studies emotions and institutions, institutional change, field theory and entrepreneurship. She received the 2016 ASQ Scholarly Contribution Award for the paper published in 2010 that had the most significant impact on the field of organization studies.

This page intentionally left blank

SECTION 1

INTRODUCTION

This page intentionally left blank

MACROFOUNDATIONS: EXPLORING THE INSTITUTIONALLY SITUATED NATURE OF ACTIVITY

Christopher W. J. Steele, Timothy R. Hannigan,
Vern L. Glaser, Madeline Toubiana and Joel Gehman

In recent years, institutionalists have devoted increasing attention to the so-called "microfoundations" of institutions: that is, to the everyday activities and dynamics through which institutions are constituted, exert their influence, and decline into obscurity (Haack, Sieweke, & Wessel, 2019; Powell & Colyvas, 2008; Powell & Rerup, 2017). While the value of such work is both substantial and self-evident, several authors have expressed concern that the imagery of "microfoundations" smuggles in an inappropriate ascription of causal primacy to "the micro," or even to atomistic individuals, and thus casts into shadow some critically important facets of institutions and institutional theory (Boxenbaum, 2019; Hwang & Colyvas, 2019; Jepperson & Meyer, 2011). Most notably, a focus on microfoundations risks obscuring the constitutive and contextualizing powers of institutions (Gehman, Lounsbury, & Greenwood, 2016; Lounsbury & Wang, 2020; Meyer, 2010; Wooten & Hoffman, 2017). Constitutively, institutional arrangements are inscribed into the symbolic frameworks, bodies, emotional registers, and sensory apparatuses through which people experience world and self (Bitektine, Haack, Bothello, & Mair, 2020; Meyer & Vaara, 2020; Toubiana, in press; Voronov & Weber, 2020); as well as being inscribed into the forms and workings of organizations and other social actors (Marquis & Tilcsik, 2013; Meyer, 2010; Tracey, Phillips, & Jarvis, 2011; Waeger & Weber, 2019). Institutional arrangements also play a complex and intricate contextualizing role: furnishing settings, materials, and infrastructures for local episodes of individual, interactional, and organizational cognition, emotion, and action (Creed, Hudson, Okhuysen, & Smith-Crowe, 2014; Hinings,

Logue, & Zietsma, 2017; Lawrence & Graham, 2015; Lounsbury & Glynn, 2019; Ocasio, Thornton, & Lounsbury, 2017; Sadeh & Zilber, 2019; Steele, in press). Both of these themes sit oddly with any explanatory privileging of "the micro" – indeed, at first glance, they would seem to support a precisely inverted prioritization of "the macro." With such thoughts in mind, the 2018 Alberta Institutions Conference invited participants to articulate the "macrofoundations of institutions"; using this impish terminology (Fine, 1991) in a purposefully provocative call.

For us, the concept of macrofoundations was ultimately intended to be heard in harmonic counterpoint with that of microfoundations: to highlight that "the micro" and "the macro" are always and everywhere entwined in a co-constitutive interplay, in which both have every bit as (patently in)valid a claim to being foundational (Fine, 1991; Meyer & Vaara, 2020; Steele, Toubiana, & Greenwood, 2019).[1] Contributions to the conference seemed to us to intuit, embrace, and embody this spirit. The interest and enthusiasm of the 106 registered participants motivated the present volume – and the 34 presentations provided plenty of material for inclusion! The 11 chapters of this volume, drawn from this rich vein of material, explore and expand upon the broad notion of macrofoundations empirically and theoretically; and we would like to express our gratitude to all the contributors for the work that they did in generating an eclectic yet coherent array of insights into the constitutive and contextualizing powers of institutions. Here, we will briefly introduce the 11 chapters, in their order of appearance. We do so under four headings, which we have used to structure the volume: "definitions and pontifications," "macrofounding the local," "localizing the macrofoundational," and "reflections and future directions."

