WEI Shuguang, LIU Xianjun

Institutionalized Mutuality in Canada-China Management Education Collaboration

Abstract This paper examines the Canada-China Management Education Program (CCMEP, 1983–1996) between the University of Toronto (UT) and Huazhong University of Science and Technology (HUST). In this paper, we create a “Three Levels/Four Parameters” analytical framework, based on the concept of mutuality from Johan Galtung (1980) and the concept of institutions from W. Richard Scott (2007). We use this framework to analyze management cooperation between UT and HUST. Qualitative data is collected through open-ended interviews with participants of the CCMEP and from a review of historical literature. Through this analysis, we find that mutuality in the CCMEP was gradually established. During this process, the national macro-level institutional framework, the interactive consultations between UT and HUST, and the increased understanding of HUST’s needs and culture constitute the three levels of institutionalized mutuality in the CCMEP. The UT project directors’ understanding about Chinese culture, values, and beliefs was the key to the success of the CCMEP. Among the four parameters of mutuality, autonomy is the core parameter.

Keywords mutuality, regulative institutions, normative institutions, cultural-cognitive institutions

Introduction

In 1982, an agreement was reached between the Canadian International

WEI Shuguang (✉)

School of Management, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, Wuhan 430074, China

E-mail: weishuguang@hust.edu.cn

LIU Xianjun

School of Education, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, Wuhan 430074, China

Development Agency (CIDA) and the Chinese government for the provision of financial aid towards management education in eight higher education institutions in China. This program was called the Canada-China Management Education Program (CCMEP). The Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC) and the Ministry of Education (MoE) of China arranged for the establishment of a direct cooperative relationship between Huazhong University of Science and Technology (HUST) and the University of Toronto (UT). The CCMEP was composed of two phases: Phase I, from early 1983 to late 1989; and Phase II, from early 1990 to late 1994. In total, the CCMEP lasted for 12 years. During these 12 years, a total of \$4,355,164 in Canadian dollars was provided to the UT/HUST linkage.

During the first phase of CCMEP, UT and HUST developed a good level of mutuality and friendship. After Phase I, CIDA initiated another two programs. These were called the Canada-China University Linkage Program (CCULP; from 1989–1995) and the Special University Linkage Consolidation Program (SULCP; from 1996–2001). The CCULP and SULCP had a profound impact on the development of Chinese higher education institutions and their surrounding communities in a wide range of knowledge areas, including education, health, agriculture, the environment, and engineering (AUCC, 2000). The CCULP was established as a result of the improved relationships between universities in both countries and the positive CCMEP experience; and the SULCP was created as a continuation of the CCULP (Wilson, 2001). The success of the CCULP and SULCP can be ascribed to their approach, which emphasized mutuality. This approach was distinctly different from the traditional development aid models adopted by most Western countries in their relationships with the developing world, following the era of decolonization (Leng & Pan, 2013). In this study, the focus is on the development of mutuality between UT and HUST. To understand this, the authors conduct an institutional analysis of the process of mutuality development in the CCMEP.

In this study, the authors create an analytical framework based on the concept of mutuality from Johan Galtung (1980) as reinterpreted by Ruth Hayhoe, and the concept of institutions from W. Richard Scott (2007). A “Three Levels/Four Parameters” analytical framework is proposed. Institutions contain three levels: regulative, normative, and cultural-cognitive systems. Mutuality is made up of four parameters: equity, autonomy, solidarity, and participation. This paper will

introduce the methodology, followed by an overview of the CCMEP and the development of mutuality during this program. Emerging themes from the historical literature and interviews are presented based on this analytical framework.

Theoretical Framework

Galtung's concept of mutuality is rooted in his World Order Models Project theory. He proposed four parameters—structurally oriented goals of international relations—which together make up the concept of mutuality. These parameters are *equity*, *autonomy*, *solidarity*, and *participation*. According to Galtung, the future world order should have the following characteristics: A more equal society, economic prosperity, and environmental sustainability. This was unlike the framework widely used at that time, which evaluated only efficiency, effectiveness, and the impact of pure techniques. The latter framework was lacking in several areas: It did not compare the assistance policies of different countries; it did not include China's perspective when evaluating to what extent these policies contributed to mutuality in the larger picture; and in particular, it did not consider how these policies reflected and implemented principles of autonomy, equality, solidarity, and participation. So Galtung's framework considers deeply rooted cultural and political values. Ruth Hayhoe used Galtung's framework to study international assistance for education in China in the 1980s (Hayhoe, 2007, p. 96). She suggested the use of this framework to evaluate the policies and practices of different countries and worldwide organizations that were providing assistance for education in China. Hayhoe summarized these four values:

Equity suggests aims and forms of organization that are reached through full mutual agreement. *Autonomy* suggests a respect for the theoretical perspectives rooted in peripheral culture that would require center participants to gain a thorough knowledge of this culture. *Solidarity* suggests forms of organization that encourage maximum interaction among peripheral participants and growing links between them and their fellow researchers. *Participation* intimates an approach to knowledge that does not stratify in a hierarchical way but assumes the possibility of a creative peripheral contribution from the very beginning. (Hayhoe, 1989, p. 134)

Phirom Leng and Julia Pan (2013) used Hayhoe's summarization of mutuality to research the issue of mutuality in CCULP and SULCP. They refined the framework of mutuality to focus on Canadian-Chinese cooperative programs in the following way.

Equity suggests that "aims and forms of international programs between Chinese and Canadian universities were mutually reached." *Autonomy* means that "both Chinese and Canadian participants were willing to learn about and show respect for each other's culture, values, system of knowledge and belief system." *Solidarity* suggests that "Chinese universities, faculty and researchers were connected with one another within and outside their own institutions, and gained institutional, local and national government support." *Participation* intimates that "during the programs, Chinese faculty, researchers and administrators participated fully in all activities and contributed to knowledge production on an equal basis" (Leng & Pan, 2013, p. 7).

In this study, mutuality is seen in terms of institutional arrangements, and studied as a process of institutional development. The authors use the concept of *institutions* defined by the new institutionalism in organizational analysis. Scott (2007) organizes the work on institutions around "three pillars" (p. 56). Regulative systems, normative systems, and cultural-cognitive systems are crucial to a thorough understanding of institutions. Scott sees these pillars as a continuum, moving from the conscious to unconscious; and from the legally enforced to the taken-for-granted collective meaning of systems and social practices. Thus, these three pillars can be seen as three levels of institutions. According to this definition, institutions have multiple faces. Institutions stand out as the most durable of social structures, consisting of symbolic elements, social activities, and material resources. This kind of social structure is able to maintain and reproduce itself through intergenerational transmission. As Anthony Giddens (1984) puts it, "by definition, institutions are relatively enduring in social life and give social systems solidity and stability" (p. 24).

