

The Culture of History in Sport Management's Foundation: The Intellectual Influence of Harvard Business School on Four Founding Sport Management Scholars

Ari de Wilde, Chad Seifried, and Melvin L. Adelman

In this essay, the researchers explore the careers of four foundational figures in sport management, who received training as historians. Drawing on a wide range of primary and secondary sources, we illustrate how Earle Zeigler, Guy Lewis, Stephen Hardy, and Lawrence Fielding helped create the field of Sport Management with insights drawn from business historians, especially those at the Harvard Business School. Overall, we claim that sport business history can serve to help frame much of the field and is vitally relevant to the study of the sports industry. Furthermore, we advocate that the study of history be included as a prominent area within sport management curriculums. To support this assertion, we elucidate the importance of the historical case-study approach to sport management.

The field of Sport Management has become increasingly specialized and narrowed by a reliance on now popular methods (e.g., qualitative and quantitative) promoted, practiced, and recycled by scholars in the field (Amis & Silk, 2005; Slack, 1997, 1998; Zeigler, 2007a). Research in sport management did clearly progress due to improvements in the production of reliable and valid research instrumentation (e.g., Heere & Dickson, 2008; Seo & Green, 2008). However, this came at a price as several sport scholars articulated when expressing their concerns about the quality and selection of methods chosen and used during research inquiries (Boucher, 1998; Mahony & Pitts, 1998; Olafson, 1990, 1995; Cousens & Slack, 2005). Amis and Silk (2005) appealed to the sport management community, in a special issue of the *Journal of Sport Management*, to embrace “innovative ways of thinking about and/or carrying out sport management research” (p. 355). Their work suggested that history was an essential element to embrace a “bricolage” approach to sport management scholarship. The researchers of this examination propose that historical methods could serve as a valuable tool to help sport management theory evolve.

de Wilde is with the Dept. of Education, York College of Pennsylvania, York, PA. Seifried is with the Dept. of Kinesiology, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA. Adelman is with the School of Physical Activity and Educational Services, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH.

Primarily, we sponsor it as a complementary method to fruitfully explicate and study important questions/topics related to the social, political, economic, historical, and cultural realities or context that impact sport institutions and the sport industry as a whole. As Amis and Silk (2005) accurately maintain, “we cannot obviate the need for an understanding of history and context by hiding behind terms such as reliability, validity, and generalizability” (p. 359).

Studying topics through a historical analysis can help those engaged in sport studies better comprehend how sport management evolved into its contemporary form and potentially points to possible future changes or expectations which are helpful qualities required by sport managers (Seifried, *in press*). Understanding events and phenomena through a historical perspective specifically helps sport managers avoid viewing “present circumstances in idiosyncratic, traditional, narrow, or shallow ways... and reveals new possibilities” (Mason, McKenney, & Copeland, 1997, p. 307). Yet even more important is that historical analysis clearly illuminates that events and decision are not merely a product of informal or market forces but human decision makers, whether they are entrepreneurs, organization leaders or consumers. Essentially, we declare that studying the history of events or phenomena is a most relevant method of inquiry for sport management since every topic possesses a context or history.

Sport historians helped to shape the field of sport management. They devised graduate study programs, served to create field accreditation standards, contributed to the writing of some important basic textbooks, and supplied significant information to fundamental models, which ultimately both educated students and served as the qualitative basis for numerous studies (Hardy, 1987; Lewis, 1980; Lewis & Appenzeller, 1985; Mullin, Hardy, & Sutton, 2007; Zeigler, 1992). Many of these sport scholars obtained their framing ideas from the work of business historians at the Harvard Business School (H.B.S.) where the study of business history continues to remain a major area of inquiry. With an area dedicated to “Business History” and a full twenty faculty members who list business history as an area of expertise, the Harvard Business School provides an excellent example of how a business-oriented sport management environment could use sport business history (“Faculty & Research,” 2008).

With this in mind, we argue that scholars of business, sport history, and sport management should more closely examine their common ground. Thus, we will examine the careers of four foundational figures in sport management, who received training as historians: Earle Zeigler, Guy Lewis, Stephen Hardy, and Lawrence Fielding.¹ Utilizing a wide range of primary and secondary sources, the researchers specifically seek to examine and illustrate how these scholars’ historical training helped them create significant and important work for the development of the Sport Management field. Next, we will briefly analyze the Harvard Business School and how it served as a vital source of influence for these individuals and helped them develop relevant literature and course curriculum in sport management. The researchers also suggest sport business history training can serve to help frame much of the field and appears vitally relevant to the study of the sports industry. We advocate historical study should be included as a more prominent area within sport management studies and or curriculums. To support this assertion, we argue for more opportunities using the case-study approach as one example to help develop the discipline of Sport Management into the future.

Harvard Business School Model

The roots of sport business history can be traced to the foundation of the Harvard Business School. Academicians formed the H.B.S. in 1908 as one of the nation's first business schools; the Wharton School of Finance and Commerce at the University of Pennsylvania was the first in the 1880s (Leach, 1993, pp. 153–165). The H.B.S. selected economic historian Edwin Francis Gay to serve as the first dean of the school (McCraw, Koehn, & Nelles, 1999), which he directed until 1919 when he resigned to run the *New York Evening Post*. Wallace Brett Donham succeeded Gay but at that point the H.B.S. enjoyed neither recognition nor respect. Harvard's Graduate School of Business had less than twenty students, many of who were in fact undergraduates ("Business Humanist," 1942).

To build the school's program and its reputation, Donham, a graduate of Harvard Law School, followed his Alma Mater's pedagogic style, popularized by a liberal arts focus, through adopting a case study-centered curriculum. Later called the "Business Humanist," Donham created a "problem method" of inductive pedagogy at H.B.S. (McCraw, et al., 1999). Donham saw "business history," as a separate discipline from economic history and case study methodology as central to its ability to allow students to examine "specific situations as they came to business men and their communities in the past" (McCraw, et al., 1999, p. 246). Donham largely launched the H.B.S. with history and humanistic study but with an appreciation for other more scientifically oriented disciplines.² Thus, in the rapidly changing impersonal and unpredictable world of the 1920s, business history provided H.B.S. a proven academic discipline, in the unproven and dynamic academic business environment ("Business Humanist," 1942; Hawley, 1979; Wiebe, 1967).

