



Norwegian
Business School

This file was downloaded from BI Open, the institutional repository (open access) at BI Norwegian Business School <https://biopen.bi.no>

It contains the accepted and peer reviewed manuscript to the chapter cited below. It may contain minor differences from the published version.

Amdam, R. Executive Education. Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Business and Management. 12 Jan. 2022, from <https://oxfordre.com/business/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190224851.001.0001/acrefore-9780190224851-e-205>.

Copyright policy of Oxford University Press., the publisher of this chapter.

<https://global.oup.com/academic/rights/permissions/autperm/?cc=gb&lang=en>

Rolv Petter Amdam

BI Norwegian Business School

Accepted chapter

Executive Education

In

The Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Business and Management

Oxford University Press

Published June 2020

DOI: 10.1093/acrefore/9780190224851.013.205

Summary

Executive education, defined as consisting of short, intensive non-degree programs offered by university business schools to attract people who are in or close to top executive positions, is a vital part of modern management education. The rationale behind executive education is different from that of the degree programs in business schools. While business schools enroll students to degree programs based on previous exams, degrees or entry tests, executive education typically recruits participants based on their positions—or expected positions—in the corporate hierarchy. While degree programs grade their students and award them degrees, executive education offers courses that do not have exams and gives participants diplomas rather than degrees.

Executive education expanded rapidly in the United States and globally after Harvard Business School launched its Advanced Management Program in 1945. In 1970, around 50 university business schools in the United States and business schools in at least 43 countries offered intense executive education programs lasting from three to 18 weeks. During the 1970s, business schools that offered executive education organized themselves into an association, first in the U.S. and later

globally. From the 1980s, executive education met competition from the corporate universities organized by corporations themselves. This led the business schools to expand executive education in two directions: open programs that organized potential executives from a mixed group of companies, and tailor-made programs designed for individual companies.

Despite being an essential part of the activities of business schools, few scholars have conducted research into executive education. Extant studies have been dominated by a focus on executive education in the context of the rigor-and-relevance debate that has accompanied the development of management education during the last 30 years. Other topics that are touched upon in research concern the content of courses, the appropriate pedagogical methods, and the effect of executive education on personal development. The current situation paves the way for some exciting new research topics. Among these are the role of executive education in creating, maintaining, and changing the business elite, the effect of executive education on socializing participants for managerial positions, and women and executive education.

Keywords

Business education; business elites; business history; executive training; management education; top executives; women as executives

Executive Education

Executive education emerged within U.S. university business schools at the end of World War II and spread to become a global phenomenon during the 1950s and 1960s. Today, executive education represents a vital part of management education all over the world, and especially among the most prestigious business schools.

By executive education, we mean short intensive programs offered by university business schools for people in or close to top management positions, and which last typically for four to twelve weeks. The programs are based on a different logic than degree programs such as the Master of Business Administration (MBA) or Master of Science (MSc) in business. While business schools enroll students to the degree programs based on previous exams, degrees or entry tests, executive education typically recruits participants based on their positions—or expected positions—in the corporate hierarchy. While degree programs grade their students and award them degrees, executive education courses do not have exams, and students receive diplomas rather than degrees (Amdam, 2016). This feature implies that executive education should be separated not only from degree programs, but also from in-house corporate programs and management development and training activities typically offered by the consulting industry. However, the boundaries between these categories are blurred.

This article begins with an outline of the historical development of executive education. It then indicates some trends in research into executive education before suggesting possible questions for further research.

The Formative Period, 1945-1970

Courses that resembled modern executive education existed in the United States and Europe even before World War II. From 1928, Harvard Business School (HBS) organized a series of courses called Special Sessions for Executives in several business subjects for men in executive positions. These courses lasted for three years and were eventually replaced by another program called Business Executive Discussion Groups from 1936 to 1941 (Amdam, 2016). From 1931, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) offered the Sloan Fellowship program for a small number of young potential top executives, a program that changed to a degree program in 1938 (Palmer et al., 2014). In 1931, the Paris Chamber of Commerce established the Centre de Perfectionnement aux Affaires on the advice of the French professor at HBS, Georges Doirot. The program of the Centre de Perfectionnement aux Affaires was separate from any university, and trained French executives in management (Fridenson, 2017).

Modern executive education as a short intensive on-campus program offered by a university business school for individuals who had the potential to become top executives began with HBS's 13-week Advanced Management Program. It was officially launched in 1945, and built upon the War Industry Training Course program, which had been established in 1943 in cooperation with the U.S. army. The aim of the Advanced Management Program was to attract men—and until 1963 solely men—who were in management positions and regarded by their employers as potential top executives.

Executive education became a huge success. In 1951, six U.S. universities offered executive programs, including HBS, MIT, Northwestern, and Wharton, and by 1958 there were 45 executive programs in the United States (West, 1970). While their introduction slowed down during the 1960s, the idea caught on in a number of countries worldwide (see Table 1). According to a survey published in 1968, there were 49 executive programs for top managers and 142 for middle managers in 43 countries in North and South America, Europe, Africa, Asia and Australia (McNulty, 1969). Some of the new business schools that offered executive education programs based on models from the United States are featured in Table 1.