We can consider mutuality within institutions as including the regulative, normative, and cultural-cognitive levels. Mutuality not only produces a constraining role by defining legal, normative, and cultural boundaries; it also plays a supportive and enabling role in cooperation activities, and promotes the progress of cooperation.

Based on the three levels of institutions and the four parameters of mutuality, a

“Three Levels/Four Parameters” analytical framework can be built, as shown in Table 1. Using this framework, we can analyze how the three levels of institutions support or enable the four parameters of mutuality. This shows us the processes, patterns, and outcomes of mutuality.

Table 1 The “Three Levels/Four Parameters” Analytical Framework

Three levels of institutions	Four Parameters of Mutuality			
	Equity	Autonomy	Solidarity	Participation
Regulative				
Normative				
Cultural-cognitive				

Methodology

This study follows a qualitative research method and emphasizes the importance of participants’ values, their experience, and the meanings they construct in the world. This method is appropriate for this study, the purpose of which is to examine the development of mutuality in the CCMEP.

The authors collected data from two main sources. The first source involved semi-structured interviews. We interviewed three deans who have retired from the HUST School of Management. One of these deans, Professor Xixian Cai, was the CCMEP director for both phases. The authors also interviewed two scholars, one of whom had earned his PhD at UT, and had been the vice dean at HUST. The other scholar had earned his MBA at UT, and had been one of the department chairs at HUST. In addition, two administrative assistants were interviewed. Thus the interviewees include project managers and coordination assistants, project participants who earned their degrees at UT and visiting scholars who conducted collaborative research with UT professors.

When interviewing the three deans, they were asked to recall how mutuality was built, and what the long-term effects of mutuality were on HUST management education. When interviewing the other two scholars, they were asked to recall their experience of studying abroad and summarize the long-term impact of the project on their personal development.

The second data source is historical literature. The authors were permitted to examine some of the CCMEP documents, including proposals, initial plans,

modified plans, summaries, documents from the MoE, and faxes sent by UT to HUST. After an analysis which involves the constant comparison of qualitative data, the whole process of the project was described, so as to analyze how far the CCMEP reflects the four parameters of mutuality—equity, autonomy, solidarity, and participation—in each level of the institutional arrangement.

An Overview of Mutuality Development in the CCMEP

Background of HUST and the CCMEP

After the Cultural Revolution, management education in China urgently needed to help China rebuild itself and to train more managers to serve the reform and opening up agenda. In May 1979, the MoE held a meeting about adjusting programs/majors, which was attended by the faculty of the engineering colleges and universities that were affiliated with the MoE. Six universities, including HUST, Tsinghua University, Tianjin University, Tongji University, Xi'an Jiaotong University, and Dalian Institute of Technology, planned to establish a major in management engineering (HUST, 2009, p. 11). It was clear that the MoE would like to provide more support to HUST to develop management education before the CIDA program. The MoE successfully persuaded the Ministry of Foreign Trade and Economic Cooperation (MOFTEC) to promote management education as a focus. The MOFTEC and CIDA started negotiations regarding a national agreement. In accordance with an agreement reached between CIDA and the Chinese government, financial aid was provided to eight institutions in China for the development of management education. HUST is one of the eight institutions that received support from CIDA.

Starting in December 1978, China implemented its reform and opening up policy and focused on economic development. Modern management education in China has been gradually established since that date. Management education was a crucial need in China at that time, with 300,000 enterprises operating within an increasingly market-oriented economy, but no capability for training managers. Academics in that field were generally engineers or Marxist economists, who had been trained under Soviet patterns of macroeconomic planning. These scholars had no relevant teaching material, and were unable to deal with the rapidly changing circumstances in China's economic environment. In short, management

knowledge at that time was a total blank (Hayhoe, Pan, & Zha, 2013).

HUST was one of the first universities in China to explore the establishment of management education after 1978. HUST was founded by the merging of the engineering departments of Wuhan University, Hunan University, Guangxi University, and the South China Institute of Technology in 1953 with the purpose of cultivating more talent for industry. In the beginning, majors at HUST included mechanical, electrical, and power engineering. After the Communist Party of China (CPC) meeting in December 1978, three HUST faculty members—Xixian Cai, Zhicheng Li, and Leili Zhang—jointly wrote to the CPC committee of HUST and proposed to establish a management education program. Jiushi Zhu, the President of HUST, agreed to their proposal. In September 1979, the Department of Economics of Engineering was founded. In September 1980, it was changed to the Department of Economic and Management Engineering. At this point, the first undergraduate major program in management, Materials Management Engineering, began its enrollment. In November 1981, the department was able to enroll students for its master's program. In 1982, the second major in management, Industrial Management Engineering, began its enrollment (HUST, 2009, pp. 1–2).

A Donor-Recipient Relationship: The Formation of Mutuality in the CCMEP

According to one summary report, in November 1982, a Chinese delegation on business management education was invited to visit Canada. A draft agreement on cooperative business management education between UT and HUST was signed by Xixian Cai, on behalf of the HUST Department of Economics and Management, and by the UT Vice President Professor Roger N. Wolff. In February 1983, negotiations began between the UT delegation, headed by Vice President Wolff, and the HUST delegation, headed by Vice President Shuren Wang. A formal agreement was reached and signed by Jiushi Zhu, the president of HUST, and James Han, the president of UT. By the end of 1983, UT had made specific arrangements for personnel exchange and for the use of funding, as stipulated in the agreement (HUST, 1985, June 20). Adjustments to this agreement were made during Professor Andrew J. Szonyi's visit to China in April 1984. In Phase I of the CCMEP, CIDA provided \$1,388,060 in Canadian dollars to the HUST/UT linkage.

Owing to the fact that HUST initiated its management program rather late, and that the preparatory work was rushed, once HUST began to implement its cooperation plan, the progress on the project during the first two years was rather slow. The initial CCMEP plan was not completed until 1987, by which time the people sent to Canada to study had exceeded the number set in the plan. As Table 2 shows, 30 people were sent to Canada and nine participants returned by 1988 (HUST, 1988, November 11).

