

Welcome to another editorial from the *Journal of Management History*. I find writing editorials to be challenging in some ways in that I must describe in a few short paragraphs the findings of academic articles, which can be highly nuanced and perhaps not readily reducible to a single paragraph. However, I also find writing editorials to be of interest – as it forces me to see patterns in the various articles that the journal produces. This is not an easy task as we published a wide variety of articles, on a wide variety of perspectives, and from authors that have very different ideas of what constitutes good history and management. Indeed, there is little agreement on whether management is a good thing – with some arguing that it is an exploitive process, and others (such as myself), that management is largely the reason for the innovation and bounty we have enjoyed over the last hundred years. Like all complicated arguments there are merits on both sides and often what we are arguing about is a world view and how the world should be. Indeed, these perspectives have created a series of debates within the field – which I have been a participant in, at times, to my sorrow.

Rather than focus on differences, it is sometimes more important to focus on similarities and agreements. Perhaps the most important area of agreement that management historians of all ilk agree upon is the importance of understanding how the past informs the present and future. I find this perspective becoming more and more important as time passes, due to the impasses that we as management scholars find ourselves in what is now the third decade of the 21st century. It seems that every year there is some business controversy, ethical lapse or some other form of malfeasance that we find our business leaders doing. The academic world is undergoing a series of crises as well. As I write this editorial, Columbia University, one of the premier institutions of higher education, is undergoing a crisis like the one that occurred 56 years ago when the campus was shut down. At our commencement address held on Friday May 10th, our speaker from the Kansas Board of Regents pointed that support for higher education in the USA is collapsing. A point that I could not disagree very much with.

Likewise, in terms of management research, every so often, we witness various issues – such as whether our research has impact and why do we study/research the corpus of knowledge we do. In answering these questions, the use of history can provide excellent and satisfactory answers. It is in this spirit that I introduce our first article, by Klaus Brockhoff, that traces how revolutionary business techniques emerge. In this case, Brockhoff analyzes how exchange-traded funds, a bundle of securities, seeks to mirror (or purports to outperform) the stock market index. The development of such securities is a recent development that has emerged over the last fifty years due to changes in technology, the development of theories (the efficient markets hypothesis and diversification) and the popularity of indexes. The major thesis is that only if a need, theory-based knowledge (often cast into software) and a technology to apply the software (like computer technology) are jointly available a revolutionary business technique can emerge. This is a thesis that others have employed, nevertheless, this provides an excellent example for scholars to track.

My thoughts on this article are that a basic instrument such as an excel spreadsheet allows for the ability to calculate very complicated mathematical equations with ease. This is something that we often forget and do not realize is that massive transformation in computing has created and changed the way we teach and practice business-especially within finance and economics, has been transformed. Whether or not this is a good thing is something for debate as some have blamed 2008 on firms taking excessive risks because their mathematical equations told them that it was a good bet. Likewise, another aspect of



this argument that warrants development is the idea that necessity is a major driver of many of these innovations. For example, the end of traditional pensions and the coming crisis of government entitlements means that most likely people will need investments to support themselves in retirement.

Our next article by Sigmund Wagner-Tsukamoto, which analyses the role of Quakerism in the practice and the conceptualization of scientific management as well as the thought process of Frederick Winslow Taylor. Taylor has long been a fascination for management historians and, as such, there is a feeling that there is little that could be still said on the subject. In fact, Dr Wagner-Tsukamoto has written two highly regarded articles on Taylor/institutional economics and Taylorism/opportunism. In the later, he wrote a highly cited and downloaded article on how Taylor had a blind spot toward managerial opportunism, in that managers may use Taylorism to gain benefits. In this article, based on archival data, he puts forward that the presence of Quakerism at Midvale Steel lowered opportunism. When Taylorism was placed in different contexts, the results were much worse, due to the lack of religious motivation.

