Chapter 7

Managing Innovation & Change: Branch Rickey Meets Machiavelli

Failure is not fatal, but failure to change might be.

John Wooden, former UCLA basketball coach

One thing is clear: we don't have the option of turning away from the future...No one can stop

productive change in the long run because the marketplace inexorably embraces it.

Bill Gates, Microsoft CEO

For the 1986-87 season the NCAA adopted the three-point shot set at a radius of about 19

feet from the basket. During the season, several coaches exploited the new rule at the expense of

their coaching colleagues. Rick Pitino, for one, built his entire offense around the shot with his

team taking many more shots per game from the 3-point range than most teams. His Providence

Friars rose from relative obscurity to compete with the Big East big boys. Ultimately, the Friars

advanced to the Final Four not only for only the second time in school history without any

players with strong NBA potential. The UNLV Runnin' Rebels also made liberal use of the 3-

point shot to advance to the Final Four in 1987. The Rebels contained several highly touted

players and a coach, Jerry Tarkanian, already known for a freewheeling offensive style.   His

1977 Final Four club averaged nearly 100 points per game long before the advent of the shot

clock or the 3-point shot. UNLV utilized the 3-point shot extensively. Even Bob Knight, a

coach known for his emphasis on defense and deliberate offensive strategy, took full advantage

of the rule change. He had one of the most accurate outside shooters in college basketball in

senior guard Steve Alford. That season, Alford took over 100 3-point shots, including making 7

in the 1987 national championship game against Syracuse.

In contrast, other coaches did not adapt quickly to the new environment. Some of these,

such as first year Western Kentucky University coach Murray Arnold did not like the new rule.

Arnold not only voiced his opinion against the shot but only reluctantly integrated it into his

offensive plans. He inherited a team that had gone to the second round of the NCAA tournament

the previous season, losing to the University of Kentucky by five points. The team returned four

of five starters and several talented younger players. Early in the season, the Hilltoppers

excelled even against top level opposition, reaching the finals of the "Preseason NIT" and

achieving a number eight ranking in a national poll. However, the finals of the NIT against

UNLV foreshadowed the season for the Hilltoppers. Arnold's team led by twenty points into the

second half when UNLV stormed back on a barrage of 3-point shots to win in overtime. Even

though the team experienced considerable success during the season, the early season dominance

eroded as they faced more teams with the willingness and ability to use the 3-pointer. In the

regular season finale, a mediocre UAB team soundly defeated WKU. Even though the team won

its conference tournament, their seeding fell to ninth and they had to play top seeded Syracuse in

the second round on Syracuse's home floor.

Innovative ideas comprise one part of what might be broadly labeled entrepreneurship.

This became a buzzword in management education during the 1990s, and its meaning can be very fuzzy. Sometimes it is merely a code word for small business management. On other occasions, it stands as a synonym for innovation. Most broadly, the term encompasses "value creation," a catchall for all the creative skills that a manager brings to the table to help the business succeed. In this chapter, the focus will be on the innovative aspects of entrepreneurship.

ADAPT OR ELSE ...

As Chapter 4 discussed at length, people are a key if not the key ingredient to the success of any team or organization. However, it is a mistake to view the mere presence of human beings as the only ingredient. People are important because they bring ideas and attributes that no machine can imitate. Some coaches become entranced with "mano-a-mano" victories without putting enough thought and creativity into designing or tweaking methods so as to permit their personnel to reach their highest potential. To give people a chance to succeed, they require the right tools, technology, and combinations with others – ideas lay behind all of these. As obvious as this may seem, strong forces and even very smart people within organizations obstinately resist adapting to new ways of doing things or combining resources in new ways.

In extreme contrast to this kind of foot-dragging, teeth-clenched opposition to change, great managers know that the ability to adapt and change ultimately determines survival – at least over the long haul. Superficially, teams and organizations may appear to find success without much change, but sooner or later, lack of it catches up to them. Many legendary sports

figures speak to its importance. The epigram from UCLA's John Wooden, "Failure is not fatal, but failure to change might be" has been attributed to other coaches as well.[1]

The most successful hockey coach of all time, Scotty Bowman, echoed the same idea but put it even more bluntly, "I found out that if you are going to win games, you had better be ready to adapt."[2]   That is a strong statement from a coach whose longevity at a championship level rivals any coach from any sport. Table 7.1 displays his achievements. He amassed nine Stanley Cups, equaling Red Auerbach for the most championships in any of the four "major" professional sports and led three other teams to the finals.

[INSERT TABLE 7.1 HERE]

Ironically, Bowman was widely known for his no-nonsense, tight-fisted control of his teams. In spite of personnel methods that could sometimes create fear and loathing, Bowman never became locked into any particular system to achieve success. His lack of personal relations may have cut short his stints earlier in his career, but it did not get in the way of his ability to adapt his tactics to the players he has as well as to changes in league rules and enforcement. He won those nine championships with three different clubs – Montreal (1973, 1976-79), Pittsburgh (1992), and Detroit (1997-98, 2002) – with varied strengths and weaknesses. Rather than trying to place all the players into a single mold, Bowman adapted his tactics to the talent on hand.[3] The Montreal teams featured all-round great play while the Pittsburgh team boasted one of the two best offensive players of all time in Mario Lemieux. His early Detroit teams adopted a

suffocating defensive scheme known as the "left-wing lock" while his later teams in Detroit were much more offense-oriented.

Effective management at any level and in any business requires carefully crafted adjustments to the environment external and internal to the organization. Competitive pressures, technology, laws, regulations, skills of people, cultural restrictions, and other matters evolve over time. Managers wedded to particular ways of doing things rather than making well-reasoned responses to the new environment have a hard time coping. Coaches and managers are just like players in that even at the highest levels of sports, differences in abilities manifest themselves, and so it is with ability to adjust to new rules. In any kind of management situation, strategic and tactical decisions are always made in the context of environmental conditions. These conditions include preferences and incomes of consumers, the current level of know-how (technology), and rules of society including laws, regulations, and widely accepted customs. None of these environmental influences are set in stone. Often, they evolve slowly, but occasionally quantum changes crop up over short periods of time such as the 3-point rule in the NCAA.