Table 2 Teachers and Graduate Students of HUST Sent to UT (by November 1988)

Degree Sought and Capacity	Planned Number of People	Actual Number of People	Remarks
MBA	10	16	Six participants were transferred master's degree students, two were visiting scholars, two were pursuing PhDs, and five began PhD programs in 1988
PhD	8	10	
Visiting scholar	6	12	
Short-term visitor	6	4	The remaining funding was used to send two people to UT in CCMEP Phase II
Total number of visits	30	44	
Total number of people	24	30	Nine participants had returned to China

The plan was for eight UT faculty members to give lectures at HUST. By 1987, eight UT professors with different specializations had come to HUST, along with two English teachers. In the early half of 1988, another three UT professors came to teach four courses, all expenses being paid out of the Phase I project fund. The courses given by these 11 UT professors were greatly needed by HUST graduate students, since HUST lacked experience in these areas. As a result, these courses greatly improved the quality of graduate training at HUST. A total of 421 people attended these classes, or five classes of HUST graduate students. The teaching and examining methods modeled by the UT professors placed strict demands on the students, and inspired them. In addition, these professors and their courses were useful sources of reference to HUST in its reform of management programs, and in its development of new and similar courses (HUST, 1988, November 11).

UT also provided equipment to HUST, including: two IBM-PCXT personal computers, two photocopiers, two electric typewriters, one projector, one TV

video order, 514 books, and computer program software. The personal computers were used alongside other computers for teaching purposes, and the books and other reference materials were widely used by students and staff. The reference books, being up-to-date, were particularly helpful to HUST faculty for class preparation, as well as to graduate students in completing their theses (HUST, 1988, November 11).

Among the nine people who returned from UT, seven set up new courses within their programs, helping raise teaching quality at HUST. For instance, Rongqiu’s Chen course entitled “Enterprise Production Management System,” was very well received by students. In it, he combined advanced Western experience with actual conditions in China (HUST, 1988, November 11). As he puts it, “After returning to HUST, I edited the first monograph on Sequencing Theory in China, which won the ‘1999 CASA/SME University Lead Award.’ I then became a famous academic leader in the field of production and operations management” (Rongqiu Chen, personal communication, November 2013).

The Canadian enrollment management experience of running a management school provided HUST with considerable enlightenment. For example, UT emphasized the education of midcareer personnel in management education. It was very interesting to note how enrollment at HUST increased, matching China’s need for more, faster trained, and better scholars. The number of students increased from 406 in 1982, to 1,264 in 1987, as shown in Table 3. In addition, 148 people enrolled in HUST’s Correspondence University and Spare-Time University Sessions, double the number of five years previously. These increases were both a manifestation of the development of China’s management education, and a result of the influence of Canadian management education. The emphasis of UT professors who fostered students’ ability to study on their own, the case study method they introduced and the elicitation method of teaching all helped HUST further its teaching reforms (HUST, 1988, November 11).

Table 3 Enrollment in HUST Management Education before and after CCMEP

Year	1982	1987
Number of undergraduate students	270	604
Number of trainees in in-service personnel program	120	550
Number of graduate students	16	110
Total number	406	1,264

Much valuable experience was gained on both sides during the CCMEP, including strengthened coordination and interchange of information. The people in charge on both sides learned a great deal. UT attached great importance to the cooperation, and formed a special organization exclusively responsible for the work. This organization was named the HUST-UT Engineering and Management Center, with Szonyi as the director, assisted by a secretary. Xixian Cai, the vice department chair of Economics and Management at HUST, was placed in charge of the Chinese side, aided by Hongchang Sun. The two sides exchanged information via fax regarding the work and requirements of each side. In addition to Szonyi's visit to China in 1983, he also visited HUST in 1984 and 1985. During his visits, problems arising from the implementation of the agreement were discussed and adjusted. For instance, during his 1984 visit, Szonyi modified the original plan and signed a memo to bring the plan more in keeping with the actual demands of the Chinese side. During his 1985 visit, he made further minor adjustments to the plan, so that mutual understanding was achieved to the satisfaction of both parties (HUST, 1988, November 11).

Before the CCMEP, the Canadian professors involved did not know much about China. During their time in China, their understanding increased, due to their experiences teaching Chinese students, and through visits to industrial and other locations. For example, after his visit to the No. 2 Automobile Factory, Professor Szonyi expressed his appreciation of the large scale and advanced equipment of the factory, and said that he was willing to contribute more to promoting friendship between scholars of the two countries.

Although valuable achievements were gained, some problems did arise during Phase I of the cooperation. First, the time it took to train a PhD student in Canada was longer than anticipated; in addition, PhD candidates were required to first take a master's degree. As a result, for Phase I of the CCMEP, none of the PhD students returned from Canada. Second, there had been too little contact between professors of the two institutions, and as a result, too few opportunities for scholars to exchange views and learn from each other. Cooperative research was slowed by language barriers and the differences between the two countries' social and economic development. Third, in order to ensure that the students supported by CIDA returned to China, necessary and effective policies and measures had to be formulated by departments on both sides (Xixian Cai, personal communication, July 2013).

In all, although the first phase of the CCMEP achieved some success, and mutuality was initiated, UT and HUST were still in a donor-recipient relationship. The deeper cultural exchange implied by the term “mutuality” was not yet occurring in Phase I. As one retired dean recalled,

Although the program director Szonyi from UT visited HUST in May 1983, April 1984 and May 1985 to discuss partial adjustment, the main plan didn't give much thought to the needs of HUST... In fact, we ourselves didn't have many demands and we always felt we were the recipient and UT was the donor. (Xixian Cai, personal communication, July 2013)

Genuine Partnership: The Maturation of Mutuality in the CCMEP

In Phase II of the CCMEP, changes were made to the program, and two more institutions were added on each side. In January 1987, the State Education Commission of China decided that in order to promote the CCMEP and to expand the benefits to more institutions, Zhejiang University and South China University of Technology (SCUT) would join the program. On the Canadian side, Wilfred Laurier University and the University of Ottawa also joined.

The competence, commitment, and cooperation of the administrative personnel at both UT and HUST increased enormously in Phase II. By this time, HUST had a clear idea of what it wanted to accomplish; UT was in full agreement with these objectives; and a solid foundation had been laid for realizing them (Gordon, 1988).

Deciding on a final plan for Phase II of the CCMEP took some time and effort. In August 1986, HUST had an exchange with UT about the initial plan for Phase II, and received a positive response. In December 1986, HUST proposed “A Draft Plan of HUST/UT Management Education Linkage Program-Phase II (1987–1990).” In January 1987, Myron Gordon, who took over leadership on the UT side, visited China and discussed the details and plan of Phase II with HUST. Together, they worked out a cooperative plan including a draft of the principles to be followed. This plan was reported to the State Education Commission of China. In May 1987, UT and HUST program leaders further discussed the program content and detailed arrangements. In October 1987, UT provided a program proposal, in accordance with both CIDA provisions and the discussions

that had already taken place. HUST examined the proposal developed by UT, and proposed some amendments to the proposal, according to notes from the Xiamen meeting in December 1987.¹ In April 1988, UT made a draft of the revised plan (HUST, 1988, November).

