



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 article cited below. It may contain minor differences from the journal's pdf version.

Matthias Kipping, Rolv Petter Amdam & Jacqueline McGlade (2020)

Making managers: a fresh look, *Management & Organizational*

*History*, 15:2, 91-114, DOI: [10.1080/17449359.2020.1842288](https://doi.org/10.1080/17449359.2020.1842288)

Copyright policy of *Taylor & Francis*, the publisher of this journal:

'Green' Open Access = deposit of the Accepted Manuscript (after peer review but prior to publisher formatting) in a repository, with non-commercial reuse rights, with an Embargo period from date of publication of the final article. The embargo period for journals within the Social Sciences and the Humanities (SSH) is usually 18 months

<http://authorservices.taylorandfrancis.com/journal-list/>

## Introduction

The idea that institutions at university level should engage in offering courses and programs to prepare people for administrative and managerial positions in commerce and business originally emerged in parallel in several countries during the mid- to late 19<sup>th</sup> century (Engwall and Zamagni 1998; Engwall, Kipping, and Üsdiken 2010; 2016). However, at that time, ‘business’ – or, more commonly, ‘commerce’ – was little respected within academia, with sociologist Thorstein Veblen (1918, 209-210) for instance, putting it at the same level as ‘athletics’ and suggesting that neither should have a place within ‘the corporation of learning’. Nor was a specific training widely seen as a prerequisite for successful businessmen – or the rare businesswoman –, though short, practical training for clerical positions was being offered since the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century at proprietary commercial schools (Conn 2019, Ch. 1). Well into the 20<sup>th</sup> century most of those running companies believed that leaders were ‘born, not made’ and that, if there was any training, it should be on the job (see, for examples from Germany, Kipping 1998a, 97). Often times, especially on the Old Continent of Europe, what sufficed was to be born into the family that owned the business. While managers hired from the outside had grown in importance earlier (e.g. Chandler 1977), they only started drawing more sustained attention by observers since the 1930s (Berle and Means 1932; see also, with a broader definition of manager, Burnham 1941).

Since then, the notion that managers need to be made, i.e. educated, has become widely accepted. And even in multigenerational family firms, the heirs apparent are nowadays usually sent to some of the top business schools either in the country of origin or, more likely, in the US – followed, in some case by a stint at McKinsey or other top consultants, portrayed by some as a kind of MBA squared (Mintzberg 1996; see also Gavett 2013; and, for examples Engwall, Kipping, and Üsdiken 2016, 251). Similarly, and relatedly,

after struggling at the outset to find their place within academia (Engwall, Kipping, and Üsdiken 2010) business and management education have developed into the most popular area of study in many countries. In the US, for instance, 386,000 out of close to 2 million bachelor's degrees in 2017-18 were in business, followed by 245,000 in health professions.<sup>1</sup> In the European Union countries, 24.3 % of the tertiary education graduates were in business and law, followed by 14.6 % in engineering and construction, and 13.8 % in health and welfare.<sup>2</sup> However, in China engineering is the most popular field among master's students with 890,000 students in 2018, followed by business with 369,000<sup>3</sup> (see also Conn 2019, 2-3).

This transformation has inspired a large body of historical research (for an overview, see, among others, Amdam 1998; Augier and March 2011; Daniel 1998; Engwall, Kipping, and Üsdiken 2016; Engwall and Zamagni 1998; Khurana 2007; Locke 1984; 1989; more critically Conn 2019; Locke 1996; Locke and Spender 2011). The extant studies have gone far to elucidate the rise of university-based degree programs with a particular focus on the graduate level, in particular the Master of Business Administration (MBA), which together with the US-based business schools has usually been portrayed as equivalent to the rise of formal ways to make managers. An additional, related focus has been the 'scientization' of research and teaching in most of these institutions since the 1950s and the gradual expansion of this American model around the world – though with research focusing in particular on its influence in Europe, broadly defined, and, to a lesser extent, Japan.

In contrast, making managers through other, non-degree types of education and training has yet to receive a similar interest and so does the content and process of these programs. There is also a need to examine more closely the actual people who receive management education in both degree- and non-degree programs as well as the wide range

of stakeholders, beyond governments and educational institutions, associated with their development. Last not least, there continues to be a dearth of studies covering all of these issues outside the 'global North'. This special issue aims to advance this research agenda with contributions that (i) go beyond the degree programs offered by business schools; (ii) discuss the roles of all actors involved in the creation of programs for making managers; (iii) examine the processes of socialization taking place within these programs; (iv) look at the gendering of management education (and management); and (v) extend research on making managers beyond the obvious institutional and geographic contexts. After summarizing the current state of research on the history of management education and its blind spots, the remainder of this introductory article will address each of these contributions in some detail.

### **What we know and what we don't know**

So far, historical research on business and management education has been focusing on two particular, interrelated aspects. The first of these has been the development of university-level institutions, granting formal degrees that would give access to managerial and executive positions – with a particular focus on master's degrees or their equivalents. In the context of France for example, this meant examining the programs in engineering, commerce, and (public) administration at the elite, university-levels *grandes écoles* (e.g. Blanchard 2015; Bourdieu 1998; Joly 2005; Locke 1989); in Germany and some of the Nordic countries on the master's (*Diplom*) programs in engineering and then, increasingly, in commerce and business economics (e.g. Joly 2005; Locke 1989; Nygaard 2020; Üsdiken, Kieser, and Kjaer 2004); and in the US – and increasingly elsewhere – the programs leading to a Master in Business Administration (MBA) (e.g. Amdam 1996; Conn 2019; Engwall, Kipping, and Üsdiken 2016; Khurana 2007; Locke 1984; 1989).