[Insert Table 1 here]

The 1950s and 1960s marked a formative period for executive education. It became a permanent feature of business school curricula, and stood alongside the well-established degree programs. The great divide between the two sectors within the business school as an institution has been overlooked by researchers, unlike the divide between research and practice—or between academic and experiential knowledge—that took place at the same time, especially within U.S. business schools. This topic has attracted several scholars (e.g. Augier & March, 2011; Engwall, Kipping, & Üsdiken, 2016; Robert R. Locke, 1984; Robert R. Locke, 1989).

In addition, some of the early adopters of executive education were able to establish a good reputation in the business community during this period, and a growing number of corporations sent their executives on programs. As Table 2 reveals, almost all of the top 12 executive programs in the *Financial Times* (FT) rankings from 2019 were established at this time. One exception is the program at the European School of Management and Technology (ESMT Berlin), which was set up in 2002. Another is the University of Chicago program, which had launched its degree-awarding Executive Master of Business Administration (EMBA) program, the first one in the world, in 1943. This illustrates that the borderline between the different categories of programs are blurred. Harvard Business School, which was ranked number three on the FT list in 2017 and number four in 2018, did not participate in the 2019 rankings.

[Insert Table 2 here]

The Executive Education Industry from the 1970s

Executive education has developed into a strong and profitable sector within the most prestigious business schools. Most of the schools in the top-12 list of executive education (Table 2)

are highly ranked in degree programs as well. For example, Stanford Graduate School of Business is ranked first in the FT ranking list of global MBAs. The European Institute of Business Administration (INSEAD) is ranked as the third best European business school for all programs. The École des Hautes Études Commerciales de Paris (HEC Paris) is number two on the European list and number two on the FT rankings list of Master in Management programs. In financial terms, HBS is one of many schools where the income from executive education and other non-degree activities exceeds the income from the degree programs.

Several factors have contributed to the creation of what we can call an international industry for executive education. Firstly, executive education appeals to the business community's need to train managers who already have a position in the corporate hierarchy. Executive education has made business schools an actor in this industry, competing with consulting firms and programs offered by the corporations themselves. The programs have legitimized the business school in the business community, and the academic credentials of the professors who teach executive education and several international accredited institutions have legitimized the programs within the university system. However, as is shown in the case of the MBA in the field of business education, finding a balance between business and university legitimization has been a challenge (e.g. Engwall, 1992; Engwall et al., 2016; Khurana, 2007).

Secondly, executive education has been institutionalized through the creation and development of international associations for executive education. In 1972, directors from nine U.S. business schools offering executive education gathered at the University of Michigan for informal discussions. They met annually from that point and founded the University Consortium for Executive Education (UNICON) in 1977. In 1986, the organization staged its first annual conference outside the United States when the delegates met in Ashridge, in the United Kingdom, and by 1991 had managed to attract 51 business schools from eight countries as members (Fair, 1991). Other associations, such as the European Foundation for Management Development (EFMD), also hold conferences and take part in activities within the field executive education.

Thirdly, executive education has emerged and defined itself in relation to the degree-awarding business schools programs, the development of management training offered by consultants, and the growth of corporate universities. The first modern corporate university, General Electric's Management Institute at Crotonville, New York, was established in 1955 in close cooperation with professors who taught executive education at HBS (Amdam, Forthcoming). Corporate universities soon developed as separate institutions, often in cooperation with business school professors at an individual level but with no institutional alliances. In the early 1980s, there were 400 corporate universities in the United States; in the late 1990s, 1,600 (Nixon & Helms, 2002). This growth pushed the business schools towards diversifying their executive programs into open and customized programs in order to compete with the corporate universities.

Finally, executive education has developed over time in an international context. Some of the executive programs were international from the very beginning, for instance, the four-week program offered by the Centre d'Études Industrielles (CEI) in Geneva from 1956. Most of the participants were from countries other than Switzerland (David & Schaufelbuehl, 2015). In 2019, non-nationals dominated in the executive education classes in many of the top-ranked business schools, such as INSEAD, the International Institute for Management Development (IMD), and the Stanford Graduate School of Business. Thirty-five percent of the participants of Stanford's executive program 'Be a leader who matters' in 2019 were from North America, 26 percent from Europe, 21 percent from Asia, and 16 percent from the rest of the world (www.gsb.stanford.edu/exec-ed/programs/stanford-executive-program/participant-profile). The global profile of these programs has had an impact on the educational profile of the top business executives in many countries. In Norway, for example, 22.7 percent of the CEOs in the top-200 enterprises in 2017 had participated in executive programs; 16 percent outside Norway, and 6.7 percent in Norway. All of those who possessed an executive education diploma from abroad had attended one of the top business schools: HBS, MIT, Wharton, IMD, INSEAD, the Instituto de Estudios Superiores de la Empresa (IESE), the London Business School,

and the Cambridge Judge Business School. This observation illustrates the global importance of the most prestigious business schools in the field of executive education (Amdam & Kvålshaugen, 2017).

