

# **MBA Alumni Perspectives Survey**

**April 2007**

## **Comprehensive Data Report**

## Table of Contents

<b>OVERVIEW .....</b>	<b>3</b>
Key Findings .....	4
<b>EMPLOYMENT STATUS .....</b>	<b>6</b>
Current Employment Status .....	6
Employed Respondents .....	7
<i>Industry of Employment</i> .....	7
<i>Location of Employment</i> .....	11
<i>Organization Scope</i> .....	12
<i>Organization Size</i> .....	14
<i>Length of Time with Current Organization</i> .....	15
Self-Employed Respondents.....	17
<i>Industry of Employment</i> .....	17
<i>Size of Business</i> .....	18
<i>Annual Revenues</i> .....	19
<i>Length of Time Self-Employed</i> .....	19
Respondents Not Currently Employed .....	20
<i>Reasons for Not Working</i> .....	20
<i>Employment Search</i> .....	20
Organizational and Job Changes .....	21
<i>Number of Employers Since Completing Graduate Business School</i> .....	21
<i>Number of Job Positions Held Since Completing Graduate Business School</i> .....	23
<i>Likelihood of Switching Employers in the Future</i> .....	24
<b>CURRENT JOB.....</b>	<b>27</b>
Current Job Function .....	27
Current Job Level .....	31
Weekly Work Hours.....	33
Promotions.....	35
Annual Base Salary .....	38
Additional Compensation.....	41
<b>EMPLOYMENT SATISFACTION.....</b>	<b>48</b>
Employer Satisfaction .....	48
Job Satisfaction.....	49
Employer and Job Assessment .....	50
Organizational Culture .....	62
<i>Organizational Culture of Self-Employed Respondents</i> .....	66
Career Goal Orientation .....	66

---

<b>THE MBA DEGREE .....</b>	<b>72</b>
Satisfaction with Graduate Management Education.....	72
Helpfulness of Graduate Business Education in Obtaining Job .....	75
Overall Value of Graduate Business Degree.....	77
Cost and Financing of a Graduate Business Education .....	78
Return on Investment .....	84
Decision to Pursue a Graduate Business Degree.....	86
School Recommendation Intention .....	87
<b>METHODOLOGY .....</b>	<b>89</b>
Background.....	89
Survey Sample.....	89
Sample Demographics.....	90
Online Questionnaire Administration.....	92
Data Analysis.....	92
<i>Category Definition</i> .....	93
Contact Information.....	95
<i>Authorship</i> .....	95
<i>Acknowledgements</i> .....	95

## Overview

The Graduate Management Admission Council® (GMAC®), the global association of leading graduate business schools and provider of the Graduate Management Admission Test® (GMAT®), conducts the MBA Alumni Perspectives Surveys biannual follow-up studies of past participants of the Global MBA® Graduate Surveys. Each year a majority of graduating students surveyed volunteer to participate in a longitudinal study tracking their career decisions and job satisfaction. The research objectives of the current study are to:

- Understand current job characteristics;
- Identify job roles and responsibilities;
- Track changes in responsibility, promotions, and salary; and
- Assess the performance of graduate management education.

This report of the April 2007 MBA Alumni Perspectives Survey is organized in terms of key topic areas addressed in the survey, as follows:

- Chapter II examines current employment status of the MBA alumni. This section describes their employment industry type, location of employment, scope and size of their employing organization, and length of time the respondent has been employed with the organization.
- Chapter III explores current jobs of the MBA alumni, including job function, job level, work hours, skill use, and promotions. Salary and additional compensation are reported in this section as well.
- Chapter IV examines various aspects of job satisfaction among MBA alumni. Career goal orientation is explored, in addition to satisfaction with aspects of one's employer and job.
- Chapter V explores a retrospective look at the MBA degree program. MBA alumni were asked to rate the value of the degree, estimate their return on investment, and whether they would make the same decision to pursue an MBA degree knowing what they know now.
- Chapter VI presents the survey methodology, response rates, and key demographic characteristics of the survey respondents.

Each section of the report also draws comparisons among graduating classes (year-to-year), program types, genders, citizenship of respondents, and U.S. subgroups.

The results of this survey do not necessarily reflect a statistically representative sample of MBA alumni worldwide. Therefore, the results of this research study should not be used to make generalizations about the MBA alumni population, but can be used as a reflection of the sample frame under consideration. However, the several clear trends that emerge from the data indicate consistency in terms of the respondent samples.

NOTE: Statistical tests were performed on all contingency tables. A probability level of  $p \leq .05$  was used as the cutoff point for significance. (Refer to the *Methodology* section for additional details.)

## Key Findings

### *Employment Status*

- The vast majority of respondents were employed at the time of the survey—91% were working for an organization and 6% were self-employed.
- Only 3% of the respondents were not working at the time of the survey, this is a lower percentage than the United States' national unemployment rate. Two-thirds of these respondents were searching for a job at the time of the survey, and approximately half of these respondents were searching for a position in the finance/accounting or products/services industries.
- Cumulatively, the six industries of banking, other manufacturing, information technology services, management consulting, investment banking, and consulting services employ one-third of the respondents. One in five of the self-employed respondents work in consulting services.
- Nearly one in five respondents was working outside their country of citizenship at the time of the survey, and the majority of respondents were working for an organization with a multinational focus.
- Respondents who graduated from full-time programs were three times more likely than those who graduated from part-time programs to have worked outside their country of citizenship. Likewise, respondents from countries outside the United States were 5.5 times to 13.25 times more likely than respondents from the United States to work outside their country of citizenship.
- On average, respondents had worked for 1.5 organizations since completing graduate business school. Employed respondents had worked at their current organization for 3.5 years, on average. MBAs appear to stay with their employers.

### *Current Job*

- Five job functions account for one-third of all employed respondents, including general management, products management, strategy, corporate finance, and other marketing/sales positions.
- Nearly three-fifths of the employed respondents held mid-level job positions at the time of the survey. On average, respondents in entry-level positions had worked for their company for 1.8 years; those in mid-level positions, 3.6 years; those in senior-level positions, 4.2 years; and those in executive-level positions, 5.7 years at their company.
- The typical workweek among employed respondents was 50 hours, but respondents in higher-level positions worked longer hours on average compared with respondents in lower-level positions.
- Slightly more than two-fifths of the respondents had received a promotion with their current employer, and 29% of these respondents felt the promotion was earned in less time than expected.
- The median annual base salary among the employed respondents was \$90,000. However, respondents in executive-level positions earned more than twice the amount of respondents in entry-level positions and 50% more than respondents in mid-level positions.

***Employment Satisfaction***

- Three-fifths of the employed respondents were either extremely satisfied or very satisfied with their employer, and about half of the respondents were extremely satisfied or very satisfied with their job position. There were no significant differences in employer satisfaction by industry type.
- The key drivers of employer satisfaction were supportive and ethical employers, pay, and the ability to achieve personal value from work.
- The key drivers of job satisfaction were challenging and interesting work, the ability to achieve personal value from work, and opportunities for using skills.
- Overall, the majority of respondents worked for organizations with centralized decision-making, a cooperative and informal atmosphere, flexible career opportunities, varied and fluid responsibilities, formalized procedures, a clear and well-communicated vision, a focus on company success, and individual performance-based rewards.
- Self-employed respondents described their businesses as having centralized decision-making, a cooperative and informal atmosphere, flexible career opportunities, varied and fluid responsibilities, loosely defined procedures, flexible and adaptable corporate goals, a focus on company success, and individual performance-based rewards.

***The MBA Degree***

- Overall, 97% of respondents were satisfied to extremely satisfied that their degree was personally rewarding and 43% of respondents were extremely satisfied. Overall, 94% of respondents were satisfied to extremely satisfied that their degree was professionally rewarding and 30% were extremely satisfied. Overall, 87% were satisfied to extremely satisfied that their degree was financially rewarding and 21% were extremely satisfied.
- Overall 88% of the employed respondents felt their graduate business education was helpful to extremely helpful in obtaining their current job.
- Nearly three-quarters of self-employed respondents considered their education extremely or very helpful in their transition to becoming self-employed.
- About three-fifths of the respondents considered their graduate business degree an outstanding or excellent value, and there was no significant correlation between overall value and the cost of the education.
- Respondents had recouped about three-fifths of their investment at the time of the survey.
- About three-fourths of the respondents indicated that knowing what they know now, they definitely would still have pursued the graduate business degree.
- Two-thirds of the respondents would definitely recommend their graduate business school to someone who has decided to pursue a graduate business degree.

## Employment Status

This chapter explores the current employment status of the MBA alumni. Respondents were categorized and analysis was conducted by three employment categories: employed by an organization, self-employed, or not employed. This chapter also describes various characteristics of the organizations in which MBA alumni were employed, such as industry type, location of employment, organization scope, organization size, and length of employment with the organization. Furthermore, this chapter explores job retention and the likelihood of switching employers.

### Current Employment Status

Overall, 97% of the respondents were either employed by an organization (91%) or self-employed (6%). Only 3% of the respondents indicated that they were not working, which is 33% better than the unemployment rate in the United States in April 2007 (4.5%)<sup>1</sup>.

Because less than 1% ( $n = 9$ ) of the respondents were involved in an internship or unpaid work project at the time of the survey, those respondents were excluded from the analysis of employment status for the various demographic characteristics.

Current Employment Status	
Employment Status	Percentage ( $n = 3,269$ )
Currently employed	91%
Currently self-employed	6%
Currently involved in an internship/unpaid work project	<1%
Not currently employed	3%
Total	100%

Respondents from the class of 2000 (8%) were significantly more likely than other respondents to indicate that they were not employed, whereas respondents from the class of 2003 (1%) were the least likely. Respondents from the class of 2001 (9%) were the most likely of the respondents to be self-employed.

Respondents who graduated from a full-time program (3%) were more likely than other respondents to not be working at the time of the survey. Graduates of executive programs (11%) were more likely than part-time MBA graduates (4%) to be self-employed.

Women (4%) were twice as likely as men (2%) to report that they were not currently working.

---

<sup>1</sup> U.S. Department of Labor (2007) Bureau of Labor Statistics Homepage. Retrieved on May 11, 2007 from <http://www.bls.gov/>.

Respondents ages 35 and older (8%) were more likely than other respondents to be self-employed.

Statistically, there were no differences in the current employment status of respondents by citizenship or U.S. subgroup.

Current Employment Status, by Demographic Characteristics					
Characteristics	Number	Employed	Self-Employed	Not Employed	Total
<b>Graduation Year<sup>1</sup></b>					
2000	153	86%	7%	<b>8%</b>	100%
2001	246	89%	<b>9%</b>	2%	100%
2002	246	87%	9%	4%	100%
2003	314	94%	5%	<b>1%</b>	100%
2004	566	92%	6%	2%	100%
2005	726	92%	6%	2%	100%
2006	1,009	92%	5%	3%	100%
<b>MBA Program Type<sup>2</sup></b>					
Full-Time	2,173	91%	6%	<b>3%</b>	100%
Part-Time	771	95%	<b>4%</b>	<b>1%</b>	100%
Executive	273	88%	<b>11%</b>	<b>1%</b>	100%
<b>Gender<sup>3</sup></b>					
Male	2,307	91%	6%	<b>2%</b>	100%
Female	945	92%	4%	<b>4%</b>	100%
<b>Age<sup>4</sup></b>					
27 and younger	202	95%	4%	1%	100%
28 to 34	1,791	93%	<b>5%</b>	2%	100%
35 and older	1,258	89%	<b>8%</b>	4%	100%
1. $\chi^2 = 36.31$ ; $df = 12$ ; $p \leq .05$ 2. $\chi^2 = 31.98$ ; $df = 4$ ; $p \leq .05$ 3. $\chi^2 = 11.85$ ; $df = 2$ ; $p \leq .05$ 4. $\chi^2 = 23.52$ ; $df = 4$ ; $p \leq .05$ Items in bold in the contingency table significantly affect the overall $\chi^2$ statistic.					

## Employed Respondents

This section of the report explores the current employment characteristics of respondents working for an organization.

### Industry of Employment

Respondents were asked to indicate the type of industry in which they were currently employed. The following table provides a detailed account of the industries in which respondents were working. The top six industries employ about a third of the respondents working for organizations. These industries were other manufacturing (6%), banking (6%), information technology or services (6%), management consulting (5%), investment banking or management (5%), and consulting services (4%). Cumulatively, the top ten industries employ nearly half of all the respondents. The remaining industries in the top ten include consumer goods (4%), telecommunications (4%), other finance (4%), and other products and services (3.3%).

