

This is a repository copy of *Special Issue: Chronologies, Periods and Events in Management and Business History*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/126661/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Tennent, Kevin Daniel orcid.org/0000-0003-1952-5969 (2018) Special Issue: Chronologies, Periods and Events in Management and Business History. *Journal of Management History*. pp. 1-13. ISSN 1751-1348

<https://doi.org/10.1108/JMH-01-2018-0006>

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



**Special Issue: Chronologies, Periods and Events in
Management and Business History**

Journal:	<i>Journal of Management History</i>
Manuscript ID	JMH-01-2018-0006
Manuscript Type:	Editorial

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Journal of Management History

Special Issue: Chronologies, Periods and Events in Management and Business History

I take pleasure in presenting this Special Issue of *JMH* focusing on chronologies, periods and events in Management and Business History. The nature of history means that all the events and periods we study are typically ordered into chronologies, often divided down into periods and events; these six papers highlight management and organizational phenomena that have in some way been defined by the periods in which they manifested themselves. All of them illustrate organizations or industries passing through particular ‘change points’, or critical evolutions, which would in some way alter the character of the industry while also presenting important continuities. It is worth briefly reflecting on the concepts of chronology and periodization, and how they characterize the topic, before we embark on the papers of the SI.

The study of history is defined by the western perception of time, which necessitates chronology, and an implicit understanding that the state of the world is constantly changing and evolving, irrevocably. Rowlinson, Hassard and Decker (2014) highlight the peculiar role that chronology plays in history – for historians it is not just that events follow each other, but that they have a distinct social and economic context without which they cannot be easily understood. Further, in practical terms one research agenda is unlikely to be able to deal concisely with the totality of history. This encourages the convenient bookending of history into manageable chunks, known as periods (Jordanova, 2006). These periods may simply relate to a convenient chunk of time, such as a century or particular decade, but for

1
2
3 analytical purposes they are likely to be characterised by incremental change yet at
4 the same time a particular structural or institutional continuity, such as ‘the long
5 nineteenth century’ (Hobsbawm, 1962, 1975, 1987) running from 1789-1914 (or
6 1918), the French Revolution being seen as the point at which the Ancient Regime
7 was decisively challenged, and bookended by the First World War. Management and
8 business histories, which do not always relate directly to political history often
9 appropriate these chunks of time in which institutional stability may be observed.
10 Further, histories are often presented as periods running between two particular crises
11 or change points which act as bookends. But yet this approach surely discourages us
12 from actually focusing upon the change points themselves, which could be a revealing
13 use of history for scholars interested in fields where adversity is important, such as
14 change management, strategic management, and entrepreneurship?
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 Such change points are often defined by exogenous political, social, economic,
30 technological, cultural, legal or even environmental changes. They are often further
31 defined by their particular temporal and spatial dimensions – they may be as short as
32 1-2 years or even a few months, yet may also run to as many as 5-6 years or more,
33 and they might be confined to one particular geographical area, city, country,
34 continent, sphere of influence, or even encompass the whole world. They may include
35 all encompassing events such as military conflicts – particularly the First and Second
36 World wars, but perhaps also periods of diplomatic conflict, such as the start and end
37 of the Cold War. They may alternatively be major economic shocks, such as the Wall
38 Street Crash of 1929, the Oil Crisis of 1973-4, or the Sub-Prime crisis of 2007-8.
39 Periods of rapid socio-economic change may also be turning points – the British
40 1960s, for instance saw the abolition of Resale Price Maintenance in 1964 (Tennent,
41 2013), before the introduction of Corporation Tax in 1965 (Mollan and Tennent,
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 2015), the Sterling crisis of 1966-67 (Schenk, 2010), and a programme of government
4 sponsored economic modernisation designed to encourage industrial development
5
6 (Owen, 1999); all of these things together wrought major changes to the business
7 environment. This is even before considering the impact of social-cultural change,
8
9 such as the creation of the teenager as a distinct category and falling birthrates
10 (Marwick, 1998). Arguably, these changes hastened the end of gentlemanly
11
12 capitalism and ushered in a new, more consumerist yet managerially aware era in
13
14 which the post-war consensus between management and labour started to break down.
15
16 Such exogenous change points, which may be characterised as 'revolutions', often see
17
18 several events take place together which undermine established cultures or routines
19
20 within business and management encouraging or perhaps even forcing a managed
21
22 response.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 **The Papers**