DEFINITIONS AND PONTIFICATIONS

In the first chapter of the volume, Steele and Hannigan make an initial exploration of what a macrofoundational agenda might entail, and the opportunities it might offer (Steele & Hannigan, 2021). They first propose focusing attention on the ways in which institutions contextualize local activities, and the ways in which institutions shape the nature of people, objects, and physical spaces. They suggest that exploring these topics should cast light on how institutional arrangements elicit, shape, and – critically – preempt micro-dynamics, on how institutions shape lived experience (and the conditions in which such experiences arise), and on the tectonics of large-scale institutional change. Importantly, they also highlight another idea that should inform any emergent macrofoundational agenda: that macrofoundational forces are implicitly and explicitly negotiated, or refracted, in the course of local happenings. In this sense, they follow Gary Alan Fine in suggesting that there are no clear causal arrows running from the micro to the macro or vice versa, but, rather, an unfolding process of mutual constitution. As they put it (p. 21):

> Macrofoundations are not linkages to stable and given entities, which hover above local activities; rather, they are concrete concatenations of activities and states of affairs over multiple sites – specific flows of effects and reactions, which work to pin local activities into place.

Their explorations ultimately lead them to suggest abandoning the imagery of "foundations" entirely, in favor of an alternative "optometric" imagery, which views the micro and macro as lenses; that is, as microscopes and macroscopes. They argue that embracing this imagery would not only encourage further reflexivity regarding the lenses we use as institutionalists – each of which draws some phenomena into focus, at the cost of blurring or blocking out others – but also help to foreground the use of various micro and macro "lenses" by participants in everyday life, as a consequential empirical phenomenon. Thus, they explore the horizons opened up by the idea of macrofoundations, even as they set aside the term.

MACROFOUNDING THE LOCAL

The next section of the volume focuses on the role of institutions in contextualizing the ostensibly "micro"; which is to say, the ways in which institutional arrangements "macrofound" local life. The three chapters flesh out the contextualizing and constitutive powers of institutions, both empirically and theoretically. Thus, Middleton, Irving, and Wright (2021) explore empirically how institutional prescriptions shape and transform the social spaces in which everyday life unfolds – with important consequences for the patterning of local activities. Biygautane, Micelotta, Gabbioneta, and Cappellaro (2021) show empirically how inter-institutional orders can provide a critical context for evolving populations of organizations – shaping local motivations and feasibilities in ways that can preempt the adoption of organizational forms. And Crawford and Dacin (2021) theorize four distinct types of punishment that can characterize institutional arrangements – contextualizing everyday activities through the shadow of punishments present, or potentially-to-be. Beyond the immediate insights that these chapters provide into multiple extant conversations, they also provide a collective justification for further research into the contextualizing and constitutive force of institutions, and a generative set of directions for future work. Below, we introduce them in more detail, in sequence.

In the first chapter of the section, Middleton et al. (2021) explore how institutions exert their influence through the mundane spaces in which everyday life unfolds, through a qualitative study of the emergency department in an Australian hospital. They begin with the premise that everyday life is consequentially contextualized by mundane spaces, such as rooms, corridors, and buildings: as the material design of these spaces, and their prevailing patterns of use, shape the ease and consequences of various lines of action. The authors then argue that such spaces are in turn shaped by institutional arrangements. In their empirical work, they explore how a shift in the institutional context of Australian medical care – reflected in an increased prioritization of time-before-treatment – gave rise to, and took effect through, a change in the design and use of space. Previously, use of a waiting room kept walk-in "emergency" patients away from the treatment area, thus rendering them less visible and reinforcing professionally accepted patterns of prioritization (which gave priority to patients delivered by ambulance). Shifting institutional priorities led to abolition of the waiting room, with all patients being

queued instead in "an internal waiting corridor" by the treatment space. In these circumstances, walk-in patients – and delays in their treatment – were made very visible indeed; enmeshing physicians in a space of surveillance that challenged their old ways of working. The authors abstract from this to argue that spaces can serve institutional arrangements by *hiding* and *revealing*. They also show how spaces provide cues for identity and for institutional policing (*reminding* people of their responsibilities), and how they offer possibilities for the physical exclusion of disruptive actors (*containing* resistance). The first chapter of this section thus shows how institutions shape the mundane spaces that contextualize everyday life; providing the macrofoundations not only for local activities, but also for one of the most immediate and concrete contexts of such activity.