<b>Detailed Industry List</b>			
<b>Industry</b>	<b>Percentage (n = 3,171)</b>	<b>Industry</b>	<b>Percentage (n = 3,171)</b>
Other Manufacturing	6.4%	Engineering	1.4%
Banking	6.4%	Marketing Services	1.3%
Information Technology or Services	5.7%	Aerospace and Defense	1.3%
Management Consulting	5.4%	Other Technology	1.1%
Investment Banking or Management	5.4%	Arts and Entertainment	1.1%
Consulting Services	4.4%	Biotechnology	1.1%
Consumer Goods	4.1%	Construction and Installation	0.9%
Telecommunications	3.5%	Other Energy and Utilities	0.8%
Other Finance	3.5%	Aviation and Airlines	0.8%
Other Products and Services	3.3%	Health Insurance	0.6%
Retail/Wholesale	3.0%	Advertising	0.6%
Pharmaceutical	2.9%	Human Resource Services	0.6%
Education or Educational Services	2.9%	Military	0.6%
Finance and Insurance	2.8%	Engineering	0.6%
Energy and Utilities	2.7%	Venture Capital	0.5%
Healthcare	2.4%	Healthcare Consulting	0.5%
Government (non-military)	2.1%	Hotel, Gaming, Leisure, and Travel	0.5%
Nonprofit/not-for-profit	1.8%	Sports and Recreation	0.5%
Food, Beverage, and Tobacco	1.8%	Mining	0.4%
Internet and/or E-commerce	1.7%	Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services	0.4%
Other Healthcare or Pharmaceutical	1.7%	Science and Research (Healthcare)	0.3%
Insurance	1.6%	Science and Research (Technology)	0.3%
Real Estate and Rental and/or Leasing	1.6%	Customer Services	0.2%
Information Technology Consulting	1.6%	Restaurant and Food Services	0.2%
Accounting	1.5%	Health Managed Care (provider)	0.2%
Other Consulting	1.4%	Utilities	0.1%
Automotive	1.4%	Other industries	0.2%

The detailed industry table was collapsed into eight groups (refer to category definitions in the *Methodology* section for details on how individual industries were collapsed). Once the industries were grouped, the finance/accounting (22%) and products/services (21%) industries represented the most popular industries among the MBA graduates. About one in seven (14%) of the respondents worked in the consulting industry, 14% worked in technology, and nearly one in ten worked in healthcare (9%) or manufacturing (9%). Additionally, 7% worked in nonprofit/government and 4% worked in energy/utilities.

Industry Group	
Industry Group	Percentage (n = 2,966)
Consulting	14%
Energy/Utilities	4%
Finance/Accounting	22%
Healthcare	9%
Technology	14%
Manufacturing	9%
Nonprofit/Government	7%
Products/Services	21%
Total	100%

Graduates of full-time MBA programs were significantly more likely than other respondents to be employed in the consulting and finance/accounting industries. Part-time MBA graduates were more likely than respondents from full-time programs to be employed in the technology industry. Executive MBA graduates were more likely than all other respondents to be employed in the energy/utility industry. Furthermore, respondents from part-time and executive programs were more likely than respondents from full-time programs to be employed in the manufacturing industry.

Industry Group, by MBA Program Type <sup>1</sup>			
Industry Group	Full-Time (n = 1,962)	Part-Time (n = 725)	Executive (n = 240)
Consulting	<b>16%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>8%</b>
Energy/Utilities	3%	4%	7%
Finance/Accounting	<b>24%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>14%</b>
Healthcare	8%	10%	<b>14%</b>
Technology	<b>13%</b>	<b>17%</b>	18%
Manufacturing	<b>8%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>14%</b>
Nonprofit/Government	7%	9%	8%
Products/Services	21%	20%	19%
Total	100%	100%	100%

1.  $\chi^2 = 78.84$ ;  $df = 14$   
Items in bold in the contingency table significantly affect the overall  $\chi^2$  statistic.

Women were more likely than men to be employed in the healthcare, nonprofit/government, and products/services industries. Men were more likely than women to be employed in the energy/utilities, technology, and manufacturing industries.

Industry Group, by Gender <sup>1</sup>		
Industry Group	Male (n = 2,102)	Female (n = 859)
Consulting	14%	13%
Energy/Utilities	5%	<b>2%</b>
Finance/Accounting	22%	22%
Healthcare	8%	<b>11%</b>
Technology	<b>16%</b>	<b>10%</b>
Manufacturing	10%	7%
Nonprofit/Government	<b>6%</b>	<b>11%</b>
Products/Services	19%	<b>24%</b>
Total	100%	100%
1. $\chi^2 = 67.40$ ; df = 7 Items in bold in the contingency table significantly affect the overall $\chi^2$ statistic.		

Respondents ages 35 and older were more likely than younger respondents to be employed in the technology and manufacturing industries. On the other hand, respondents ages 27 and younger were more likely than older respondents to be employed in the products/services industry and less likely to be employed in the consulting industry.

Industry Group, by Age <sup>1</sup>			
Industry Group	27 and Younger (n = 191)	28 to 34 (n = 1,658)	35 and Older (n = 1,111)
Consulting	<b>8%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>11%</b>
Energy/Utilities	5%	4%	5%
Finance/Accounting	27%	23%	<b>19%</b>
Healthcare	7%	8%	10%
Technology	12%	13%	<b>17%</b>
Manufacturing	6%	<b>8%</b>	<b>12%</b>
Nonprofit/Government	8%	7%	8%
Products/Services	<b>27%</b>	21%	19%
Total	100%	100%	100%
1. $\chi^2 = 67.91$ ; df = 14 Items in bold in the contingency table significantly affect the overall $\chi^2$ statistic.			

Canadian respondents were more likely to be employed in the energy/utility industry compared with other respondents. Asian respondents were more likely than other respondents to work in the finance/accounting and technology industries. Respondents from the United States were more likely than other respondents to work in healthcare and more likely than respondents from Asia and Europe to work in the nonprofit/ government industry. Respondents from Latin America were more likely than Asian respondents to work in the products/services industries.

<b>Industry Group, by Citizenship<sup>1</sup></b>					
<b>Industry Group</b>	<b>Asia (n = 291)</b>	<b>United States (n = 1,908)</b>	<b>Canada (n = 177)</b>	<b>Latin America (n = 136)</b>	<b>Europe (n = 355)</b>
Consulting	14%	13%	16%	13%	18%
Energy/Utilities	4%	4%	<b>8%</b>	3%	3%
Finance/Accounting	<b>29%</b>	20%	20%	21%	25%
Healthcare	7%	10%	8%	<b>4%</b>	7%
Technology	<b>19%</b>	14%	13%	11%	14%
Manufacturing	9%	10%	7%	7%	9%
Nonprofit/Government	<b>4%</b>	<b>9%</b>	8%	6%	<b>4%</b>
Products/Services	<b>14%</b>	21%	20%	<b>35%</b>	19%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

1.  $\chi^2 = 78.28$ ;  $df = 28$   
Items in bold in the contingency table significantly affect the overall  $\chi^2$  statistic.

There were no statistical differences in respondent industry of employment by graduation year or U.S. subgroup.

### **Location of Employment**

Respondents were asked whether they were working in their country of citizenship. Although the majority of respondents (82%) were working in their country of citizenship, about one in six (18%) were working outside their country of citizenship. Respondents who reported that they were working outside their country of citizenship were asked to indicate the country in which they were employed. Overall, six countries accounted for 76% of the respondents who work outside their country of citizenship. These countries were the United States (46%), the United Kingdom (13%), Canada (5%), Switzerland (5%), Singapore (4%), and the People's Republic of China (3%). The remaining 23% of respondents were employed in one of five other countries/areas—13% were in Europe, 6% were in Asia or Australia, 2% in the Middle East, 1% in Africa, and 1% in Latin America.

<b>Location of Employment</b>	
<b>Working in country of citizenship?</b>	<b>Percentage (n = 2,968)</b>
Yes	82%
No	18%
Total	100%

Respondents from full-time MBA programs were more likely than respondents from part-time MBA programs to work outside their country of citizenship. However, women were less likely than men to work outside their country of citizenship, and respondents ages 27 and younger were less likely than older respondents to work outside their country of citizenship. Respondents from the United States were also less likely than other respondents to work outside their country of citizenship. Among the respondents from the United States, Asian Americans were more likely than other U.S. respondents to work outside their country of citizenship.

Statistically, there were no differences in the location of employment by graduation year or industry of employment.

Location of Employment, by Demographic Characteristics		
Characteristics	Number	Percentage Working Outside Country of Citizenship
<b>MBA Program Type<sup>1</sup></b>		
Full-Time	1962	<b>23%</b>
Part-Time	727	<b>7%</b>
Executive	240	15%
<b>Gender<sup>2</sup></b>		
Male	2102	20%
Female	861	<b>15%</b>
<b>Age<sup>3</sup></b>		
27 and younger	191	<b>10%</b>
28 to 34	1663	19%
35 and older	1108	19%
<b>Citizenship<sup>4</sup></b>		
Asia	292	53%
United States	1908	<b>4%</b>
Canada	178	22%
Latin America	136	49%
Europe	355	47%
<b>U.S. Subgroup<sup>5</sup></b>		
Asian American	139	<b>8%</b>
African American	68	0%
White	1503	3%
Hispanic	71	1%
1. $\chi^2 = 87.98$ ; $df = 2$ ; $p \leq .05$ 2. $\chi^2 = 8.78$ ; $df = 1$ ; $p \leq .05$ 3. $\chi^2 = 8.79$ ; $df = 2$ ; $p \leq .05$ 4. $\chi^2 = 829.63$ ; $df = 4$ ; $p \leq .05$ 5. $\chi^2 = 11.08$ ; $df = 3$ ; $p \leq .05$ Items in bold in the contingency table significantly affect the overall $\chi^2$ statistic.		

### Organization Scope

Respondents were asked to indicate the focus of the organization for which they were currently employed. Overall, the majority (63%) worked in an organization with a multinational focus. Nearly a quarter (23%) worked in an organization with a national focus. Additionally, one in ten worked for a regional organization, and one in twenty worked for a local organization.

Scope of Organization	
Scope	Percentage ( <i>n</i> = 2,967)
Local	5%
Regional	10%
National	23%
Multinational	63%
Total	100%

Statistically, there were slight variations in the scope of the organizations for which respondents from various MBA program types were employed. Women were slightly, yet significantly more likely than men to work for a regionally focused organization. Respondents ages 27 and younger were more likely than older respondents to work for a regional organization and less likely than older respondents to work for a multinational organization. Respondents from the United States were more likely than respondents from Asia, Latin America, and Europe to work for a regional organization. European respondents were more likely than all other respondents to work for a multinational organization. Respondents who work within their country of citizenship were more likely than respondents who work outside their country of citizenship to work for a local, regional, or national organization, and respondents who work outside their country of citizenship were more likely to work for a multinational organization.

Respondents working in the energy/utility (20%), healthcare (14%), and nonprofit/government (19%) industries were more likely than respondents in the technology (3%) and manufacturing (3%) industries to work in a regional organization. Respondents in the nonprofit/government industry (37%) were more likely than other respondents to indicate that their organization had a national focus. Respondents in the technology (73%) and manufacturing (83%) industries were more likely than other respondents to indicate that their organization had a multinational focus.

Statistically, there were no differences in the scope of the organization by graduation year and U.S. subgroup

Scope of Organization, by Demographic Characteristics						
Characteristic	Number	Local	Regional	National	Multinational	Total
<b>MBA Program Type<sup>1</sup></b>						
Full-Time	1,961	5%	8%	23%	64%	100%
Part-Time	727	6%	12%	23%	59%	100%
Executive	240	4%	13%	19%	65%	100%
<b>Gender<sup>2</sup></b>						
Male	2,101	5%	9%	23%	64%	100%
Female	861	5%	<b>13%</b>	22%	60%	100%
<b>Age<sup>3</sup></b>						
27 and younger	191	5%	<b>16%</b>	28%	<b>51%</b>	100%
28 to 34	1,663	5%	9%	22%	64%	100%
35 and older	1,107	5%	10%	22%	63%	100%
<b>Citizenship<sup>4</sup></b>						
Asia	292	5%	<b>5%</b>	22%	67%	100%
United States	1,908	5%	<b>11%</b>	24%	59%	100%
Canada	178	3%	12%	21%	64%	100%
Latin America	136	4%	<b>4%</b>	21%	72%	100%
Europe	355	3%	<b>6%</b>	19%	<b>72%</b>	100%
<b>Location of Employment<sup>5</sup></b>						
In country of citizenship	2,420	5%	<b>11%</b>	24%	<b>60%</b>	100%
Outside country of citizenship	547	<b>3%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>77%</b>	100%
1. $\chi^2 = 14.21$ ; df = 6; p ≤ .05    2. $\chi^2 = 11.93$ ; df = 3; p ≤ .05    3. $\chi^2 = 16.96$ ; df = 6; p ≤ .05    4. $\chi^2 = 45.15$ ; df = 12; p ≤ .05    5. $\chi^2 = 59.06$ ; df = 3; p ≤ .05						
Items in bold in the contingency table significantly affect the overall $\chi^2$ statistic.						