The focus on these Master-level programs is surprising, not least because, from the outset, the vast majority of students enrolled in degree programs in business or management around the world were undergraduates – though the MBA did gain ground over time, reaching a proportion of close to a quarter of all business degrees in the US by the 2010s from less than a tenth in the 1950s (see Engwall, Kipping, and Üsdiken 2016, 153 and 216). The disproportionate attention paid to MBAs probably has to do with an overwhelming interest by most scholars in the most visible and well-known business schools in the US. Many of these followed the example of the Harvard Business School (HBS), which had invented the MBA and never developed any undergraduate program (Khurana 2007). Equally, if not more importantly, the obsession with MBAs has obscured other types of management education, which often take place inside the same institutions, including HBS, but without leading to a formal degree. Since many of these eventually so-called ‘executive’ programs addressed people at advanced stages in their careers, they probably contributed more to making (top) managers than the degree programs. They nevertheless only recently found some scholarly interest (see, e.g., on executive programs at HBS, Amdam 2016; see also below).

Even less is known about management training outside universities. One such example from Germany is the academy for business leadership (*Akademie für Führungskräfte der Wirtschaft*) in Bad Harzburg, which introduced scores of middle managers to a bureaucratic and authoritarian leadership model developed by the former Nazi ideologue Reinhard Höhn, who had founded the academy in 1956 (Kieser 2004, 93; Wildt 2011). And studies looking at the efforts made within large companies are also rather recent and rare – notwithstanding a brief burst of interest in the so-called corporate universities (e.g. Nixon and Helms 2011). Among the exceptions are Tichy’s (1989) brief

article on GE's Crotonville facility, which launched its first program in 1956, named and modelled after HBS' Advanced Management Program (AMP) (see Amdam, this volume) and has also been used by successive CEOs as a lever for change in the organization; Russell's (2015) detailed study of management training at Bell Canada from the 1940s through the 1960s, which he portrayed 'as much a process of adapting people to the methods and beliefs of the organization as it was about educating them to perform management functions' (quote p. 212; see also Russell 2018, which looks at all the institutions involved in making managers in Canada); Seppälä's (2018) research on management training in the retail industry in Finland; and Kipping's (2020) work on Siemens' involvement in collective efforts among German companies to promote management training – usually outside the university system, while concurrently developing management skills internally (see also Kipping 1998a). But more research is clearly needed to get a fuller view of the extent to which managers were made outside formal degree programs at university-level institutions.

Moreover, what content was taught in both the degree or non-degree programs – and how that content changed over time – has been studied even less. Early exceptions are the thesis by Meuleau (1981) on the history of HEC, one of the French *grandes écoles de commerce* and the study by Engwall (1992) on the rise of business studies in Sweden, both of which also look at the evolving curriculum. More recent efforts to look deeper 'inside the business school' can be found in some of the contributions to the eponymous volume edited by Amdam, Larsen, and Kvålshaugen (2003). Other unanswered questions pertain to the role of race and gender in making managers, both in terms of how they are portrayed in the changing curriculum and how they influence admission into management programs. Regarding the latter, at HBS the first women joined the MBA program only in 1963 (Anon. 2008; see also Howells 1978) and some of the top business schools (*grandes écoles de*

*commerce*) in France remained male only until the 1970s (Larsen 2011). With respect to the content, we need research that examines the ideas taught to future and actual managers and how they have been and continue to be marked by gender, racial or other biases. One of the rare extant examples is an examination of 249 case studies used in the core courses of the Stanford MBA between 2015 and 2017, which reveals a significant presence of gender and other stereotypes (Soule, Drabkin, and Mackenzie 2019).

The second – and related – major concern of research on the history of management education has been the emergence and global expansion of a few dominant models of commercial or business schools. For the early period, this has resulted in a focus on the pioneering commerce schools in Europe, in particular France (*écoles de commerce*) and Germany (*Handelshochschulen*) – and their subsequent adoption elsewhere, for instance in the Nordic countries (e.g. Engwall 1992) or Japan (Nishizawa 1998; see, for a more comprehensive overview, Engwall, Kipping, and Üsdiken 2016). Compared to this now largely extinct French/German model, the scholarly literature has paid significantly more attention to the emergence of the US business schools since the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, their espousal of a (natural) science paradigm in research since the 1950s and the concurrent and subsequent global expansion of this model of management education – with, as noted above, the MBA degree at its centre – as part of broader processes of Americanization.

These developments, and in particular ‘scientization’ and ‘Americanization’, have been the subject of extensive research and debates. Thus, numerous studies have identified the various external and internal stakeholders involved. For instance, the Ford Foundation is widely seen as crucial for the turn towards ‘science’ – jointly with the Carnegie Corporation (e.g. Augier and March 2011; Conn 2019, Ch 2; Khurana, Kimura, and Fourcade 2011). The

Ford Foundation was also centrally involved, this time with part of the US government, notably the Agency for International Development (AID), in a push to introduce the US business school model elsewhere (e.g. Cooke and Alcadipani 2015; Gemelli 1998; and, for a recent overview, Cooke and Kumar 2020) – often with assistance from some of the top schools, including HBS (Amdam 2020). These efforts have to be understood as part of a broader effort to establish or preserve a capitalist (‘free enterprise’) system within the context of anticommunism and the Cold War (Kipping 1998b; McGlade 1995).