34
35
36
37 I will briefly introduce the papers individually before considering them in a
38
39 thematic sense.
40

41
42 Perhaps the most ambitious paper presented in terms of scope is James
43
44 Wilson's application of deconstructionist theory to the historical development of
45
46 operations management theory, an area of study which has cosmetically reinvented
47
48 itself several times, most notably after its professionalization in response to demands
49
50 for 'scientific' rigour inspired by the work of Buffa (1961), Skinner (1969) and
51
52 Orlicky (1975) in the 1960s which seemed to redefine operations management as an
53
54 activity for the executive suite not the factory floor. Yet, Wilson points to striking
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 continuities stretching back to the era of Taylor and before, or at least rediscoveries of
4
5 old knowledge, for instance occurrences of 'lean production' known as 'hand-to-
6
7 mouth' buying in the 1910s and 1920s. Inevitably similar concerns continue to
8
9 influence the field even as it refocuses itself on supply chain management in service
10
11 dominated economies, and splits off project management, one of its earliest concerns,
12
13 as a separate discipline. A sense emerges that Wilson sees much new theory as a
14
15 rebranding exercise, designed to 'see off' exogenous threats to the discipline's
16
17 survival, while in reality preserving its core essence.

18
19
20 Simon Mollan's paper on free-standing company theory also focuses on
21
22 theoretical matters, though he calls for greater empirical engagement. The free-
23
24 standing company concept was a post-hoc attempt by Mira Wilkins (1988, 1998) to
25
26 categorise a tranche of British overseas extractive companies that appeared not to fit
27
28 the template of the conventional multinational enterprise. Given that these companies
29
30 mostly emerged in the late 19th century and mostly seemed to ebb away after the end
31
32 of the first great era of globalisation around the First World War, this theory also
33
34 seems to constitute a sort of post-hoc periodisation. Mollan suggests however that the
35
36 imposition of this template onto many thousands of separate business enterprises has
37
38 resulted in an 'ahistorical theoretical object', which lacks ability to explain change
39
40 over time. Thus free-standing companies are rendered a 'zombie category', which
41
42 has acted to stall historical research, with negative consequences for the international
43
44 management discipline.

45
46
47
48 Focusing more directly on British management history around the First World
49
50 War, Chris Corker draws on research from his Coleman Prize winning thesis to
51
52 examine the experience of Sheffield armaments companies in the 1920s as they
53
54 struggled to adapt to the new reality of peacetime and disarmament. This perhaps
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 inevitably led to retrenchment and rationalisation, but Corker demonstrates that the
4
5 companies were extremely slow to adjust their strategies to the slowdown in
6
7 government orders, with no real attempt to diversify their activities; indeed it took
8
9 some years of losses before the companies responded. This case study reminds us that
10
11 the boundaries of historical periods are imperceptible to those who live through them
12
13 – even where it was rational to adjust strategy to a radical paradigm change, the end
14
15 of the Great War, actors often appear to be slow to respond or even perhaps aloof
16
17 from change.
18
19