Research in Executive Education

A Neglected Field of Research

Given the centrality of executive education within the business school as an institution, the lack of research in executive education is striking. In business history, there has been an increasing number of publications on the growth of business education, but with a strong focus on the degree-awarding function of the institution (e.g. Engwall et al., 2016; Robert R. Locke, 1984; Robert R. Locke, 1989). Scholarly publications on the development of executive education in the United States (Amdam, 2016, Forthcoming), France (Fridenson, 2017), and Germany (Kipping, 1998) are more an exception than a rule.

Also within management research, executive education has not been researched extensively. In the journal *Academy of Management Learning & Education (AMLE)*, a leading journal within the field of management education and learning, a search of “executive education” gave 19 hits among 1050 articles from 2002 to 2018; “MBA” gave 96 hits; “management training” gave 30 hits; and “management development” gave 102 hits, suggesting that degree-awarding programs and training within the firm are perceived as more important among researchers. The next section will highlight some trends that emerged from the studies published by *AMLE*.

Research Trends

Among the 19 articles on executive education in *AMLE* between 2002 and 2018 in, there were three book reviews and one article that was not relevant for present purposes. An analysis of the 15 remaining papers, of which nine were published in a special issue in 2007, revealed that research into executive education is in its infancy. There are no common theoretical frameworks and

few shared references, and most of the papers are motivated from observations of empirical phenomena. The studies focused more on the practical implications of executive education than on the development of theory. This is also the case for papers that could be characterized as conceptual essays with no empirical content (see Table 3). After consulting articles in other highly ranked journals that have occasionally published on the topic, we find further support for these tendencies. Among the highly ranked journals that have published papers on executive education, we find *Academy of Management Executives* (e.g. Watson, 1988), *British Journal of Management* (e.g. Butler, Delaney, & Spoelstra, 2015), *California Management Review* (e.g. Ghoshal, Arnzen, & Brownfield, 1992), *Human Management Resources* (e.g. Hall, 1986), *Journal of International Marketing* (e.g. Miller, 1998), *Journal of Managerial Psychology* (e.g. Liedtka, Weber, & Weber, 1999), *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* (e.g. Elmore, 1990), *Management Learning* (e.g. Culpin & Scott, 2012), and *Supply Chain Management* (e.g. Bernon & Mena, 2013).

Although the number of research studies on executive education is small, some trends have emerged. These are the question of rigor and relevance, the content of executive education, pedagogical approaches, and the effect and evaluation of executive education.

[Insert Table 3 here]

Rigor and relevance

One topic that interests researchers is the debate on rigor and relevance in executive education. This question has been addressed in several studies of management education in general and of MBA education in particular (for a summary, see (Vaara & Fay, 2011). From being perceived as too practical and too distinct from the university academic standards of the 1950s and 1960s, management education has lately been accused of being too abstract and remote from practice. It is not surprising that this debate also appears in studies of the field of executive education, where courses are shorter and more suited to business executives and their practice.

Participation in executive education is as a general rule financed solely by companies, but in some cases by individuals who are searching for new business opportunities. Therefore, the programs need to be highly relevant and attractive to customers. Consequently, as Büchel and Antunes have argued (2007b), there is a need for a close dialogue between business schools and CEOs and other top executives so that their expectations are understood and satisfied by the programs. A successful response to signals from the market requires that business school deans and program managers are able to deal with them in the ongoing processes of revision (Doh & Stumpf, 2007).

Based on their studies of how students had evaluated the outcome of an action-learning based program, Tushman, Fenollosa, McGrath, O'Reilly, & Kleinbaum (2007) suggested that an action-learning approach may help to bridge the gap between academia and practice. Others have warned against a practical approach to the dilemma of rigor and relevance. The dilemma means not only finding the right tools to bridge the gap; what is of prime importance is that the nature of the gap needs to be understood. Based on an ethnographic study, Ungureanu and Bertolotti (2018) showed how academics and executives engage in boundary work through executive education, and they proposed that business schools should become trading zones for boundary work. However, Harrison, Leitch, and Chia (2007) took a very critical approach to this question, warning business schools against responding uncritically to some business executives' requests for shorter courses with more time spent on cases that would yield immediate results. However, if business schools do not resist this pressure, it may mean that they will have forgotten the competitive advantage universities have over the consulting industry: unlike the consulting industry, the business schools can offer academic research-based knowledge. Instead of moving in the direction of the consulting industry, business schools should make efforts to improve programs based on academic knowledge.