How countries at the receiving end reacted to the active spread of the US management and business school model in terms of adopting, hybridizing or rejecting the ideas and institutional set-up has also been studied extensively. In many European countries this American export of management and management education after World War II met with ‘active importers’ (Bjarnar and Kipping 1998), usually ‘modernizing élites’ (Djelic 1998), which saw the US system as a way to break down traditional societal structures, based mainly on hereditary privilege and ownership, through a novel way of making managers. But even in these countries, which included France and Germany, the established higher education systems made the wholesale transfer of US-type institutions, like the university-based business school, and degree programs, like the MBA, difficult, if not impossible. For the German case, for instance, Kieser (2004) speaks of an outright rejection, while Kipping (1998a) points to a ‘hidden’ Americanization outside the universities (see, for the French case, among others, Kipping and Nioche 1998). It was in the Mediterranean countries, where some of the elements of the US model took hold – though ultimately also in a ‘hybridized’ form (Kipping, Üsdiken, and Puig 2004). In Spain for instance it was the universities tied to religious orders that did espouse business schools and the MBA, largely as a way to retain if not increase their influence on business elites – though they also infused the content with a



good dose of the Catholic social doctrine (*ibid.*; for other cases, see, e.g., Engwall 2004; Juusola, Kettunen, and Alajoutsijärvi 2015).

But while the literature has looked at the transfer and adaptation processes and their varied outcomes in these European countries, there is still scope for further investigation, namely when it comes to all the stakeholders involved and how their objectives and interactions resulted in these different outcomes. Even more important is an extension of studies on the Americanization of management education and making managers to regions beyond Europe, since the research on other parts of the world is rather sparse in comparison (for an overview and a list of business schools outside the US, see Engwall, Kipping, and Üsdiken 2016). Thus, even on Japan, we have only very limited research (e.g. Nishizawa 1998) though we do know more about Americanization there in general (e.g. Kudo, Kipping, and Schröter 2004). Much less is known about most other countries. For Latin America there have been recollections, observations and recommendations by some of those involved in establishing business schools there (see, for Brazil, Anderson 1987; for Peru, Coleman 2005; and, more generally, Gómez-Samper 1992; 2009). There have also been historical overviews (e.g. Davila 1991) and some recent work on the US influence in Brazil (Cooke and Alcipadani 2015; Wanderley and Barros 2019) as well as Mexico (Bátiz-Lazo, 2013). For India, where there traditionally was a strong preference for technical education (Bassett 2015), one can also find some actor accounts on the development of management education after independence (e.g. Hill, Haynes, and Baumgartel 1973), recent academic research on the establishment of the leading business schools, which suggests that the influence of the British colonizer was replaced by US neo-colonialism (Kumar 2019; Srinivas 2008), as well as a study of management development at Tata (Masrani, Perriton, and McKinlay 2018). For Africa, the interest has been very recent and focuses almost exclusively on the present and

future rather than the historical development (Thomas et al., 2016; 2017). A promising perspective with respect to these non-European contexts that has been gaining some traction is post-colonialism (see, e.g., Abreu-Pederzini and Suárez-Barraza 2020; Kumar 2019).

With respect to scientization there have recently been some suggestions that it might have contributed to a major departure from the supposed earlier focus on making managers into professionals (see esp. Khurana 2007; also Augier and March 2011). Others have expressed doubt in this respect pointing to early references to both ‘science’ and ‘profession’ as part of the ongoing efforts by the newly created schools to strengthen their legitimacy within the university context (Engwall, Kipping, and Üsdiken 2016). As Daniel (1998) already showed earlier, since the inception of business schools and the MBA there has been an ongoing debate regarding the balance between rigor and relevance in management research and education. Yet others have questioned the US model of business schools and management education even more fundamentally. Mintzberg (2004), for instance, forcefully argued that providing students with an MBA degree is not the same as training managers, just like swimming cannot be taught in a classroom, only in an actual pool (for even more scathing critiques of the US business schools’ failures, see Conn 2019; Locke 1996; Locke and Spender 2011).

As already noted above, all of these debates focus on the most visible business schools, almost exclusively located in the US, in this hierarchically structured field as well as the degree programs they offer, notably the MBA. But as Amdam (2016) has recently shown, ‘scientization’ left an important part of these same business schools, executive education, largely untouched, even though the latter emerged during the same period. This observation leads to further questions, namely whether the same is true for education and training

outside these business schools; and whether scientization might have engulfed them at later stages, just like it gradually gained ground in business schools and management departments around the world following the global expansion of the American model of management education after World War II, discussed above. This special issue can obviously not fill all of the many gaps identified above. But its contributions provide a glimpse into the kind of work that could start addressing some of these blind spots and improve our understanding of where and how managers were being made.

### **What this special issue contributes**

The articles in this special issue explore these new perspectives on making managers in different contexts with an empirical focus on the first decades after World War II. While addressing topics that have been more or less overlooked in the extant historical literature on management education, these contributions often link to emerging trends in current research. Some of them also take into account the insights of a new stream of historical studies on management education and business schools, mainly published in management and organization journals, which apply theoretical perspectives to these issues, such as a Bourdieusian view on socialization (e.g., Abreu-Pederzini and Suárez-Barraza 2020; Vaara and Fay 2011), international business theories on the internationalization of business schools (e.g., Engwall and Kipping 2013; Guillotin and Mangematin 2015; Rogmans 2019) or postcolonial theory on the development of management education outside the US and Europe (e.g. Abreu-Pederzini and Suárez-Barraza 2020; Siltaoja, Juusola, and Kivijärvi 2019). The remainder of this introduction presents the contributions of the different articles to the extant literature on making managers, covering five different topics.