In order to reach a mutual consensus, Professor Gordon invited the HUST program director to UT for further discussion. HUST vice president Weifang Zhong and program director Xixian Cai visited UT, Wilfred Laurier University, and the University of Ottawa between May and June of 1988. Before leaving China, the HUST program leaders had proposed a tentative Phase II cooperation plan, reported it to the State Education Commission of China, and received some feedback from the ministry. UT delivered the revised draft plan to HUST in April 1988. In response to this draft plan, HUST wanted to:

- reduce the number of people pursuing an MBA from 20 to 15, and said that the most appropriate number would be below 10;
- increase the number of visiting scholars from eight to 14;
- increase the number of short-term visiting scholars from 10 to 12;
- increase the equipment costs from \$100,000 in Canadian dollars to between \$250,000 and \$300,000 (15% of the total amount was calculated); and
- reduce the number of English teachers to four (HUST, 1988, November).

The program leaders on both sides were ready to discuss these five changes in a friendly manner. Professor Gordon was very respectful and understanding of HUST's viewpoint, and also put forward his own views. Much discussion was held regarding the MBA part of the plan. Professor Gordon said that in Phase II, the other two Canadian universities should account for a share of about 40%. While neither Wilfrid Laurier University nor the University of Ottawa had a doctoral program, recruiting more MBA students could result in more funding from the government. Gordon thought that the total number of MBA students should be no less than 15. In addition, he did not want to reduce the number of English teachers, believing that the learning outcomes of joint MBA classes would be greatly enhanced by good English language training. Gordon agreed with the other aspects of the HUST plan, however. He suggested that the remaining funding from Phase I could be spent on increasing the number of visiting scholars in Phase II. In addition, Gordon proposed that it was unnecessary to include these arrangements in the Phase II plan. He pointed out

¹ This meeting included the eight Chinese institutions involved in the CCMEP.

that avoiding major changes in the plan would help to prevent another review from CIDA, and would avoid any governmental disapproval or delay in 1988. Professor Gordon agreed to make further revisions later, on his next visit to China in the spring of 1989, after reporting to CIDA and obtaining funding (HUST, 1988, November).

The proposal process for Phase II, lasting from 1986 to 1988 showed that UT and HUST were mutually revising and modifying the cooperation plan through faxes and field visits. During this period, the two sides negotiated roughly six times. The annual CCMEP summaries from 1990 to 1993 showed that both sides made adjustments to the program in almost every year. Among these, the biggest adjustment was that both sides agreed against sending MBA and PhD students to Canada from 1992 onwards, based on the fact that most MBA and PhD students did not return on time (HUST, 1992, May 23). This adjustment fully reflects the manner in which UT respected HUST's needs, and shows that mutuality had been more fully reached.

Based on this mutual cooperation, Phase II of the CCMEP achieved very good outcomes, and HUST greatly maximized its benefits from the linkage program (HUST, 1993, May). Professor Gordon's great contribution and input was essential to the success of Phase II of the program. Beneficial outcomes from Phase II can be summarized as follows:

- UT and HUST jointly trained MBA students. According to the original agreement, two to three MBA classes would be jointly run, with an enrollment of 100 students. In fact, six MBA classes were run from 1987 to 1992, with an enrollment of 137 students. During this phase, UT sent 10 English teachers to HUST, along with 18 professors of various subjects. All these courses were highly evaluated by the students, who not only obtained knowledge of Western business management practices, but also benefited from the way these courses suited China's reform needs. The purpose of sending English teachers to HUST was twofold. Firstly, it helped raise the English levels of those prospective students and scholars to be sent to UT and Canadian partner institutions, but more importantly, it reduced the need for Chinese interpreters at HUST when non-Chinese speaking Canadian faculty taught at HUST. As well, it provided an opportunity for greater interaction between Canadian faculty and Chinese students.

- Phase II of the CCMEP improved junior faculty's professional capabilities.

During the visit of each Canadian professor at HUST, a junior faculty member was assigned to work as an assistant teacher. As a result, these junior faculty members gradually obtained an in-depth understanding of the courses being taught, and at the same time learned a great deal about the new teaching methodology being presented. While fulfilling their tasks, they not only improved their professional knowledge, but also built up greater capabilities for research. This training helped to build a solid foundation for HUST's development of new business management courses.

- The three Chinese universities in the program sent a total of 21 senior visiting scholars to Canada during this phase. These scholars were all professors and associate professors with rich teaching experience. Through their short-term visits, they learned a great deal about the teaching methodology used in Canadian management education, and collected valuable new materials and information. On their return, these scholars provided the Chinese universities with excellent examples of how to improve teaching quality and develop future MBA courses of their own.

- UT and HUST developed joint research projects between faculty members on both sides. In Phase II, six UT professors came to China, where they performed joint research with HUST professors on China's economic development and the development of township-owned enterprises. During the same phase, five HUST professors were sent to Canada, where they worked with UT professors to research the practical application of computers in business management, such as designing systematic models and decision information systems. Other joint research projects carried out during Phase II included: (1) A comparative study of living standard and consumption levels in China and Western countries by Professors Gordon, Zhiming Yan, and Haichun Chen; (2) the reliability and cost of equipment by Professors Jardine and Xinshi Tian; (3) China's strategy and policy of technical introduction by Professors Gordon and Xixian Cai (HUST, 1993, May).

- Professor Gordon contributed a great deal to joint research and publication. Before the CCMEP, Gordon's research interests included the use of accounting and finance in the decentralized control of large corporations, the cost of capital and valuation of corporations, and the comparison of market and regulation in control utility companies. During the CCMEP, Gordon became fascinated by China's economy, and his research interests expanded to include China's

economic development, growth, and security under welfare capitalism and market socialism. For example, Gordon's paper "China's Path to Market Socialism" with Qingrui Xu and Jin Chen was published in the Chinese *Journal of Industrial Engineering and Engineering Management* (Gordon, Xu, & Chen, 1992). Professor Gordon also conducted research on economic development in Chinese urban cities, such as Wuhan, where HUST was located. This research, done with Zhilong Tian and Xixian Cai, was published in *Management World* (Tian, Cai, & Gordon, 1995). Even after the CCMEP, Gordon kept in touch with Chinese scholars and continued to publish with them. For example, a paper he coauthored with Yue Li and Zhilong Tian titled "Towards a Workable Effective Corporate Governance System for China's State Owned Enterprises" was published in *China's Tax Reform Options* (Gordon, Li, & Tian, 1998a). His paper with Yue Li and Zhilong Tian titled "The Future of Market Socialism in China" was published in *Taxation in Modern China* (Gordon, 1998b), and his paper titled "Growth and Security under Welfare Corporate Capitalism and Market Socialism" was published in *Social Security Reform in China* (Gordon, 1999).