Content, pedagogy and the effect of executive education programs

Fritz Roethlisberger, one of the creators of the first executive education programs, the Advanced Management Program at HBS, once said: 'At that time I decided that my goal was not to make persons into better executives but to make executives into better persons' (Roethlisberger, 1977: 112). If we accept this as a rationale for executive education, what should the programs include? How can we ensure that the programs have any effect? How can we measure the results? What pedagogical principles are suitable for executive education?

As a general trend, the content of executive education has over time focused more on general management than on functional disciplines, and more on personal development than on advanced mathematics, statistics, and economics, disciplines that became part of MBA education in the 1960s. The case method has been a dominant pedagogical approach since the very beginning. Despite being in the market for more than 70 years, we still have limited knowledge of the effect of executive education. The need for a better understanding of learning outcomes was addressed by Hogan and Warrenfeltz (2003). Garvin (2007) argued that if business schools are to understand the rationale of executive education and its effect on executives, they must recognize that executive education is unique and different from teaching younger students on degrees.

Teaching through the use of cases has always been closely associated with HBS, a leader in executive education (for teaching based on the Harvard-tradition, see Schiano & Andersen, 2014). The case method is based on the idea that students should learn and reflect based on their experiences in business practice. The need to link executive education programs to practice is a central feature of academic research into the development of new pedagogical methods, such as more active research-based teaching (Yorks, Beechler, & Ciporen, 2007) or the use of management tools that are copyrighted and sold as brands (e.g. Armstrong & Sadler-Smith, 2008 on The Mind Gym.). Others have argued for greater use of transformational programs (De Vries & Korotov, 2007), or of coaches in the learning process (Hooijberg & Lane, 2009). However, it is difficult to see any voice in the research literature that gives any direction for a discourse on the future content and pedagogy and content in executive education.

Unexplored Opportunities

Given the centrality of executive education, especially in the highest ranked business schools, and the ambition to act in concert with business on creating and developing business leaders, executive education is an exciting and promising field for academic research. Here, we outline three topics to illustrate potential research opportunities.

Education and elites

Several studies have addressed the impact of higher education on the creation, maintenance, and reproduction of business elites. In many countries, it has played an important role in shaping or reproducing them, for example through the *grande écoles* in France, higher engineering institutions in Germany, and MBA degrees from prestigious business schools in the United States (e.g. Hartmann, 2018; Whitley, Thomas, & Marceau, 1984). According to Ellersgaard, Larsen, and Munk's (2013) study of the career paths of the top 100 CEOs in France, Germany, and Denmark, the French business elites take degrees from *grande écoles*, the university educated German business elites have bourgeois backgrounds, and the Danish business elites spend considerable time working in the field of economics. In Norway, over the past 50 years top business executives have tended to possess degrees in engineering or business from either from the Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU) in Trondheim, or one of the two main business schools, the Norwegian School of Economics (NHH) in Bergen and the Norwegian Business School (BI) in Oslo (Amdam & Kvålshaugen, 2017; Kvålshaugen & Amdam, 2014).

However, these studies are focused on degree-granting section of higher education institutions. From an institutional perspective, it is therefore legitimate to assume that formal degrees in engineering and business help to maintain a relative high degree of equality in the labor market. The impact of non-degree executive education on the composition of the business elites is less apparent. Anecdotal evidence and some smaller studies, such as that of the educational

background of the top 200 CEOs in Norway in 2017 (Amdam & Kvålshaugen, 2017), indicate that executive education plays an increasing role in the reproduction of national business elites. One reason for this is that executive education attracts managers who are already recognized as having the potential to reach the top levels of their organizations. Another is that it has a global status; it has been introduced into different national contexts with the purpose of attracting business elites. Furthermore, it supplements other educational career paths, and it does not represent the same kind of threat to national norms as certain other programs. For example, MBA education has been perceived as something that could replace—rather than complement—components of existing national systems.

Socialization of executives through executive education

The hypothesis that executive education plays an important role in the formation of business elites may be associated with its socialization function. A study of executive education in the United States between 1945 and 1970 indicated that one function of executive education was to socialize men into the values, norms, habits, and language of the new class of professional managers (Amdam, Forthcoming). Vaara and Fay (2011) argued that French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu's framework of the acquisition of economic, cultural, social, and symbolic capital, which may help to increase one's chances of reaching a top position, is applicable in the case of modern MBA education. In Bourdieu's (1990) understanding, the educational field produces cultural capital by increasing the students' knowledge and skills, including knowledge on how codes and languages within the field they are intended to work. Social capital is added through the social contacts and networks that emerge during the period of study, and diplomas and degrees varying according to the prestige of the school or the university, add symbolic capital. In the United States, the production of these types of capital permeated executive education in its formative years.