One coach whose long run of success is attributable to his ability to stay one step ahead of the competition is Tom Landry. As an assistant coach for the New York Giants in the 1950s, he coordinated defensive strategies. When he took this job, defensive players typically just reacted to the movement of the ball. Landry thought that defensive players could gain an advantage by observing patterns of behavior of offensive players. Reading of "keys" meant the defenders would observe the positioning of offensive players or the initial movement of various offensive players and use these as a signals to the play's intent. By the 1960s, this "keying" on

offensive players has become standard throughout the league. In 1956, he adjusted his defensive personnel and alignment to better stop the offenses of the Cleveland Browns and Chicago Bears as well as to make better use of the unique skills of one of his young players, Sam Huff. Most professional teams had to this point used five lineman on defense. In his new alignment, Landry used four linemen and placed Huff at middle linebacker along with two other "outside linebackers" with the intent of having a defense better able to respond to a run or pass. Landry's "4-3" defense is still the standard more than forty years later.

When he became head coach of the newly formed Dallas Cowboys in 1960, Landry turned his innovative ideas more to offense. If he did not pioneer the use of multiple offensive formations, he certainly popularized them as a means to complicate the challenge to the defensive of keying on a play merely by observing the pre-snap formation of the offense. He reinvented the use of the "shotgun" formation where the quarterback received the snap several yards behind the center to give the quarterback more time and better vision in obvious passing situations. He was one of the first coaches to send plays in from the sideline – a practice for which he was widely criticized by players and media alike, but a practice now universal in football. He organized game films by specific plays and by positions in order to better analyze success and failure of plays. Back on defense, he adjusted his 4-3 defensive alignment into the 4-3 "flex" in 1964 as more teams began to use multiple offensive formations. Among other things, the "flex" moved one defensive lineman back from the line of scrimmage in situations where running plays were more likely.[4] He also was one of the early coaches to use five defensive backs in obvious passing situations. Beyond the on-the-field strategies, he emphasized

the evaluation of players' mental abilities and motivation in addition to their athletic abilities.

Landry's success with innovations was not an accident. He called innovations "my greatest

strength" and credited his background in engineering and quality control concepts with helping

him recognize concepts that could be applied to football.[5] With this background, he viewed

innovation as an ongoing process necessary to stay ahead of or at least keep up with the

competition.

IMITATING THE INNOVATORS

Although he was elected to both the College and Pro Football Hall of Fame, won over 80

percent of his games as a college coach, led the LA-San Diego Chargers to five Western

Division titles and one AFL championship, and innovated many of the elements of current

offensive football strategy, Sid Gillman only briefly became a household name among average

football fans. Since the 1970s, names such as Bill Walsh, Don Coryell, Joe Gibbs, John Gruden

and others have become widely hailed for their innovative developments in offensive football

strategy – especially in the passing game. Their ideas and adjustments to them have come to be

labeled the "West Coast Offense" or "West Coast Passing Game." Usually Walsh and to a lesser

extent, Coryell, are credited as the innovators with a brief reference to influences on them. Yet,

Sid Gillman was already developing and deploying his radically different passing attack when

Walsh and Coryell were still a long way from NFL head coaching posts. The West Coast

offense for which they receive credit and used by the majority of NFL champions since the early

1980s closely reflects many much of the passing offense Gillman used. He initiated the concept of spreading the field horizontally and vertically to open up passing lanes and give quarterbacks more options to throw the ball. "He was way ahead of his time in organization, in the passing game, and offensive football," Al Davis told The Associated Press in an interview in January 2000. "In the '60s, the passing game was not yet really developed. At the advent of the AFL (in 1960), the Chargers were the flagship for all teams to follow, all teams to emulate."[6]

Beyond his influence on passing attacks and long preceding it, Gillman was an innovator in the use of film and cameras to capture the events during games and then analyze the film. Gillman's reliance on game film was attributed in large part to the fact that his family operated movie theaters in Minneapolis. In his first coaching job, at Denison, Ohio University in 1935, he saw an advertisement for a 35-millimeter projector for $35. We can't afford that," Mrs. Gillman recalled in an interview three years ago. "He says, 'I have to have this.' That was the beginning. He would come home, we would put up a white sheet on the wall, Sid would show me these films."

As with most any innovation, there are precursors to innovators. Sid Gillman was this kind of innovator. These people push the envelope of ideas beyond the level that most other managers and leaders are ready to consider. Even when they demonstrate success with their new ways, they generate few immediate disciples. Because of their ideas and their personalities as independent and non-conventional thinkers, they may be seen as flaky. Another half or full generation may pass before events come together in a way to support the full-scale development and adoption of ideas. By that time, the initial innovator may have faded and receive little credit

for the innovations. Even histories describing sequence of events and ideas leading up to the

innovation may fail to fully appreciate the early genius.

Whether in sports leagues or through industries, innovations usually disperse in the way

described above. They tend to follow an "S-shaped" path as depicted in Figure 7.1.   Just as with

Sid Gillman, the innovation starts out slowly, at some points begins to be adopted by the

majority, and then finally is adopted by the holdouts.

[INSERT FIGURE 7.1 HERE]

In the context of managerial abilities, the first part of the dispersion represents the adoption by

forward-looking managers on the watch for things that can help their companies improve. The

second part represents the adoption by managers, who may be more cautious, but soon respond

to the competitive pressure to keep up with the leaders in the industry. The last phase of the

dispersion often reflects the managers who just don't get it or are so set in their ways to bury

their heads in the sand or use the innovative item sparingly and begrudgingly. In some cases,

this last phase only takes place after the managers who drag their feet have been removed and

replaced with new ones.

Another element of innovation illustrated by sports is that it may mean reemphasizing or

remolding something that has fallen into disuse. For instance, Rick Pitino and some of his

assistants adopted intensive shooting practice as an innovative idea. In some ways, the idea that

this practice would ever have fallen out of favor as an integral part of basketball training is hard

to fathom. Yet, in the emphasis on defensive schemes and other aspects of training, repetitive and extensive shooting practice had fallen out of use by a large number of college coaches by the mid 1980s. Tom Landry's use of the "shotgun" formation reflected this "innovation from the past" by taking a formation that had fallen into disuse and reintroducing it.

One of the most astounding examples of success through reemphasizing or adapting existing methods took place during the 1990 NCAA Basketball Tournament, when the Lions of Loyala Marymount made a highly publicized advance to the West Regional Finals. Their story became national news because of the death of their star player, Hank Gathers, who died from complications of a heart condition during their conference tournament. Stirred by his death and in spite of his absence, LMU marched over more highly seeded teams -- New Mexico State, Michigan, and Alabama.   The Michigan win was especially startling. LMU not only defeated the third-seeded, defending national champions, but humiliated them in an unprecedented 149 to 115 onslaught in which Loyola scored an eye-popping 84 points in the second half. Ultimately, the eventual national champions that year, UNLV, ended the dream run for the Lions.