20
21 Nicholas Burton's paper looks at a reverse situation to Corkers' in that it
22
23 studies an industry which was actively benefitting from new government policy, as
24
25 the Thatcher government sought to de-regulate saving for retirement in 1980s Britain.
26
27 Oral history is used to interview people active in the industry at the time, to discover
28
29 the impacts that de-regulation had on actual product design. Modularity (Schilling,
30
31 2000), an idea from systems theory, is used as a lens to understand both changes
32
33 through time but also through hierarchy, including how changes from the demand and
34
35 regulatory level influenced product design. Burton's paper is thus methodologically
36
37 interesting as it maps changes in the industry across two dimensions. Its conclusion
38
39 that this interplay drove the industry became more 'modular' over time as value
40
41 chains vertically disintegrated demonstrates that we should not assume periods to be
42
43 homogenous blocks of time, but rather than they can be characterised by complex
44
45 evolution over time, often characterised by twists and turns that make conventional
46
47 narrative employment challenging.
48
49

50
51 Laura Singleton's paper, which focuses on the US urban crisis of the 1960s,
52
53 demonstrates the extent to which social circumstances could also impact business.
54
55 Singleton demonstrates that racial tensions in dozens of US cities led to an eruption of
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 violence in the summer of 1967; this caused concern significant enough for Corporate
4 America to cooperate with the mayors of cities including Atlanta, Boston, Chicago
5 and Detroit to form the National Urban Coalition, supported by companies as high
6 profile as Chase Manhattan Bank, Time Inc., General Electric and Ford Motor, to
7 form a National Urban Coalition. This was followed by another body, the National
8 Alliance of Businessmen, which attempted to work with industry to create new long
9 term jobs for people from deprived areas. Both bodies ran into difficulty by the early
10 1970s however, partly because they relied to a large extent on the voluntary part-time
11 participation of executives, and partly because of a shortage of local goodwill coupled
12 with intuitional weakness. Both bodies survived until the 2000s, but lacking support
13 from the highest profile companies, degenerated into localised coalitions. The events
14 of 1967 appeared to have ushered in a new period of Corporate Social Responsibility,
15 driven by the urgency of the crisis but this proved to be a false dawn for companies
16 and communities alike. Periods of crisis can undoubtedly open up new historical
17 periods, but they may not ultimately have the entirely hopeful outcomes that actors
18 hoped for.

19
20 Alex Gillett and Kevin Tennent also consider the interplay between business
21 and society in perhaps one of the most social of industries – association football, or
22 soccer. Focusing on the 1980s struggles of an English football club in a declining
23 industrial area, Middlesbrough AFC, they use the theory of institutional logics to
24 develop a new ‘institutional logic of professional sport’. To do this they explore the
25 attempts of the local authority to save the club, important to Middlesbrough as it
26 represented the town’s chemical and steel industries. But formal cooperation between
27 the two bodies was ‘blocked’ by the different institutional logics of local government
28 and professional sport, despite the utility maximising character of both. This case

1
2
3 study reminds us that what is often retrospectively cast as a 'dark age' before a
4
5 defining event that in some way opens up a new 'sunny upland' can be misleading; in
6
7 a classic illustration of the pitfalls of retrospective periodisation it is claimed by
8
9 authors such as Walters and Hamil (2013: 743) that English soccer was declining in
10
11 prestige and importance in the 1970s and 1980s, before the founding of the Premier
12
13 League in 1992, with its increased TV money and sponsorship, somehow made the
14
15 game 'relevant' again and aided its globalisation process. But for contemporary actors
16
17 and policy makers, both in terms of the local authority and the industrialists who
18
19 ultimately saved the club, Middlesbrough AFC was desperately relevant and a cause
20
21 urgently worth believing in despite the poor financial state of the club and the alleged
22
23 poor reputation of the sport. Indeed, this rescue happened in time for Middlesbrough
24
25 to benefit from participation in the Premier League in the 1990s, but football's
26
27 increased commercialisation was in reality an attempt to increase its already existing
28
29 popularity, not to introduce it for the first time.
30
31
32
33
34