### Organization Size

Respondents were relatively evenly distributed among small, medium, and large organizations—31% worked for an organization with fewer than 1,000 employees, 36% worked for an organization with 1,000 to 24,999 employees, and 33% worked for an organization with 25,000 or more employees.

Size of Organization	
Number of Employees	Percentage ( <i>n</i> = 2,968)
Fewer than 5	1%
5 to 9	2%
10 to 24	4%
25 to 49	3%
50 to 99	4%
100 to 249	6%
250 to 499	5%
500 to 999	5%
1,000 to 2,499	7%
2,500 to 4,999	9%
5,000 to 9,999	8%
10,000 to 24,999	12%
25,000 or more	33%
Total	100%
Number of Employees (collapsed)	( <i>n</i> = 2,968)
Fewer than 1,000	31%
1,000 to 24,999	36%
25,000 or more	33%
Total	100%

Respondents who graduated in 2000 were more likely than other graduates to work for a large organization, and respondents from the class of 2006 were more likely than other respondents to work for a mid-sized organization. Also, full-time MBA graduates were less likely than part-time graduates to work for a mid-sized organization, and part-time MBA graduates were less likely than other respondents to work for a large organization. Respondents ages 27 and younger were more likely than other respondents to work for a small organization and less likely than other respondents to work for a mid-sized organization.

Respondents in the finance/accounting and technology industries were more likely than other respondents to work for a large organization. Respondents in the energy/utility and healthcare industries were more likely than other respondents to work in a mid-sized organization. Respondents in the consulting and nonprofit/government industries were more likely than other respondents to work for a small organization.

Respondents working outside their country of citizenship (39%) were significantly more likely than respondents working within their country of citizenship (32%) to work in a large organization.

Not surprisingly, respondents working for a local, regional, or national organization tended to work for smaller organizations compared with respondents who work for a multinational organization.

Statistically, there were no differences in the size of the organization for which respondents were employed by gender, citizenship, and U.S. subgroup.

Size of Organization, by Demographic Characteristics					
Characteristic	Number	Fewer than 1,000 (Small)	1,000 to 24,999 (Mid-Sized)	25,000 or more (Large)	Total
<b>Graduation Year<sup>1</sup></b>					
2000	131	27%	31%	<b>43%</b>	100%
2001	218	34%	33%	33%	100%
2002	213	29%	43%	28%	100%
2003	295	29%	34%	37%	100%
2004	523	31%	35%	35%	100%
2005	667	32%	32%	36%	100%
2006	921	30%	<b>40%</b>	30%	100%
<b>MBA Program Type<sup>2</sup></b>					
Full-Time	1962	32%	<b>33%</b>	35%	100%
Part-Time	727	28%	<b>43%</b>	<b>29%</b>	100%
Executive	240	28%	37%	35%	100%
<b>Age<sup>3</sup></b>					
27 and younger	191	<b>38%</b>	<b>28%</b>	34%	100%
28 to 34	1663	31%	35%	33%	100%
35 and older	1108	28%	38%	34%	100%
1. $\chi^2 = 26.67$ ; $df = 12$ ; $p \leq .05$ 2. $\chi^2 = 24.27$ ; $df = 4$ ; $p \leq .05$ 3. $\chi^2 = 12.20$ ; $df = 4$ ; $p \leq .05$					
Items in bold in the contingency table significantly affect the overall $\chi^2$ statistic.					

### Length of Time with Current Organization

On average, respondents have worked for their current employer for 3.5 years. The responses ranged from a minimum of zero years with the organization to a maximum of 36 years.

Length of Time with Current Organization	
Statistic	Number of Years
5 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	0.3
25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	1.0
Median	2.0
75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	4.5
95 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	11.0
Mean	3.5
Standard Error	.1
Number	$n = 2,978$

Not surprisingly, there was a link between the time that had elapsed since graduation and the length of time respondents had worked for their organization. Graduates of executive programs worked for their organizations longer than did respondents from part-time and full-time MBA programs. Additionally, respondents from part-time programs worked for their organizations longer than respondents who graduated from full-time programs. Men worked for their organizations for a longer period of time compared with women, and older respondents worked for their organizations longer than did younger respondents. Respondents from the United States worked for their organizations longer than did respondents from Asia or Latin America.

<b>Length of Time with Current Organization, by Demographic Characteristics</b>			
<b>Characteristic</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Median</b>	<b>Mean</b>
<b><i>Graduation Year<sup>1</sup></i></b>			
2000	131	5.0	<b>4.9</b>
2001	219	4.0	<b>5.0</b>
2002	214	3.5	<b>4.2</b>
2003	295	3.0	<b>3.2</b>
2004	523	2.5	<b>3.3</b>
2005	671	1.8	<b>3.1</b>
2006	925	1.0	<b>3.3</b>
<b><i>MBA Program Type<sup>2</sup></i></b>			
Full-Time	1,968	1.5	<b>2.3</b>
Part-Time	730	4.5	<b>5.3</b>
Executive	241	5.5	<b>7.3</b>
<b><i>Gender<sup>3</sup></i></b>			
Male	2,108	2.0	<b>3.6</b>
Female	865	2.0	<b>3.1</b>
<b><i>Age<sup>4</sup></i></b>			
27 and younger	191	1.0	<b>1.7</b>
28 to 34	1,668	1.8	<b>2.5</b>
35 and older	1,113	3.0	<b>5.2</b>
<b><i>Citizenship<sup>5</sup></i></b>			
Asia	292	2.0	<b>2.8</b>
United States	1,916	2.0	<b>3.7</b>
Canada	180	2.0	3.6
Latin America	136	1.8	<b>2.6</b>
Europe	355	1.9	3.1
1. F = 11.01; df = 6,2971; p ≤ .05 2. F = 337.71; df = 2,2936; p ≤ .05 3. F = 8.08; df = 1,2971; p ≤ .05 4. F = 187.64; df = 2,2969; p ≤ .05 5. F = 5.86; df = 4,2874; p ≤ .05 Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.			

## Self-Employed Respondents

This section describes employment characteristics of the 192 respondents (6%) who were self-employed, including their industry of employment, the size of their organization, the number of employees in their organization, their annual revenues, and the length of time these respondents have been self-employed. Overall, 20% of the self-employed respondents were self-employed prior to entering graduate business school. On average, self-employed respondents started only one business.

### Industry of Employment

Nearly two out of five self-employed respondents had a consulting business, and nearly another third was in the products/services industry. About one in eight self-employed respondents worked in the finance/accounting or technology industry.

Detailed Industry List			
Industry	Percentage	Industry	Percentage
Consulting Services	20%	Healthcare Consulting	1%
Management Consulting	9%	Information Technology Consulting	1%
Internet and/or E-commerce	8%	Venture Capital	1%
Other Consulting	5%	Biotechnology	1%
Other Finance	5%	Engineering	1%
Other Products and Services	5%	Telecommunications	1%
Real Estate and Rental and/or Leasing	4%	Arts and Entertainment	1%
Retail/Wholesale	4%	Engineering	1%
Consumer Goods	4%	Energy and Utilities	1%
Construction and Installation	3%	Health Insurance	1%
Finance and Insurance	3%	Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services	1%
Investment Banking or Management	3%	Aerospace and Defense	1%
Healthcare	3%	Other Manufacturing	1%
Information Technology or Services	3%	Government (Non-military)	1%
Food, Beverage, and Tobacco	3%	Aviation and Airlines	1%
Marketing Services	3%	Hotel, Gaming, Leisure, and Travel	1%
Human Resource Services	2%	Sports and Recreation	1%
Accounting	2%	Other industry	1%

<b>Industry Group</b>	
<b>Industry Group</b>	<b>Percentage (n = 192)</b>
Consulting	39%
Products/Services	29%
Finance/Accounting	13%
Technology	13%
Healthcare	4%
Energy/Utilities	1%
Manufacturing	1%
Nonprofit/Government	1%
Other	1%
Total	100%

### Size of Business

On average, self-employed respondents employed eight employees each. However, nearly a quarter (24%) of the self-employed respondents did not have any employees. Three-fifths (58%) employed fewer than 10 employees, 15% employed 10 to 50 employees, and 3% employed more than 50 employees.

<b>Number of Employees</b>	
<b>Number of Employees</b>	<b>Percentage (n = 192)</b>
None	24%
Fewer than 10	58%
10 to 50	15%
More than 50	3%
Total	100%
Mean	8
Median	2

On average, self-employed respondents in the products and services industry employed 55 employees each and those in the technology industry employed 11 employees each. Additionally, self-employed respondents in the consulting industry each employed five employees, and those in the finance/accounting industry each employed three employees.

<b>Mean Number of Employees, by Industry Group†</b>		
<b>Industry Group</b>	<b>Number of Respondents</b>	<b>Mean Number of Employees</b>
Consulting	74	5
Products/Services	55	10
Finance/Accounting	24	3
Technology	25	11

† There were fewer than 10 respondents in the healthcare, energy/utility, manufacturing, and nonprofit/government industries, data not displayed.

### Annual Revenues

Half of the self-employed respondents reported less than \$250,000 in annual revenues. About one in eight reported \$250,000 to \$499,999 in annual revenue. One in ten reported \$500,000 to \$999,999 in revenue, and one in five reported a million dollars or more in annual revenues.

Annual Revenues	
Annual Revenue	Percentage ( <i>n</i> = 192)
Less than \$250,000	50%
\$250,000 to \$499,999	12%
\$500,000 to \$999,999	10%
\$1,000,000 to \$4,999,999	14%
\$5,000,000 to \$9,999,999	5%
\$10,000,000 or more	1%
Prefer not to say	9%
Total	100%

### Length of Time Self-Employed

On average, the respondents had been self-employed for 3 1/3 years. The responses for length of self-employment ranged from a minimum of zero years to a maximum of 30 years.

Length of Time Self-employed	
Statistic	Number of Years
5 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	.5
25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	1.0
Median	2.0
75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	4.0
95 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	10.0
Mean	3.3
Standard Error	.3
Number	<i>n</i> = 192

The median length of self-employment for respondents in the consulting, products/services, finance/accounting, and technology industries was two years.

Length of Time Self-employed, by Industry Group†			
Industry Group	Number	Median Number of Years	Mean Number of Years
Consulting	74	2	3
Products/Services	10	2	3
Finance/Accounting	24	2	2
Technology	25	2	3

† There were fewer than 10 respondents in the healthcare, energy/utility, manufacturing, and nonprofit/government industries. Therefore, data are not displayed for these industries.

## Respondents Not Currently Employed

This section describes employment characteristics of the 90 respondents (3%) who were not employed at the time of the survey.

### Reasons for Not Working

One fifth of the respondents were not working due to family reasons. Overall, 16% of the respondents were not working because they were continuing their education. The educational courses these respondents were pursuing included Ph.D. programs, medical school, law school, and engineering programs, to name a few. One in ten respondents was not working because they were laid off due to company instability, and 9% quit because they were dissatisfied with the work or quality of the clients.

Reasons for Not Working	
Reasons	Percentage (n = 90)
I quit for family reasons	20%
I quit to continue my education	16%
I was laid off due to company instability	10%
I quit because I was dissatisfied with the work itself and/or the quality of the clients	9%
I quit to move elsewhere	8%
I was terminated	7%
I quit because I was dissatisfied with my hours, pay benefits, and/or my coworkers/boss	6%
I was laid off due to a weak economy	1%
I quit to start my own business	1%
Other	23%
Total	100%

### Employment Search

Overall, two-thirds (66%) of the respondents who were not working at the time of the survey were searching for a job. The remaining one-third (33%) of the respondents not working at the time of the survey were not searching for jobs.

A little more than half of the respondents who were seeking employment were looking for jobs in either the finance/accounting industry (27%) or the products/services industry (27%). Additionally, 16% were seeking employment in the consulting industry, and 11% were seeking jobs in the technology industry. About one in ten (9%) were seeking jobs in the nonprofit/government industry, 5% were seeking jobs in healthcare, and 4% were seeking positions in manufacturing.

<b>Type of Industry Respondents Searching for Work Were Seeking</b>	
<b>Industry</b>	<b>Percentage (n = 55)</b>
Finance/Accounting	27%
Products/Services	27%
Consulting	16%
Technology	11%
Nonprofit/Government	9%
Healthcare	5%
Manufacturing	4%
Total	100%

Nearly a third of the respondents seeking employment were searching for finance/accounting positions. About a quarter were seeking positions in general management. One in five were seeking consulting positions, and 15% were seeking marketing/sales positions. Additionally, 6% were seeking operations/logistics positions, 2% were seeking human resource positions, and 2% were seeking IT/MIS positions.