Paul Westhead took over as head coach of the basketball program at Loyola Marymount University in 1985.   He had previously coached the LA Lakers to a World Championship in 1980 but was fired in favor of Pat Riley over reported disputes with key players.   Upon his arrival at LMU, Westhead instituted an unconventional style of play emphasizing fast-breaking offense and pressure defense. After both made or missed shots by an opponent, LMU would pass the ball upcourt rapidly, attempting to shoot very quickly upon gaining possession.   When they scored, they would employ a full-court defense to attempt to influence the opponent into a

quicker tempo of play. They shot a large number of 3-point shots and played pressure defense.

Westhead did not invent any of these tactics, but he pushed them to extremes not seen before.

For example, LMU had a goal to shoot within 3 seconds from the time when they gained

possession of the ball.

Even though it led to high scoring and frenetic play, Westhead's system required

discipline and sacrifice by his players. For the system to work, the LMU players had to be

physically conditioned to a point exceeding the norms for college players of the era. For at least

the first three years, the new system caught many supposedly more talent-laden opponents

unable to cope with the pace of play. Although LMU had made only one appearance in the

NCAA tournament in the prior 27 years, they earned three straight tournaments births from 1988

to 1990. In the 1988 NCAA tournament, LMU defeated a more highly seeded Wyoming team

119 to 115, before falling to traditional powerhouse North Carolina.

Whether the West Coast offense or an up-tempo playing style, these episodes indicate

that one does not have to be the first person to come up with an idea to benefit from it. Utilizing

ideas on which others have done experiments and endured many of the start-up costs may, in

fact, be a more efficient way to profit from innovations than being at the very outset. Bill Gates

and Microsoft are frequently mocked because their "Windows" mimicked rather than innovated

the graphics-based interfaces now universally used. As the episodes above indicate, successful

and effective adaptation is not all about being first. However, it is also not about being last.

Those who often profited the most in the cases above were those who recognized the value of

someone else's innovation fairly early on.

PEOPLE AS THE INNOVATION

The racial integration of baseball starting with Robinson at the outset of the 1947 season and joined by Larry Doby of the Cleveland Indians in July has been well documented as an historical episode.[7] In 1946 when Brooklyn Dodger general manager Branch Rickey surreptitiously plotted the introduction of not only the first but several blacks to join the Dodgers, the outcome of his plan was far from certain. As late as 1945, it appeared as though the chance of an African-American joining the major leagues was still far off. Owners of poorly performing teams had ignored suggestions to use black players to enhance their teams' fortunes. Philadelphia owner, Bill Veeck, had already been blocked in his attempt to bring black players to his team. Still, Rickey forged ahead and recruited Jackie Robinson along with Roy Campenella, holding his plan in such close confidence that even Campanella thought that the overtures toward him were to play with the Negro League Brooklyn Brown Dodgers rather than the National League's Brooklyn Dodgers.

Societal pressures along with Branch Rickey's motives have been mulled over extensively. Yet, whatever his broader social agenda, if he had one at all, Branch Rickey intended to utilize black players to make the Dodgers a better team. In this respect, his addition of black players to the Dodgers tapped into the innovative and entrpreneurial abilities that he had shown while serving as general manager of the St. Louis Cardinals during the 1920s and 1930s.[8] Because of the difficulty in competing for major league-level players with clubs such as the Yankees, he revolutionized the scouting and development of players by instituting tryout

camps for thousands of young players. To further develop the players found to be promising, he

placed them in minor league teams, starting what came be know as the "farm system" – an

innovation that survives to present times, albeit in altered ownership formats. Lesser known

among Rickey's contributions to the game were the use of pitching machines, specialized spring

training facilities, and promotions such as ladies day and free admittance to young boys.

Innovating in the use of black ball players was not as simple as just signing someone to a

contract. It demanded that Rickey overcome several obstacles in order to bring Jackie Robinson

and others to the Dodgers. Rickey first had to recognize that black athletes in general and these

players in particular possessed skills that make the Dodgers a better team. By itself, this was not

novel – members of the black press had long touted black players as remedies for bad MLB

teams. For instance, a telegram from Pittsburgh sportswriter Chester Washington to the manager

of the Pirates in 1933 stated, "Know your club needs players. Have answers to your prayers

right here in Pittsburgh. Josh Gibson catcher Buck Leonard first base S. Paige pitcher and Cool

Papa Bell all available at reasonable figures. Would make the Pirates formidable Pennant

contenders."[9] Looking back, Hall of Fame pitcher Dizzy Dean said of Satchel Paige "... the best

pitcher I ever saw."[10]

Yet, agreement about the potential contribution of black players was far from universal.

Rickey's assessment of blacks veered from the mainstream outlook. Whether because of lack of

attention, poor evaluation, or fear of harassment, few in MLB had even hinted at the capability of

black players at helping. Hall of Fame pitcher Bob Feller, for one, had played many

"barnstorming" games against black teams. Moreover, he was not noted as a white player who

ever begrudged the introduction of black players. Yet, he predicted that only Satchel Paige and

Josh Gibson might possess major league talent. He viewed Robinson abilities with skepticism.

Among major league owners and managers, only maverick Bill Veeck expressed an appreciation

for what black players might add on the field.

The racial integration as an innovation story in MLB has been repeated in many other

sports leagues. Atlantic Coast Conference basketball followed the same path. The growth of the

University of North Carolina as a basketball powerhouse can, in part, be attributed to coach Dean

Smith's willingness to be at the leading edge of the use of black athletes. While much has been

made of the Texas Western's (now Texas-El Paso) NCAA championship in 1966 because of

their use of five black starters against an all white Kentucky squad, NCAA Final Four history

from the mid 1950s through the mid 1970s illustrates the typical path of innovation. Before the

mid 1950s, segregation permitted college basketball to be dominated by all-white or nearly all-

white teams. By the mid 1950s, the landscape began to change as Table 7.2 shows. The

University of San Francisco won championships in 1955 and 1956 with an African-American

star player – future NBA legend Bill Russell. During the late 1950s and early 1960s, the Final

Four saw an increasing number of teams that were not only integrated but had black players who

were the keys to their success including Wilt Chamberlain at Kansas, Elgin Baylor at Seattle,

Oscar Robertson at Cincinnati.