- Both UT and HUST assisted in training junior faculty members. The number of faculty members sent to Canada after 1988 had increased from 12 to 36, including 19 long-term scholars and 17 short-term scholars (HUST, 1993, May; HUST, 1995, April). The junior faculty members who returned to China after completing their courses in Canada helped to strengthen the faculty resources at HUST.² These junior faculty members had greatly improved their knowledge of business management and helped to develop the HUST faculty, which became outstanding in both teaching and research. They submitted 13 papers to the two symposia held by CIDA, and all 13 were published (HUST, 1993, May).

- UT and HUST jointly organized three workshops during Phase II. According to Professor Gordon's proposal, HUST organized the Equipment Management Workshop in November/December 1991. Workshop participants came from two dozen large factories and mines in Hubei province. In May 1994, the Financial Management Workshop was organized. About 30 participants from more than 20 universities in China attended this workshop. In May 1995, the Tax Management Workshop was organized, and was attended by faculty from some universities and managers from tax offices. These workshops were assessed highly both on

² Although most returned to HUST, nine long-term scholars sent to UT before 1990 did not return.

and off campuses (HUST, 1995).

- UT provided HUST with useful equipment and books. The equipment alone added up to about 200 thousand Canadian dollars in value, and included a 48-seat voice laboratory, a computer-aided teaching room, a Human Factors Engineering laboratory, and some advanced computers. In addition, UT donated nearly 400 textbooks, along with some reference books.

The purpose of Phase II of the management education linkage program was to help the Chinese universities train their teachers in mastering knowledge of modern management; to enhance their teaching and research capacity; and to promote mutuality and friendship between Chinese and Canadian universities through cooperation. Based on an assessment of the program results, the aims of the CCMEP were basically achieved. Through this linkage program, HUST gained useful teaching equipment, trained almost all their young faculty members, trained a large number of graduate students, gained advanced scientific management education experience, and enhanced the teaching and research capabilities of HUST School of Management.

Although Phase II of the CCMEP achieved excellent outputs, there were also shortcomings. The Chinese side did not have enough voice on funding decisions because funding was in CIDA's charge. For instance, the funds remaining from training MBA and PhD students could not be used to send visiting scholars to Canada. Some reasonable needs on the Chinese side involving teaching and training were not met. The Chinese side had no right to audit the use of funds.

The fact that HUST benefited more greatly in Phase II than in Phase I was predominantly due to Gordon's understanding of HUST, and to the more mature degree of mutuality of the two sides in Phase II (Xixian Cai, personal communication, July 2013). The following quotation describes a change that occurred during Phase II, presented from the Canadian perspective:

The Phase I and the original Phase II program placed primary emphasis for the transformation of management education at our linkage partners on the return to China of MBA and PhD students in Canada. It is now uncertain when and if the large number of able and well-trained young people who came to Canada will return. It is therefore necessary to shift the emphasis to the training of older people in Canada and to activities in China, the latter including the development of new training programs. (University of Toronto, 1991, April 12)

From the shift described in this quotation, we can infer that in Phase II, the Canadian side was aware of and understanding towards HUST's needs. In other words, the relationship between UT and HUST in Phase II was a genuine partnership rather than a donor-receipt relationship.

Institutional Analysis of the Development of Mutuality in CCMEP

The Macro-Framework of Mutuality Development

The regulative level of institutions emphasizes the regulative processes of law, rule, and activity monitoring. These regulative processes include the establishment of rules, supervision, rewards, and punishments in an attempt to influence future behavior. Although the concept of regulation inevitably reminds us of repression and constraint, many regulative rules have had beneficial effects on the actors involved. For example, regulative rules may permit actors to take action, to obtain special rights and benefits, and so on. Institutions have the social functions of constraining and enabling social behavior (Scott, 2007, pp. 60–61).

The agreements, regulations, and memorandums signed between Canada and China can be considered as a kind of regulative institution. These items can be viewed as a series of macro-frameworks at the national level. They provided a basis for cooperation, along with the objectives, content, and means required to carry such cooperation through. And it is within these macro-frameworks that the four parameters of mutuality—equity, autonomy, solidarity, and participation—were gradually established.

- Equity. According to a document authored by Michael Oliver and translated by Xi'an Jiaotong University, CIDA did not sign program implementation contracts with Canadian universities. Instead, the Canadian and Chinese universities signed the preliminary contracts directly with each other. CIDA only signed contracts about program funding with the Canadian universities (Oliver, 1982). This document states that the reason for this arrangement was to give universities more freedom to meet their own needs, and to make good use of funding; and that this arrangement allowed universities to avoid trivial aspects of supervision and management from CIDA. Therefore, institutions on both sides had greater freedom to decide on the size and specific contents of cooperation

and collaboration.

- **Autonomy.** CIDA's assistance in management education to eight key Chinese universities was intended to help the faculties of these universities master the scientific knowledge of modern management; to enhance their teaching and research capabilities; and to promote mutuality and friendship between Canada and China through cooperation (HUST, 1995, April). In general, the purpose of the project included two aspects. First were the measurable benefits or outcomes; and second were mutuality and friendship on the cultural level, shown in mutual respect and understanding about each other's cultural values.

- **Solidarity.** As described earlier, in January 1987, the State Education Commission of China released an order to expand the benefits of the program to include more institutions (State Education Commission, 1987, January), and both sides agreed to increase the number of institutions in the linkage. The resulting multi-institutional linkage was led by the two original institutions from Phase I. The newly added institutions participated in some of the activities being carried out by the two main institutions. The document released by the State Education Commission of China stated that the ministry was in charge of the overall design, coordination, and external negotiations of CCMEP. For instance, in order to ensure that students return from Canada, the State Education Commission of China released management rules about going abroad for study. These actions on the part of the State Education Commission of China demonstrated the support of the Chinese government towards the CCMEP.

- **Participation.** One memorandum signed in March 1987 mentioned that there were two levels of cooperation: the university level and the national level (MOFTEC of China & Department of Foreign Affairs of Canada, 1987, March). Cooperation at the university level included training MBA and PhD students in Canada, and exchanging visiting scholars to conduct collaborative research. Cooperation at the national level included management education collaborative visits, and holding national and international conferences. First, the State Education Commission of China was responsible for encouraging college deans from these eight institutions to visit Canadian management education schools. Second, national and international conferences on Chinese management issues and topics were held in China and Canada. These provisions allowed Chinese faculty members, researchers, and program managers to participate extensively in various activities, promoting knowledge creation in an equal manner.