<b>Type of Job Function Respondents Searching for Work Were Seeking</b>	
<b>Job Function</b>	<b>Percentage (n = 54)</b>
Finance/Accounting	31%
General Management	24%
Consulting	20%
Marketing/Sales	15%
Operations/Logistics	6%
Human Resources	2%
IT/MIS	2%
Total	100%

## **Organizational and Job Changes**

This section of the report explores the number of organizations and jobs respondents have had since completing their graduate business degree as well as the likelihood that respondents who were working for an employer will switch employers in the future.

### **Number of Employers Since Completing Graduate Business School**

Overall, respondents had worked for 1.5 organizations since completing graduate business school. The majority (62%) had worked for only one organization, and a quarter (25%) had worked for two organizations. An additional 10% worked for three or more organizations, and only 2% had not worked since completing graduate business school.

<b>Number of Organizations Worked for since Completing Graduate Business School</b>	
<b>Number of Organizations</b>	<b>Percentage (n = 3,226)</b>
None, I have not been employed	2%
One	62%
Two	25%
Three	7%
Four or more	3%
Total	100%
Mean	1.5
Median	1.0

On average, respondents who were self-employed at the time of the survey worked for significantly more organizations since completing graduate business school compared with other respondents.

Not surprisingly, the longer the respondents had been out of school, the more likely they were to have worked for more organizations compared with respondents who recently graduated.

Graduates of full-time programs worked for significantly more organizations since graduation compared with respondents from the other program types.

Not surprisingly, respondents ages 35 and older had worked for significantly more organization compared with respondents ages 28 to 34.

<b>Number of Organizations Worked For Since Completing Graduate Business School, by Demographic Characteristics</b>			
<b>Characteristic</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Median Number of Organizations</b>	<b>Mean Number of Organizations</b>
<b><i>Current Employment Status<sup>1</sup></i></b>			
Currently employed	2,939	1.0	1.5
Self-employed	188	1.0	<b>1.7</b>
Not currently employed	90	1.0	1.3
<b><i>Graduation Year<sup>2</sup></i></b>			
2000	149	2.0	<b>2.2</b>
2001	245	2.0	<b>2.0</b>
2002	243	2.0	<b>2.0</b>
2003	311	2.0	<b>1.8</b>
2004	554	1.0	<b>1.5</b>
2005	721	1.0	<b>1.3</b>
2006	1,003	1.0	<b>1.2</b>
<b><i>MBA Program Type<sup>3</sup></i></b>			
Full-time	2,157	1.0	<b>1.6</b>
Part-time	762	1.0	1.4
Executive	264	1.0	1.3
<b><i>Age<sup>4</sup></i></b>			
27 and younger	203	1.0	1.4
28 to 34	1,780	1.0	<b>1.5</b>
35 and older	1,234	1.0	<b>1.6</b>

<b>Number of Organizations Worked For Since Completing Graduate Business School, by Demographic Characteristics</b>		
1. F = 7.24; df = 2,3214; p ≤ .05	2. F = 88.11; df = 6,3219; p ≤ .05	3. F = 20.33; df = 2,3180; p ≤ .05
4. F = 7.27; df = 2,3214; p ≤ .05		
Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.		

There were no statistical differences in the mean number of organizations for which individuals worked since completing graduate business school by gender, citizenship, U.S. subgroup.

### **Number of Job Positions Held Since Completing Graduate Business School**

On average, respondents had held two job positions since completing graduate business school. A third (33%) of the respondents had held only one position, 35% held two positions, 19% held three positions, and 12% held four or more job positions since completing graduate business school.

<b>Number of Job Positions Held Since Completing Graduate Business School</b>	
<b>Number of Job Positions</b>	<b>Percentage (n = 3,160)</b>
One	33%
Two	35%
Three	19%
Four or more	12%
Total	100%
Mean	2.2
Median	2.0

Respondents who worked for more organizations since completing graduate business school also held more job positions compared with respondents who worked for fewer organizations.

The longer the respondent had been out of school, the more likely they were to have held more job positions compared with those who recently graduated.

Graduates of full-time programs held more job positions compared with respondents who graduated from part-time and executive programs.

Older respondents held more job positions compared with the number held by younger respondents.

<b>Number of Job Positions Held Since Completing Graduate Business School, by Demographic Characteristics</b>			
<b>Characteristic</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Median Number of Jobs</b>	<b>Mean Number of Jobs</b>
<b><i>Number of Organizations<sup>1</sup></i></b>			
One	1,998	1.0	<b>1.7</b>
Two	815	2.0	<b>2.6</b>

<b>Number of Job Positions Held Since Completing Graduate Business School, by Demographic Characteristics</b>			
<b>Characteristic</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Median Number of Jobs</b>	<b>Mean Number of Jobs</b>
Three	239	3.0	<b>3.5</b>
Four or more	108	4.0	<b>4.2</b>
<b>Graduation Year<sup>2</sup></b>			
2000	149	4.0	<b>3.9</b>
2001	241	3.0	<b>3.3</b>
2002	240	3.0	<b>3.1</b>
2003	310	3.0	<b>2.7</b>
2004	547	2.0	<b>2.3</b>
2005	708	2.0	<b>1.9</b>
2006	965	1.0	<b>1.4</b>
<b>MBA Program Type<sup>3</sup></b>			
Full-time	2,106	2.0	<b>2.3</b>
Part-time	756	2.0	2.0
Executive	257	2.0	1.8
<b>Age<sup>4</sup></b>			
27 and younger	199	2.0	<b>1.9</b>
28 to 34	1,751	2.0	<b>2.1</b>
35 and older	1,202	2.0	<b>2.3</b>
1. F = 454.72; df = 3,3156; p ≤ .05      2. F = 291.28; df = 6,3153; p ≤ .05 3. F = 38.59; df = 2,3116; p ≤ .05      4. F = 16.57; df = 2,3149; p ≤ .05 Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.			

Statistically, there were no differences in the mean number of job positions held since completing graduate business school by gender, citizenship, and U.S. subgroup.

### Likelihood of Switching Employers in the Future

Respondents who were employed at the time of the survey were asked to indicate the likelihood that they will switch employers or organizations at various times in the future. Overall, only 8% of the respondents reported that they were extremely likely to switch employers in the next six months, 10% were extremely likely to switch in the next year, and 29% were extremely likely to switch in the next five years.

There was significant overlap in the individuals reporting that they were likely to switch in each time period.

<b>Likelihood of Switching Employers or Organizations</b>						
<b>What is the likelihood that you will switch employers or organizations...</b>	<b>n = 2,978</b>					<b>Total</b>
	<b>Extremely Likely</b>	<b>Very Likely</b>	<b>Somewhat Likely</b>	<b>Not Very Likely</b>	<b>Not At All Likely</b>	
in the next 6 months?	8%	6%	15%	32%	39%	100%
in the next year?	10%	11%	22%	34%	22%	100%
in the next 5 years?	29%	24%	32%	11%	4%	100%

There were significant differences by graduation year in the percentage of respondents who indicated that they were extremely likely to switch employers in the next five years. However, these differences were only slight. There were no significant differences by graduation year in the percentage of respondents who indicated that they were extremely likely to switch employers in the next six months or in the next year.

Likelihood of Switching Employers or Organizations, by Graduation Year				
Graduation Year	Number	Percentage Extremely Likely		
		in the next 6 months? <sup>1</sup>	in the next year?	in the next 5 years? <sup>1</sup>
2000	131	11%	13%	27%
2001	219	5%	5%	24%
2002	214	7%	10%	27%
2003	295	6%	13%	34%
2004	523	6%	8%	25%
2005	671	9%	11%	32%
2006	925	10%	11%	30%

1.  $\chi^2 = 13.57$ ;  $df = 6$ ;  $p \leq .05$

Respondents from Latin America (4%) were the least likely of the respondents to indicate that they were extremely likely to switch employers in the next six months. There were no significant differences by citizenship in the percentage of respondents who indicated that they were extremely likely to switch employers in the next year or in the next five years.

Likelihood of Switching Employers or Organizations, by Citizenship				
Citizenship	Number	Percentage Extremely Likely		
		in the next 6 months? <sup>1</sup>	in the next year?	in the next 5 years? <sup>1</sup>
Asia	292	7%	8%	32%
United States	1,916	8%	11%	28%
Canada	180	12%	14%	36%
Latin America	136	<b>4%</b>	8%	27%
Europe	355	11%	9%	31%

1.  $\chi^2 = 11.08$ ;  $df = 4$ ;  $p \leq .05$   
Items in bold in the contingency table significantly affect the overall  $\chi^2$  statistic.

African American respondents were significantly more likely than Asian American respondents to indicate that they were extremely likely to switch employers in the next six months. Additionally, African American respondents were more likely than all other U.S. respondents to indicate that they were extremely likely to switch employers in the next year. There were no significant differences by U.S. subgroup in the percentage of respondents who indicated that they were extremely likely to switch employers in the next five years.

Likelihood of Switching Employers or Organizations, by U.S. Subgroup				
U.S. Subgroup	Number	Percentage Extremely Likely		
		in the next 6 months? <sup>1</sup>	in the next year? <sup>2</sup>	in the next 5 years?
Asian American	140	<b>3%</b>	7%	29%
African American	68	<b>21%</b>	<b>22%</b>	38%
White	1,510	8%	11%	27%
Hispanic	71	<b>10%</b>	8%	34%

1.  $\chi^2 = 20.46$ ;  $df = 3$ ;  $p \leq .05$     2.  $\chi^2 = 11.38$ ;  $df = 3$ ;  $p \leq .05$   
Items in bold in the contingency table significantly affect the overall  $\chi^2$  statistic.

Respondents in the nonprofit/government industry were more likely than respondents in the manufacturing industry to indicate that they were extremely likely to switch employers in the next six months. Respondents in the nonprofit/government industry were more likely than other employed respondents to indicate that they were extremely likely to switch employers in the next year. Finally, respondents in the nonprofit/government industry were more likely than respondents in the finance/accounting industry to indicate that they were extremely likely to switch employers in the next five years.

Likelihood of Switching Employers or Organizations, by Industry of Employment				
Industry	Number	Percentage Extremely Likely		
		in the next 6 months? <sup>1</sup>	in the next year? <sup>2</sup>	in the next 5 years? <sup>3</sup>
Consulting	411	8%	9%	34%
Energy/Utility	120	6%	8%	21%
Finance/Accounting	645	7%	9%	<b>25%</b>
Healthcare	268	10%	12%	28%
Technology	421	9%	12%	32%
Manufacturing	271	<b>4%</b>	8%	24%
Nonprofit/Government	218	<b>14%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>39%</b>
Products/Services	612	7%	9%	30%

1.  $\chi^2 = 20.58$ ;  $df = 7$ ;  $p \leq .05$     2.  $\chi^2 = 17.35$ ;  $df = 7$ ;  $p \leq .05$     3.  $\chi^2 = 30.96$ ;  $df = 7$ ;  $p \leq .05$   
Items in bold in the contingency table significantly affect the overall  $\chi^2$  statistic.

Statistically, there were no differences by MBA program type, gender, or age in the percentage of respondents who indicated that they were extremely likely to switch employers in the next six months, in the next year, and in the next five years.

## Current Job

This section explores current jobs among MBA graduate respondents who were working in an organization, including their job function, job level, work hours, skill use, and promotions. Additionally, this section examines respondent job responsibility, autonomy, motivation, and the amount of feedback provided by their boss or supervisor. Salary and additional compensation are also included.

## Current Job Function

Respondents were asked to indicate the job function in which they were currently employed. The top five job functions are occupied by slightly more than one-third (36.1%) of the employed respondents. These functions include general management, product management, strategy, corporate finance, and other marketing and sales positions.