I found this article to be a highly significant and important one for several reasons. First, the concept of the role of religion has been downplayed in the development of management thought. This is not surprising as management emerged during a period for which the world was becoming more secular. As such, I do not believe (with some exceptions such as Rowntree works) that religion has received its due in either management practice, research or thought. I have long noted that movements such as human relations did not focus on outside relationships (such as religious ones) to the detriment of exploring management. Second, this paper presents an unusual and challenging case in which Taylorism (considered to be the exemplar on rationality) seemed to work best under conditions where Quakerism was a guiding light to encourage good behavior. Third, it provides evidence regarding why Taylorism was such a complex and difficult system, with tremendous amounts good and bad that has been caused by Taylorism as well as the divergent reactions to it. This is an important article.

Our next article by Massimo Sargiacomo, Luana Gliosca and Martin Quinn on Barilla, a common pasta used by millions of people and a staple in dining rooms around the world. I enjoy case studies that use companies that are generally well known. I feel one of the advantages of these types of cases is that they make the principles of the case more understandable and reachable for students. In addition, I have been very fascinated with family-owned businesses and especially how they change from being a family-owned business to one that is publicly owned. I especially find this interesting because the principal agent problems for family-owned businesses are often very different than those of public companies.

This paper uses the three-circle model to analyze family dynamics, ownership and business operations from a period of 1877 until 1977, which demonstrates the key interplay between these three factors and how they differentially influence governance and strategic decisions of the company. First, family dynamics plays a role in shaping decision-making processes; second, ownership structures affect control and financial strategies; and business operations, business operations and implementation of strategy. The paper provides evidence that the three-circle model is dynamic and complex than the originators of the three-circle model intended. This paper provides an example of how history and theory can complement each other.

Our next two papers come from the Halifax school of management history – one of the most productive and important schools in management history. One of the key founders of the field, Albert G. Mills, has won a well-deserved Greenwood for his contributions to management history; his wife, Jean, will be a future winner as well. Although the Halifax school (and Millses in particular) has numerous contributions, the one I think I like the most was how they have used political events such as the New Deal to further examine how

---

political movements shape management theory. This is a point that scholars have been quite familiar with as management scholars such as Luther Gulick played key role in shaping management thought. However, what Mills and his group of students have done is to make this point better known.

Our first paper from this group by Kantola et al., analyzes how the Medicare Act of 1965, which occurred during the Johnson Administration's Great Society, which attempted to radically transform the role of the American government in monitoring the economy. In particular, the Medicare Act was designed to cover older Americans, who may not have medical insurance. The role of the government and medical insurance is a highly complex one in the USA as it appears that average Americans want government to make insurance cheaper, but, at the same time, do not want government involvement. The paper correctly notes that Americans tend to be very anti-statist and accordingly, any time it is suggested that the government get involved, Americans cry socialism. However, it is also true that Americans also desire fair-play and support government policies. Although our welfare state is very different than Europeans, we do have a welfare state.

As such, the authors point out the complicated path toward passing or blocking the Medicare Act of 1965. First, the authors point out (similar to the one made by James T. Patterson) that conservatives had largely lost power in Congress. However, the authors go beyond this point in that they analyze the role of rhetoric in shaping political discourse. Second, they demonstrate that both supporters (unions) and opponents (insurance companies) deployed the same classical liberal values in terms of either supporting or opposing Medicare. Third, the overall success of the rhetorical strategy depended upon the context of the situation – namely, the key role of American's strong commitment to individualism, for good or ill.

The second paper comes from Nick Deal (and coauthors – including the Millses) about Harry Hopkins and the New Deal. The New Deal is one of the most complicated, debated and misunderstood political movements within American history. Indeed, scholars have even argued about whether there was a single New Deal or if there were multiples (a second, a third and even a fourth). Partly this is because of role of President Roosevelt, who lacked a background in business and economics. His solution was experimentation and often pursued different policies. In addition, he also cultivated a bunch of lieutenants, of varying ability and radicalism. The most important of these was Harry Hopkins – who was an administrator of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration, the Civil Works Administration and the Works Progress Administration. In these roles, he may have been the most important and influential man in Washington, not named Roosevelt.