In 1927, the Harvard Business School hired economic historian Norman Scott Brien Gras and established the Isidor Straus Chair of Business History. (Isidor Straus was an owner of Macy's Department Store and perished in the sinking of the *Titanic*.) One year earlier, historians at the Harvard Business School also began the foundational journal in the field, the *Bulletin of the Business Historical Society*, which is now the prestigious *Business History Review* (Gras, 1950). The journal published by the H.B.S. remains one of the primary outlets for the field of business history. Still, despite these successes, business history at the H.B.S. faced early challenges. Gras summed up the main problem eloquently early in his tenure at Harvard by stating

Teaching history to a group of professional students just a few months before they expect to enter practical affairs is an exceedingly difficult task. I am not sure I will succeed, but I do sympathize with the motive behind the experiment, that is, to give the students a cultural background for their work and a perspective to their training. (McCraw, et al., 1999, p. 246–247)

To help the H.B.S. become one of the finest centers of business history and communicate this emphasis on historical study, Gras hired several famous business history professors from the 1930s through the 1960s. Henrietta Larson, Gras' former student and the first woman to receive tenure at the Harvard Business School, and Ralph Hidy, who was Gras' heir in the Straus chair during the 1950s and 1960s, emerged as two superior examples (Hidy & Hidy, 1962; Johnson, 1978). Following Ralph Hidy, Alfred Chandler, Jr. was hired and he directed the program to operate

in a middle ground that used sociological theory, but one which also concentrated on qualitative history (McCraw, 1988, p. 293).

Chandler revolutionized the business history field by taking a “value-neutral social science approach” (McCraw, Koehn, & Nelles, 1999, p. 250). His work relied on empirical research, but not econometric models, to provide insight into successful business practice. As an example, in his classic work *The Visible Hand* (1977), Chandler argued that from 1870 to 1920 the visible hand of the manager at large center firms replaced the invisible hand of the market in resource coordination. This study, for which Chandler won the Pulitzer Prize, challenged economic models (i.e., Adam Smith) that only explained the massive growth in business through markets (Chandler, 1977). In so doing, Chandler established the place of qualitative business history and made history relevant and essential to study in business schools. In writing the work, he asked questions such as

How were things done at a particular point in the history of business? What forces operated to propel changes in the way things were done? How were they done afterwards? Who led the movement for change, and why? How did roles within the organization shift, and how did the organization’s own function evolve? Why did particular changes come in some types of industries but not in others? (McCraw, et al., 1999, p. 251)

Chandler promoted the study of change over time and the usefulness of understanding broad historical shifts and trends. Chandler, who used hard statistics and empiricism to generate theory, created a knowledge base in the spirit of sociologists Talcott Parsons and Max Weber (McCraw, 1988). Essentially, Chandler’s ability to *generalize* trends and examine *causation* across vast historical periods was paramount to his importance as a scholar (McCraw, 1988), and his thoughts influenced several important figures in sport management.

While the scale and scope of his work would expand over the years, Chandler’s themes remained embedded in his foundation of entrepreneurial history. For example, Chandler also participated in the “Research Center in Entrepreneurial History,” which eminent economic historian Joseph Schumpeter started before his death in 1950. Schumpeter famously defined the role of the entrepreneur as an “innovator,” and doer-of-new-things (McCraw, 2007; Schumpeter, 1947, p. 152). McCraw (1988) argued that in “Chandler’s hands, Schumpeter’s individual entrepreneur—the source of innovation in modern business—became a collective entity, institutionalized among teams of managers operating within structures they themselves defined” (McCraw, 1988, p. 9). Thus, though big business and its organizational structure were Chandler’s focus, he never lost sight of the fundamental theme of business and entrepreneurial history. In fact, he premised his three major works, *Strategy and Structure* (1962), *The Visible Hand* (1977), and *Scale and Scope* (1988), on this idea.³

Interestingly, the field of Business History survived an assault at Harvard during the 1960s and 1970s. In the midst of the quantitative revolution, the social sciences at many universities embraced the scientific paradigm (Kuhn, 1962). History as a discipline was not immune from this movement, and became more quantitative. Moreover, scholars, such as the economic historian Robert Fogel and other quantitative economic historians, challenged the existence of qualitative business

history. They argued that economic historians could understand much of important American history through quantitative econometric analyses of markets (Fogel, 1964). In reaction, Chandler refuted Fogel, pointing out the severe limitations of economic determinism when applied to history (McCraw, 1988).

Chandler's work and influence did not end with publications like *The Visible Hand*. He also focused on making history relevant pedagogically to professional business students. After he took over the Isidor Straus Chair in 1971, he revamped the H.B.S.'s business history classes to be more in line with other subjects. He revived student interest in business history, which sagged before his arrival. Most prominently, Chandler was influential in creating the still successful course entitled "The Coming of Managerial Capitalism." Chandler also coauthored a book of case studies specifically for this class, which drew largely on his previous research and examples from the business community (Chandler & Tedlow, 1985). In line with Chandler's research, instructors in the class ask three main questions: (1) "Once, not very long ago, there was no such thing as professional business management. What happened to make it necessary, and how did it develop?" (2) "What was the impact of the rise of big business and professional management on the American workforce, and vice versa?" and (3) "What was their impact on American government, and vice-versa?" (McCraw, et al., 1999, p. 253). The questions, which are identical to the ones that guided Chandler's work, examine causation in the development of American capitalism in a form that emphasizes a theory of big business.

In a similar fashion to the Harvard Business School, a surprising number of sport management's academic parents experienced professional historical training. They, too, framed the emerging discipline of Sport Management with their experience as historians, which were significantly impacted by Chandler and the H.B.S. and the questions they produced. Yet, today sport management scholars often overlook the study of sport history, viewing it as a nonscientific and, therefore mostly irrelevant field (Seifried, in press). Consequently, as Earle Zeigler argued, the respective fields, "don't speak to each other and actually don't know that they should (or how to do so)" (E. Zeigler, personal communication, December 16, 2008). This is interesting if we accept sport management school accreditation requires a sociocultural core.