[INSERT TABLE 7.2 HERE]

By the mid to late 1960s, the innovation was imitated more widely, and schools that extensively integrated early on soon came to dominate the Final Four. In addition to Texas Western, this list includes teams such as UCLA, North Carolina, Houston, and Michigan. During the 1960s and 1970s, many lessor known schools including Texas Western, Loyola, Jacksonville, Dayton, Western Kentucky, Memphis State, and Florida State reached their apex of basketball success during this period because of their willingness to be innovative in using black players before some of the larger schools. All of these teams reached the NCAA's Final Four over this era for the only time in school history with the exception of Memphis State, which returned in 1985.[11]

Whether looking at MLB or the NCAA, the introduction of black athletes highlights an important point. Managers tend to think innovation in terms of new tools, machines, or ways of doing something. Innovations also include new ways of utilizing people.   Another aspect of the racial integration in sports is that, as with any innovation such as the evolution of the NFL passing game noted above, the process takes time. Some existing managers are able to make the adjustment, but in other cases, the adjustment by team could only fully be realized when the old managers were replaced by new managers. In fact, the evidence shows that for both MLB and the ACC, it took the elimination or retirement of an entire generation of managers before all teams fully adopted the use of black players.

HURDLES TO INNOVATION & IMITATION

Legendary coaches with long, long records of success such as John Wooden, Scotty Bowman, and Tom Landry have not only been disciples of innovation and change but preached it gospel.   Prominent business executives have paralleled this message. Still, the roadblocks to valuable organizational chance are so frequent and widespread that the phrase "organizational inertia" has been coined as sort of law of organizations – not an ironclad law but more of a general maxim.   Why is there such reluctance to innovation and change on the part of organizations and the managers within them?

In part, some coaches and managers do not see change as important. They may have seen statements such as Vince Lombardi's about football, "Football is blocking and tackling. Everything else is mythology," and observe his relatively simple strategies coupled with his success and conclude that adaptation and ideas have little to do with success.   After all, even John Wooden said that basketball was a simple game. They do not see that Wooden's statement did not negate the importance of adjustment in the face of personnel or rule changes. They also do not recognize that as successful as Lombardi was, his stay at the top was short in comparison to the tenure of people like Bowman or Landry. Over a ten-year run with the Packers largely using one core group of players, the need for change and adjustment was much less than would have been the case over two or three decades. Along with buying into an overly simplistic view of effective managing, ego also can step in the way of sound judgement.   Coaches and other kinds of managers can become intent on doing it "my way." Notre Dame's Frank Leahy once said, "Egotism is the anesthetic that dulls the pain of stupidity."

This does not imply that every coach with a big ego is stupid, but it does indicate that

smart coaches and managers inflict harm on themselves by allowing their egos to dumb down their coaching abilities. Success frequently breeds arrogance and complacency. Additionally, success may create a risk-averse anxiety about change. As Lou Holtz put it, "when you're number one, change becomes intimidating."[12] When a team is performing poorly, change entails little if any downside risk. In contrast, making changes when a team is succeeding already raises the specter of changing the wrong thing and causing a decline in performance. Many of the innovations in MLB such as the adoption of night games illustrate this very problem. Although night baseball proved highly successful, it was by no means an easy feat. The hesitancy of the NHL to get rid of fighting and increase the size of the skating area to encourage a European style of hockey may draw from this same kind of thinking – "we're doing pretty good where we are, why risk changing?"

A coach such as Philadelphia Flyers' and former Dallas Stars' coach Ken Hitchcock stands in contrast to Scotty Bowman. Like Bowman, Hitchcock gained a reputation as a my-way-or-the-highway kind of leader who frequently butted heads with players. Also like Bowman, he obviously has coaching ability. After taking over the reins of the Stars in 1995, he built them into a contending team based on a defense-first style of play. Behind the goalkeeping gymnastics of Ed Belfour, the Stars won the Stanley Cup in 1999 and returned to the finals again in 2000. Unlike Bowman, Hitchcock did not adapt his team's tactics to the personnel on hand. During the 2000-2001 season, Belfour's play began to decline so that many of the close defensive games began to swing against them. The St. Louis Blues embarrassed the Stars, sweeping them out of the playoffs in four straight games during the second round. During the

2001 offseason, the Stars acquired three players to help produce more scoring. However, rather than adapting his system to the new talent, Hitchcock attempted to force the new players into his system and, ultimately, lost his job as the team struggled. It took a change for Hitchcock to succeed further – a change of his coaching position from the Stars to the Philadelphia Flyers where the team's personnel better fit his unflinching idea of how to play the game. The Stars rebounded from their 2001-02 season to win their division while Hitchcock took the Flyers to the Eastern Conference finals in 2004.

Maybe no better example of the failure to adapt can be found than Bob Knight as head basketball coach at Indiana University. Knight cut his coaching teeth at Army Academy at West Point during the late 1960s and early 1970s. With this experience and given his preferences, he came to Indiana in 1971 with not only a very dictatorial coaching style but with a hot temper and a brusque public manner. Even though such methods had already begun to be questioned in some circles, they played fairly well in Indiana during the 1970s. Knight's teams experienced tremendous success winning NCAA championships in 1976, 1981, and 1987, making Knight a coaching celebrity and a state icon.

Knight found out, though, that even icons, who do not adapt, can turn back into mere mortals. Over the 1990s, the performance of Knight's teams slid from exceptional to only good and, at time, average. Concurrent with these changes and preceding them, cultural views about acceptable behavior for coaches had changed dramatically since the early 1970s. On- and off-court temper tantrums by coaches, even highly successful ones, came to be viewed with much more scrutiny as well as disdain by a larger section of the population, even in mid-America.

Knight had littered his career with a series of negative public incidents – a conviction in absentia in Puerto Rico for an altercation with a police officer and the on-court throwing of a chair among the most discussed. An incident involving grabbing a player around the neck and shoving him during practice placed Knight in jeopardy of his job after a videotape of the event surfaced. A subsequent event led to his dismissal by Indiana's Board. During and after these events, Knight showed defiance and complete unwillingness to adapt to the shift in external conditions that made such behavior intolerable at most leading universities.

Beyond ego-based unwillingness to see the need for change, managers fall into habits. Humans are creatures of habit. Longevity in a position begins to cut in on a manager's willingness to adapt if he or she becomes even more tied to certain ways of doing things. This fact may suggest a sort of managerial life cycle that arises. As managers age, if they become set in their ways and more tied to particular ways of doing things, they become less capable of adapting to changes in markets, technology, or rules and customs. Even highly successful coaches unable to adapt to the changes around them can put themselves at risk.