<b>Detailed Job Function List</b>			
<b>Job Function</b>	<b>Percentage</b>	<b>Job Function</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
General Management	9.1%	Real Estate	1.4%
Product Management	7.3%	Systems Analysis	1.4%
Strategy	7.3%	Change Management	1.4%
Corporate Finance	7.2%	Systems Consulting	1.4%
Other Marketing/Sales	5.2%	Other Human Resources	1.1%
Other Finance/Accounting	5.2%	Product Development	1.0%
Other Consulting	4.0%	Entrepreneurial	1.0%
Accounting/Auditing	3.8%	Communications	0.9%
Investments	3.6%	Logistics	0.9%
Operations	3.6%	Production/Manufacturing	0.7%
Other Information Technology/MIS	3.3%	Staffing and Training	0.6%
Sales Management	2.9%	Product Management	0.4%
Sales	2.9%	Advertising	0.4%
Business Development	2.7%	Public Relations	0.4%
Market Research	2.5%	Public Finance	0.3%
Other General Management	2.3%	Telecommunications	0.3%
Banking	2.3%	Compensation and Benefits	0.2%
Treasury and Financial Analysis	2.2%	Change Management	0.2%
M&A (Mergers & Acquisitions)	2.0%	Electronic Commerce	0.2%
Other Operations/Logistics	1.8%	Industrial/Labor Relations	0.1%
Purchasing	1.6%	Other job function	1.1%
Engineering	1.6%	Total	100%

The detailed job function table was collapsed into seven groups (refer to the *Methodology* section for category definitions and details on how individual job functions were collapsed). Once the industries were grouped, two job functions represented more than half of the employed respondents, where 28% of the respondents worked in a finance/accounting position and 23% worked in a marketing/sales position. Additionally, 16% worked in consulting positions, 13% in general management, 7% in information technology/MIS positions, and 2% in human resources.

Job Function Group	
Job Function Group	Percentage (n = 2,936)
Marketing/Sales	23%
Operations/Logistics	11%
Consulting	16%
General Management	13%
Finance/Accounting	28%
Human Resources	2%
IT/MIS	7%
Total	100%

Respondents working in a marketing/sales position were more likely than other respondents to be working in the technology, healthcare, and products/services industries. Respondents in operations/logistic positions were more likely to be in the energy/utility, healthcare, and manufacturing industries. Respondents in general management positions were more likely to be in the healthcare and products/services industries. Not surprisingly, respondents working in a job function with a corresponding industry group were more likely to be employed in that industry group, such as consulting, finance/accounting, and IT/MIS.

Industry Group, by Job Function Group <sup>1</sup>							
Industry Group	Job Function Group						
	Marketing/ Sales (n = 666)	Operations/ Logistics (n = 331)	Consulting (n = 471)	General Management (n = 367)	Finance/ Accounting (n = 832)	Human Resources (n = 69)	IT/MIS (n = 195)
Consulting	5%	4%	54%	7%	5%	20%	15%
Energy/Utilities	2%	7%	3%	5%	5%	1%	3%
Finance/Accounting	13%	8%	7%	12%	51%	13%	11%
Healthcare	13%	15%	7%	12%	5%	1%	7%
Technology	19%	17%	8%	14%	8%	16%	35%
Manufacturing	9%	21%	4%	8%	8%	14%	10%
Nonprofit/Government	5%	7%	5%	13%	5%	13%	9%
Products/Services	34%	22%	12%	28%	14%	20%	10%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

1.  $\chi^2 = 1539.57$ ;  $df = 42$ ;  $p \leq .05$   
Items in bold in the contingency table significantly affect the overall  $\chi^2$  statistic.

Graduates of 2003 were more likely than other respondents to be working in a marketing or sales position. The class of 2006 was more likely than other classes to have an operations/logistics position. General management positions were more likely to be held by graduates of 2002 compared with other graduating classes. The class of 2006 was less likely than other graduating classes to have a finance/accounting position.

Job Function, by Graduation Year <sup>1</sup>							
Job Function Group	2000 (n = 127)	2001 (n = 215)	2002 (n = 211)	2003 (n = 291)	2004 (n = 520)	2005 (n = 663)	2006 (n = 909)
Marketing/Sales	22%	20%	20%	<b>29%</b>	25%	20%	23%
Operations/Logistics	11%	13%	10%	8%	10%	10%	<b>14%</b>
Consulting	20%	12%	14%	15%	16%	17%	17%
General Management	8%	14%	<b>18%</b>	12%	12%	13%	12%
Finance/Accounting	28%	31%	31%	28%	28%	32%	<b>25%</b>
Human Resources	3%	3%	2%	3%	3%	2%	2%
IT/MIS	8%	7%	5%	5%	7%	6%	8%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

1.  $\chi^2 = 52.21$ ;  $df = 36$ ;  $p \leq .05$   
Items in bold in the contingency table significantly affect the overall  $\chi^2$  statistic.

Graduates of full-time programs were more likely than graduates of part-time programs to have a consulting position and more likely than all other respondents to have a finance/accounting position. Yet, graduates of full-time programs were less likely than part-time program graduates to have an operations/logistics position and less likely than all other respondents to have an IT/MIS position. Graduates of part-time programs were the most likely of the graduates to have a human resource position and graduates of executive programs were the most likely to have a general management position.

Job Function, by MBA Program Type <sup>1</sup>			
Job Function Group	Full-Time (n = 1,938)	Part-Time (n = 721)	Executive (n = 239)
Marketing/Sales	23%	23%	19%
Operations/Logistics	<b>9%</b>	<b>17%</b>	14%
Consulting	<b>19%</b>	<b>10%</b>	13%
General Management	11%	12%	<b>23%</b>
Finance/Accounting	<b>32%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>18%</b>
Human Resources	2%	<b>3%</b>	1%
IT/MIS	<b>4%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>11%</b>
Total	100%	100%	100%

1.  $\chi^2 = 165.84$ ;  $df = 12$ ;  $p \leq .05$   
Items in bold in the contingency table significantly affect the overall  $\chi^2$  statistic.

Women were more likely than men to have a marketing/sales or human resources position. On the other hand, men were more likely than women to have an operations/logistics or IT/MIS position.

Job Function, by Gender <sup>1</sup>		
Job Function Group	Male (n = 2,084)	Female (n = 847)
Marketing/Sales	<b>21%</b>	<b>28%</b>
Operations/Logistics	12%	<b>9%</b>
Consulting	17%	15%
General Management	13%	11%
Finance/Accounting	28%	28%

Job Function, by Gender <sup>1</sup>		
Job Function Group	Male (n = 2,084)	Female (n = 847)
Human Resources	<b>1%</b>	<b>5%</b>
IT/MIS	7%	<b>5%</b>
Total	100%	100%

1.  $\chi^2 = 54.02$ ;  $df = 6$ ;  $p \leq .05$   
Items in bold in the contingency table significantly affect the overall  $\chi^2$  statistic.

Respondents ages 35 and older were more likely than respondents ages 28 to 34 to have an operations/logistics or general management position. However, respondents ages 28 to 34 were more likely than other respondents to have a consulting position. Respondents ages 27 and younger were more likely than respondents ages 35 and older to have a finance/accounting position.

Job Function, by Age <sup>1</sup>			
Job Function Group	27 and Younger (n = 185)	28 to 34 (n = 1,651)	35 and Older (n = 1,094)
Marketing/Sales	25%	24%	20%
Operations/Logistics	11%	<b>9%</b>	<b>14%</b>
Consulting	<b>7%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>14%</b>
General Management	9%	<b>10%</b>	<b>17%</b>
Finance/Accounting	<b>38%</b>	31%	<b>23%</b>
Human Resources	3%	2%	3%
IT/MIS	6%	6%	8%
Total	100%	100%	100%

1.  $\chi^2 = 95.19$ ;  $df = 12$ ;  $p \leq .05$   
Items in bold in the contingency table significantly affect the overall  $\chi^2$  statistic.

European respondents were more likely than respondents from the United States to have a consulting position. Canadian respondents were the most likely of the respondents to have a general management position. Asian respondents were more likely than Canadian respondents to have a finance/accounting position.

Job Function, by Citizenship <sup>1</sup>					
Job Function Group	Asia (n = 289)	United States (n = 1,887)	Canada (n = 176)	Latin America (n = 135)	Europe (n = 352)
Marketing/Sales	22%	24%	23%	23%	19%
Operations/Logistics	9%	13%	10%	7%	9%
Consulting	12%	<b>14%</b>	19%	19%	<b>27%</b>
General Management	11%	11%	<b>22%</b>	13%	15%
Finance/Accounting	<b>36%</b>	29%	<b>21%</b>	28%	24%
Human Resources	2%	3%	2%	1%	2%
IT/MIS	7%	7%	5%	9%	5%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

1.  $\chi^2 = 80.03$ ;  $df = 24$ ;  $p \leq .05$   
Items in bold in the contingency table significantly affect the overall  $\chi^2$  statistic.

There were no statistical differences by U.S. subgroup in the job functions reported by respondents.

### Current Job Level

Respondents were asked to indicate the level of the organization in which they were currently employed. Overall, 59% of the respondents held mid-level jobs in their organization, and a quarter (25%) of the respondents held senior-level positions. An additional 7% held entry-level positions and 9% held executive-level positions.

There was a significant difference by job level in the average number of years respondents worked for their company. Respondents at higher levels of the organization were more likely to have worked for the organization for more years compared with respondents at lower job levels. On average, respondents in entry-level position had worked for their company for 1.8 years. Respondents in mid-level positions had worked at their company for 3.6 years, senior-level positions had worked for 4.2 years, and executive-level positions had worked for 5.7 years at their company.

Job level	
Job Level	Percentage (n = 2,964)
Entry level	7%
Mid-level	59%
Senior level	25%
Executive level	9%
Total	100%

Respondents in the finance/accounting and nonprofit/government industries were more likely than respondents in the technology industry to have an entry-level position. Respondents in the manufacturing industry were more likely than respondents in the finance/accounting industry to have an executive-level position.

Respondents in general management positions were the most likely of the respondents to have an executive-level position. Additionally, these respondents were more likely than respondents in finance/accounting positions to have a senior-level position. Meanwhile, respondents with finance/accounting positions were more likely than respondents with general management positions to have an entry-level position. Respondents with marketing/sales positions were more likely than respondents with general management positions to have a mid-level position.

Job Level, by Job Characteristics						
Characteristic	Number	Entry Level	Mid-Level	Senior Level	Executive Level	Total
<i>Industry Group<sup>1</sup></i>						
Consulting	409	9%	60%	23%	7%	100%
Energy/Utility	120	8%	58%	28%	7%	100%
Finance/Accounting	642	<b>9%</b>	62%	24%	<b>5%</b>	100%
Healthcare	268	7%	56%	26%	11%	100%

Job Level, by Job Characteristics						
Characteristic	Number	Entry Level	Mid-Level	Senior Level	Executive Level	Total
Technology	420	<b>4%</b>	60%	25%	11%	100%
Manufacturing	269	6%	57%	23%	<b>14%</b>	100%
Nonprofit/Government	214	<b>11%</b>	54%	24%	11%	100%
Products/Services	610	6%	59%	26%	9%	100%
<b>Job Function Group<sup>2</sup></b>						
Marketing/Sales	664	6%	<b>66%</b>	23%	4%	100%
Operations/Logistics	331	7%	58%	28%	7%	100%
Consulting	470	8%	60%	28%	5%	100%
General Management	368	<b>2%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>35%</b>	100%
Finance/Accounting	830	<b>10%</b>	64%	<b>21%</b>	5%	100%
Human Resources	68	6%	63%	25%	6%	100%
IT/MIS	194	5%	65%	21%	8%	100%

1.  $\chi^2 = 44.59$ ;  $df = 21$ ;  $p \leq .05$     2.  $\chi^2 = 421.57$ ;  $df = 18$ ;  $p \leq .05$   
 Items in bold in the contingency table significantly affect the overall  $\chi^2$  statistic.

The longer a respondent had been out of graduate business school, the more likely the respondent was to have a senior-level or executive-level position. Graduates of executive programs were more likely than other graduates to have senior- or executive-level positions and less likely to have mid-level positions. Additionally, respondents from full-time programs were more likely than other graduates to have an entry-level position.

Men were more likely than women to have a senior- or executive-level position, whereas women were more likely to have entry- or mid-level positions. However, older respondents were more likely than younger respondents to have senior- and executive-level positions, and male respondents were significantly older than female respondents.

Respondents from Latin America and Europe were more likely than other respondents to have executive-level positions. Additionally, Latin American and European respondents were more likely than respondents from the United States to have senior-level positions. On the other hand, respondents from the United States were more likely than respondents from Europe and Latin America to have a mid-level position. Asian respondents were more likely than all other respondents to have an entry-level position.

Statistically, there were no differences in the job level of respondents by U.S. subgroup.