Evaluations of participants in executive education programs have shown that "creating new personal networks" scored highest on the participants' perception of outcomes. This result was much

higher than among MBA graduates (Crotty, 1974, 1985). From a global perspective, we could hypothesize that the development of executive education emerged as an initiative to develop leaders in periods of social transformation. In the case of the United States, executive education emerged to support the development of business leaders for the new managerial capitalism after World War II. In Europe, executive education expanded from the late 1950s as part of a vision to strengthen the European mindset of business leaders in a period of transformation from national to regional markets in the childhood of the European Common Market (for the European vision during first years of INSEAD from 1959, see Barsoux, 2000). In India, executive education had a central position within the new Indian Institute of Management Ahmedabad from 1961 (Anubhai, 2011), and it played an important function in decolonization (Kumar, 2019).

Women as executives

When executive education emerged after World War II, only men participated, and this remained the case until the 1960s. Stanford and HBS accepted the first women on their courses in 1962/63, but for a long time there were few, if any women in executive education (Amdam, Forthcoming). In the early 21st century, women represent a minority in executive education.

The literature on women and management education has focused on the exclusion and absence of women in executive education, such as management education, in general (e.g. Bryans & Mavin, 2003; McTiernan & Flynn, 2011; Simpson, 2006; Simpson & Ituma, 2009). However, a small number of historical studies have examined how women entered the classrooms of the business schools, albeit they did so at a much later stage than schools of law, education or medicine (e.g. Horowitz, 2012). Hicks (2004) pointed out that Oxford and Harvard gave up the idea of special programs in business administration for women, who were allowed on the general programs in the 1960s and 1970s. Larsen (2011) observed a similar process in France, and compared it to Norway where women were legally accepted into the first business school from 1936 but formed a very small minority.

These studies focused on degree programs in business and illustrated that the entrance of women in business education went hand in hand with the new gender liberation movement from the 1960s. However, the norms and attitudes that prevented them from participating in executive education programs remain. Studies on women in executive education are rare. In the context of the current global debate on gender and top executive positions, the relative small number of women in executive education is a fascinating but untapped field for research.

Conclusion

In modern business education, executive education is defined as consisting of short, intensive non-degree programs offered by university business schools to attract people who occupy top or near to top executive positions, represents a vital part of the activities. Executive education appeared just after World War II, and was based on a different logic to that of the degree programs in business schools. While business schools enroll students to degree programs based on the students' previous exams, degrees or entry tests, executive education typically recruits participants based on their positions—or expected positions—in the corporate hierarchy. While degree programs grade their students and award them degrees, executive education programs have no exams and give students diplomas rather than degrees.

Despite being a vital part of a business school's activities, few scholars have undertaken research into executive education. Extant research is dominated by focusing on executive education in the context of the rigor and relevance debate that has accompanied the development of management education during the last 30 years. Other topics that are touched in the context of research are the content, the appropriate pedagogical methods, and the effect of executive education on personal development. The current situation in research paves the way for some exciting new topics. Among them are the role of executive education in creating, maintain and changing the business elite, the effect executive education has on socializing participants to managerial positions, and women and executive education.

Table 1

Examples of executive education programs established between 1945 and 1968

First time offered	Country	Institution/Place
1945	USA	Harvard Business School
1949	Canada	Huron College London, Ontario
1954	Turkey	University of Istanbul
1956	Philippines	AMP in the Far East, Baguio
	Chile	JEFT/ICARE, Valparaiso
1957	Japan	Kawanda, Keio University
1958	Switzerland	IMEDE, Lausanne
1959	France	INSEAD
1960	Nigeria	Nigeria Institute of Management and Administration
	Mexico	IMAN, Mexico City
1961	India	Indian Institute of Management Ahmedabad
	Egypt	The Management Development Institute
1962	Pakistan	West Pakistan Institute of Management
1964	Central America	INCAE
1965	Israel	Tel Aviv
1967	Tunisia	CAMSED
	Venezuela	IESA
1968	Singapore	Singapore Institute of Management

Source: Amdam, 2019

Table 2

Financial Times Rankings 2019: Executive Education Open Programs

Number	Business School	Country of origin	First executive program	Comments
1	IMD Business School	Switzerland	1956	Offered by as an open program by CEI, which merged with IMEDE to become IMD in 1991
2	Stanford Graduate School of Business	US	1952	
3	University of Chicago: Booth	US	1943	This was an Executive MBA program, the first in the world
4	University of Michigan: Ross	US	1952	
5	INSEAD	France	1959	
6	IESE Business School	Spain	1958	Source
6	University of Oxford: Said	UK	1953	Started as a private venture and adopted by Oxford University in 1955
8	ESTM Berlin	Germany	2002	
9	Columbia Business School	USA	1952	
10	University of Pennsylvania: Wharton	USA	1953	Executive program for the security industry
11	HEC Paris	France	1967	
12	Washington University: Olin	US	1957	Offered by Brookings Institution, which became a partner with the university

Note. The first programs at CEI and INSEAD were 8–10 month non-degree programs, i.e., longer than the other executive education programs. They were a hybrid of typical executive education and MBA programs.

Sources: rankings.ft.com; business schools web sites; Amdam, 2019; Barsoux, 2000; David & Schaufelbuehl, 2015; McNulty, 1969.