Tom Landry provides an ironic case in point of a coach who, as noted above, spent a career innovating and adapting and then became fell victim to past success, and a growing entrenched in a particular way of doing things. He came aboard as founding coach of the Dallas Cowboys in 1960 and earned a reputation as an innovator as discussed earlier in the chapter. He first gained this reputation as a defensive assistant coach for the New York Giants and carried it through his first decade or more as head coach of the Cowboys. However, Landry had made nearly all of his major adjustments by the mid 1970s. Over the next decade, other coaches such

as Don Coryell at San Diego, Bill Walsh at San Francisco, and Joe Gibbs at Washington became

the innovators in terms of offensive strategy and coaches such as Buddy Ryan at Chicago

became the defensive innovators. By his last three or four seasons as head coach, Landry's

Cowboys had become predictable and ineffective. What had been relatively novel ideas, became

set in stone as the Cowboys system. Even his attempts to mix in new ideas from the "West Coast

Offense" were largely thrust upon him. The team went 12 and 17 from 1986-1988 with a dismal

3-13 record in 1988, leading to Landry's removal when Jerry Jones purchased the team after that

season.

As with individuals and their attachment to the status quo, organizations also become

entrenched through the collective action of individuals.   The slow pace of expansion has been a

common one. MLB has consistently drug its feet on bringing teams to new locations. While

most of the attention of the move of the Dodgers from Brooklyn to Los Angeles has fixated on

the anxieties of the jilted Brooklyn fans, maybe a more relevant business question is why did it

take so long for MLB to place teams on the West Coast? Even then, it only took place because

the Dodgers and Giants relocated – not because MLB located new teams into these obviously

lucrative markets but untapped markets.   In many respects, the Pacific Coast League operated

more as an alternative major league than as a minor league system in the years leading up to the

Dodger and Giant move. As early as 1946, the San Francisco PCL club was making managerial

moves and publicly pushing the idea of gaining MLB status. In the 1940s, the Mexican League

was strong enough to serve as an alternative for some major leaguers during a labor crisis. Yet,

the cities went without MLB representation until the Dodgers and Giants did not make their

move until 1957, and no MLB team played regular games (other than an opening game) below

the 48 states until the 2003 season.

MLB's expansions in the early 1960s and during the 1990s came about not as much

because of the foresight of its managers but at the gunpoint of competition. In the 1950s, it was

the talk of a rival league forming that led to the eventual placement of a second teams in the Los

Angeles and New York areas and a team in Houston. In the 1990s, MLB had proclaimed that no

new expansion was likely after the Marlins and Rockies. Yet, the frontburner plans of the U.S.

Baseball League to go into untapped markets such as Phoenix and Tampa moved MLB's

schedule ahead much more rapidly.   A case in point for MLB is its move into Spanish-speaking

areas. During the 2002-2003 offseason, MLB announced that the Montreal Expos would be

playing some of their games in Puerto Rico. The question that should accompany this move is

why had MLB not placed a team in the Caribbean, Mexico, or Latin America already when a

franchise like the Expos has floundered to find a strong fan base in Montreal for so many years?

Even without the Expos' struggles, these markets south of U.S. borders have been untapped even

though they are hotbeds of baseball interest. Likewise, the Washington D.C. market, the seventh

largest television market in the U.S., still lacks a major league team.

The radio broadcasting of baseball games and the playing of games at night under lights are

examples of the same kind of foot-dragging on changes that turned out to be wildly successful

for baseball. From the 1920s up through the 1940s, both of these ideas were put forward and

frequently hammered down by the objections of players, coaches, and managers.   The objections

to night games stalled its adoptions even though Pacific Coast League games at night drew

nearly three times as many fans as day games and in spite of successful experimentation with it.[13] As late as 1945, Babe Ruth objected to night games because he thought that they would shorten player's careers.[14] MLB club owners saw broadcasts as a theat to live attendance and tried to curb its implementation in the early 1930s.[15]   Finally, in 1935 MLB's Commissioner, Kennesaw Landis, gave his ok to broadcasts. However, these episodes repeated themselves when the Cubs, Braves, and Mets began sending their games over cable television "superstations" in the 1980s. Rather than seeing cable telecasts for what they were – an opportunity for MLB to expand it market relative to rivals in other forms of entertainment – MLB owners once again saw the innovation as a threat to live attendance.

These cases involving baseball highlight the fact that whenever collective action is necessary to bring change, additional obstacles to innovation crop up. These can broadly be described as "politics." The ability to implement effectively change by overcoming political obstacles and objections is one of the great skills of managing. As much as arrogance or risk aversion stymie innovation and adaptation, they do not overshadow organizational politics as a roadblock. Politics is a fact of life within organizations – not just governmental organizations. In fact, the Italian philosopher Machiavelli said, "Entrepreneurs are simply those who understand that there is little difference between obstacle and opportunity and are able to turn both to their advantage." While his writings have often been directed toward the cultivation of power, they can just as easily be interpreted as an early "how to" manual on effectively managing including and especially the management of change. Whatever the perspective to Machiavelli's writing one takes, one point is clear – political impediments to important and effective change crop up

from many sources.

There is no such thing as an a-political environment, whether in sports or everyday business. Owners with a stake in protecting their "turf" conspire and lobby to keep other teams out – "rent-seeking." When a new idea requires a group decision process, the opportunity for internal politics and personal agendas to take hold increases. On most league-wide issues, the leagues require two-thirds or three-fourths majorities. If a change, such as expansion, requires the approval of two-thirds of the owners, then a minority of owners who either see direct loss or who are among the more risk averse owners can block such a move. For instance, if the owner of the Orioles views a team in Washington D.C. as negatively impacting his financial situation and few other owners are by nature hesitant, then the expansion is blocked. The case of night games and broadcasting likely involves the fears and reluctance of the most cautious owners to slow down innovative ideas of those who are more daring. This is one key reason why innovations in business are often developed by smaller organizations. Innovation is normally spearheaded by the most forward looking and least risk averse owners. A single entrepreneur or small group of like-minded partners more easily take a step out into the unknown than a larger organization where more executives or committees must sign on to the change. At some point in the process, individuals who are among the more cautious in an organization are able to stall or stop the change. The role of leaders like Judge Landis become important in politically-driven situations. Where they are opposed to change, they can exert a great influence through manipulation of agendas or harassment of those seeking change.

On sports teams, players sometimes break into little coalitions along positional lines such

as pitcher and infielders or offensive lineman and linebackers. At times, the coalitions have formed along racial lines. On other occasions, the intra-team networks are based on star versus everyone else, player age and experience, or off-the-field interests. Whatever the basis for these networks, they can become focal points for interest group activity – groups of players trying to influence team decisions to their advantage. Sometimes the group's advantage may coincide with the overall team objectives, but in many cases it may not. Similar coalitions and networks form in other kinds of organizations around functional units, pay levels, levels of management, hourly versus salaried employees, and so on. Whatever the organization, individuals and coalitions pursuing their own narrow agendas within an organization mimic the kinds of activities of government-oriented interest groups. They become information networks operating in the background, hallways, offices, and shadows. They make and enforce deals. They lobby for viewpoints; they subtly harass those who oppose them.