Job Level, by Demographic Characteristics						
Characteristic	Number	Entry level	Mid-Level	Senior Level	Executive Level	Total
<b>Graduation Year<sup>1</sup></b>						
2000	130	4%	55%	<b>32%</b>	9%	100%
2001	100	<b>2%</b>	51%	<b>32%</b>	<b>16%</b>	100%
2002	219	<b>3%</b>	57%	29%	11%	100%
2003	100	6%	56%	27%	10%	100%
2004	213	<b>4%</b>	61%	26%	8%	100%
2005	100	8%	61%	22%	8%	100%
2006	294	<b>11%</b>	60%	<b>21%</b>	7%	100%

Job Level, by Demographic Characteristics						
Characteristic	Number	Entry level	Mid-Level	Senior Level	Executive Level	Total
<b>MBA Program Type<sup>2</sup></b>						
Full-Time	1,958	<b>9%</b>	61%	23%	7%	100%
Part-Time	728	<b>4%</b>	63%	25%	9%	100%
Executive	239	<b>2%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>26%</b>	100%
<b>Gender<sup>3</sup></b>						
Male	2,099	<b>6%</b>	57%	26%	<b>11%</b>	100%
Female	860	<b>10%</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>5%</b>	100%
<b>Age<sup>4</sup></b>						
27 and younger	188	<b>29%</b>	60%	<b>10%</b>	<b>2%</b>	100%
28 to 34	1,661	8%	<b>66%</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>6%</b>	100%
35 and older	1,109	<b>3%</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>15%</b>	100%
<b>Citizenship<sup>5</sup></b>						
Asia	292	<b>11%</b>	57%	25%	7%	100%
United States	1,907	7%	<b>64%</b>	<b>21%</b>	8%	100%
Canada	179	6%	55%	29%	9%	100%
Latin America	136	4%	<b>43%</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>14%</b>	100%
Europe	353	6%	<b>46%</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>14%</b>	100%

1.  $\chi^2 = 79.90$ ; df = 18;  $p \leq .05$     2.  $\chi^2 = 178.82$ ; df = 6;  $p \leq .05$     3.  $\chi^2 = 50.90$ ; df = 3;  $p \leq .05$     4.  $\chi^2 = 340.29$ ; df = 6;  $p \leq .05$   
5.  $\chi^2 = 87.65$ ; df = 12;  $p \leq .05$   
Items in bold in the contingency table significantly affect the overall  $\chi^2$  statistic.

## Weekly Work Hours

Respondents were asked to specify the number of hours they typically work in a week. On average, respondents worked 50 hours per week. Yet, a majority of respondents indicated that they worked 50 hours or more per week on average. Slightly more than a third of the respondents worked between 40 and 49 hours per week, and 4% worked fewer than 40 hours per week.

Weekly Work Hours	
Hours	Percentage (n = 2,964)
Fewer 40 hours	4%
40 to 49 hours	37%
50 hours or more	59%
Total	100%
Mean	49.7
Median	50.0

Respondents working in the consulting and finance/accounting industries worked longer hours on average compared with respondents in the energy/utility, healthcare, technology, nonprofit/government, and products/services industries. Respondents in the energy/utility, technology, manufacturing, and products/services industries worked longer hours compared with respondents in the nonprofit/government industry.

Respondents in marketing/sales positions worked longer hours than respondents in IT/MIS positions. Respondents in consulting and finance/accounting positions worked longer hours

compared with respondents in marketing/sales, operations/logistics, and IT/MIS positions. Respondents in general management positions worked longer hours compared with respondents in operations/logistics and IT/MIS positions.

Respondents in higher-level positions work longer hours each week, on average, compared with respondents in lower-level positions.

<b>Number of Hours Worked Per Week, by Job Characteristics</b>			
<b>Characteristic</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Median Number of Hours</b>	<b>Mean Number of Hours</b>
<b>Industry Group<sup>1</sup></b>			
Consulting	411	50.0	<b>51.8</b>
Energy/Utility	120	50.0	<b>48.3</b>
Finance/Accounting	645	50.0	<b>51.7</b>
Healthcare	268	50.0	<b>49.0</b>
Technology	421	50.0	<b>48.4</b>
Manufacturing	271	50.0	49.6
Nonprofit/Government	218	45.0	<b>44.6</b>
Products/Services	612	50.0	<b>49.5</b>
<b>Job Function Group<sup>2</sup></b>			
Marketing/Sales	667	50.0	<b>48.8</b>
Operations/Logistics	332	50.0	<b>48.5</b>
Consulting	472	50.0	<b>51.6</b>
General Management	369	50.0	<b>50.7</b>
Finance/Accounting	832	50.0	<b>50.5</b>
Human Resources	69	50.0	47.9
IT/MIS	195	45.0	<b>46.3</b>
<b>Job Level<sup>3</sup></b>			
Entry level	217	45.0	<b>46.4</b>
Mid-level	1,750	50.0	<b>49.2</b>
Senior level	729	50.0	<b>50.8</b>
Executive level	268	50.0	<b>52.8</b>
1. F = 16.51; df = 7,2958; p ≤ .05      2. F = 10.60; df = 6,2929; p ≤ .05      3. F = 21.38; df = 3,2960; p ≤ .05			
Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.			

There was a significant difference by graduation year in the average number of hours worked per week. Graduates of part-time programs worked fewer hours on average compared with other respondents, but men worked significantly longer hours compared with the number of hours women worked. Respondents ages 27 and younger worked fewer hours compared with older respondents, and respondents from the United States worked fewer hours on average compared with European respondents.

Statistically, there were no differences in the average number of hours worked per week by U.S. subgroup.

Number of Hours Worked Per Week, by Demographic Characteristics			
Characteristic	Number	Median Number of Hours	Mean Number of Hours
<b>Graduation Year<sup>1</sup></b>			
2000	131	50.0	49.7
2001	219	50.0	50.5
2002	214	50.0	51.0
2003	295	50.0	49.9
2004	523	50.0	49.4
2005	671	50.0	50.3
2006	925	50.0	48.8
<b>MBA Program Type<sup>2</sup></b>			
Full-Time	1,968	50.0	50.4
Part-Time	730	47.0	<b>47.4</b>
Executive	241	50.0	51.2
<b>Gender<sup>3</sup></b>			
Male	2,108	50.0	<b>50.8</b>
Female	865	48.0	<b>47.1</b>
<b>Age<sup>4</sup></b>			
27 and younger	191	45.0	<b>45.9</b>
28 to 34	1,668	50.0	50.0
35 and older	1,113	50.0	49.9
<b>Citizenship<sup>5</sup></b>			
Asia	292	50.0	49.2
United States	1,916	50.0	<b>49.4</b>
Canada	180	50.0	49.1
Latin America	136	50.0	51.3
Europe	355	50.0	<b>51.3</b>
1. F = 2.45; df = 6,2971; p ≤ .05                      2. F = 27.37; df = 2,2936; p ≤ .05 3. F = 82.80; df = 1,2971; p ≤ .05                      4. F = 14.96; df = 2,2969; p ≤ .05 5. F = 4.00; df = 4,2874; p ≤ .05 Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.			

## Promotions

Overall, 44% of the respondents indicated that they received a promotion with their current employer. Among those who received a promotion, 29% felt that it took less time than they expected, 47% felt that it was just the right amount of time, 20% felt that it took a little too long, and 3% felt that it took a very long time to receive their promotion. A vast majority of the respondents who received a promotion reported a change in job title (85%), a pay increase (90%), and an increase in responsibility (83%). Additionally, fewer than half of the respondents indicated that their promotion involved an increase in budgetary authority, an increase in the number of subordinates they manage, and becoming a team leader.

Not surprisingly, respondents who had been employed with their employer for a greater number of years were more likely than other respondents to have received a promotion. Yet, these respondents were more likely to indicate that the promotion took longer to receive compared with other respondents.

<b>Promotions</b>	
<b>Response</b>	<b>Percentage (n = 2,964)</b>
Received promotion with current employer	44%
<b>Respondents who received a promotion</b>	
<b>Do you feel that it took...</b>	
Less time than expected	29%
Just the right amount of time	47%
A little too long	20%
A very long time	3%
Total	100%
<b>Did your recent promotion involve†...</b>	
A change in job title	85%
A pay increase	90%
An increase in responsibility	83%
An increase in budgetary authority	41%
An increase in the number of subordinates you manage	47%
Becoming a team leader	40%
† Responses add to more than 100% because of multiple selections.	

There were no statistical differences in the percentage of respondents who received a promotion or in the distribution of the length of time it took to receive a promotion by industry or job function. However, among the respondents who received a promotion, respondents in the manufacturing and products/services industry were more likely than respondents in the consulting and finance/accounting industry to indicate that their promotion involved an increase in budgetary authority. Additionally, respondents in general management positions were more likely than respondents in finance/accounting positions to report an increase in budgetary authority and an increase in the number of subordinates they manage.

Graduates of 2000 through 2004 were more likely to have received a promotion compared with graduates in the class of 2006. Among the respondents who received a promotion, respondents in the class of 2001 were less likely than other respondents to indicate that the promotion took less time than expected, and they were more likely than other respondents to indicate that the promotion took a little too long. However, among the respondents who received a promotion there were no differences in the characteristics of the promotion by graduation year.

<b>Promotions, by Graduation Year</b>							
<b>Response</b>	<b>2000 (n = 131)</b>	<b>2001 (n = 219)</b>	<b>2002 (n = 214)</b>	<b>2003 (n = 295)</b>	<b>2004 (n = 523)</b>	<b>2005 (n = 671)</b>	<b>2006 (n = 925)</b>
Received promotion with current employer <sup>†</sup>	73%	58%	64%	55%	54%	43%	24%
<b>Respondents who received a promotion</b>							
<b>Do you feel that it took<sup>2</sup>...</b>							
Less time than expected	20%	16%	28%	26%	33%	34%	33%
Just the right amount of time	48%	52%	46%	47%	47%	45%	48%
A little too long	26%	28%	24%	22%	18%	17%	16%
A very long time	6%	4%	3%	4%	2%	3%	3%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

<i>Did your recent promotion involve†...</i>							
A change in job title	86%	87%	83%	89%	87%	85%	80%
A pay increase	91%	91%	94%	91%	91%	89%	87%
An increase in responsibility	80%	79%	88%	89%	84%	81%	82%
An increase in budgetary authority	36%	41%	49%	43%	37%	42%	41%
An increase in the number of subordinates you manage	54%	50%	53%	49%	46%	46%	42%
Becoming a team leader	47%	45%	46%	42%	39%	37%	34%

1.  $\chi^2 = 276.78$ ;  $df = 6$ ;  $p \leq .05$     2.  $\chi^2 = 32.70$ ;  $df = 18$ ;  $p \leq .05$   
 Items in bold in the contingency table significantly affect the overall  $\chi^2$  statistic.  
 † Responses add to more than 100% because of multiple selections.

Statistically, there was no difference by MBA program type in the percentage of respondents who received a promotion. However, graduates of part-time programs were more likely than other respondents to indicate that the promotion took a little too long. Additionally, graduates of executive programs were more likely than other respondents who received a promotion to report an increase in their budgetary authority.

There were no significant differences by gender in the percentage of respondents who received a promotion or in the distribution in the length of time it took to receive a promotion. However, males were more likely than females to report that their promotion included an increase in responsibility, an increase in budgetary authority, an increase in the number of subordinates they manage, and becoming a team leader.

Respondents ages 35 and older were more likely than younger respondents to have received a promotion with their current employer, but respondents ages 35 and older were more likely than younger respondents to indicate the promotion took a very long time. Additionally, respondents ages 35 and older were more likely than respondents ages 27 and younger to report that their promotion included an increase in budgetary authority and an increase in the number of subordinates they manage.

<b>Promotions, by Age</b>			
<b>Response</b>	<b>27 and Younger (n = 191)</b>	<b>28 to 34 (n = 1,668)</b>	<b>35 and Older (n = 1,113)</b>
Received promotion with current employer <sup>1</sup>	40%	42%	48%
<b>Respondents who received a promotion</b>	<b>(n = 76)</b>	<b>(n = 706)</b>	<b>(n = 530)</b>
<b>Do you feel that it took<sup>2</sup>...</b>			
Less time than expected	<b>49%</b>	31%	<b>24%</b>
Just the right amount of time	41%	48%	47%
A little too long	<b>9%</b>	19%	24%
A very long time	1%	2%	<b>5%</b>
Total	100%	100%	100%
<b>Did your recent promotion involve†...</b>			
A change in job title	76%	85%	86%
A pay increase	93%	91%	89%
An increase in responsibility	81%	84%	83%

<b>Promotions, by Age</b>			
<b>Response</b>	<b>27 and Younger (n = 191)</b>	<b>28 to 34 (n = 1,668)</b>	<b>35 and Older (n = 1,113)</b>
An increase in budgetary authority <sup>3</sup>	<b>28%</b>	38%	<b>47%</b>
An increase in the number of subordinates you manage <sup>4</sup>	<b>31%</b>	44%	<b>53%</b>
Becoming a team leader	36%	40%	40%
1. $\chi^2 = 9.16$ ; df = 2; p ≤ .05      2. $\chi^2 = 35.28$ ; df = 6; p ≤ .05      3. $\chi^2 = 14.28$ ; df = 2; p ≤ .05      4. $\chi^2 = 18.01$ ; df = 2; p ≤ .05 Items in bold in the contingency table significantly affect the overall $\chi^2$ statistic. † Responses add to more than 100% because of multiple selections.			