Table 3

Papers on Executive Education (EE) in Academy of Management Learning & Education between 2002 and 2018

Paper	Topic	Motivation	Theory-based perspective	Method	Outcome
Hogan & Warrenfeltz, 2003	Learning outcome in EE	Need to understand the effect of learning	Learning and self-awareness	Conceptual	Need to focus more on self-awareness in EE
Büchel & Antunes, 2007a	Intro to special issue	Under-researched topic	No specific	Conceptual	Direction for future research
Büchel & Antunes, 2007b	CEOs' perception of EE	Need more knowledge about practice	No specific	Interviews with three CEOs	Need more knowledge about EE
De Vries & Korotov, 2007	Transformational EE	Research based	Transformational management development	Conceptual	Need for transformational EE programs
Doh & Stumpf, 2007	Understand the logic of business school	Need to understand the strong growth of EE	Top management literature	Interviews with five heads of EE providers	Change business school leaders' attitudes to clients
Garvin, 2007	The distinct feature of teaching EE compared to MBA	Need for more skilled executive teachers	No specific	Interviews with some experienced case methods teachers	Better understanding of teaching EE vs MBA
Harrison et al., 2007	Develop the universities' competitive advantage in EE	How to deal with the sustained pressure to be immediately relevant to practitioners	Rigor and relevance debate	Conceptual	Need to reshape management thinking based on academic knowledge
Houde, 2007	Analogically situated experiences as a pedagogical method	Observation of educational practices	Situated, experiential and analogical learning	Conceptual	The advantages and limitation of analogically situated learning
Tushman et al., 2007	Bridging rigor and relevance	Research based	Rigor and relevance debate	Quantitative analysis of student evaluation	Action-learning programs enhances learning
Yorks et al., 2007	Changes in EE curriculum	Time pressure for executives to use less time for EE	Assessment studies	Action research	Improved methods for assessment
Armstrong & Sadler-Smith, 2008	The Mind Gym: a new way of learning	Need more knowledge about practice	No specific	Interviews with two founding directors of the Mind Gym	Need to introduce new methods from business
Hooijberg & Lane, 2009	Use of coaches to give feedback in EE	Need to understand the increasing use of coaches	Coaching effectiveness	Survey	Participants want coaches to participate in their learning
Petriglieri, Wood, & Petriglieri, 2011	Develop a model for personal development in EE programs	Growth of personal development programs	Learning for leadership	Qualitative study of selected programs and interview with students	Implication for EE programs

Pless, Maak, & Stahl, 2011	Learning from participating in programs with NGOs in developing countries	Research based	Responsible corporate leadership	Interviews	Showing the usefulness of the this kind of program
Ungureanu & Bertolotti, 2018	How academics and executives engage in boundary work	Research based	Boundary work	Ethnographic	Business schools can become trading zones for boundary work

References

- Amdam, R. P. (2016). Executive Education and the Managerial Revolution: The Birth of Executive Education at Harvard Business School. *Business History Review*, 90(4), 671-690. doi:10.1017/S0007680517000010
- Amdam, R. P. (2019). The internationalization of executive education, 1945-1970. In T. d. S. Lopez, C. Lubinski, & H. Tworek (Eds.), *The Routledge Companion to the Makers of Global Business* (pp. 125-137). London: Routledge.
- Amdam, R. P. (Forthcoming). Creating the New Executive: Post-War Executive Education and Socialization into the Managerial Elite. *management and Organizational History*.
- Amdam, R. P., & Kvålshaugen, R. (2017). Norske toppledere og deres utdanningsbakgrunn i 2016. *Magma*, 20(5), 64-69.
- Anubhai, P. (2011). *The MBA story: The DNA of an institution*. Noida and London: Random House India.
- Armstrong, S. J., & Sadler-Smith, E. (2008). Learning on Demand, at Your Own Pace, in Rapid Bite-Sized Chunks: The Future Shape of Management Development? *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 7(4), 571-586. doi:10.5465/AMLE.2008.35882197
- Augier, M., & March, J. G. (2011). *The roots, rituals, and rhetoric of change: North American business schools after the Second World War*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Barsoux, J.-L. (2000). *INSEAD: From Intuition to Institution*. Houndsmill: Macmillan.
- Bernon, M., & Mena, C. (2013). The evolution of customised executive education in supply chain management. *Supply Chain Management*, 18(4), 440-453. doi:10.1108/SCM-07-2012-0262
- Bourdieu, P. (1990). *The logic of practice*. Cambridge UK: Polity Press.
- Bryans, P., & Mavin, S. (2003). Women Learning to Become Managers: Learning to Fit In Or to Play a Different Game? *Management Learning*, 34(1), 111. doi:10.1177/1350507603034001133
- Butler, N., Delaney, H., & Spoelstra, S. (2015). Problematizing 'Relevance' in the Business School: The Case of Leadership Studies. *British Journal of Management*, 26(4), 731-744. doi:10.1111/1467-8551.12121
- Büchel, B., & Antunes, D. (2007a). From the Guest Co-Editors: Executive Education in "TOIL". *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 6(3), 305-309. doi:10.5465/AMLE.2007.26361621
- Büchel, B., & Antunes, D. (2007b). Reflections on Executive Education: The User and Provider's Perspectives. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 6, 401-411. doi:10.5465/AMLE.2007.26361629
- Crotty, P. T. (1974). Continuing Education and the Experienced Manager. *California Management Review*, 17(1), 108-123. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=bth&AN=6412507&site=ehost-live>
- Crotty, P. T. (1985). A Decade Later: Continuing Education and the Experienced Manager. *Human Resource Planning*, 8(1), 29-47. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=bth&AN=14618052&site=ehost-live>
- Culpin, V., & Scott, H. (2012). The effectiveness of a live case study approach: Increasing knowledge and understanding of 'hard' versus 'soft' skills in executive education. *Management Learning*, 43(5), 565-577. doi:10.1177/1350507611431530
- David, T., & Schaufelbuehl, J. M. (2015). Transatlantic Influence in the Shaping of Business Education: The Origins of IMD, 1946-1990. *Business History Review*, 89(1), 75-97. doi:10.1017/S0007680515000069
- De Vries, M. K., & Korotov, K. (2007). Creating Transformational Executive Education Programs. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 6(3), 375-387. doi:10.5465/AMLE.2007.26361627