### 1. *Making managers outside business school degree programs*

The first insight from the articles in this issue is the need to examine the function of management education and training activities outside the formal degree programs at business schools. While several scholars have focused on the development of the MBA in the US (e.g., Khurana 2007; Sass 1982) and different types of business degrees in Europe (e.g., de Man and Karsten 1994; Engwall 1992; Meyer 1998; Starkey and Tiratsoo 2007; Üsdiken 2003), few have addressed the non-degree activities at business schools and programs outside these formal degree programs.

Among others, Kipping (1998a) has shown that in post-WWII Germany, short management development programs for managers played an important role in the preparation for executive positions in a country that was reluctant to include management and leadership in the curricula within its higher education system. In France, the *Centre de preparation aux affaires* (CPA), created already in 1931 by George Doriot, a French professor at HBS, and the Paris Chamber of Commerce, had a similar function, and offered management development programs taught by US business schools professors in a context where existing universities and grandes écoles were reluctant to be involved in the preparation for management positions (Fridenson 2017). One could argue that CPA prepared the way for the creation of INSEAD in 1959, a European business school where the borderlines between degree-programs and executive programs were blurred from the very beginning (Amdam 2020; Barsoux 2000).

Recent research has shown that in the US executive education emerged after World War II within business schools in parallel to the growth and scientization of degree programs. The aim was to attract men – and to the early 1960s, only men – who were already in management position to short intensive non-degree programs and prepare them

for more demanding higher-level management positions (Amdam, 2016). In his contribution to the special issue, 'Creating the new executive: postwar executive education and socialization into the managerial elite', Rolv Petter Amdam shows how executive education developed as a new area within US business schools from 1945 to the 1970s. While the degree programs became strongly affected by the attempts to make the US business school more academic by basing them on scientific principles (Augier and March 2011), executive education blossomed with a practical approach, where the preparation of the participants to share the norms and codes of the managerial elite was more important than the formal academic content.

As discussed above, recent work has also started to examine management education outside the business schools through corporate training programs. Two articles in the special issue contribute additional cases to this research stream. Thus, in "'Measured by two yardsticks": women in bank management training, 1960s to 1990s', Allison Elias shows how many US commercial banks created internal training programs for women – though, differently from the other known cases, not of their own volition but under pressure from grassroots activism and anti-discriminatory legislation. And in his contribution, A. Junn Murphy demonstrates that immediately after World War II the interest in management already extended beyond a business context by examining the case of the Army Management School and its programs as a way of 'Making managers in the US military'.

## *2. Acting to create programs for making managers*

Extant research has already shown how a great variety of organizations and actors were involved in creating institutions and systems for developing and educating managers. Thus, taken together the contributions in Engwall and Zamagni (1998) highlighted the strong

impact of national institutional factors on the reception and implementation of new ideas and knowledge from the US on how to educate and develop managers in different countries. Several additional studies have shown that factors other than the political and education system also played an important role in shaping new arenas for education and training managers. In Germany, for instance, where universities were reluctant to offer courses and programs with a practical approach for those in management positions, businessmen themselves, influenced by ideas from the US, entered the arena as an important actor and initiated executive development programs outside the universities, whether inside large firms such as Siemens or through the creation of new providers or forums (Kipping 1998a). In France, the business community, represented by the chambers of commerce, played a similar role for making managers, namely by creating and supporting new educational institutions, the *écoles de commerce* (Meuleau 1981; Blanchard 2015). The chambers were even prepared to bypass their own creations, when these proved reluctant to offer executive education, and contributed to the establishment of the CPA in the interwar years (see above) and INSEAD in the post-WWII period (Barsoux 2000; Fridenson 2017). In Spain strong regional family networks played a crucial role in redesigning the system for making managers by establishing new business schools in the 1950s (Puig 2003), while in Switzerland, two multinationals, Nestle and Alcan, had a similar function (David and Schaufelbuehl 2015).

In his article Mitchell J. Larson examines two well-known actors, government and business. His novel contribution consists in a detailed analysis of their at times competing, at times complementary suggestions for 're-imagining management education in post-WWII Britain', showing how the visions and activities of both actors ultimately shaped the creation of the London and Manchester Business Schools. In the US banking case examined by Elias,

government and business are also important actors, though with rather stereotypical roles: the former imposing new rules regarding gender equality on the latter. But her contribution also shines light on two new sets of actors, seldom, if at all considered in earlier studies: grassroots activists who increased the pressure on the banking corporations, often through the court system; and HR professionals who developed ways to respond to that pressure by designing management training programs and career paths for women in these organizations.

### 3. *Socializing managers into (evolving) business elites*

An important – and innovative – trend in the recent literature on management education has been to draw on the work of the French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu who had himself studied the renovation and replication of elite networks through the French system of *grandes écoles* (Bourdieu 1998; Bourdieu and Passeron 1977/1990). Applying his perspective to the global expansion of the MBA, Vaara and Fay (2011) have argued that the MBA education should be interpreted as a socialization process to increase the students' cultural, social and symbolic capital. Recent empirical research has provided some evidence in this respect. Thus, Maclean, Harvey, and Chia (2010) have stressed the importance of social class among the British business elite and, in his study on training at Bell Canada from 1945 to the 1960s, Russell (2015) has highlighted that one of its main functions was to align employees and managers to the belief system of the company.