There were no statistical differences by citizenship in the percentage of respondents who received a promotion or in the distribution in the length of time it took to receive a promotion. Yet, among the respondents who received a promotion, Asian respondents were less likely than Canadian respondents to report a change in job title. Respondents from the United States were more likely than respondents from Europe to report a pay increase as a part of their promotion. Respondents from Latin America who received a promotion were more likely than other respondents to report an increase in budgetary authority and becoming a team leader.

There were no significant differences in promotions by U.S. subgroup.

### Annual Base Salary

Eighty-seven percent of employed respondents reported their annual base salary. On average, the MBA alumni earned \$94,825 per year in base salary. There were significant correlations between the number of years a respondent had worked for an employer and their annual base salary ( $r = .166$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ) and between graduation year and annual base salary ( $r = -.177$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ). Additionally, there was a significant correlation between the number of hours worked per week and annual base salary ( $r = .277$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ).

<b>Annual Average Base Salary (U.S. Dollars)</b>	
<b>Statistic</b>	<b>(n = 2,577)</b>
Mean	\$94,825
25 <sup>th</sup> percentile	\$70,000
Median	\$90,000
75 <sup>th</sup> percentile	\$112,000

Respondents in the consulting industry reported greater earnings compared with respondents in the finance/accounting, nonprofit/government, and products/services industries. Respondents in the energy/utility, finance/accounting, healthcare, and technology industries reported greater earnings compared with respondents in the nonprofit/government and products/services industries. Respondents in the manufacturing and products/services industries reported a greater annual salary compared with respondents in the nonprofit/government industry. There were significant positive correlations between the number of years of employment with their current employer and annual base salary (Pearson correlation coefficient [r] ranges from .13 and .28;  $p \leq .05$ ) for each industry, except the nonprofit/government industry.

Respondents in consulting and general management positions reported higher earnings compared with respondents in all other positions. There were significant positive correlations between the number of years of employment with their current employer and annual base salary (Pearson correlation coefficient [ $r$ ] ranges from .12 and .23;  $p \leq .05$ ) for most job functions, except human resources and IT/MIS.

Not surprisingly, respondents in higher-level positions reported significantly greater earnings compared with the respondents in lower-level positions. For senior-level ( $r = .12$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ) and executive-level positions ( $r = .21$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ), there were significant positive correlations between the number of years they were employed by the organization and annual base salary. However, there were no significant correlations among respondents in entry-level and mid-level jobs by the number of years in which they were employed by their organization.

<b>Annual Average Base Salary, by Job Characteristics (U.S. Dollars)</b>			
<b>Characteristic</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Median</b>	<b>Mean</b>
<b>Industry Group<sup>1</sup></b>			
Consulting	355	\$100,000	<b>\$104,971</b>
Energy/Utility	107	\$93,700	<b>\$102,823</b>
Finance/Accounting	554	\$93,000	<b>\$96,003</b>
Healthcare	233	\$94,000	<b>\$101,225</b>
Technology	371	\$92,000	<b>\$98,316</b>
Manufacturing	237	\$90,000	<b>\$94,662</b>
Nonprofit/Government	176	\$67,800	<b>\$71,620</b>
Products/Services	534	\$85,000	<b>\$87,608</b>
<b>Job Function<sup>2</sup></b>			
Marketing/Sales	584	\$87,000	<b>\$87,858</b>
Operations/Logistics	289	\$88,000	<b>\$91,587</b>
Consulting	420	\$100,300	<b>\$105,789</b>
General Management	312	\$100,000	<b>\$107,908</b>
Finance/Accounting	718	\$87,000	<b>\$91,571</b>
Human Resources	55	\$84,760	<b>\$84,439</b>
IT/MIS	168	\$87,000	<b>\$93,066</b>
<b>Job Level<sup>3</sup></b>			
Entry-level	180	\$60,000	<b>\$65,952</b>
Mid-level	1,524	\$86,000	<b>\$87,508</b>
Senior level	633	\$100,500	<b>\$107,446</b>
Executive level	230	\$120,000	<b>\$132,176</b>
1. $F = 15.08$ ; $df = 7,2559$ ; $p \leq .05$ 2. $F = 14.51$ ; $df = 6,2539$ ; $p \leq .05$			
3. $F = 142.78$ ; $df = 3,2563$ ; $p \leq .05$			
Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.			

Higher annual base salaries were associated with the amount of time that had elapsed since graduation—the longer respondents had been out of graduate business school, the more they typically earned.

Graduates of executive programs reported higher annual salaries compared with the salaries reported by graduates of other program types. Among full-time ( $r = .12$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ) and part-time ( $r = .15$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ) graduates, there were significant correlations between annual base salary and the

number of years employed for the organization, but the correlation among executive graduates was not statistically significant.

Men reported higher salaries compared with women, and there were significant correlations by gender between the annual base salary and the number of years employed for the organization. However, as shown, older respondents reported higher salaries compared with younger respondents, and women tended to be younger than men.

European respondents reported higher earnings compared with all other respondents. There were significant correlations between annual base salary and the number of years employed for the organization among respondents from the United States, Canada, and Europe.

There were no statistically significant differences in annual base salary by U.S. subgroup.

<b>Annual Average Base Salary, by Demographic Characteristics (U.S. Dollars)</b>			
<b>Characteristic</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Median</b>	<b>Mean</b>
<b><i>Graduation Year<sup>1</sup></i></b>			
2000	115	\$109,000	<b>\$111,395</b>
2001	189	\$105,000	<b>\$111,041</b>
2002	182	\$100,000	<b>\$103,228</b>
2003	260	\$95,000	<b>\$102,205</b>
2004	457	\$90,000	<b>\$91,343</b>
2005	596	\$88,710	<b>\$92,852</b>
2006	778	\$85,000	<b>\$87,562</b>
<b><i>MBA Program Type<sup>2</sup></i></b>			
Full-Time	1,706	\$90,000	<b>\$92,818</b>
Part-Time	629	\$85,000	<b>\$88,451</b>
Executive	211	\$120,000	<b>\$127,836</b>
<b><i>Gender<sup>3</sup></i></b>			
Male	1,842	\$94,550	<b>\$99,494</b>
Female	732	\$82,500	<b>\$83,021</b>
<b><i>Age<sup>4</sup></i></b>			
27 and younger	160	\$56,950	\$57,647
28 to 34	1,447	\$88,000	\$90,876
35 and older	967	\$100,000	\$106,844
<b><i>Citizenship<sup>5</sup></i></b>			
Asia	210	\$84,380	<b>\$89,174</b>
United States	1,687	\$90,000	<b>\$94,364</b>
Canada	160	\$75,000	<b>\$86,127</b>
Latin America	114	\$90,000	<b>\$90,267</b>
Europe	321	\$100,000	<b>\$106,577</b>
1. F = 15.20; df = 6,2570; p ≤ .05 2. F = 79.73; df = 2,2543; p ≤ .05 3. F = 82.30; df = 1,2572; p ≤ .05 4. F = 117.32; df = 2,2571; p ≤ .05 5. F = 9.42; df = 4,2487; p ≤ .05 Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.			

## Additional Compensation

Overall, 93% of the employed respondents reported additional compensation beyond their annual base salary. About two-thirds reported receiving a performance-based bonus and a benefits package. Additionally, about one in five reported receiving stock options, profit sharing, and a stock option plan.

Additional Compensation	
Response†	Percentage (n = 2,978)
Stock options	21%
Benefits package	64%
Signing bonus	15%
Moving allowance	16%
Performance-based bonus	66%
First-year bonus	9%
Profit sharing	21%
Commissions	5%
Tuition reimbursement	17%
Car or car allowance	14%
Housing allowance or reimbursements	8%
Stock purchase plan	23%
Other compensation	8%
No additional compensation	7%

† Responses add to more than 100% because of multiple selections.

There were statistically significant differences in the percentage of respondents reporting additional compensation by industry group. Respondents in the finance/accounting, healthcare, and manufacturing industries reported more additional compensation compared with other respondents and a significantly higher percentage for three items. About a fifth of the respondents employed in the nonprofit/government industry reported that they did not receive additional compensation, a higher percentage compared with respondents in the finance/accounting industry. Yet, a quarter of the respondents in the nonprofit/government industry reported receiving tuition assistance, which was a significantly higher percentage compared with respondents in the consulting industry.

Additional Compensation, by Industry Group								
Response†	Consulting (n = 441)	Energy/ Utilities (n = 120)	Finance/ Accounting (n = 645)	Healthcare (n = 268)	Technology (n = 421)	Manu- facturing (n = 271)	Nonprofit/ Government (n = 218)	Products/ Services (n = 612)
Stock options <sup>1</sup>	10%	30%	21%	30%	41%	17%	1%	17%
Benefits package <sup>2</sup>	60%	68%	63%	71%	65%	68%	53%	65%
Signing bonus <sup>3</sup>	22%	15%	16%	17%	13%	11%	4%	15%
Moving allowance <sup>4</sup>	14%	27%	14%	23%	16%	18%	9%	17%
Performance-based bonus <sup>5</sup>	68%	77%	76%	68%	68%	72%	28%	64%
First-year bonus <sup>6</sup>	9%	10%	12%	10%	10%	5%	1%	8%
Profit sharing <sup>7</sup>	23%	23%	25%	15%	21%	27%	2%	22%

Additional Compensation, by Industry Group								
Response†	Consulting (n = 441)	Energy/ Utilities (n = 120)	Finance/ Accounting (n = 645)	Healthcare (n = 268)	Technology (n = 421)	Manu- facturing (n = 271)	Nonprofit/ Government (n = 218)	Products/ Services (n = 612)
Commissions <sup>8</sup>	6%	<b>1%</b>	5%	3%	<b>8%</b>	3%	<b>2%</b>	5%
Tuition reimbursement <sup>9</sup>	<b>13%</b>	23%	16%	<b>23%</b>	18%	21%	<b>25%</b>	14%
Car or car allowance <sup>10</sup>	13%	<b>13%</b>	9%	16%	12%	<b>21%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>18%</b>
Housing allowance or reimbursements <sup>11</sup>	6%	11%	<b>6%</b>	10%	7%	<b>12%</b>	8%	9%
Stock purchase plan <sup>12</sup>	<b>16%</b>	28%	25%	25%	<b>38%</b>	19%	<b>1%</b>	22%
Other compensation <sup>13</sup>	9%	9%	7%	8%	7%	6%	<b>16%</b>	7%
No additional compensation <sup>14</sup>	6%	8%	<b>5%</b>	5%	7%	6%	<b>22%</b>	7%
1. $\chi^2 = 211.01$ ; df = 7; p ≤ .05    2. $\chi^2 = 24.59$ ; df = 7; p ≤ .05    3. $\chi^2 = 41.31$ ; df = 7; p ≤ .05    4. $\chi^2 = 37.97$ ; df = 7; p ≤ .05    5. $\chi^2 = 185.10$ ; df = 7; p ≤ .05 6. $\chi^2 = 33.77$ ; df = 7; p ≤ .05    7. $\chi^2 = 64.33$ ; df = 7; p ≤ .05    8. $\chi^2 = 24.65$ ; df = 7; p ≤ .05    9. $\chi^2 = 30.10$ ; df = 7; p ≤ .05    10. $\chi^2 = 51.88$ ; df = 7; p ≤ .05 11. $\chi^2 = 16.25$ ; df = 7; p ≤ .05    12. $\chi^2 = 133.25$ ; df = 7; p ≤ .05    13. $\chi^2 = 23.28$ ; df = 7; p ≤ .05    14. $\chi^2 = 76.91$ ; df = 7; p ≤ .05								
Items in bold in the contingency table significantly affect the overall $\chi^2$ statistic.								
† Responses add to more than 100% because of multiple selections.								

Respondents in marketing/sales positions reported receiving significantly more additional compensation compared with all other respondents, while respondents in IT/MIS positions were the most likely of the respondents to indicate that they did not receive any additional compensation beyond their annual base salary. Yet, respondents in the IT/MIS and operations/logistics were more likely than respondents in consulting to report receiving tuition reimbursement.