One of the deans of the School of Management at HUST said that the CCMEP was successful because it paid more attention to program design at the highest level, including cooperation objectives, planning, and implementation (Jinlong Zhang, personal communication, December 2013). The agreements and memorandums between the two governments ensured these parts of the program design.

The Interactive and Collective Negotiation of Mutuality Development

In addition to regulative institutions, there are also descriptive, evaluative, and responsible institutions in social life. These kinds of institutions are called normative rules. Normative systems include values and norms. *Values* refer to valuable ideas that are preferred or needed by actors; various standards are used to compare and evaluate existing structure or behaviors. *Norms* stipulate how things should be done, and provide the means to pursue legal outcomes. A normative system determines the target (such as winning the game, gaining benefits, etc.) and points out proper ways to pursue the target (such as the rules of the game, the concept of fair trade, etc.). A normative system imposes a restriction on social behaviors and also offers a motivation to social action in the form of enabling effects. Therefore, normative systems not only give rights to actors but also impose responsibilities on them; not only offer privileges but also impose obligations; and not only provide license but also implement commands and manipulation (Scott, 2007, p. 64).

According to this description, consultation, negotiation, visits, intercollegiate exchanges, and similar activities can be seen as normative institutions. These activities reflect a kind of interactive, cooperative, and mutual system. They provide impetus for cooperation, so that agreements can be executed and the two sides can mutually interact during the execution of the agreements. It is precisely because of the mutual interaction between UT and HUST that the four aspects of mutuality—equity, autonomy, solidarity, and participation—were truly reflected.

- Equity. As one dean of the School of Management at HUST commented,

Because management education in HUST was just created, we lacked faculties and didn't know how to carry out management education. We were particularly excited to

hear that there was such a great program, hoping to learn how to develop management education from UT. HUST president Mr. Jiusi Zhu paid great attention to this program. He wanted to learn from UT how to develop management education and how to make HUST into a comprehensive university. (Xixian Cai, personal communication, September 2013)

In this context, a formal agreement was reached in February 1983, and signed by President Jiusi Zhu of HUST, and President James Han of UT. The dean recalled,

.... Project director Gordon in Phase II gave more consideration to views and needs of HUST and tried to make the project meet the requirements of HUST. In fact, we ourselves hadn't made many demands and we had always felt we were the recipient and UT was the donor. But in Phase II Professor Gordon tried his best to meet the needs of China and the Chinese side was also clearer about its needs. So the relationship between HUST and UT changed from donor-recipient to genuine partnership. (Xixian Cai, personal communication, September 2013)

- **Autonomy.** The summary report for Phase I of the CCMEP mentioned that the Canadian side had little knowledge about China in the beginning. Lecturing and visiting helped them to learn more about China. As described earlier, Professor Szonyi was very impressed with the No. 2 Automobile Factory, for example. In Phase II, Professor Gordon thought of many ways to strengthen student management, and focused on academic exchanges between the two countries. Gordon fully understood HUST's considerations and took every measure to meet its needs. When HUST proposed to reduce the number of MBA and PhD students and increase that of visiting scholars, Gordon suggested that the remaining Phase I funding could be used for this purpose. When most of the MBA and PhD students sent to Canada in the first two years of Phase II did not return to China, Gordon agreed to stop sending graduate students to Canada and instead increase the number of visiting scholars. As a result, the CCMEP shifted emphasis to the training of older people in Canada, and to other activities in China, such as the development of new training programs (University of Toronto, 1991, April 12). These examples fully reflect how the Canadian side was gaining understanding about Chinese culture, values, beliefs, and needs.

- **Solidarity.** In Phase II, SCUT and Zhejiang University also benefited from the linkage project. SCUT sent two graduate students and two visiting scholars to Canada, and Zhejiang University sent four visiting scholars and one doctoral student for joint training (HUST, 1993, May). The CCMEP received strong support from the State Education Commission of China. One report commented:

We think other administrative fees in Phase II are too high. But Professor Gordon said that it was set in accordance with CIDA provisions and it shouldn't be modified. So we request that the State Education Commission of China could negotiate with CIDA on this matter. (HUST, 1988, November)

Thus, the CCMEP was supported by the government. Similarly, the CCMEP was supported at the university level. At HUST, the CCMEP was under the direct leadership of the vice president for external affairs. The external affairs office and the School of Management were responsible for the implementation and management of CIDA projects. The vice president, the director of the external affairs office, and the project director all attended meetings in which the project plan was discussed and modified. The external affairs office was responsible for the reception affairs and management of people sent to Canada. The School of Management was in charge of selecting people to go abroad, recommending and reviewing who should be invited to HUST, and proposing HUST's requirements regarding new courses (HUST, 1995, April). According to the 1990 Annual Summary, "The progress of CIDA project in 1990 was satisfactory. The School of Management benefited from CCMEP in teaching, research and faculty development. These benefits were achieved with the support of campus leaders and the external affairs office" (HUST, 1991, January).

- **Participation.** Faculty members, project managers, and researchers in China participated in various activities to promote the equal creation of knowledge. In September 1990, HUST sent a team on a short-term visit. The team included one senior campus leader, one external affairs office staff member, and the dean of the School of Management. These leaders learned about the experience of management education in Canada, conducted academic exchanges, and met the campus leaders in Canadian universities (HUST, 1991, January). The Communist Party of China HUST committee chair, two vice presidents, and the director of

the external affairs office visited UT five times. Phase II also emphasized the participation of women. A female student was included among the five jointly trained doctoral students, and the number of women in the visiting team accounted for 21.4%. Four female (senior) visiting scholars were sent from SCUT and Zhejiang University. These examples show a wide range of participation in various activities to create knowledge.

The Micro-Foundations of Mutuality Development

The cultural-cognitive institutional level is the cognitive dimension of human existence. Cognition is the intermediary between external stimulation and an individual's reaction. It is a series of symbolic representations about the external world that are internalized in each individual. Symbols—words, signals, and gestures—shape our sense of the meaning of an object or activity. *Meaning* is included in interactions, and could be used to understand continual interaction. It is meaning that maintains and transforms interactions. Analysts attempting to understand or explain any action should not only consider the objective conditions of the action but also consider the actor's understanding of it. The cultural-cognitive level of institutions emphasizes the commonsense framework, belief system, or cultural framework (Scott, 2007, pp. 65–67).