Three articles in this special issue also highlight the role of management education programs in socializing participants into the managerial and business elite in a given national context. This idea is core in Amdam's article on 'creating the new executive', where he shows that the main objective of the executive education programs created at US business

schools in the post-WWII period was to socialize the participants into the norms, values and codes of the American business elite – an objective that manifested itself in the content and organization of these programs. And, as Larson shows in his contribution, when re-imagining business education after WWII, government and business in the UK based their suggestions on underlying visions of the country's future business elite, namely in terms of broader access and a more socially responsible focus. Covering the same period, Chinmay Tumble in his detailed study shows how the newly created Indian Institute of Management (IIM) in Ahmedabad started with a broader vision and basis for a new kind of Americanized business elite, but quickly came to recruit students with backgrounds in science, technology and engineering, socialized them into managerial positions and thus, already in the 1960s, fomented – and cemented – ‘the rise of the technological manager in India’.

#### *4. Involving women in the making of managers*

The socialization perspective also offers an approach to study the role of education in encouraging or preventing women from reaching (top) management positions. As noted above, well into the post-WWII period higher education in business was typically reserved for men, with HBS opening its MBA program for female participants only in 1963, and the top French business schools taking an additional decade to eventually do the same. There is remarkably little historical research on women and management education. Among the exceptions is the doctoral dissertation by Larsen (2005; 2011), who has used gender as a category of analysis in a historical comparison of French and Norwegian business education. She showed how women were excluded from programs that educated future top managers, either formally, like at the leading business schools in France, or in practice by being directed or encouraged to attend special programs for women with a lower social status in Norway.



Similarly, before being able to join HBS in 1963, the only opportunity for women to study business at Harvard was a women-only diploma program in business administration offered by Radcliffe College from 1937 (Howells 1978). Discrimination continued once women entered corporate offices, which consisted of separate gender spheres that only very gradually disappeared from the 1970s onward (Kwolek-Folland 2002).

These findings regarding the two spheres are confirmed by Elias in her article on the role of women in US commercial banks, where they were confined to low-paying clerical positions with no access to the management ranks. This changed only following outside pressures from activists and government (see above) – and did so only gradually, with some in-house management training tailored to women only, thus confirming rather than removing gender biases and barriers. In his contribution, Amdam shows how the new executive education programs at US business schools in the 1960s also cemented established gender roles. The wives of the all-male participants were explicitly cast as supporters for their husbands' aspirations to accede to higher ranks in their organizations and the managerial elite. They joined the program during the last week in part to attend multiple common social activities but also to examine a *small* business case, attend the participants' presentations of their *big* case, and receive lectures, among others, on *caring for an executive husband!*

##### 5. *Extending research into new contexts*

While there has been a widespread recognition that management has become ubiquitous over the past decades, extending linguistically and practically into many other domains, including the public sector or churches (for an overview, Engwall, Kipping and Üsdiken 2016, Chapter 1), there has been limited research on the influence of this expansion on how and,

in particular, where all these new managers are being made. It seems like there is a generalized assumption that more MBAs are being hired for all these additional managerial roles and positions and that business schools add some content that looks at the specificities for the various contexts, such as health care, where managerialization itself has been studied quite extensively. One can also imagine that some of this will be addressed by executive education – though, as noted, this is an area of management education, where research is still in its infancy.

Another context that has only received limited attention when it comes to the expansion of management education have been countries outside the ‘center’ or ‘secondary center’ (see for this terminology Engwall, Kipping, and Üsdiken 2016. 30-33), i.e., the US and (Western) Europe as well as, to a more limited extent, Japan. As noted above, there have been some advances recently, especially with respect to Latin America. But like the earlier Euro-centric studies most of the recent research has also focused on the ‘Americanization’, of management education – though there has been a trend to examine them using a post-colonial framework. In most of these cases, the predominant pre-occupation has been to situate these countries on a continuum between outright rejection and full adoption, usually pointing to adaptation and hybridization (see above). While producing important insights, such a center-periphery dichotomy – or, more recently, post-colonial perspective – might have obscured important internal dynamics in all of these countries – though they can obviously not be disconnected from external pressures and influences.

Three articles in this special issue go, to a larger or lesser extent, beyond the known contexts. Thus, Murphy adds to extant research on the managerialization of the US military, which has often been attributed to a wide range of outsiders, by examining the establishment of an own management school in the US Army in the early 1950s and its long-

term impact. Modelled partially after executive education at HBS, it made managerial terminology and ideas an integral component of military training significantly earlier than widely suggested. As for 'Americanization', Larson's article on the origins of the London and Manchester Business Schools points to the internal dynamics behind their creation. While drawing on the US model, they also, and probably predominantly, responded to the concerns by government and business regarding the future of the British managerial elite. Similarly, Tumble shows how the Indian Institutes of Management (IIMs), established since the early 1960s, first and foremost reflect Indian pre-occupations, preferences and patterns, namely with respect to the dominance of educational qualifications based in science and technology – and this regardless of all the foreign, especially US influences and assistance during their foundations.

## **Conclusion**

While covering widely different areas, taken together, the articles in this special issue show the extent of the research that still needs to be conducted to better understand the making of managers and how it differs over time and space. During the first post-WWII decades managers are being made not only the military, but in many other domains outside traditional business organizations – confirming in a way the more encompassing earlier view by Burnham (1941) who, from a Marxist position, had defined 'managers' not by the ownership of the means of production but by their ambitions, their 'drive for social dominance, for power and privilege, for the position of ruling class' but had said little about how those ambitions were formed and came to be realized. In this respect, the special issue contributions highlight the crucial role of socialization into this managerial class. They also show how certain groups, at least in some countries, largely dominated access to that class

for prolonged periods of time. And on the flipside, they point to mechanisms, including those linked to management education, which explicitly and deliberately excluded other groups, from this class and how difficult they were to overcome.