Earle Zeigler

As Earle Zeigler said, "If you know where you've been, and know where you are, you will be in a much better position to know where you should go..." (E. Zeigler, personal communication, December 16, 2008). Zeigler, who still instructs students "to plan their investigations through the use of a horizontal-analysis [multi-disciplinary] approach" (Ibid), began his collegiate journey at Bates College, a small liberal arts institution in Lewiston, Maine. While there during the 1940s, he majored in German, and participated in and coached several sports. Later he went to Yale, where he also coached, and completed a Ph.D. in the Philosophy and History of Education under the tutelage of eminent scholar of education John S. Brubacher (Zeigler, 2009). Importantly, his dissertation was titled "A History of Professional Preparation for Physical Education in the United States, 1861–1948" (1951). After completing his degree, Zeigler, as a professor and dean, taught, advised, chaired, and administered at the University of Western Ontario, the University of Michigan,

the University of Illinois, and again the University of Western Ontario, where he stayed from the early 1970s until the early 1990s.

Earle Zeigler has produced over 40 books and 400 articles in a variety of disciplines or professional areas (organizational management theory and practice, philosophy, professional preparation, and history) since 1948. These achievements provided him the ability to hold important positions related to these various sport disciplines early in their respective developmental stages. For example, he operated as a vice-President of the Canadian Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation between 1955–1956. In 1974–1975, Zeigler's peers selected him to serve as President of the Philosophic Society for the Study of Sport (now the International Association for Sport Philosophy). Roughly ten years later, Zeigler also acted as an Honorary Past President of the North American Society for Sport Management (NASSM) in 1986 due to his work to help create this society in 1985. Today NASSM continues to respect his contribution to sport management through naming their most prestigious award in his honor.⁴

Appropriately, based on this background, Zeigler should be seen as a contributory influence in launching the fields of Sport History, Sport Management and Sport Philosophy. At the University of Western Ontario he found, "the inadequacy of the theoretical and practical training for management" (Zeigler, 2007b, p. 10) and looked to the experiences and practices promoted by the Harvard Business School to rectify these deficiencies. Specifically, Zeigler drew from the school's case-study methodology with its emphasis on business history, and wrote important works such as *Administration of Physical Education and Athletics: A Case Method Approach* (1959a) and *The Case Method Approach: Instructional Manual* (1959b), which were fundamental to the growth of sport and physical activity administration.

In the 1960s, Zeigler, and other scholars such as Franklin Henry, contested Harvard president James B. Conant's critical statements against the existence and practice of the discipline of Physical Education (Conant, 1963; Zeigler, 2005, p. 155–189). In response to his critique, Zeigler supported the "Big Ten Body of Knowledge Project," which led to the strong development of the subdisciplines of history and administration, as well as philosophy within the field of Physical Education (Zeigler & McCristal, 1964). These subdisciplines eventually evolved into the disciplines of sport administration, history and philosophy, *inter alia*. Similar to Wallace Donham at H.B.S., Zeigler used the study of history as a central focus to the curriculums and literature he created.

Guy Lewis

Another parent of Sport Management reached academic maturity during the 1960s and 1970s. His name was Dr. Guy Maxton Lewis and he completed his doctoral work at the University of Maryland under Dr. Marvin Eyler, a legendary administrator and advisor to many eminent figures in the field of Sport History (Wiggins, 2005). Following the completion of his dissertation in 1964 titled, "The American Intercollegiate Football Spectacle, 1869–1917," Lewis became a faculty member at Penn State University, and later at the University of Massachusetts in their highly successful "Sport Studies" departments (Wiggins, 2005). Quickly, Lewis became a prominent sport historian, especially in the area of collegiate athletics (Lewis, 1967; 1969; 1973; 1977; Wiggins, 2005). During the 1970s, the literature

of sport history grew rapidly as academicians from both physical education and history departments embraced the study of sport drawing upon the new social history movement, which explored the histories of the masses from the “bottom-up” (Adelman, 1973, 1983; Wiggins & Mason, 2005, p. 41; Foner, 2002, p.11). In this period of expansion and recognition, historians housed within Physical Education departments, led largely by Lewis and Eyler, created and founded important journals and conferences for the field of sport studies. For example, in 1973 Lewis and Eyler were at the forefront of the establishment of The North American Society for Sport History and its publication, the *Journal of Sport History* (Metcalf, 2005). From the outset, both scholars also made a concerted effort to move the field of sport history beyond its confines. At the time, the field was almost exclusively in physical education departments, and Lewis was at the center of the early effort to build bridges with faculty in history departments. Within a decade this orientation bore fruit, as faculty in history departments began to attend the conferences and started to write for the new sport-oriented journals.

With new conferences, journals, and growing acceptance in history departments, the literature on sport history grew significantly in the 1970s. However, the pressure to embrace sport history as a subdiscipline of social history, the primary history paradigm at the time, moved sport historians away from a sport studies’ orientation (Adelman, 1983, Berryman, 1973). This trend to look at sport as a representation of the social and cultural world continues to this day, and represents one of the main disconnects between other sport-focused disciplines, including sport management. In other words, rather than focusing on the sport industry, historians typically focused on what sport revealed about a certain time period (Hardy, 1986).

The increasing specialization and embracing of social history did not produce a dramatic job growth for sport historians within the field of sport studies. As a result, Lewis became disenchanted with the sport history field as it was then defined and thus sought to help move the field in a different direction. His solution centered on developing one of the first degree-granting sport administration programs of any kind in 1971 at the University of Massachusetts (Parkhouse & Pitts, 2005; Zeigler, 2007b). During the late 1970s, Lewis used business history to push physical education and sport administration scholars to examine and engage with business studies. Much as he did with the field of Sport History, Lewis reached outside of sport studies to grow sport management:

Lewis took a visionary risk of bringing in faculty who were not in the Sport Studies area. By reaching out to Dr. Bernie Mullin, who held a PhD in Business with a research interest in Sport, and then shortly thereafter, to Professor [Glenn] Wong, a lawyer with an interest in sport law, they all began to pave the way to sport business. (“Room dedication for Dr. Guy Lewis,” p.1)

Overall, Lewis’ actions moved sport management/administration scholars toward an emphasis in sport business through the use of history and individuals with diverse backgrounds and training.