Despite his importance, Hopkins has not received his general due, he does not receive much notice in Brinkley's *End of Reform*, nor Schwarz's *The New Dealers*. Most of the literature on Hopkins seems to cover his War years, where he served as a personal envoy of Roosevelt. In this role, Hopkins dealt with (and won the confidence of) Churchill and Stalin. This paper, using ANTi-history analyzes how Hopkins through his close association with Roosevelt as well as his administration of various New Deal programs had an outside influence on shaping the role of the state. In particular, the ongoing crisis of, the Great Depression, provided Hopkins with the ability to modify and change public management. This was a very thoughtful paper.

Our sixth paper by Chad Seifried et al. analyzes the use of rhetorical history as a strategic device. Again, this paper covers another well-known company, Jack Daniels, a whiskey manufacturer, to analyze how the company (and its founder) used its past to evoke nostalgia on the part of consumers, becoming a competitive advantage as a result. Chiefly, Jack Daniels utilizes four types of nostalgia: personal, historical, collective and cultural to connect

consumers with a past and provide the brand with a sense of authenticity. In other words, Jack Daniels invokes an image of the American frontier, when whiskey was home-made or created by artisans, rather than a mass-produced staple that it has become. This image means when someone consumes Jack Daniels they are harking back to a better time.

The paper makes the following contributions to the literature. Namely, the use of a company's history as a source of competitive advantage. Of course, this history is often heavily managed by the company and may not be accurate – more an invented tradition, than reality. The paper provides key insights for managers on how to leverage history to enhance and maintain brand loyalty. As such, this paper is one that could be read for great profit for students in undergraduate and graduate strategic management classes. The use of history is one that is often underused as a tool of pedagogy. This case is especially strong because it takes a known company with a long history to make a salient point.

Our seventh paper by Joel Bolton, Frank C. Butler and John Martin is on the measurement of firm performance within the strategic management literature. More than any paper, this work highlights the overwhelming importance of studying the history of a variable (concept, construct, etc.) over a period. This is a very important paper. Before, I summarize the findings of the paper, I must issue a word of concern: namely the validity of our measurements determines the validity of our research. Without valid measurement, our findings should be taken with a grain of salt. This paper provides strong evidence that our measurements have not been used in an acceptable manner. This paper analyzed 1,972 research articles from top management journals published between 2015 and 2019 to determine whether the measurement of firm performance has evolved from a single item to a multiple dimension measurement. The paper found that most articles “that approximately two-thirds of papers that measure firm performance are published using only a single measure of firm performance, and approximately three-fourths do not measure firm performance across multiple dimensions.” I find these results stunning.

It does beg the question of what a measurement of a firm's performance should be, does it matter if it is multidimensional, and what those dimensions need to be in the face of changing notions of what a firm should do. I am supportive of better measures, but I also wonder what the finance literature could teach us. When I calculated the value of a stock, my belief was that free cash to the firm is the best measure financially and it provided the best measure of how the firm is doing from a pure economic perspective. But if we consider the other roles a firm should do, then we must concede that multidimensional needs to be constructed. This article highlights the importance of developing better measures.

Our final paper is by Bianca Sousa and Pedro Ferreira is a literature review of employee brand equity (EBBE), which is the added value of favorable employee perceptions that enhances a firm's reputation. The paper analyzed 30 pages from Scopus and the Web of Science. They make the following findings namely that EBBE is a driver of organizational performance. Leadership and culture play a key role in determining EBBE. However, they temper their findings by noting that we need more qualitative and multilevel research to determine understanding of EBBE. This is a very important paper highlighting the role of employee perceptions and leader behaviors in shaping performance.

**Jeff Muldoon**

*School of Business, Emporia State University, Emporia, Kansas, USA*