And while questioning some of the findings from the extant literature and opening up new avenues for further research, the articles do confirm one of the key findings of the former: the role of the first post-WWII decades as a crucial transformative period. However, they also show how this transformation went beyond the widely studied – and oft-decried – scientization at business schools in the US and the Americanization of management education elsewhere – positively evaluated by some, critically assessed by many others. Thus, the transformation in the US also included the rise of executive education, a significant part of management training that was not subjected to scientization while located within the same elite business schools; it also saw more sustained efforts, still ongoing today, to make women into managers – largely in response to government regulation; and it witnessed the notion of management and managers spreading to and taking hold in other domains such as the military. And outside the US, the American model of management education was, without doubt – influential. But it contended more with local initiatives, debates and preferences pushed by a wide range of stakeholders than has hitherto been known and recognized. Overall, both in the US and elsewhere, this led to more variegated outcomes, which – like the rest of the questions raised by the contributors to this special issue – deserve more investigation going forward.

## References

- Abreu-Pederzini, G. D., and M. F. Suárez-Barraza. 2020. "Just Let Us Be: Domination, the Postcolonial Condition, and the Global Field of Business Schools." *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 19(1): 40-58.
- Amdam, R. P. ed. 1996. *Management education and competitiveness: Europe, Japan, and the United States*. London: Routledge.
- 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.
- Amdam, R. P. 2020. "The Internationalization of Executive Education, 1945-1970." In *The Routledge Companion to the Makers of Global Business*, edited by T. d. S. Lopes, C. Lubinski, and H. Tworek, 125-137. London: Routledge.
- Amdam, R.P., R. Kvålshaugen, and E. Larsen, eds. 2003. *Inside the Business Schools: The Content of European Business Education*. Oslo: Abstrakt
- Anderson, D. A. 1987. *Management Education in Developing Countries: The Brazilian Experience*. Boulder and London: Westview Press.
- Augier, M. and J. G. March 2011. *The Roots, Rituals, and Rhetoric of Change: North American Business Schools after the Second World War*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Austin, G., C. Dávila, and G. Jones. 2017. "The Alternative Business History: Business in Emerging Markets." *Business History Review*, 91(3): 537-569.
- Barsoux, J.-L. 2000. *INSEAD: From Intuition to Institution*. Houndsmill: Macmillan.
- Bassett, R. 2016. *The Technological Indian*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bátiz-Lazo, B. 2013. "The Adoption of US-Style Business Education in Mexico, 1945-2005." *América Latina en la Historia Económica* (40): 158-198.
- Berle, A. A. Jr. and G. C. Means. *The Modern Corporation and Private Property*. New York: Macmillan
- Bjarnar, O. and M. Kipping. 1998. The Marshall Plan and the Transfer of US Management Models to Europe: An Introductory Framework. In *The Americanisation of European Business: The Marshall Plan and the Transfer of US Management Models*, edited by M. Kipping and O. Bjarnar, 1:17 London: Routledge.
- Blanchard, M. 1995. *Les Écoles supérieures de commerce. Sociohistoire d'une entreprise éducative en France*. Paris: Garnier.
- Bourdieu, P. 1998. *The State Nobility: Elite Schools in the Field of Power*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. and J. C. Passeron. 1977/1990. *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. London: Sage.
- Burnham, J. 1941 *The Managerial Revolution: What is Happening in the World*. New York: John Day.
- Chandler, A. D. Jr. 1977 *The Visible Hand: The Managerial Revolution in American Business*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press
- Coleman, A. B. 2005. *The Academic Adventure: The Founding of ESAN*. Privately Printed.
- Conn, S. 2019. *Nothing Succeeds Like Failure: The Sad History of American Business Schools*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Cooke, B. and R. Alcadipani. 2015. "Toward a Global History of Management Education: The Case of the Ford Foundation and the São Paulo School of Business Administration, Brazil." *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 14(4): 482-499.
- Daniel, C. A. 1998. *MBA: The First Century*, Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press