In the next chapter, Biygautane et al. (2021) begin with the observation that institutional theorizing has generally privileged western conceptions of institutional orders, neglecting the distinctive workings of institutional orders in non-western cultures. To illustrate this, they argue that the tribal system in Qatar anchors the inter-institutional system in that setting and has given rise to distinctive institutional orders of state, market, and family. The authors then show how these institutional orders in Qatar, as a macro-institutional context, have consequentially shaped the adoption and implementation of a Western organizational form – in the form of public–private partnerships (e.g., long-term contracts between government actors and private actors, based on a delegation of responsibilities for the construction, ownership, and management of an infrastructure project). For example, their study shows how the role of the ruling family in government mitigated the very need for public–private partnerships by fusing the public and private sectors, and by prioritizing the needs of certain interest groups in a manner that reduced the benefits that might accrue from public–private partnerships. Additionally, the authors point to the ways in which the tribally influenced role of the state, the lack of market norms of competition in Qatar, and the uncertainty foreign investors faced in their interactions with the ruling family, collectively led to public–private partnerships *creating* inefficiencies – the exact opposite of what might be expected in a western context (optimistically speaking). The chapter thus "reveal[s] the importance of considering the culturally-contingent nature of institutional orders in examinations of countries that are particularly distant from the Anglo-Saxon tradition"; both as an end in itself, and as a means of better understanding more localized or specific dynamics, in those contexts.

In the third chapter of the section, Crawford and Dacin (2021) draw our attention to the macrofoundational by exploring the distinct types and patterns of punishment that can uphold institutional arrangements. Building on the premise that "one way that institutions exercise their constitutive power is by punishing wrongdoers or those who violate the integrity of the institution (beliefs, norms, structures and practices)," they introduce four distinct types of punishment, which vary in their visibility and formalization. While the first type of punishment, retribution, is the formalized and visible type most often explored in the literature (i.e., sanctions, fines, and incarceration), the authors argue that the three other types – punishment-as-charivari, punishment-as-rehabilitation, and punishment-as-vigilantism – though less explored, are equally important. They draw our attention to

the shaming efforts which are part of punishment-as-charivari, to restoration and forgiveness as part of punishment-as-rehabilitation, and to intense violence as the core mechanism of punishment-as-vigilantism. In the process, they highlight the multimodal nature of punishment, and the role of emotions, the material and the symbolic in defining both punishment and response. Crawford and Dacin thus cast light on another way in which institutions macrofound local activities: by inspiring and intertwining with distinctive regimes of punishment, which contextualize everyday life. In addition, they also illuminate the recursive relationship between the micro and the macro. In both punishment-as-charivari and punishment-as-vigilantism, for example, people who are emotionally invested in institutions seek to publicly shame or to hurt others in order to uphold those institutions. Institutional arrangements and patterns of punishment thus contextualize local efforts to reinforce and defend institutions; with micro and macro unfolding in a co-constitutive interplay. In closing, the authors critique institutional researchers for ignoring some of the most harmful ways institutions can operate – through violence – and ask readers to take seriously the role of violence as they further explore the macrofoundational agenda.