- Doh, J. P., & Stumpf, S. A. (2007). Executive Education: A View From the Top. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 6(3), 388-400. doi:10.5465/AMLE.2007.26361628
- Elmore, R. F. (1990). THE FOUR KEYS TO A SUCCESSFUL EXECUTIVE-EDUCATION PROGRAM: CURRICULUM, LOGISTICS, MARKETING. *Journal of Policy Analysis & Management*, 9(1), 138-143. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=bth&AN=5869975&site=ehost-live>
- Engwall, L. (1992). *Mercury meets Minerva: Business studies and higher education - The Swedish case*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Engwall, L., Kipping, M., & Üsdiken, B. (2016). *Defining management: Business schools, consultants, media*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Fair, R. R. (1991). *A short history of the university consortium for executive education*. <https://www.uniconexed.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/UNICON-History-1972-1989-Robert-Fair-11-04-1991.pdf>.
- Fridenson, P. (2017). La formation continue des dirigeants d'entreprise en France depuis 1944. In J.-P. Barrière, R. Boulat, A. Chatriot, P. Lamard, & J.-M. Minovez (Eds.), *Les trames de l'histoire : entreprises, territoires, consommations, institutions. Mélanges en l'honneur de Jean-Claude Daumas* (pp. 143-160). Besançon Presses Universitaires de Franche-Comté.
- Garvin, D. A. (2007). Teaching Executives and Teaching MBAs: Reflections on the Case Method. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 6(3), 364-374. doi:10.5465/AMLE.2007.26361626
- Ghoshal, S., Arnzen, B., & Brownfield, S. (1992). A Learning Alliance between Business and Business Schools: Executive Education as a Platform for Partnership. *California Management Review*, 35(1), 50-67. doi:10.2307/41166712
- Hall, D. T. (1986). Dilemmas in Linking Succession Planning to Individual Executive Learning. *Human Resource Management*, 25(2), 235-265. doi:10.1002/hrm.3930250206
- Harrison, R. T., Leitch, C. M., & Chia, R. (2007). Developing Paradigmatic Awareness in University Business Schools: The Challenge for Executive Education. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 6(3), 332-343. doi:10.5465/AMLE.2007.26361624
- Hartmann, M. (2018). Internationality within business elites and national elite educational institutions. In C. Maxwell, U. Deppe, H.-H. Krüger, & W. Helsper (Eds.), *Elite education and internationalisation: From early years to higher education* (pp. 75-91). Cham: Springer.
- Hicks, M. (2004). Integrating women at Oxford and Harvard, 1964-1975, . In L. T. Ulrich (Ed.), *Yards and Gates: Gender in Harvard and Radcliffe History* (pp. 245-270). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hogan, R., & Warrenfeltz, R. (2003). Educating the Modern Manager. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 2(1), 74-84. doi:10.5465/AMLE.2003.9324043
- Hooijberg, R., & Lane, N. (2009). Using Multisource Feedback Coaching Effectively in Executive Education. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 8(4), 483-493. doi:10.5465/amle.2009.47785468
- Horowitz, H. L. (2012). Lecture on the History of Women at Harvard in Honor of Harvard's 375th Anniversary.
- Houde, J. (2007). Analogically Situated Experiences: Creating Insight Through Novel Contexts. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 6(3), 321-331. doi:10.5465/AMLE.2007.26361623
- Khurana, R. (2007). *From higher aims to hired hands: The social transformation of American business schools and the unfulfilled promise of management as a profession*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Kipping, M. (1998). The hidden business schools: Management training in Germany since 1945. In L. Engwall & V. Zamagni (Eds.), *Management education in historical perspective* (pp. 95-110). Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press.