Further drawing on his historical training, Lewis also wrote the seminal piece “The Sport Enterprise” in 1980, which appeared in a special issue of *Arena Review* (now the *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*). In that article, Lewis provided an “outline of the sports enterprise” and suggested, “where and how management fits into the picture” (p. 12). Framing his study within the ideas Harvard business

historian Arthur Cole expressed in his article “Perspectives on Leisure Time Business” (1964), Lewis showed the changing aspects of the sport marketplace, and the necessity of stimulating business demand for sport managers to create a field of their own (Lewis, 1980, p.12, 17). At this time, Lewis again argued for the necessity of the study of business history in sport management.

In *Successful Sport Management* (1985) edited by Herb Appenzeller, and in other publications, Lewis’ interdisciplinary scholarship and innovation significantly helped to launch Sport Management as a viable, business-oriented discipline into the 1980s and beyond. Lewis eventually left the Department of Sport Management at the University of Massachusetts to help establish the Department of Sport & Entertainment Management at the University of South Carolina, where he is currently a professor emeritus (Wiggins, 2005). In one of his former doctoral student’s words, Guy Lewis largely “started two fields—sport history and sport management” (S. Hardy, personal communication, December 17, 2008).

Stephen Hardy

While Chandler revolutionized the study of business history at Harvard during the 1970s, across the same state in Amherst, Stephen Hardy pursued graduate study under Guy Lewis. Hardy began his academic career as a Latin major and hockey player at Bowdoin College. After he graduated, he taught and coached at Vermont Academy from 1970 to 1972, but he wanted to pursue graduate work. In his words, “I was looking for grad programs (thinking history) in 1971-1972 when a family friend sent me info about the brand new UMass sport admin MS program. I couldn’t believe that something like that existed, so I applied and got in, with the intention of getting an MS and becoming an AD” (S. Hardy, personal communication, December 16, 2008). Lewis convinced Hardy to pursue a Ph.D. in sport studies as well as an M.A. in History. Hardy gathered more field experience in sport administration when he finished his sport administration master’s degree in 1976. Specifically, he funded graduate school by serving as an Assistant Commissioner of the Eastern College Athletic Conference (E.C.A.C.), which preceded the Big East conference as the dominant organization in the Northeast. In 1978, Hardy finished his master’s degree in history before completing his doctoral degree in sport studies in 1980.

Before finishing his dissertation, Hardy accepted a position at the University of Washington as the Coordinator of the M.S. Program in Sport Administration. While there, he completed his dissertation, which ultimately became the book *How Boston Played* (1982). His dissertation combined both of his interests in sport administration and sport history. Looking at policy issues, land rights, social issues, and the development of consumption communities, Hardy examined, among other things, how Bostonians formed their “emerald necklace” park system and playground association (Hardy, 1999, pp. xv–xxxiv).

In 1982, Hardy moved to Robert Morris College to become chair of the Department of Sport Management. In the mid-1980s, working amid scholars of management, accounting, marketing, and economics, Hardy used their influence to help him write a more explicit call for interdisciplinary sport history and sport management research, publications, projects, and presentations (S. Hardy, personal communication, December 16, 2008). In “Entrepreneurs, Organizations, and the Sport Marketplace: Subjects in Search of Historians,” Hardy (1986) boldly

challenged sport historians by breaking with the dominant social history paradigm of the field, asserting that they could better approach sport history from a business perspective. Drawing on work by Lewis, the Harvard Business School, and Chandler, Hardy provided a framework to examine organizational and producer issues in sport history. During this time, Hardy also helped to found NASSM and wrote a curriculum for sport management that strongly emphasized a business school and history model (Hardy, 1987).

Soon after, Hardy also wrote another seminal piece linking sport history and sport management, "Entrepreneurs, Structures, Sportgeist: Old Tensions in a Modern Industry" (1990a). In this article, Hardy created a model of tensions in sport throughout much of history and examined ways in which entrepreneurs used those tensions to sell the product and services produced by sport. In addition to Chandler, eminent economic historian Joseph Schumpeter and his notion of an entrepreneur as an "innovator" clearly influenced Hardy's work (1947, p. 152). Hardy used many similar historical and nonhistorical models in later works after he moved to the University of New Hampshire. For example in *Sport Marketing*, which he coauthored with William A. Sutton and Bernard Mullin (2007), Hardy and his peers filled this textbook with historical examples, such as a case study based on Donald Fisher's (1993) sport business history article, "The Rochester Royals and the Transformation of Professional Basketball, 1945–57" (Mullin, Hardy, & Sutton, 2007, pp. 35–36). Hardy's contribution to supporting the use of sport history examples as a framework for sport management practices is something that we argue Sport Management should recognize, accept, and reproduce more widely.

Taking cues from Chandler, Hardy clearly saw the entrepreneur as the central figure in the construction of modern sports. In a recent essay, "Polo at the Rinks: Shaping Markets for Ice Hockey in America, 1880–1900," (2006), Hardy continued to argue "one cannot understand the development of any sport . . . without examining the fingerprints from their [entrepreneur's] visible hands" (p. 159). In seeing both the fields of sport history and sport management as the study of the sport industry, Hardy saw the entrepreneur's market creation as central to the growth of the sport industry (Hardy, 1990b). He viewed the study of sport history and management as completely compatible, when historians answered questions in which scholars of sport management were interested (Hardy, 1999). Again, in Hardy's eyes, questions that examined how and why the sport industry developed, and why it developed when it did, were central to the study of the sport industry.

As Wiggins and Mason (2005) showed, sport historians moved from examinations of causation in the 1980s and 1990s to a much greater focus on sport's social and cultural meanings (2005, pp.48–49). In essence, instead of heeding Hardy's call in 1986, sport historians increasingly examined sport's external meanings instead of analyzing internal issues within sport history and the sport industry. While Hardy's recognition of this point helped challenge the focus of sport history in 1986, the field of sport history moved in a decidedly different direction from scholars of sport management and other disciplines in sport studies more generally. Possibly, as a result, sport historians faced increasing marginalization in sport studies (Wiggins & Mason, 2005, pp.41–42). Still, some were actively practicing Hardy's call to study sport business from a contextual or historical perspective. As an example, Lawrence Fielding cowrote several historical case studies for sport management

researchers to help support the use of sport history in the study sport business or management practices (Miller, Fielding, & Pitts, 1993).