- David, T. and J. M. Schaufelbuehl. 2015. "Transatlantic Influence in the Shaping of Business Education: The Origins of IMD, 1946–1990." *Business History Review*, 89(1): 75-97.
- Davila, C. 1991. "The Evolution of Management Education and Development in Latin America." *Journal of Management Development*, 10(6): 22-31.
- de Man, H. and L. Karsten. 1994. "Academic Management Education in the Netherlands." In L. Engwall, & E. Gunnarsson (Eds.), *Management Studies in an Academic Context*, edited by L. Engwall and E. Gunnarsson, 84-115. Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Studia Oeconomiae Negotiorum.
- Djelic, M.-L. 1998. *Exporting the American Model: The Post-War Transformation of European business*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Engwall, L. 1992. *Mercury Meets Minerva: Business Studies and Higher Education; The Swedish Case*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Engwall, L., E. Gunnarsson, and E. Wallerstedt. 1996. "Mercury's Messengers: Swedish Business Graduates in Practice. In *Management Education and Competitiveness: Europe, Japan and the United States*, edited by R. P. Amdam, 194-211. London: Routledge
- Engwall, L. 2004. "The Americanization of Nordic Management Education." *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 13(2): 109-117,
- Engwall, L. and M. Kipping, M. 2013. "The Internationalization of International Management Education and its Limitations." In *The Routledge Companion to International Management Education*, edited by D. Tsang, H.H. Kazeroony, and G. Ellis, 319-343. London and New York: Routledge.
- Engwall, L., M. Kipping, M., and B. Üsdiken. 2010. "Public Science Systems, Higher Education, and the Trajectory of Academic Disciplines: Business Studies in the United States and Europe," in *Reconfiguring Knowledge Production*, edited by R. Whitley, J. Gläser, and L. Engwall, 325-353. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Engwall, L., M. Kipping, and B. Üsdiken. 2016. *Defining Management: Business Schools, Consultants, Media*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Engwall, L., & V. Zamagni, eds. 1998. *Management Education in Historical Perspective*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Fridenson, P. 2017. "La formation continue des dirigeants d'entreprise en France depuis 1944." In *Les trames de l'histoire : entreprises, territoires, consommations, institutions. Mélanges en l'honneur de Jean-Claude Daumas*, edited by J.-P. Barrière, R. Boulat, A. Chatriot, P. Lamard, & J.-M. Minovez, 143-160. Besançon Presses Universitaires de Franche-Comté.
- Gavett, G. 2013. "Is Your Next Great CEO a Management Consultant?" *Harvard Business Review*, 19 November; <https://hbr.org/2013/11/is-your-next-great-ceo-a-management-consultant>
- Gómez-Samper, H. 1992. "The Business of a Business School: A Latin American View." *International Executive*, 34(2): 107-112.
- Gomez-Samper, H. 2009. "Business Schools in Latin America: Global Players at Last? In *Best Human Resource Management Practices in Latin America*, edited by A. Davila and M. M. Elvira, 170-179. London and New York: Routledge.
- Guillotín, B. and V. Mangematin. 2015. "Internationalization Strategies of Business Schools: How Flat Is the World?" *Thunderbird International Business Review*, 57(5): 343-357.
- Hartmann, M. 2000. "Class-specific Habitus and the Social Reproduction of the Business Elite in Germany and France." *Sociological Review*, 48(2): 241-261

- Hill, T. M., W. W. Haynes, and H. Baumgartel. 1973. *Institution Building in India: A Study of International Collaboration in Management Education*. Boston: Harvard University, Graduate School of Business Administration, Division of Research.
- Howells, D. E. 1978. *A Century to Celebrate: Radcliffe College, 1879-1979*. Cambridge, MA: Radcliffe College.
- Joly, H. 2005. *Formation des élites en France et en Allemagne*, Cergy Pontoise: CIRAC.
- Juusola, K., K. Kettunen, K., and K. Alajoutsijärvi. 2015. "Accelerating the Americanization of Management Education." *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 24(4): 347-369.
- 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.
- Khurana, R., K. Kimura, and M. Fourcade. 2011 "How Foundations Think: The Ford Foundation as a Dominating Institution in the Field of American Business Schools," *HBS Working Paper* 11-070.
- Kieser, A. 2004. "The Americanization of Academic Management Education in Germany," *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 13(2): 90-97.
- Kipping, M. 1998a. "The Hidden Business Schools: Management Training in Germany since 1945". In *Management Education in Historical Perspective*, edited by L. Engwall and V. Zamagni, 95-110. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press.
- Kipping, M. 1998b. "'Operation Impact': Converting European Business Leaders to the American Creed." In *The Americanisation of European Business*, edited by M. Kipping and O. Bjarnar, 55-73. London: Routledge.
- Kipping, M. 2020. "The Other Siemens: Its Role in Transforming the Training of Managers in Germany". In *Unternehmen im Wettbewerb: Gedenkschrift für Wilfried Feldenkirchen (1947-2010)*, edited by S. Hilger and H. A. Wessel, 147-168. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Kipping, M. and J.-P. Nioche. 1998. "Much Ado About Nothing? The US Productivity Drive and Management Training in France, 1945-60"- In *Missionaries and Managers: American Influences on European Management Education*, edited by T. R. Gourvish and N. Tiratsoo, 50-76. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Kipping, M., B. Üsdiken, and N. Puig. 2004. "Imitation, Tension, and Hybridization: Multiple 'Americanizations' of Management Education in Mediterranean Europe", *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 13(2): 98-108.
- Kudo, A., M. Kipping, and H. Schröter. eds. 2004. *German and Japanese Business in the Boom Years: Transforming American Management and Technology Models*. London: Routledge.
- Kumar, A. 2019. "From Henley to Harvard at Hyderabad? (Post and Neo-) Colonialism in Management Education in India." *Enterprise & Society*, 20(2): 366-400.
- Kwolek-Folland, A. 2002. *Incorporating Women: A History of Women and Business in the United States*. New York, N.Y: Palgrave.
- Kvålshaugen, R. and R. P. Amdam. 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. 2005. *Invisible Strategies: Gender in French and Norwegian Business Education, 1870-1980*. Bergen: Rökkansenteret.
- Larsen, E. 2011. "The Masculine Foundation of Business Education: France and Norway in Comparison (1870s-1940s)". *Entreprises et Histoire* (65): 24-42.