- Kumar, A. (2019). From Henley to Harvard at Hyderabad? (Post and Neo-) Colonialism in Management Education in India. *Enterprise & Society*, 20(2), 366-400. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/eso.2018.86>
- Kvålshaugen, R., & Amdam, R. P. (2014). Stability and change in managerial elites: The institution of management education in Norway from 1936 to 2009. *management and Organizational History*, 9(3), 272-287.
- Larsen, E. (2011). THE MASCULINE FOUNDATION OF BUSINESS EDUCATION: FRANCE AND NORWAY IN COMPARISON (1870s-1940s). *Entreprises et Histoire*(65), 24-42,143-144,144.
- Liedtka, J. M., Weber, C., & Weber, J. (1999). Creating a significant and sustainable executive education experience. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 14(5/6), 404. doi:10.1108/02683949910277157
- Locke, R. R. (1984). *The End of the Practical Man: Entrepreneurship and Higher Education in Germany, France, and Great Britain, 1880-1940*. Greenwich & London: JAI Press.
- Locke, R. R. (1989). *Management and higher education since 1940*. Cambridge UK: Cambridge University Press.
- McNulty, N. G. (1969). *Training Managers: The International Guide*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.
- McTiernan, S., & Flynn, P. M. (2011). "Perfect Storm" on the Horizon for Women Business School Deans? *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 10(2), 323-339. doi:10.5465/amle.10.2.zqr323
- Miller, M. M. (1998). Perspectives: The Radical Shift to Global Executive Education--A Look Back from the Year 2007. *Journal of International Marketing*, 6(1), 81-90. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=bth&AN=5942347&site=ehost-live>
- Nixon, J. C., & Helms, M. M. (2002). Corporate universities vs higher education institutions. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 34(4), 144-150.
- Palmer, T., Canney, C., White, A., Choate, M., Thurston-Lighty, K., Thurston-Lighty, R., & Waibel, N. (2014). *MIT Sloan: Celebrating Our Past, Inventing The Future*. Cambridge MA, London: Third Millennium Publishing.
- Petriglieri, G., Wood, J. D., & Petriglieri, J. L. (2011). Up Close and Personal: Building Foundations for Leaders' Development Through the Personalization of Management Learning. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 10(3), 430-450. doi:10.5465/amle.2010.0032
- Pless, N. M., Maak, T., & Stahl, G. K. (2011). Developing Responsible Global Leaders Through International Service-Learning Programs: The Ulysses Experience. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 10(2), 237-260. doi:10.5465/amle.10.2.zqr237
- Roethlisberger, F. J. (1977). *The elusive phenomena: An autobiographical account of my work in the field of organizational behavior at the Harvard Business School*. Boston: Harvard University Press.
- Schiano, B., & Andersen, E. (2014). *Teaching with cases : a practical guide*.
- Simpson, R. (2006). Masculinity and Management Education: Feminizing the MBA. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 5(2), 182-193. doi:10.5465/AMLE.2006.21253782
- Simpson, R., & Ituma, A. (2009). Transformation and feminisation: the masculinity of the MBA and the "un-development" of men. *Journal of Management Development*, 28(4), 301-316. doi:10.1108/02621710910947344
- Tushman, M. L., Fenollosa, A., McGrath, D. N., O'Reilly, C., & Kleinbaum, A. M. (2007). Relevance and Rigor: Executive Education as a Lever in Shaping Practice and Research. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 6(3), 345-362. doi:10.5465/AMLE.2007.26361625
- Ungureanu, P., & Bertolotti, F. (2018). Building and Breaching Boundaries at Once: An Exploration of How Management Academics and Practitioners Perform Boundary Work in Executive Classrooms. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 17(4), 425-452. doi:10.5465/amle.2016.0095

- Vaara, E., & Fay, E. (2011). How Can a Bourdieusian Perspective Aid Analysis of MBA Education? *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 10(1), 27-39. doi:10.5465/AMLE.2011.59513271
- Watson, R. (1988). New Visions for University-Sponsored Executive Education Programs. *Academy of Management Executive* (08963789), 2(4), 321-323. doi:10.5465/AME.1988.4274778
- West, J. P. (1970). *A comparative analysis of university executive development programs conducted in 1958 and 1968*. (PhD). The University of Iowa. PhD dissertation,
- Whitley, R., Thomas, A. B., & Marceau, J. (1984). *Masters of business : the making of a new elite?* London: Tavistock Publications.
- Yorks, L., Beechler, S., & Ciporen, R. (2007). Enhancing the Impact of an Open-Enrollment Executive Program Through Assessment. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 6(3), 310-320. doi:10.5465/AMLE.2007.26361622