Lawrence Fielding

Lawrence Fielding, another advisee of Marvin Eyler, completed his doctoral work in sport history at the University of Maryland. Upon completion of his dissertation in 1974, "Sport on the Road to Appomattox," Fielding accepted a position at the University of Louisville, where he researched sport history for the next decade, although he published in nonsport history journals as well (Fielding, 1984). In 1985, NASSH recognized Fielding's scholarship with the Seward Staley address at their annual conference (Wiggins, 2005). Similar to Lewis before him, Fielding began to pursue sport management as a field of inquiry, but, unlike Lewis, Fielding continued to write historical pieces on sport management topics within sport management journals. Particularly, Fielding wrote or cowrote several historical studies on sport marketing topic/subjects (Fielding & Miller, 1996a; 1996b; 1998; Fielding, Miller, & Brown, 1999). He also coauthored a significant number of well-known sport management articles, including "Industry Segmentation Theory and the Sport Industry Model" (1994). In this article, Pitts, Fielding, and Miller discussed "The Sport Performance Segment," "The Sport Production Segment" and the "Sport Promotion Segment," as a model of industry segmentation. The article should be considered a framing piece for sport marketing work and teaching. For example, it was featured in *Case Studies in Sport Marketing*, where the authors wrote, "theory is merged into reality" (Pitts, 1998, pp. 6–7). Fielding later became Chair of the Department of Sport Marketing and Sport Management at Indiana University and NASSM named him a Fellow in 2002. He continues to be a recognized figure within sport management and sport history circles.

Lawrence Fielding is perhaps the best example of an academician who brought sport business history into the realm of sport management. The courses Fielding taught as Chair of the Sport Management and Marketing program at Indiana University also provide an example, in addition to his publication record, of how business history could become an organized area within Sport Management. At Indiana University, Fielding taught classes such as a "History of Sport in America," and "The Sport Industry." Indiana University described the latter as a "study of the sport industry with an emphasis on developing an understanding of how firms with the sport industry create a competitive advantage" ("Kinesiology Graduate Courses," 2008). It is a class that seeks to ask questions that which appear very similar to the Harvard Business School's "Coming of Modern Capitalism," course and a class suited for sport business historians to lead.

Fielding's work also emphasized the entrepreneur similar to Hardy and the Harvard Business School. Specifically, before the tremendous growth of Nike occurred, Albert Spalding, and other entrepreneurs like bicycle tycoon Albert Pope were shown to be particularly important to the development of modern Western sports in the late 19th century. In essence, Fielding and others demonstrated how these people shaped and created a sporting ideology and market (Fielding, & Miller, 1996a, 1996b, 1998; Hardy, 1990b). As an example, the formation of standard rules and sports internationally was due to entrepreneurs. Fielding, it should be noted, published one of the few true historical analyses in *The Journal of Sport*

Management with his case study of the entrepreneurs behind the Harlem Globetrotters. In the article, he and coauthors Lori K. Miller and James R. Brown argued that the historical case study provided valuable “practice scenarios” with which sport management scholars could teach (Fielding, Miller, & Brown, 1999). In so doing, he practiced exactly the type of scholarship for which we are calling.

Discussion/Conclusion

While the study of entrepreneurial history and the often nonquantifiable agency of entrepreneurial innovation dominated successful research in business history, the prestigious *Journal of American History* (2005) showed in “Interchange: History in the Professional Schools” professionally trained historians can operate adaptively in prestigious schools of “business, divinity, education, journalism, law and medicine” (p. 553). Furthermore, they can tailor their curriculum to be professional-school focused. For instance, at the Harvard Business School, Nancy Koehn adjusts M.B.A. student instruction by assigning “many fewer historiographical readings” than in a history department and expects much more “interdisciplinary discussion and curiosity” from their students which they can apply to create practical solutions (p. 561). Business historians also continue to thrive at the Harvard Business School because they remain one of the primary producers of H.B.S.’ renowned case studies. As Chandler pointed out, “Don’t forget, the heart of this [H.B.S.] school’s curriculum has always been the case study, and the case study is precisely what a historian does, what a historian is trained to do” (Kantrow, 1986, p. 82; McCraw, et al., 1999).

Interestingly, with the current global recession Harvard Business School’s long-term view of business and leadership is once again receiving praise (Holland, 2009). We believe the discipline of Sport Management could easily embrace business history and the case study approach in curriculums and research endeavors to benefit the field. In fact, in older NASSM guidelines, a “History of Sport Management” was proposed as an area of inquiry for the field (National Association for Sport and Physical Education & North American Society for Sport Management, 1993, p. 3). In the future, we advocate scholars need to better record, embrace, and use the histories of prominent figures and events in sport to educate peers and students about the context of sport. Works completed by the scholars above demonstrate that narratives, trials, and tribulations are academically important to every member of the sport management community. We argue historical practice will undoubtedly improve the legacy of those in the future because it recognizes the successes and failures of the past. An emphasis on Best Business Practices, utilizing history and case studies also serve as another viable teaching method because it encourages role-playing activities and use of a variety of available resources (Seifried, in press; Fielding, et al. 1999). Essentially, similar to case studies, leadership exercises, such as those practiced at Harvard Business School, provide students the opportunity to collect, examine, and develop an understanding of the context entrepreneurs and organizations endured and how decisions were rendered at specific moments in time (Kantrow, 1986).

Central to this work, we also highlighted the importance of narratives to entrepreneurial studies. As Chandler successfully showed, and Hardy endorsed, business historians of sport need to ask questions that are relevant to a business environment like: How was this promoter successful? or Why was she success-

ful? As an example, take Hardy's (1990a) discussion of Senda Berenson at Smith College in the 1890s as a women's physical educator. Berenson saw athletics as a necessary tool to help strengthen the female gender. However, she sought to separate out game traits that she saw as detrimental to women's participation in athletics. From the game of "basket ball," which James Naismith invented in Springfield in 1891, Berenson created her "moderate" game form, "by women, for women" (p. 73). Next, she chaired the Committee on Women's Basket Ball and published her rules in Spalding guidebooks, which were nationally distributed and provided critical ideological sanction for her vision of the women's game. For nearly a century afterward, Berenson's creation of "moderate" basketball remained a nationally accepted form, and eventually became a subject of vigorous debate (Lucas, 2003). Through this narrative, Hardy (1990a) was able to show how and why Berenson was successful, and how important her context was to her success. Berenson's narrative is one form of entrepreneurial narrative, but these narratives can take many forms. Histories like this one advocated by these pillars in sport management are readable in both a history and business environment, and we argue should be a core grounding to any sport management program.