All managers must learn to live with a certain amount of internal politics. Players, coaches, and other kinds of employees and managers naturally draw closer to some others or have interests that are more closely aligned with others within the organization. Alliances will always tend to form on these bases. Individuals will always have some interests in pursuing their agendas that may be at odds with the health of the organization as a whole. That is the essence of the "agency problem" discussed in Chapter 2. Still, in many organizations managers do not take active steps to limit internal politics and let it and personal power plays exert far too big of a role. Managers who experience long-term success tend to implement policies that help limit the scope and negative influence of political influence on decisions.

One means to limit political maneuvering is taking actions and implementing policies that make information more transparent throughout the organization. Such policies tend to have the effect of "sunshine laws." Bill Parcells' emphasis on candor in communication is one version of such a policy. On Parcells' teams, every player not only knows where he stands but has a fairly good idea of where everyone else stands also.   Another element in diminishing politics is for lead managers to make crystal clear to others that ideas matter much more than rank or ability to maneuver. Mike Krzyzewski's openness and development of input from his assistant coaches and even players plays such a role. He may not operate a complete open marketplace for ideas, but it is a long shot away from managers who develop cultures that are all based on shmooze, largesse, and political skill.   People must be encouraged not only to develop and present new ideas as a kind of therapy for them, but the ideas must be taken seriously. In contrast, many coaches and managers permit cultures that do just the opposite. In many organizations, players, managers or other employees may actually endure ridicule and other penalties for honesty and new ideas. These penalties may not be put forward as such. In fact, they may be disguised as part of unrelated decisions. Nonetheless, people soon catch on to the fact that keeping your thoughts to yourself is the best policy, even if those thoughts may be very beneficial to the company.

These politics-limiting practices seen in coaching legends closely parallel those used by business leaders such a Bill Gates. In Gates' view, political maneuvering can be reduced by first making sure that everyone has the same message – a mirror of Bill Parcells. In addition, he promotes clear and direct (sometimes to the point of harsh) communication just like Parcells.

Like Krzyzewski, he advocates open discussion of issues. These aspects with attempts to eliminate conflicting objectives and inter-unit rivalry define Gate's attempt to shape Microsoft's culture of innovation and adaptation.[16]

An equally important way to overcome obstacles to change is through the recruitment of creative people and put them in positions where they can help to motivate change. Just as with aversion to risk and most other attitudes, people differ with regard to their ability to envision and embrace innovation and adaptation. Positive change may, on occasion, just "happen" due to forces external and internal to an organization coming together in the right way at the right time. More often, organizational change that improves things does not just pop up in this way. Instead, it happens as a result of someone or some group making a conscious effort to adjust the way the people, policies, technology, or products of the firm. Not everything that happens, even for good, may be planned in advance. Plans may change "on the fly" as new information and knowledge is created in the very process of change. Still, significant and positive change usually requires an advocate within an organization who manages the changes, especially the political aspects. Frequently, the people who motivate change are out of the mainstream. Tom Peters coined the term "skunks" for such people who tend to promote innovation through their defiance of convention and individualistic ideas.[17]

For example, the racial integration in baseball was an exercise in innovation and entrepreneurship that social and competitive forces alone did not bring about – instead, it took the influence of these forces along with insightful and skilled management. In fact, an article by the author, Robert McCormick, and Robert Tollison in the *American Economic Review* shows

that just like most other innovations, the dispersion of black players among MLB teams followed

the S-shaped curve illustrated in Figure 7.2. The teams with better and more forward-looking

management such as the Dodgers and Giants went first.[18] The best teams tended to use black

players before the bad teams in MLB, and the full process of racial integration took about 25

years with large differences in the use of black players across teams long after Jackie Robinson

took the field. The Boston Red Sox, for instance, did not field a single black player until 1959.

Teams with the largest share of black players, such as the San Fransisco Giants, St. Louis

Cardinals, and Los Angeles Dodgers excelled during the 1960s as many teams continued to drag

their feet.

[INSERT FIGURE 7.2 HERE]

In particular, the seminal beginnings of the racial innovation with Branch Rickey

displayed cunning regarding the politics, public relations, and human relations needed to make

the innovation work. In fact, he went so far as to consult a sociologist regarding the qualities of

the player and the supporting environment needed to make the "great experiment" a success. He

condensed his list to six requisite items. First, the player had to be "right" on the field. In one

respect this point is obvious. The team needed quality players. However, in terms of the politics

of introducing the first black player, one who performed poorly would damage more than just his

own career. Second, the player had to be "right" off the field. Rickey realized that no matter

how good the player, there would be important public relations responsibilities work that the

player would have to fill well. Third, the "reaction of his own race" had to be right. By this,

Rickey meant that the player could not have undue demands and expectations placed upon him

by the black community. He needed to be a ballplayer – not an ambassador paraded to every

conceivable event. Fourth, the reaction of the press and public needed to be "right." To a large

extent, this lay beyond Rickey's control, although he could cultivate the press' attitude to some

extent. Fifth, he needed the right place to season the player before pulling him to the majors.

Rickey did not want the experiment ruined before it ever got off the ground. Last, the reaction of

his fellow players had to be "right. " This depended to some extent on Rickey and the club's

manager but also on the reaction of a few key team leaders.[19]

        With both sound planning and some luck, the right set of "political" circumstances fell

into place. What was within Rickey's realm of influence, he meticulously managed. To insure

the right player, he spent $25,000 in scouting Jackie Robinson. He placed Robinson in Montreal

so as to minimize racial issues during his minor league preparation. He also sensed that in

commissioner Happy Chandler, he had an at least a facilitator if not an outright ally in brining

blacks to the playing field. He also capitalized on the talents of Dodger manager Leo Durgocher.

While Durgocher collected a reputation as both a colorful and fiery personality, he was forward-

looking and very adept at handling sticky situations. For example, when a few prominent

Dodgers staged a petition drive among other players to lobby to keep Robinson off the team,

Durgocher called a 1:00 A.M. meeting in which he made it clear that Robinson would help the

team win pennants, and thereby, help every Dodger player. He noted that "colored" players were

coming to baseball, and they had better wake up or lose out. He then ended the meeting by

saying he did not want to see their petition.[20] Finally, he also mentored and assisted Robinson in dealing with the pressures associated with being the first black in an all-white sea, including handling the insults of other players and inequitable treatment form even some umpires.