- 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.
- Locke, R. R. 1996. *The Collapse of the American Management Mystique*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Locke, R. R. and J.-C. Spender. 2011. *Confronting Managerialism: How the Business Elite and their Schools Threw our Lives out of Balance*. London: Zed Books
- Maclean, M., C. Harvey, and R. Chia. 2010. "Dominant Corporate Agents and the Power Elite in France and Britain". *Organization Studies*, 31(3): 327-348.
- Masrani, S. K., L. Perriton, and A. McKinlay. 2018. "Getting Together, Living Together, Thinking Together: Management Development at Tata Sons 1940–1960." *Business History*: 1-19.
- Mayer, M. and R. Whittington. 1999. "Euro-Elites: Top British, French and German Managers in the 1980s and 1990s". *European Management Journal*, 17(4): 403-407.
- McGlade, J. 1995. *The Illusion of Consensus: American Business, Cold War Aid and the Industrial Recovery of Western Europe, 1948-1958*. George Washington University.
- Meuleau, M. 1981. *H.E.C. 1881-1981. Histoire d'une grande école*. Jouy-en-Josas, École des Hautes Études Commerciales.
- Meyer, H.-D. 1998. "The German Handelshochschulen, 1989-1933: A New Departure in Management Education and Why it Failed". In *Management Education in an Historical Perspective*, edited by L. Engwall and V. Zamagni. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Mintzberg, H. 1996. "Musings on Management". *Harvard Business Review*, 74(4): 61–67.
- Mintzberg, H. (2004). *Managers, Not MBAs: A Hard Look at the Soft Practice of Managing and Management Development*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- Nishizawa, T. 1998. "The Development of Managerial Human Resources in Japan: A Comparative Perspective". In *Management Education in an Historical Perspective*, edited by L. Engwall and V. Zamagni. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Nixon, J. C. and M. M. Helms. 2002. "Corporate Universities vs Higher Education Institutions". *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 34(4), 144–150.
- Puig, N. 2003. "Education Spanish Managers: The United States, Modernising Networks, and Business Schools in Spain". *Inside the Business Schools: The Content of European Business Education*, edited by R. P. Amdam, R. Kvålshaugen and E. Larsen, 58-86. Oslo: Abstrakt.
- Rogmans, T. 2019. "A Response to 'Institutional Logic of Business Bubbles: Lessons From the Dubai Business School Mania.' The Development of Dubai as a Global Business Education Hub". *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 18(3): 493-501.
- Russell, J. 2015. "Organization Men and Women: Making Managers at Bell Canada from the 1940s to the 1960s". *Management & Organizational History*, 10(3-4): 213-229.
- Russell, J. 2018. *Making Managers in Canada, 1945-1995: Companies, Community Colleges, and Universities*. New York: Routledge.
- Sass, S. A. 1982. *The Pragmatic Imagination: A History of the Wharton School 1881-1981*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Seppälä, J. 2018. "Changing content and form: corporate training in Finnish retailing, 1900–1975". *Management & Organizational History*, 13(2): 160-190.



- Siltaoja, M., K. Juusola, and M. Kivijärvi. 2019. "'World-class' fantasies: A neocolonial analysis of international branch campuses." *Organization*, 26(1): 75-97.
- Soule, S. A., D. Drabkin, and L Mackenzie, L. 2019. "The Stereotypes in MBA Case Studies", *Harvard Business Review*, 24 June ; <https://hbr.org/2019/06/the-stereotypes-in-mba-case-studies>
- Srinivas, N. 2008. "Mimicry and Revival: The Transfer and Transformation of Management Knowledge to India, 1959-1990". *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 38(4): 38-57.
- Starkey, K. and N. Tiratsoo. 2007. *The Business School and the Bottom Line*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vaara, E. and E. Fay. 2011. "How Can a Bourdieusian Perspective Aid Analysis of MBA Education?" *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 10(1): 27-39.
- Thomas, H., M. Lee, L. Thomas, and A. Wilson. 2016. *Africa: The Management Education Challenge*. Bingley, UK: Emerald.
- Thomas, H., M. Lee, L. Thomas, and A, Wilson. 2017. *Africa: The Future of Management Education*. Bingley, UK: Emerald
- Tichy, N. M. 1989. "GE's Crotonville: A Staging Ground For Corporate Revolution". *Academy of Management Executive*, 3(2): 99-106
- Veblen, T. 1918. *The Higher Learning in America*. New York: BW Huebsch.
- Wanderley, S. and A. Barros. 2019. "The Alliance for Progress, Modernization Theory, and the History of Management Education: The case of CEPAL in Brazil." *Management Learning*, 51(1), p.55-72.
- Wildt, M. 2011. "Der Fall Reinhard Höhn: Vom Reichssicherheitshauptamt zur Harzburger Akademie," in A. Gallus & A. Schildt (Eds.) *Rückblickend in die Zukunft*, edited by A. Gallus and A. Schildt, 254-271. Göttingen: Wallstein.
- Üsdiken, B. 2003. "Plurality in Institutional Environments and Educational Content: The Undergraduate Business Degree in Turkey. In *Inside the Business Schools: The Content of European Business Schools*, edited by R. P. Amdam, R. Kvålshaugen and E. Larsen. Oslo: Abstrakt.
- Üsdiken, B., A. Kieser, and P. Kjaer 2004. "Academy. Economy, and Polity: *Betriebswirtschaftslehrer* in Germany, Denmark and Turkey before 1945." *Business History*. 46(3), p. 381-406.

---

<sup>1</sup> National Center for Education Statistic. Table 322.10, Bachelor's degrees conferred by postsecondary institutions, by field of study: Selected years, 1970-71 through 2017-18. ([https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d19/tables/dt19\\_322.10.asp](https://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d19/tables/dt19_322.10.asp))

<sup>2</sup> Eurostat: Distribution of tertiary education graduates by broad field of education, 2017 ([https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Tertiary\\_education\\_statistics#Graduates](https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Tertiary_education_statistics#Graduates))

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.statista.com/statistics/1095325/china-number-of-postgraduate-master-doctor-students-by-subject-area/>