Overwhelmingly, the works of the scholars presented above also demonstrate historians and the study of history should be seen as seeking to communicate tensions and changing value systems to convey the importance of context. In an environment, in which "future focused" oriented scholars dominate, it is easy to forget that much of business occurs in a nonquantifiable manner. We recognize scholars in any school seek generalizability in their studies but what makes these studies universally valid? Social scientists would concede that no model is perfect for every situation (Skinner & Edwards, 2005). Therefore, the methods used by historians and other humanities' disciplines should be seen as important additions. In this light, the Harvard Business School prompts their business students to "look to history for perspectives as they make choices— professional and personal— in their lives" (Kantrow, 1986, p. 558). We further add that history serves to adequately augment and enhance quantitative or empirical works when doubt in their figures exists.

Similar to the scholars above, Seifried (in press) and Mason et al. (1997) proposed historical study also provides students with an opportunity to demonstrate their level of understanding on a topic. Mason et al. (1997) specifically identified that this occurs through the development of inductive reasoning skills. Analogies, connections, differences, and agreements through pattern analysis serve to help any scholar or student create new or advanced conceptual perspectives (Mason et al., 1997). We advocate this could help members of our academic and professional community anticipate future events and create the appropriate strategy, which promotes or prohibits the phenomena. Again, courses and advisors who use the case-study approach advocated and supported by these scholars and the H.B.S. should see inductive reasoning significantly improved.

Finally, although we recognize there are a number of texts related to the history of Sport Management, and sport business history, (Chelladurai, Shanmuganathan, & Nageswaran, 2002; Washington & Ventresca, 2008; Zeigler, 2007a; Ross, 2005; Girginov & Sandanski, 2008), few discuss the history of its founders and/or important figures. Despite recent criticisms of his more than half-a-century of work (McCraw, 2008), Chandler's idea of business history and its practice within business schools presents a still viable model for sport management to adopt and

use. We argued in this paper that the genealogy of the sport management discipline is at least partially due to the vision of inductive pedagogy, case studies, and business historians who wrote and taught in the Harvard Business School (“Business Humanist,” 1942; Zeigler, 2007b, p. 10). Furthermore, much of the development of the field of sport management should be credited to the hard work provided by these individuals. The historical training these scholars received provided them with an exceptional and unique perspective on sport management. Historical training and research also provides scholars today an exciting and relevant format of research (Booth & Rowlinson, 2006; Jones & Shaw, 2006). As evidenced by new journals such as *Enterprise & Society* (2000), *Management and Organizational History* (2006) and *The Journal of Historical Research in Marketing* (2009), historical analysis represents a methodology that scholars across a broad range of disciplines in business schools are using with increasing frequency. It is something sport management scholars should not overlook. After all, those not able to appreciate the past may certainly be positioned to repeat it.

Acknowledgments

The research for this article was undertaken while Ari de Wilde was a doctoral student at The Ohio State University.

Notes

¹ While these four individuals are all male, their careers reflected the evolution toward a more gender equitable sport studies profession. All four individuals to our knowledge worked with women as colleagues and students, although in the case of Zeigler and Hardy in the capacity as scholars in other academic areas of inquiry. Of those in sport management, Fielding would be the major example although we confess we are less insightful into whom were Guy Lewis’ students at either the University of Massachusetts or the University of South Carolina. However, the larger issue is that sport management as something distinctive from the old sport and physical education administration field had its start to some degree in a gendered world, when many universities categorized their physical activity studies under a Health, Physical Education and Recreation (H.P.E.R) rubric. It would remain so for at least a good part of the field’s early years. In this vein, Adelman (2009) discussed the gendered nature of the field of sport history, and the topic of gender in the field of sport management is a deserving one for a future paper. Certainly, many female scholars made myriad contributions to the field of sport management.

² During this period, researchers at Harvard Business School were also trying to make connections with business and physiology, especially with the famed Harvard Fatigue Laboratory (Horvath & Horvath, 1973).

³ In *Strategy and Structure* (1962), Chandler examined several large corporations, including Standard Oil and General Motors during the first half of the twentieth century. Chandler highlighted the centrality of decentralization in corporate management and argued “strategy precedes structure” (“HBS Professor Alfred Chandler Jr. . . . Dead at 88,” 2007, ¶ 5). In 1977, Chandler published the *Visible Hand*, which argued that at large center corporations administrative coordination replaced Adam Smith’s invisible hand of the market around the turn-of the twentieth century. In *Scale and Scope*, (1988) Chandler showed common managerial behaviors that were successful, such as the centrality of continued innovation to success.

⁴ Several other awards have also been bestowed to Zeigler. For instance, he received the Honor Award by the Canadian Association for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance in

1975 and another Honor Award from the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance in 1981. This was followed by the Hetherington Award (American Academy of Physical Education) in 1989, the Luther Halsey Gulick Medal (AAHPERD) in 1990, and recognition by the North American Society for the Study of Sport History (NASSH) in 2008 as important to the Contributions to Sport History.