The attitudes, understanding, values, and beliefs in the minds of the project directors can be considered as the cultural-cognitive level of institution. Existing management education in Canada provided a micro-framework or foundation for the CCMEP, and the project directors promoted cooperation based on their cultural framework. This level of analysis reveals a rich and deep meaning that would not be present in an analysis of efficiency or technical level. This micro-foundation fully reflects the aims and objectives of the CCMEP and reflects the deeper cultural meaning of the cooperation.

- **Equity.** Professor Szonyi implemented the project plan with less consideration for HUST's needs, while Professor Gordon tried his best to meet HUST's needs. Professor Gordon took practical measures to contribute to the achievements of the CCMEP. He cut funding for students who chose not to return to HUST, and so much appreciated those returning to HUST on time that he even bought tickets for them (Xixian Cai, personal communication, September 2013).

One interviewee mentioned that Professor Gordon was very excited to hear his decision to go home (Jianqiao Liao, personal communication, November 2013).

- **Autonomy.** HUST appreciated Gordon very much for his devotion to the CCMEP. In February 1993, HUST wrote a letter to the International Cooperation Department of the State Education Commission of China about inviting Gordon to become a professor emeritus of HUST. The letter contained a description of Gordon's exceptional support for the program.

Professor Gordon appraised the existing policies and guidelines of China. He considered Chinese students as his family members and offered some mentoring to them. He is very responsible for his work and often travels between Canada and China, getting to know the implementation of CCMEP and discussing problems and issues in the implementation. He often talks with students and scholars having returned to HUST and encourages them to work hard. Professor Gordon determined to cultivate more managers for China. He always encourages students to return home on time; buys return ticket for them sometimes; and drives them to airport. He always tried his best to meet our requests and allocated special funds to support collaborative research between UT and HUST in computer model, system simulation and expert systems of the rationalization of production organization. (HUST, 1993, February 10)

The 1992 Annual Summary contained a similar mention of Professor Gordon:

During Professor Gordon's visit to China in 1992, in addition to the discussion of CCMEP implementation, he also met young faculty returning home. He talked with them one by one about their working conditions and heard their views on CCMEP. (HUST, 1993, January)

In a fax sent by Professor Gordon to Professor Xixian Cai, the CCMEP director at HUST in 1991, we can see Professor Gordon's respect towards HUST and China:

Thank you for your long and informative letter of July 27th which I have just received. I fully understand and support your views on not employing Chinese students as part of the Canadian faculty we send over to China. I would also very much like to see them

return to render service to HUST and I sympathize with your colleagues and your views in this regard. In fact if I were in your position I would make the same decision as you made.³

- **Solidarity.** The annual summaries contain descriptions that show how UT supported HUST in encouraging Chinese students to return home when their studies were complete. “When Christmas and New Year’s Day approached, all the department managers of the School of Management jointly sent greeting cards to students in Canada and eagerly expected them to return home early” (HUST, 1991, January).

In September 1990 when the delegation of HUST visited UT, the vice president, external affairs officer and dean of School of Management specially met all students and scholars studying in Canada, introducing the domestic situation to them, exchanging ideas with them. This greatly increased their understanding about the domestic situation. (HUST, 1991, January)

- **Participation.** Project director Xixian Cai of HUST visited UT in 1983, 1986, 1988, and 1992 successively. Cai also conducted collaborative research with Professor Gordon as described earlier. Faculty members returning from Canada contributed greatly to management education at HUST. For example, Dr. Jianqiao Liao was quickly promoted to associate professor after his return in 1991. He built an ergonomics laboratory for HUST, opened a new course on ergonomics, applied for project funding from the National Natural Science Foundation of China and National Defense Fund, and published more than 10 papers. When we interviewed him, he said, “all of my achievements... benefited from CCMEP” (Jianqiao Liao, personal communication, November 2013). Zhilong Tian earned an MBA in Canada in 1990, and then returned. He also applied for a project from the National Natural Science Foundation; in addition, he published a textbook titled “Market Research,” opened several new MBA courses, published more than 10 papers, and was promoted to associate professor in 1994 (HUST, 1995, April). These examples clearly show participation at the cultural-cognitive level.

³ M. Gordon (1991, August 14). *Letter to Xixian Cai*. Copy in possession of Shuguang Wei.

Conclusion

The CCMEP was China's largest, best managed, and most productive international cooperation project in the field of management education. This project played a crucial role in the development of management education at HUST. Through the CIDA project, HUST gained equipment, training for young faculty members and graduate students, an increased knowledge of management education, and enhanced teaching and research capabilities. Thus, this project had a very significant effect on HUST management education. Project directors Szonyi and Gordon, UT faculty members, and other Canadian leaders were very friendly and collaborative with HUST.

Through this analysis of the CCMEP, it appears that mutuality in the CCMEP was gradually established. During this process, the national macro-level institutional framework, the interactive consultations between UT and HUST, and the Canadians' increased understanding of HUST's needs and culture constitute the three levels of institutionalized mutuality in the CCMEP. The UT project directors, and particularly Professor Gordon, gained understanding of Chinese culture, values, and beliefs; this understanding was the key to the success of the CCMEP. Through this project, not only did HUST management education develop rapidly but a profound friendship between UT and HUST was established.

This study showed that the modified definition of mutuality by Ruth Hayhoe, borrowed from Galtung, can be used to analyze the relationship between universities in an international academic cooperation, and is particularly suitable for the analysis of international academic assistance projects. Among the four parameters, the second parameter, autonomy, is the core parameter of mutuality. The innovative aspect of this study has been the development of a "Three Levels/Four Parameters Analytical Framework," and its use in analyzing management cooperation between UT and HUST.

References

- Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada. (AUCC). (2000). *Canada-China university partnerships: Answering community needs*. Ottawa, Canada: The Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada.
- Galtung, J. (1980). *The true worlds: A transnational perspective (Preferred worlds for the*