35 **The Contribution of the Special Issue**

36
37
38

39 The papers presented in this Special Issue provide us with an opportunity to grapple
40
41 with one of the under addressed questions in management history as it attempts to
42
43 place itself at the centre of the management studies discipline. While much discussion
44
45 centres on how history might be integrated with the broader concerns of social
46
47 science, and how history might become more theoretical, periodisation, and how it
48
49 shapes our perception of historical continuity and change remains a theoretical
50
51 concern which emerges from within the history discipline itself. Continuity and
52
53 change are surely critical factors to periodisation; I hope that in this SI we have
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 helped historians to think about the extent to which change is an ontological
4 phenomenon which exists in an empirical sense, or the extent to which it is actually a
5 construct projected and narrated by historians in a theoretical sense, without the real
6 consideration that we are writing with hindsight.
7
8
9

10
11 Of the papers here Gillett and Tennent, Burton, Corker and Singleton all
12 consider change in an empirical sense, though also see within their historical episodes
13 opportunities for the development of broader theoretical concerns. Gillett and
14 Tennent's paper seeks to challenge existing periodisation to some extent, though, and
15 this strand also runs through the papers by Mollan, and Wilson. Both Mollan and
16 Wilson attempt to deal with periodisation essentially imposed by theorists acting in a
17 particularly ahistoricist fashion. Mollan, for instance, deals with a question that arises
18 from the scholarship of Mira Wilkins, a close ally of Alfred D. Chandler, which leads
19 us into the very heart of our discipline, perhaps challenging Wilkins in the same way
20 that Lameroux, Raff and Temin (2004) pleaded for a less Whiggish approach to
21 history. Also looking at the other side of the Whiggism coin is Singleton, whose paper
22 considers the attempts of America's largest corporations to include those apparently
23 left behind by their prosperity and dominance. Yet Singleton's paper, which traces
24 the decline of these efforts over a thirty-five year period, ably shows the dangers of
25 finalism – what often matters in history is where the case under examination is
26 considered to end; we as historians can choose to take our leave before the negative
27 consequences of a course of action or an intervention are revealed.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 Wilson points to further dangers of finalism and presentism inherent perhaps
49 in theory abstraction from history itself, perhaps even a danger of assumption of
50 historical fact before empirical study has been conducted. In one the fields examined
51 by Wilson, Project Management, there has recently been an upsurge of interest in the
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 potential of history to reveal the specifics of ‘forgotten knowledge’ in past
4
5 engineering and construction schemes (Söderlund and Lenfle, 2013), a call also
6
7 answered by Gillett and Tennent (2017) elsewhere. Wilson, Corker, Gillett and
8
9 Tennent, and Burton draw our attention further to the liminal periods around the
10
11 beginning and ends of different periods, and highlight that it is difficult for historians
12
13 to neatly pinpoint where they begin and end.
14