References

- Adelman, M.L. (1973). Academicians and athletics: Historians' views of American sport. *The Maryland Historian*, 4, 123–137.
- Adelman, M.L. (1983). Academicians and American athletics: A decade of progress, 1973–1982. *Journal of Sport History*, 10, 80–106.
- Adelman, M.L. (2009). Differing with Dyreson, but finding many points of agreement: Another look at the roads of sport history and sport historians. Paper presented at the North American Society for Sport History, Ashville, North Carolina.
- Amis, J., & Silk, M. (2005). Rupture: promoting critical and innovative approaches to the study of sport management. *Journal of Sport Management*, 19, 355–366.
- Berryman, J. (1973). Sport history as social history. *Quest*, 20, 65–72.
- Booth, C., & Rowlinson, M. (2006). Management and organizational history: prospects. *Management and Organizational History*, 1, 5–30.
- Boucher, R.L. (1998). Toward achieving a focal point for sport management: a binocular perspective. *Journal of Sport Management*, 12, 76–85.
- Business Humanist. (1942, May 25) *Time Magazine*. Retrieved December 22, 2008, from <http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,766582,00.html>
- Chandler, A.D., Jr. (1962). *Strategy and structure: Chapters in the history of the industrial enterprise*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chandler, A.D., Jr. (1977). *The visible hand: The managerial revolution in American business*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Chandler, A.D., Jr. (1988). Scale, scope, and organizational capabilities. In T. McCraw (Ed.), *The essential Alfred Chandler: Essays toward a historical theory of big business* (pp. 472–504). Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Chandler, A.D., Jr., & Tedlow, R. (1985). *The coming of managerial capitalism: A casebook of American economic institutions*. Homewood, IL: Richard Irwin Inc.
- Chelladurai, P., Shanmuganathan, D., & Nageswaran, A.S. (2002). Sport in modern India: policies, practices and problems. *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, 19, 319–342.
- Cole, A. (1964). Perspectives on leisure-time business. *Explorations in Entrepreneurial History*, 1, 6–28.
- Conant, J. (1963). *The education of American teachers*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Cousens, L., & Slack, T. (2005). Field-level change: The case of North American major league professional sport. *Journal of Sport Management*, 19, 13–42.
- Faculty & Research. (2008). *HBS.edu*. Retrieved December 20, 2008, from <http://pine.hbs.edu/external/keywordFacAction.do?keyword=business%20history&keyty%20pe=ALL>
- Fielding, L.W. (1974). *Sport on the road to Appomattox*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park.
- Fielding, L.W. (1984). No 'I' in team sports. *Physical Educator*, 41, 181–185.
- Fielding, L.W., & Miller, L.K. (1996a). Historical eras in sport marketing. In B.G. Pitts & D.K. Stotlar (Eds.), *Fundamentals of Sport Marketing* (2nd ed., pp. 37–60). Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology, Inc.
- Fielding, L.W., & Miller, L.K. (1996b). Advertising and the development of consumer purchasing criteria: The sporting goods industry, 1900–1930. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 5, 37–50.

- Fielding, L.W., & Miller, L.K. (1998). The ABC trust: A chapter in the history of capitalism in the sporting goods industry. *Sport History Review*, 29, 44–58.
- Fielding, L.W., Miller, L.K., & Brown, J.R. (1999). Harlem Globetrotters International, Inc. *Journal of Sport Management*, 13, 45–77.
- Fisher, D. (1993). The Rochester Royals and the transformation of professional basketball, 1945–57. *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, 10, 20–48.
- Fogel, R.W. (1964). *Railroads and American economic growth: Essays in econometric history*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press.
- Foner, E. (2002). *Who owns history?: Rethinking the past in a changing world*. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Girginov, V., & Sandanski, I. (2008). Understanding the changing nature of sports organisations in transforming societies. *Sport Management Review*, 11, 21–50.
- Gras, N.S.B. (1950). Past, present and future of the business historical society. *Bulletin of the Business Historical Society*, 24, 1–12.
- Hardy, S. (1982). *How Boston played: Sport recreation, and community 1865-1915*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Hardy, S. (1986). Entrepreneurs, organizations, and the sport marketplace: Subjects in search of historians. *Journal of Sport History*, 13, 14–33.
- Hardy, S. (1987). Graduate curriculums in sport management: The need for a business orientation. *Quest*, 39, 207–216.
- Hardy, S. (1990a). Entrepreneurs, structures, and the sportgeist: old tensions in a modern industry. In D. Kyle & G. Stark (Eds.), *Essays on sport history and sport mythology* (pp. 45–82). College Station: Texas A&M Press.
- Hardy, S. (1990b). Adopted by all the leading clubs: sporting goods and the shaping of leisure, 1800-1900. In R. Butsch (Ed.), *For fun and profit: The transformation of leisure into consumption* (pp. 71–101). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Hardy, S. (1999). Where did you go Jackie Robinson? Or, the end of history and the age of sport infrastructure. *Sporting Traditions*, 16, 85–100.
- Hardy, S. (2006). “Polo at the rinks”: Shaping markets for ice hockey in America, 1880–1900. *Journal of Sport History*, 33, 158.
- Hawley, E. (1979). *The Great War and the search for a modern order, a history of the American people and their institutions, 1917-1933*. New York: St. Martin’s Press.
- HBS Professor Alfred Chandler Jr., pre-eminent Business Historian, dead at 88. (2007, May 17). *Harvard University Gazette Online*. Retrieved January 2, 2009, from <http://www.news.harvard.edu/gazette/2007/05.17/27-chandler.html>
- Heere, B., & Dickson, G. (2008). Measuring attitudinal loyalty: Separating the terms of affective commitment and attitudinal loyalty. *Journal of Sport Management*, 22, 227–239.
- Hidy, R.W., & Hidy, M.E. (1962). Henrietta M. Larson: An appreciation. *Business History Review*, 36, 1–10.
- Holland, K. (2009, March 15). Is it time to retrain business schools? *The New York Times*, p. BU1.
- Horvath, S.M., & Horvath, E.C. (1973). *The Harvard fatigue laboratory: Its history and contributions*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Interchange: History in the professional schools. (2005). *The Journal of American History*, 92, 553–76.
- Johnson, A.M. (1978). Ralph Willard Hidy, 1905-1977. *Business History Review*, 52, 154–164.
- Jones, D.G., & Shaw, E.H. (2006). Historical research in the journal of macromarketing, 1981-2005. *Journal of Macromarketing*, 26, 178–192.
- Kantrow, A. (Ed.). (1986). Why history matters to managers. *Harvard Business Review*, 81–88.
- Kinesiology Graduate Courses. (2008). Retrieved December 20, 2008, from <http://www.indiana.edu/~kines/academics/grad.shtml#k516>
- Kuhn, T. (1962). *Structure of the scientific revolutions*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