- 1990's). New York, NY: Free Press.
- Giddens, A. (1984). *The constitution of society: Outline of the theory of structuration*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Gordon, M. (1988). *University of Toronto-Huazhong University of Science and Technology Management Education Linkage Project-Phase II/Revised Linkage Proposal for Phase II*.
- Gordon, M. (1999). 福利资本主义和市场社会主义下的经济增长与社会保障 [Growth and security under welfare corporate capitalism and market socialism]. In D. Xu, J. Yin, & Y. Zheng (Eds.), *中国社会保障体制改革: '98 中国社会保障国际研讨会论文集* [Social security reform in China: International Symposium on China's Social Security (selected papers)] (pp. 425–441). 北京, 中国: 经济科学出版社 [Beijing, China: Economic Science Press].
- Gordon, M., Li, Y., & Tian, Z. L. (1998a). A workable and effective corporate governance system for China's state owned enterprises. In T. Fulton, J. Li, & D. Xu (Eds.), *China's tax reform options* (pp. 255–292). Singapore: World Scientific Publishing.
- Gordon, M., Li, Y., & Tian, Z. L. (1998b). The future of market socialism in China. In D. J. S. Brean (Ed.), *Taxation in modern China* (pp. 245–284). New York, NY: Routledge Press
- Gordon, M., Xu, Q. R., & Chen, J. (1992). 中国通往利用市场机制的社会主义道路 [China's path to market socialism]. *管理工程学报* [Journal of Industrial Engineering and Engineering Management], 6(3), 1–5.
- Hayhoe, R. (1989). *China's universities and the open door*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Hayhoe, R. (2007). *Full circle: A life with Hong Kong and China*. Beijing, China: Educational Science Publishing House.
- Hayhoe, R., Pan, J., & Zha, Q. (2013). Lessons from the legacy of Canada-China university linkages. *Frontiers of Education in China*, 8(1), 78–102. doi: 10.3868/s110-002-013-0007-7
- Huazhong University of Science and Technology. (HUST). (1985, June 20). 中国华中工学院与加拿大多伦多大学经济管理教育合作情况小结 [Summary of cooperation in Business Management Education between HUST of China and University of Toronto of Canada]. 武汉, 中国: 华中科技大学 [Wuhan, China: Huazhong University of Science and Technology (HUST)].
- Huazhong University of Science and Technology. (HUST). (1988, November). 关于我校同多伦多大学第二周期管理项目合作计划的函 [Letter on Huazhong University of Science and Technology-The University of Toronto Management Education Linkage Proposal for Phase II]. 武汉, 中国: 华中科技大学 [Wuhan, China: Huazhong University of Science and Technology (HUST)].
- Huazhong University of Science and Technology. (HUST). (1988, November 11). 华中理工大学与加拿大多伦多大学管理教育合作项目第一周期小结 [Summary of CCMEP I between HUST of China and University of Toronto of Canada]. 武汉, 中国: 华中科技大学 [Wuhan, China: Huazhong University of Science and Technology (HUST)].
- Huazhong University of Science and Technology. (HUST). (1991, January). 1990 年 CIDA 项目进展情况小结 [1990 annual summary of CIDA Program]. 武汉, 中国: 华中科技大学 [Wuhan, China: Huazhong University of Science and Technology (HUST)].

- Huazhong University of Science and Technology. (HUST). (1992, May 23). 华中理工大学经济管理学院-多伦多大学东亚管理中心会谈纪要 [*Discussion minutes on meeting attended by HUST School of Economic Management and UT Center for Asian Management*]. 武汉, 中国: 华中科技大学 [Wuhan, China: Huazhong University of Science and Technology (HUST)].
- Huazhong University of Science and Technology. (HUST). (1993, January). CIDA 项目 1992 年工作总结及 1993 年计划安排 [*Annual summary for 1992 and annual plan for 1993 of CIDA Program*]. 武汉, 中国: 华中科技大学 [Wuhan, China: Huazhong University of Science and Technology (HUST)].
- Huazhong University of Science and Technology. (HUST). (1993, February 10). 华中理工大学. 关于邀请加拿大 Myron J. Gordon 教授为我校名誉教授的请示 [*Invitation letter to the State Education Commission of China Regarding inviting M. J. Gordon to be an Emeritus Professor of HUST*]. 武汉, 中国: 华中科技大学 [Wuhan, China: Huazhong University of Science and Technology (HUST)].
- Huazhong University of Science and Technology. (HUST). (1993, May). 华中理工大学和加拿大多伦多大学管理教育合作项目第二周期计划执行情况汇报 [*Report on the performance of Phase II HUST/UT CCMEP Linkage Program*]. 武汉, 中国: 华中科技大学 [Wuhan, China: Huazhong University of Science and Technology (HUST)].
- Huazhong University of Science and Technology. (HUST). (1995). 中国-加拿大管理教育项目有关情况汇总 [*A summary of some related information about CCMEP*]. 武汉, 中国: 华中科技大学 [Wuhan, China: Huazhong University of Science and Technology (HUST)].
- Huazhong University of Science and Technology. (HUST). (1995, April). 华中理工大学与加拿大多伦多大学中加管理教育合作项目第二周期终期总结 [*Final summary of Huazhong University of Science and Technology-the University of Toronto Management Education Linkage Project-Phase II*]. 武汉, 中国: 华中科技大学 [Wuhan, China: Huazhong University of Science and Technology (HUST)].
- Huazhong University of Science and Technology. (HUST). (2009). 华中科技大学管理学院 30 年 [*The first 30 years of the School of Management at HUST*]. 武汉, 中国: 华中科技大学 [Wuhan, China: Huazhong University of Science and Technology (HUST)].
- Leng, P., & Pan, J. (2013). The issue of mutuality in Canada-China educational collaboration. *Comparative and International Education/Éducation comparée et internationale*, 42(2), art. 6.
- MOFTEC of China, & Department of Foreign Affairs of Canada. (1987, March). 中华人民共和国政府和加拿大政府的谅解备忘录 [*Memorandum between the Chinese and Canadian Governments*].
- Oliver, M. (1982). 中国-加拿大管理教育协作规划校际联系协议指导原则 [*Guiding principles on CCMEP Intercollegiate Linkage*]. 西安, 中国: 西安交通大学 [Xi'an, China: Xi'an Jiaotong University].
- Scott, W. R. (2007). 制度与组织: 思想观念与物质利益 (第 3 版) [*Institutions and organizations: Ideas and interests*] (W. Yao & L. F. Wang, trans., 3rd ed.). 北京, 中国: 中国人民大学出版社 [Beijing, China: China Renmin University Press].

- State Education Commission. (1987, January). 关于增加中加管理教育合作项目学校的通知 [*Notice about the increase of CCMEP Linkage Institutions*].
- Tian, Z. L., Cai, X. X., & Gordon, M. (1995). 中国企业的战略决策如何影响企业的经济效益: 对武汉市 200 多家制造企业的统计分析 [How strategic decisions of Chinese enterprises affect their economic efficiency: A statistical analysis to more than 200 manufacturing enterprises in Wuhan]. *管理世界* [*Management World*], (3), 148–152.
- University of Toronto. (1991, April 12). *Revised activities and budget proposal for Phase II/HUST/UT Linkage*. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto.
- Wilson, J. (2001). *A history of CIDA's China program. Draft. Prepared for the China Program, Asia Branch, Canadian International Development Agency*. Retrieved January 31, 2015, from http://www.oise.utoronto.ca/cidec/UserFiles/File/Research/CIDEC_Projects/Conference2014/Wilson_s_paper_2001.pdf