LOCALIZING THE MACROFOUNDATIONAL

This discussion of the inseparability of micro and macro neatly sets the scene for the third section of the volume. Here, we emphasize a second element of the "macrofoundational agenda" as we see it: that macrofoundations are themselves locally negotiated in part, and are matters of implicit and explicit local concern as local happenings unfold. This opposition to the analytic partitioning of the macro and micro is a critically important idea behind the macrofoundational challenge first posed by Gary Alan Fine, and a key part of the spirit of the volume. The three chapters in this section explore empirically how local understandings of institutional arrangements and their impacts play into local activities – and how these local activities, through their concatenations and reverberations, constitute and reconstitute the macro-context over time. First, Brüggemann, Kroezen, and Tracey (2021) explore how the felt encroachment of dominant institutional logics can inspire efforts at resistance; efforts that may not only preserve marginalized logics, but also drive their refinement, elaboration, and evolution. In the second chapter, Hannigan and Casasnovas (2021) explore the interplay of micro and macro in emerging fields: how field-configuring events, captured by media reports, serve as provisional portraits of the field that contextualize further events; providing a kind of "bootstrapping" process of field emergence. In the final chapter of the section, Meyer, Kornberger, and Höllerer (2021) explore how local efforts to understand and change a complex configuration of institutional arrangements – in their case, the city of Sydney – helped to constitute a distinctive thought style, associated with a reformulated "public" of participants and audiences; essentially providing "the city" with a new infrastructure for ongoing self-reflection or thought. All three chapters give a sense of the recursive or

co-constitutive relationship between "the macro" and "the micro," as we unpack in more detail below.

Brüggemann et al. (2021) observe that existing research has not considered what happens to marginalized logics in fields with a dominant logic. By exploring the empirical case of the UK trade publishing industry, they cast light on the ways in which field actors' active resistance to dominant logics can not only preserve marginalized logics, but also fuel their elaboration and evolution; thus driving ongoing change in institutional arrangements. More specifically, they show how the evolution of a marginalized editorial logic in publishing occurred along three generative paths, as actors resisted the dominant market logic: *preservation*, in which conformity to the marginalized logic was used as a special marker of reputation and prestige by high-status publishing houses; *purification*, in which the editorial logic was articulated in contradistinction to the market logic, emphasizing and elaborating the merits of a more vocational approach to publishing; and *radicalization*, where the editorial logic of publishing became increasingly bound up with other interests and concerns that were marginalized by the market logic. Together these efforts to navigate a macrofoundational context have led to the refinement and evolution of the marginalized editorial logic; which continues to spread, and transform that context in turn. As a multimethod study combining interviews, participant observation, and archival data over several years, the chapter provides a rich historical account of activity in the periphery of a field: illuminating the active institutional work around "logics that are seemingly left behind in the wake of a shift toward a new dominant logic" (p. 124), and its consequential nature. This contributes to recent calls to better understand the dynamics of intra-logic evolution, and the historical contingencies of logics; uncovering distinct patterns of institutional change. This chapter thus explores how institutions contextualize local activities, while also casting light on how these contextualizations are localized – becoming the felt and understood context for local actions and acts of resistance – and how local actions shape logic and field evolution.

In the following chapter, Hannigan and Casasnovas (2021) take up this same theme of the recursivity between the micro and the macro. They explore how early moments of field emergence both structure and are structured by provisional understandings of the field as a macro-context. Through a multimethod empirical study combining topic modeling and qualitative field methods, they track early activity of the impact investing field in the UK. They use the metaphor of a camera obscura to show how traces of key moments are partially captured by the media, and turned into provisional pictures of the field that inform later moments. In a context full of ambiguity and complexity, these provisional pictures and their elements serve as macrofoundational cues, which affect how actors in this field come to understand and develop their relative positioning. Field-configuring events – as moments of intense interaction – play a particularly important role in shaping these provisional portraits of the field, and thus help reconfigure the ways in which actors are meaningfully arranged and interrelated. This study thus helps us begin to theorize the emergence of early institutional infrastructures (Zietsma et al., 2017). Importantly, for our purposes, the authors highlight recursivity between micro and macro: how key (micro) events or "moments," captured in