- Leach, W. (1993). *Land of desire: Merchants, power and the rise of a new American culture*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Lewis, G. (1964). *The American intercollegiate football spectacle, 1869-1917*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park.
- Lewis, G. (1967). America's first intercollegiate sport: the regattas from 1852 to 1875. *Research Quarterly*, 38, 637-648.
- Lewis, G. (1969). Theodore Roosevelt's role in the 1905 football controversy. *Research Quarterly*, 40, 717-724.
- Lewis, G. (1973). World war I and the emergence of sport for the masses. *The Maryland Historian*, 2, 1-24.
- Lewis, G. (1977). Sport, youth culture and conventionality, 1920-1970. *Journal of Sport History*, 4, 129-150.
- Lewis, G. (1980). The sports enterprise. *Arena Newsletter*, 4, 12-17.
- Lewis, G., & Appenzeller, H. (1985). *Successful sport management*. Charlottesville, VA: The Mitchie Company.
- Lucas, S. (2003). Courting controversy: Gender and power in Iowa's girls basketball. *Journal of Sport History*, 30, 281-308.
- Mahony, D.F., & Pitts, B.G. (1998). Research outlets in sport marketing: the need for increased specialization. *Journal of Sport Management*, 12, 259-272.
- Mason, R.O., McKenney, J.L., & Copeland, D.G. (1997). An historical method for MIS research: Steps and assumptions. *Management Information Systems Quarterly*, 21, 307-320.
- McCraw, T.K. (2007). *Prophet of innovation: Joseph Schumpeter and creative destruction*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- McCraw, T.K. (2008). Alfred Chandler: his vision and achievement. *Business History Review*, 82, 207-226.
- McCraw, T.K. (Ed.). (1988). *The essential Alfred Chandler: Essays toward a historical theory of big business*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- McCraw, T.K., Koehn, N.F., & Nelles, H.V. (1999). *Business history*. In T. K. McCraw & J.L. Cruikshank (Eds.), *The intellectual venture capitalist: John H. McArthur and the work of the Harvard Business School, 1980-1995* (pp. 245-72). Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Metcalf, A. (2005). Marvin Eyer: A personal tribute. *Journal of Sport History*, 32, 71-75.
- Miller, L.K., Fielding, L.W., & Pitts, B.G. (1993). The rise of the Louisville Slugger in the mass market. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 2, 9-16.
- Mullin, B.J., Hardy, S., & Sutton, W.A. (2007). *Sport marketing* (3rd ed.). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- National Association for Sport and Physical Education & North American Society for Sport Management. (1993). *Sport management program standards and review protocol*. Reston, VA: Author.
- Olafson, G.A. (1990). Research design in sport management: What's missing, what's needed? *Journal of Sport Management*, 4, 103-120.
- Olafson, G.A. (1995). Sport management research: ordered change. *Journal of Sport Management*, 9, 338-345.
- Parkhouse, B.L., & Pitts, B.G. (2005). History of sport management. In B.L. Parkhouse (Ed.), *The management of sport: Its foundation and application* (4th ed., pp. 2-14). New York: McGraw Hill.
- Pitts, B.G. (Ed.). (1998). *Case studies in sport marketing*. Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology.
- Pitts, B.G., Fielding, L.W., & Miller, L.K. (1994). Industry segmentation theory and the sport industry: Developing a sport industry segment model. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 3, 15-24.
- Room dedication for Dr. Guy Lewis. (September, 2007). *UMass Isenberg School of Management, Sport Management Alumni Newsletter*. Retrieved May 27, 2009 from:

- http://www.isenberg.umass.edu/sportmgt/uploads/textWidget/871.00013/documents/August_07_Newsletter.pdf
- Ross, J.A. (2005) Hockey capital: Approaches to the study of the sport industry. *Business and Economic History Online*, 3. Retrieved June 20, 2008 from: <http://www.h-net.org/~business/bhcweb/publications/BEHonline/2005/ross.pdf>.
- Schumpeter, J. (1947). The creative response in economic history. *The Journal of Economic History*, 7, 149–159.
- Seifried, C.S. (in press). Review of historical methods for sport management: How studying history benefits sport management. *International Journal of Sport Management*.
- Seo, W.J., & Green, B.C. (2008). Development of the motivation scale for sport online consumption. *Journal of Sport Management*, 22, 82–109.
- Skinner, J.S., & Edwards, A. (2005). Inventive pathways: fresh visions of sport management research. *Journal of Sport Management*, 19, 404–421.
- Slack, T. (1997). *Understanding sport organizations: The application of organization theory*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Slack, T. (1998). Is there anything unique about sport management? *European Journal of Sport Management*, 5, 21–29.
- Washington, M., & Ventresca, M.J. (2008). Institutional contradictions and struggles in the formation of U.S. collegiate basketball, 1880-1938. *Journal of Sport Management*, 22, 30–49.
- Wiebe, R.H. (1967). *The search for order, 1877-1920*. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Wiggins, D.K. (2005). Marvin Eyler and his students: a legacy of scholarship in sport history. *Journal of Sport History*, 32, 77–90.
- Wiggins, D.K., & Mason, D. (2005). The socio-historical process in sport studies. In D. Andrews, D. Mason, & M. Silk (Eds.), *Qualitative methods in sport studies* (pp. 39–65). Oxford, UK: Berg.
- Zeigler, E.F. (1951). *A history of professional preparation for physical education in the United States, 1861-1948*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Yale University.
- Zeigler, E.F. (1959a). *Administration of physical education and athletics: A case method approach*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Zeigler, E.F. (1959b). *The case method approach: Instructional manual*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Zeigler, E.F. (1992). Using the rays from history's shining lantern as we face an uncertain future. *Journal of Sport Management*, 6, 206–214.
- Zeigler, E.F. (2005). *History and status of American physical education and educational sport*. Victoria, B.C.: Trafford.
- Zeigler, E.F. (2007a). Sport management must show social concern as it develops tenable theory. *Journal of Sport Management*, 21, 297–318.
- Zeigler, E.F. (2007b). *An encounter with management in physical activity and sport*. Retrieved December 16, 2008, from <http://www.nassm.com/files/Zeigler-Encounter.pdf>.
- Zeigler, E.F. (2007c). *An encounter with philosophy in sport and physical activity education* (unpublished manuscript).
- Zeigler, E.F. (2009). *Sport and physical activity in human history: A "Persistent Problems" analysis*. (unpublished manuscript).
- Zeigler, E.F., & McCristal, K.L. (1964). A history of the Big Ten body-of-knowledge project in physical education. *Quest*, 9, 79–84.