15
16 Periodisation is, therefore, a form of post-hoc historical theorisation – it may
17
18 be useful because we have to start somewhere, but it can also distract from the
19
20 building of chronology as it may lead to the ahistorical assumption that just because
21
22 there appeared to be some form of institutional continuity for a period of time (as for
23
24 instance Wilkins imposes with her thousands of free-standing companies, apparently
25
26 appearing consistent between 1870 and 1914, in many industries and countries), it can
27
28 distract us from the empirical reality presented by the flow of events. Therefore, we
29
30 need to build a more nuanced form of periodisation, or else, to allude to McCloskey
31
32 (1985), we perhaps risk creating continuums of ‘gnomic past’ where little change of
33
34 interest to management historians is assumed to take place, closing down
35
36 investigation. Perhaps a useful route forward would be greater pluralism among
37
38 historians, of the sort called for by the Canadian historian Ged Martin (2004), who
39
40 called for historians to study longer periods in order to avoid the misunderstanding of
41
42 historical context and ahistoricism caused by overspecialisation. Just as management
43
44 historians need to be aware of the need for greater theoretical impact, or indeed
45
46 ‘integrity’ of their work (Maclean, Harvey and Clegg, 2016), they need to consider
47
48 carefully the historical integrity of their work including the underpinning assumptions
49
50 that periodisation and chronology bring.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7 Buffa, E.S., 1961. *Modern production management*. New York: Wiley.
- 8
9
10 Gillett, A.G. and Tennent, K.D., 2017. Dynamic Sublimes, Changing Plans, and the
11 Legacy of a Megaproject: The Case of the 1966 Soccer World Cup. *Project*
12 *Management Journal*, 48(6), pp.93-116.
- 13
14
15 Hobsbawm, E. J., 1975. *The Age of Capital: 1848-1875*, Weidenfeld & Nicolson:
16 London
- 17
18
19 Hobsbawm, E. J., 1987. *The Age of Empire: 1875-1914*, Weidenfeld & Nicolson:
20 London.
- 21
22
23 Hobsbawm, E. J., 1962 *The Age of Revolution: Europe 1789-1848*, Weidenfeld &
24 Nicolson: London.
- 25
26
27 Jordanova, L. J., 2006. *History in Practice*, Bloomsbury: London.
- 28
29
30 Lamoreaux, N.R., Raff, D.M. and Temin, P., 2004. Against whig history. *Enterprise*
31 *& Society*, 5(3), pp.376-387.
- 32
33
34 Martin, G., 2004. *Past Futures: The Impossible Necessity of History*. Toronto:
35 University of Toronto Press.
- 36
37
38 Marwick, Arthur, 1998. *The Sixties: Cultural Revolution in Britian, France, Italy and*
39 *the United States, c. 1958-c. 1974*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 40
41
42 Maclean, M., Harvey, C. and Clegg, S.R., 2016. Conceptualizing historical
43 organization studies. *Academy of Management Review*, 41(4), pp.609-632.
- 44
45
46 McCloskey, D.N., 1985. *The Rhetorics of Economics*. Madison: University of
47 Wisconsin Press.
- 48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Mollan, S., and Tennent, K. D., "International taxation and corporate strategy:
4 evidence from British overseas business, circa 1900–1965." *Business History* 57, no. 7
5 (2015): 1054-1081.
6
7

8
9 Orlicky, J., 1975. *Materials requirements planning*, New York: McGraw-Hill Book
10 Co.
11

12
13 Owen, G., 1999. *From Empire to Europe: The Decline and Revival of British Industry*
14 *Since the Second World War*, London: HarperCollins.
15

16
17 Rowlinson, M., Hassard, J., and Decker., S., "Research strategies for organizational
18 history: A dialogue between historical theory and organization theory." *Academy of*
19 *Management Review* 39, no. 3 (2014): 250-274.
20
21

22
23 Schenk, Catherine R., 2010. *The Decline of Sterling: Managing the Retreat of an*
24 *International Currency, 1945-1992*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
25
26

27
28 Schilling, M.A., 2000. Toward a general modular systems theory and its application
29 to interfirm product modularity. *Academy of management review*, 25(2), pp.312-334.
30
31

32
33 Skinner, W., 1969. "Manufacturing, the Missing Link in Corporate Strategy,"
34 *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 42, No. 2, p. 136–145.
35
36

37
38 Söderlund, J. and Lenfle, S., 2013. Making project history: Revisiting the past,
39 creating the future. *International Journal of Project Management*, 31(5), pp. 653-662.
40
41

42
43 Tennent, Kevin D. 2013. "A distribution revolution: Changes in music distribution in
44 the UK 1950–76." *Business History* 55, no. 3, pp. 327-347.
45

46
47 Walters, G. & Hamil, S., 2013. The contests for power and influence over the
48 regulatory space within the English professional football industry, 1980–2012,
49 *Business History*, 55:5, 740-767
50

51
52 Wilkins, M. and Schröter, H.G. eds., 1998. *The free-standing company in the world*
53 *economy, 1830-1996*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Wilkins, M., 1988. The free-standing company, 1870-1914: an important type of
4
5 British foreign direct investment. *The Economic History Review*, 41(2), pp.259-282.
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Journal of Management History