Rickey's accomplishment with the Dodgers provides a template for successful innovation in most business settings. Usually, successful innovation requires more than merely inventing or discovering a technical improvement. Rather, it typically requires the successful application of technical abilities, public relations, politics, and human relations. Beyond recognizing the talent in black baseball players, Rickey had to negotiate a political and cultural minefield in order to make his innovative idea a workable reality on-the-field.   In Robinson's minor league season with Montreal and during his first few years in the majors, visiting cities such as Baltimore or St. Louis created logistical problems because of the segregation policies of hotels and restaurants. Also, the spring training site in Florida posed similar problems that were more difficult because of the amount of time involved. Rickey used another innovative idea to overcome the segregation problems at spring training by purchasing an abandoned military facility near Vero Beach and creating "Dodger Town." Within this closed community, the Dodgers could sleep, eat, and train according to their own rules regarding racial integration, helping Robinson and other black Dodgers avoid the discrimination of rural Florida.

MINDLESS IMITATION

Not all successful ideas deserve imitation. Willingness to adapt, by itself, reflects only one part of the recipe for a successful manager.   The other critical ingredient is the ability to

adapt in productive ways. Many managers in business and in sports have torpedoed themselves, not by the lack of change, but the direction of their change or the mindless imitation of change initiated by someone else. Professional football supplies clear examples of mindless imitation versus well-conceived adaptation. Possibly the best example in recent years has been the imitation of the "West Coast Offense" mentioned earlier in connection with Sid Gillman as an innovator. This name has been given to similar kinds of sophisticated passing attacks developed primarily by Don Coryell as head coach of St. Louis in the 1970s and San Diego in the 1980s and by Bill Walsh as an assistant coach at Cincinnati in the 1970s and as head coach at San Fransisco in the 1980s. As noted above, the schemes use receivers and running backs in ways to create four or five receiving options for quarterbacks on a given play and isolate weak spots or weaknesses in specific defenders. In addition, the schemes emphasize very precise route running and timing between quarterback and receiver so that decisions are made quickly and accurately.

Without a doubt, the West Coast systems and modifications of them as used by their originators and some of their disciples have been very successful. Coryell's team twice advanced to the AFC Championship. Ex-San Diego assistant, Joe Gibbs, won three Super Bowls in Washington. Walsh's teams and those carrying on his legacy with the 49ers won 5 Super Bowls. Ex-San Francisco assistant, Mike Holmgren won a Super Bowl at Green Bay. In addition, the Denver Broncos used the offensive system in winning two Super Bowls. So what was the trouble? How did enlightened imitation turn into thoughtless imitation? By the late 1990s, the "West Coast Offense" had become the benchmark. Some teams drew elements from its principles, while many blatantly attempted to imitate it in every detail, hiring head coaches

and assistants with extensive backgrounds in it. However, as with any particular system, success

of the West Coast scheme depended heavily on its use by players with skills that closely matched

the key skills required by the system.   The teams who excelled using the system employed

quarterbacks with exceptional skill in quickly moving from one potential receiver to another –

their "progression" – and in delivering the ball with great precision and exact timing. This list

includes Ken Anderson at Cincinnati, Dan Fouts at San Diego, Joe Montana at San Francisco,

Troy Aikmen at Dallas, Brett Favre at Green Bay, and John Elway at Denver.

Most of the teams who tried to imitate the offense did so with either mediocre

quarterbacks or quarterbacks with great abilities but abilities that did not fit the system well –

strong arms or quick feet but not especially accurate arms or quick decisions. Instead of

evaluating and using the assets on hand to the best of their abilities, many coaches were

determined to fit square pegs into round holes in the blind pursuit of imitating certain successful

teams. If the pegs did not fit, then those players were discarded. As a result, many of the teams

using the system faltered even though their assistant coaches came with impeccable West Coast

credentials. In the hands of quarterbacks who made slower progressions from receiver to

receiver or who lacked the pin-point precision demanded, the system often devolved into little

more than what ex-coach and commentator John Madden has derisively called the "dump and

dink" offense.

Two recent and glaring example of mindless imitation of the West Coast system occurred

in Cleveland and Detroit. In Cleveland, the 49er-think emanated largely from the front office.

The reborn Browns selected former 49er front office man, Carmen Policy, to be their President

and CEO. He placed Dwight Clark, a former 49er player under Bill Walsh and front office

executive in San Francisco, as Vice President in charge of football operations. While the coach

they hired, Chris Palmer, was not directly tied to the 49ers, his offensive schemes mimicked

them in most respects. On offense, they selected almost exclusively young players that they

could mold into the system.   After a 2-14 opening year that drew little criticism, Palmer was

fired after a 3-13 second year in which the team finished last in scoring, averaging only 10

points per game and scoring 3 or fewer points in six games. Clark soon followed Palmer to the

unemployment line. New coach, Butch Davis, propelled the team to a solid showing in 2001 and

reached the playoffs in 2002.

Because the Browns were an expansion club, the problem of tunnel vision with regard to

the West Coast system is not as obvious as it has been in Detroit. The setup was nearly identical

to Cleveland – the general manager, Matt Millen, played for the 49ers and he hired a head coach,

Marty Mornhinwheg, who had served as offensive coordinator in San Francisco from 1997-2000

after serving as an assistant under first generation 49er disciple Mike Holmgren in Green Bay.

Unlike the expansion situation in Cleveland, Millen and Mornhinwheg took over a team that had

finished just out of the playoffs with 9-7 and 8-8 records the two prior years and possessed

several key players in their prime. In spite of this seeming solid foundation, the team plunged to

a 2-14 record in Millen and Mornhinwheg's first year and the second year imitated the first with

only 5 wins. Mornhinwheg inherited a young quarterback with 4 years of experience who had

shown strong potential but who was not well suited to play the position, just like Joe Montana

during the 49er glory days of the 1980s. The coach quickly grew frustrated with his performance

and flip-flopped quarterbacks throughout the season. At the end of the 2002 season, Millen dumped Morninwheg with considerable pressure from ownership.

The Washington Redskins of the 1980s and early 1990,s along with the Denver Broncos of the late 1990s, supply interesting counterpoints to the mindless imitation. As an assistant with the San Diego Chargers in the late 1970s, Gibbs spent time at ground zero of one variant of the West Coast offense. Although one could easily see influences of the West Coast schemes with those he used with the Redskins during the 1980s, Gibbs developed many unique characteristics both around his own ideas as well as tailored around his players' talents. His offensive schemes were not merely knockoffs of those he had seen in San Diego. The same can be said of Mike Shanahan at Denver. Shanahan came out of the San Francisco-West Coast offensive coaching mill, but his offensive schemes blended in power running much more than with most teams mindlessly trying to imitate the West Coast schemes.

A similar history can be traced in professional basketball. If one looks back at successful NBA teams of the 1960s and 1970s, most teams employed two guards who traded off responsibility in bringing the ball up court and "setting up the offense." Exceptions did exist, such as Bob Cousy in the 1950s and 1960s or Nate Archibald in the 1970s. Yet, teams such as the Knicks, Lakers, post-Cousy Celtics, Bullets, and others did not run systems where only one person "ran the point." In the 1979-80 season, Earvin "Magic" Johnson entered the NBA with the Los Angeles Lakers. Johnson was a truly unique talent. Although taller than many NBA forwards at the time at 6 feet 8 inches, he could handle the ball and pass with an ability surpassing most smaller players. Because of these abilities, he became a prototypical "point

guard." Through the rest of the 1980s and the 1990s, many NBA coaches and general managers became enamoured of the idea of having a point guard that could run an offense Magic Johnson style. The trouble was that very few if any players possessed Johnson's talents. Few could match his vision of other players and passing skills and none could match his size. Still, coaches began to put the ball in the hands of one player over and over down the court. Moreover, most of these teams did not possess the complimentary players that helped make the Lakers a great team. At 6 feet 8 inches, Magic could be a liability trying to guard smaller and quicker guards. The mix of players defensive skills among the Lakers help to offset this potential disadvantage.

Not surprisingly, the other teams that continued to excel during the 1980s and 1990s did not follow the point-guard mania. These teams included the Celtics in the 1980s with Dennis Johnson and Cedric Henderson or Danny Ainge at guard, the Pistons in the late 1980s and 1990s with Isaiah Thomas and Joe Dumars at guard, and the Bulls in the 1990s with Michael Jordan, Ron Harper, and several other players at guard. These teams continued to play systems where both guards, and sometimes forwards, carried the load much more equally in handling the ball.

Mindless imitation not only occurs in sports but has also been passed off as sound business strategy in management education circles under academic-sounding words such as "benchmarking." Benchmarking became a management buzzword during the 1990s. As with many other management buzzwords, the idea contains a kernel of good sense -- identify a successful organization or set of organizations, observe key aspects of their organizational structure or decision making, and use these as a point of reference for making decisions within one's own organization. Also like many such buzzwords, the management consulting crowd

picked up on the idea and quickly adulterated it into little more than a slogan that set the stage

for mindless imitation. Along with the thoughtless imitation, shrewd but unprincipled managers

saw the idea as a way to pick-and-choose to justifying decisions already made. The trouble with

benchmarking as it began to be practiced is highlighted in the sports examples described above.

Many companies and organizations instituted benchmarking schemes only to focus on one or

few parts of some other organization's success and fail to see these practices as part of part of a

bigger picture. Along with this myopia, they frequently overlooked the unique combination of

resources has to make the system work. In doing so, they missed the point being stressed here as

so critical to the success of managers, that is, working to integrate the decisions of management

so that they work well together and utilize the resources available to their full potential.

REPLAY

1.   Continual adaptation – whether by innovating or imitating – is a hallmark of great

        coaches. They preach it and practice it. It separates the truly great managers over the

        long term from the rest of the pack. Even highly successful managers who quit adapting

        begin to fail.

2.   Effective change does not require a manager to be novel. Skillfully adopting and

        adapting the innovations of others, sometimes ones that have been shelved, has created

        many profitable opportunities in sports and business as Tom Landry showed with the

"shotgun" formation.

3.   The integration of Major League Baseball shows how the utilization of untapped people or bringing in new people are ways of innovating just like new technologies, products, and equipment.

4.   Managers with long term records of success like Bill Parcells and Mike Krzryweski not only innovate and imitate but also create organizational cultures that reduce obstacles to innovation and imitation such as internal politics.

5.   Mindless imitation is a recipe for failure. Mediocre and poor coaches are frequently adopt this kind of monkey-see, monkey-do model. Carefully observing and analyzing the successful practices of other people and organizations can spur thinking about adaptation, but applications must be made with regard to the assets and limitations on hand.

Notes

---

1. John Wooden (with Jack Tobin), *They Call Me Coach* (Chicago: Contemporary Books, 1988), p. 119.

2. From "Quotations on Coaching and Leadership," www.wow4u.com/coaching/.

3. See Douglas Hunter, *Scotty Bowman: A Life in Hockey* (Toronto: Penguin Books, 1999), for an extensive look at Bowman's career and methods.

4. Many of these innovations are discussed in Tom Landry (with Gregg Lewis), *Tom Landry* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1990), pp. 154-158.

5. See Landry, *Tom Landry*, p. 154.

6. Many of the details of Gillman's contributions exist either as oral history or encyclopedic information. These quotes related here are gleaned from "Hall of Fame Coach Sid Gillman dead at 91, www.nfl.com, June 24, 2003, and John Nadel, "Hall of Fame Coach Sid Gillman Dies," mac-sports.ocsn.com, June 24, 2003.

7. The most widely cited history is Jules Tygiel, *Baseball's Great Experiment* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1983).

8. Racial integration as an innovation is discussed in Brian L. Goff, Robert E. McCormick, and Robert D. Tollison, "Racial Integration as an Innovation: Empirical Evidence from Sports

Leagues," *American Economic Review* 92 (March 2002), pp. 16-26.

9. From Geoffrey C. Ward and Ken Burns, *Baseball: An Illustrated History* (New York: Knopf, 1994), p. 247.

10. Tygiel, *Great Experiment*, p. 27.

11. See Jim Savage, *The Encyclopedia of the NCAA Basketball Tournament* (New York: Dell Publishing, 1990).

12. Lou Hotlz, *Winning Every Day: The Gameplan for Success* (New York: Harper Business, 1998), p. 79.

13. *New York Times*, August 10, 1930 and September 7, 1930.

14. *New York Times*, July 10, 1945.

15. *New York Times* December 8, 1931 and October 20, 1932.

16. See Robert Heller, *Bill Gates* (London, Dorling Kindersley, 2000).

17. See Robert Heller, *Tom Peters* (London, Dorling Kindersley, 2000).

18. See Goff, McCormick, and Tollison, "Racial Integration," pp. 16-26.

19. See David Halberstam and Stout, eds., *The Best American Sports Writing* (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1995), p. 223 for the reprint of the original 1955 *Sports Illustrated* article.

20. See Roger Kahn, *The Era 1947-1957*, New York: Ticknor and Fields, 1993, p. 36.