Additional Compensation, by Job Function							
Response†	Marketing/ Sales (n = 667)	Operations/ Logistics (n = 332)	Consulting (n = 472)	General Management (n = 369)	Finance/ Accounting (n = 832)	Human Resources (n = 69)	IT/MIS (n = 195)
Stock options <sup>1</sup>	<b>25%</b>	25%	<b>15%</b>	21%	21%	20%	16%
Benefits package <sup>2</sup>	68%	68%	63%	61%	63%	68%	56%
Signing bonus <sup>3</sup>	15%	14%	<b>22%</b>	<b>11%</b>	16%	<b>6%</b>	<b>5%</b>
Moving allowance <sup>4</sup>	<b>19%</b>	<b>20%</b>	19%	15%	<b>13%</b>	17%	<b>9%</b>
Performance-based bonus <sup>5</sup>	69%	63%	70%	63%	70%	64%	<b>56%</b>
First-year bonus <sup>6</sup>	7%	<b>6%</b>	11%	7%	<b>13%</b>	4%	<b>4%</b>
Profit sharing <sup>7</sup>	18%	25%	19%	24%	23%	20%	19%
Commissions <sup>7</sup>	<b>11%</b>	<b>2%</b>	3%	5%	<b>3%</b>	3%	<b>1%</b>
Tuition reimbursement <sup>8</sup>	15%	<b>24%</b>	<b>14%</b>	18%	17%	23%	<b>24%</b>
Car or car allowance <sup>9</sup>	<b>19%</b>	13%	14%	<b>24%</b>	<b>7%</b>	9%	<b>7%</b>
Housing allowance or reimbursements <sup>10</sup>	<b>11%</b>	10%	8%	8%	<b>5%</b>	9%	5%
Stock purchase plan <sup>11</sup>	<b>26%</b>	27%	21%	<b>18%</b>	24%	16%	20%
Other compensation <sup>12</sup>	<b>6%</b>	7%	10%	9%	7%	10%	<b>12%</b>
No additional compensation <sup>13</sup>	6%	6%	6%	8%	6%	9%	<b>15%</b>

### Additional Compensation, by Job Function

1. $\chi^2 = 22.48$ ; df = 6; $p \leq .05$	2. $\chi^2 = 14.74$ ; df = 6; $p \leq .05$	3. $\chi^2 = 43.57$ ; df = 6; $p \leq .05$	4. $\chi^2 = 29.56$ ; df = 6; $p \leq .05$	5. $\chi^2 = 22.08$ ; df = 6; $p \leq .05$
6. $\chi^2 = 33.59$ ; df = 6; $p \leq .05$	7. $\chi^2 = 86.57$ ; df = 6; $p \leq .05$	8. $\chi^2 = 26.89$ ; df = 6; $p \leq .05$	9. $\chi^2 = 86.01$ ; df = 6; $p \leq .05$	10. $\chi^2 = 22.54$ ; df = 6; $p \leq .05$
11. $\chi^2 = 17.02$ ; df = 6; $p \leq .05$	12. $\chi^2 = 15.28$ ; df = 6; $p \leq .05$	13. $\chi^2 = 26.00$ ; df = 6; $p \leq .05$		

Items in bold in the contingency table significantly affect the overall  $\chi^2$  statistic.

† Responses add to more than 100% because of multiple selections.

Respondents in higher-level positions were more likely than respondents in lower-level positions to have received stock options or a car allowance, but respondents in lower-level positions were more likely to have received a signing bonus. Respondents in entry-level positions were the least likely of the respondents to have received a performance-based bonus. Respondents in executive-level positions were more likely than other respondents to have received profit sharing and commissions but less likely than other respondents to have received a stock purchase plan. About one in six respondents in entry-level positions reported that they did not receive additional compensation, a significantly higher percentage compared with other respondents.

### Additional Compensation, by Job level

Response†	Entry-Level (n = 217)	Mid-Level (n = 1,750)	Senior Level (n = 729)	Executive Level (n = 268)
Stock options <sup>1</sup>	<b>9%</b>	19%	<b>26%</b>	<b>26%</b>
Benefits package	60%	65%	64%	59%
Signing bonus <sup>2</sup>	<b>22%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>7%</b>
Moving allowance	18%	17%	16%	12%
Performance-based bonus <sup>3</sup>	<b>46%</b>	68%	70%	62%
First-year bonus	11%	9%	8%	9%
Profit sharing <sup>4</sup>	17%	20%	22%	<b>30%</b>
Commissions <sup>5</sup>	3%	4%	5%	<b>8%</b>
Tuition reimbursement	13%	18%	18%	19%
Car or car allowance <sup>6</sup>	<b>5%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>32%</b>
Housing allowance or reimbursements	6%	7%	9%	9%
Stock purchase plan <sup>7</sup>	19%	24%	23%	<b>15%</b>
Other compensation	10%	7%	8%	10%
No additional compensation <sup>8</sup>	<b>16%</b>	6%	7%	7%

1. $\chi^2 = 38.31$ ; df = 3; $p \leq .05$	2. $\chi^2 = 37.60$ ; df = 3; $p \leq .05$	3. $\chi^2 = 51.91$ ; df = 3; $p \leq .05$	4. $\chi^2 = 17.65$ ; df = 3; $p \leq .05$
5. $\chi^2 = 7.96$ ; df = 3; $p \leq .05$	6. $\chi^2 = 131.32$ ; df = 3; $p \leq .05$	7. $\chi^2 = 13.19$ ; df = 3; $p \leq .05$	8. $\chi^2 = 29.25$ ; df = 3; $p \leq .05$

Items in bold in the contingency table significantly affect the overall  $\chi^2$  statistic.

† Responses add to more than 100% because of multiple selections.

The most recent graduates from the class of 2006 were more likely than other respondents to report receiving a signing bonus, moving allowance, and tuition reimbursement in the past year. Along with the class of 2005, they were also more likely to have received a first-year bonus. However, graduates in 2006 were less likely than other respondents to have received stock options and a performance-based bonus.

Additional Compensation, by Graduation Year							
Response†	2000 (n = 131)	2001 (n = 219)	2002 (n = 214)	2003 (n = 295)	2004 (n = 523)	2005 (n = 671)	2006 (n = 925)
Stock options <sup>1</sup>	<b>34%</b>	<b>27%</b>	26%	22%	21%	20%	<b>17%</b>
Benefits package	60%	65%	64%	58%	64%	65%	66%
Signing bonus <sup>2</sup>	8%	8%	6%	16%	10%	12%	<b>24%</b>
Moving allowance <sup>3</sup>	12%	<b>11%</b>	<b>10%</b>	15%	13%	17%	<b>21%</b>
Performance-based bonus <sup>4</sup>	<b>81%</b>	75%	71%	73%	70%	69%	<b>56%</b>
First-year bonus <sup>5</sup>	6%	4%	2%	8%	7%	<b>12%</b>	<b>13%</b>
Profit sharing	31%	24%	20%	19%	20%	20%	21%
Commissions	4%	5%	4%	4%	4%	5%	5%
Tuition reimbursement <sup>6</sup>	12%	10%	11%	14%	10%	15%	<b>29%</b>
Car or car allowance <sup>7</sup>	10%	13%	<b>21%</b>	<b>18%</b>	12%	13%	12%
Housing allowance or reimbursements <sup>8</sup>	6%	5%	<b>3%</b>	<b>12%</b>	7%	8%	8%
Stock purchase plan	31%	21%	25%	21%	25%	23%	21%
Other compensation	7%	11%	8%	6%	9%	7%	8%
No additional compensation	9%	5%	5%	7%	7%	7%	8%

1.  $\chi^2 = 31.84$ ; df = 6; p ≤ .05    2.  $\chi^2 = 107.66$ ; df = 6; p ≤ .05    3.  $\chi^2 = 30.91$ ; df = 6; p ≤ .05    4.  $\chi^2 = 78.58$ ; df = 6; p ≤ .05  
5.  $\chi^2 = 45.65$ ; df = 6; p ≤ .05    6.  $\chi^2 = 131.08$ ; df = 6; p ≤ .05    7.  $\chi^2 = 18.66$ ; df = 6; p ≤ .05    8.  $\chi^2 = 15.68$ ; df = 6; p ≤ .05  
Items in bold in the contingency table significantly affect the overall  $\chi^2$  statistic.  
† Responses add to more than 100% because of multiple selections.

Full-time MBA graduates were more likely than other respondents to have indicated receiving a signing bonus, moving allowance, first-year bonus, and a housing allowance in the past year. Graduates of executive programs were more likely than others to have reported receiving stock options and a car allowance. Executive and part-time graduates were more likely than full-time graduates to have received tuition reimbursement in the past year.

Additional Compensation, by MBA Program Type			
Response†	Full-Time (n = 1,968)	Part-Time (n = 730)	Executive (n = 241)
Stock options <sup>1</sup>	20%	20%	<b>32%</b>
Benefits package	63%	66%	68%
Signing bonus <sup>2</sup>	<b>19%</b>	7%	8%
Moving allowance <sup>3</sup>	<b>20%</b>	7%	14%
Performance-based bonus	66%	66%	71%
First-year bonus <sup>4</sup>	<b>11%</b>	5%	6%
Profit sharing <sup>5</sup>	20%	23%	26%
Commissions	5%	4%	7%
Tuition reimbursement <sup>6</sup>	<b>10%</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>31%</b>
Car or car allowance <sup>7</sup>	13%	12%	<b>22%</b>
Housing allowance or reimbursements <sup>8</sup>	<b>9%</b>	4%	8%
Stock purchase plan	23%	23%	25%

Additional Compensation, by MBA Program Type			
Response†	Full-Time (n = 1,968)	Part-Time (n = 730)	Executive (n = 241)
Other compensation	8%	8%	9%
No additional compensation	8%	5%	6%
1. $\chi^2 = 19.45$ ; df = 2; p ≤ .05    2. $\chi^2 = 62.11$ ; df = 2; p ≤ .05    3. $\chi^2 = 66.80$ ; df = 2; p ≤ .05    4. $\chi^2 = 28.02$ ; df = 2; p ≤ .05 5. $\chi^2 = 8.77$ ; df = 2; p ≤ .05    6. $\chi^2 = 201.22$ ; df = 2; p ≤ .05    7. $\chi^2 = 14.82$ ; df = 2; p ≤ .05    8. $\chi^2 = 20.84$ ; df = 2; p ≤ .05 Items in bold in the contingency table significantly affect the overall $\chi^2$ statistic. † Responses add to more than 100% because of multiple selections.			

There slight, yet significant differences in the percentage of respondents receiving additional compensation by gender. These included stock options, a benefits package, a performance-based bonus, a first year bonus, profit sharing, commissions, car allowance, housing allowance, and a stock purchase plan—men were more likely than women to have reported receiving each of these in the past year.

Additional Compensation, by Gender		
Response†	Male (n = 2,108)	Female (n = 865)
Stock options <sup>1</sup>	22%	18%
Benefits package <sup>2</sup>	62%	69%
Signing bonus	15%	14%
Moving allowance	17%	14%
Performance-based bonus <sup>3</sup>	68%	62%
First-year bonus <sup>4</sup>	10%	7%
Profit sharing <sup>5</sup>	22%	18%
Commissions <sup>6</sup>	5%	3%
Tuition reimbursement	17%	18%
Car or car allowance <sup>7</sup>	16%	9%
Housing allowance or reimbursements <sup>8</sup>	9%	6%
Stock purchase plan <sup>9</sup>	24%	20%
Other compensation	8%	9%
No additional compensation	7%	8%
1. $\chi^2 = 4.40$ ; df = 1; p ≤ .05    2. $\chi^2 = 10.94$ ; df = 1; p ≤ .05    3. $\chi^2 = 8.62$ ; df = 1; p ≤ .05 4. $\chi^2 = 5.76$ ; df = 1; p ≤ .05    5. $\chi^2 = 8.07$ ; df = 1; p ≤ .05    6. $\chi^2 = 8.15$ ; df = 1; p ≤ .05 7. $\chi^2 = 25.72$ ; df = 1; p ≤ .05    8. $\chi^2 = 9.07$ ; df = 1; p ≤ .05    9. $\chi^2 = 7.03$ ; df = 1; p ≤ .05 Items in bold in the contingency table significantly affect the overall $\chi^2$ statistic. † Responses add to more than 100% because of multiple selections.		

Older respondents were more likely than younger respondents to have reported receiving stock options, but younger respondents were more likely than older respondents to have received a signing bonus in the past year. Respondents ages 27 and younger were less likely than older respondents to have received a performance-based bonus. Respondents ages 35 and older were more likely than younger respondents to have received tuition reimbursement and a car allowance.

Additional Compensation, by Age			
Response†	27 and Younger (n = 191)	28 to 34 (n = 1,668)	35 and Older (n = 1,113)
Stock options <sup>1</sup>	<b>12%</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>25%</b>
Benefits package	67%	63%	65%
Signing bonus <sup>2</sup>	19%	<b>18%</b>	<b>10%</b>
Moving allowance	17%	17%	14%
Performance-based bonus <sup>3</sup>	<b>53%</b>	66%	69%
First-year bonus <sup>4</sup>	12%	10%	<b>7%</b>
Profit sharing	18%	20%	23%
Commissions	7%	4%	6%
Tuition reimbursement <sup>5</sup>	13%	16%	<b>21%</b>
Car or car allowance <sup>6</sup>	10%	11%	<b>18%</b>
Housing allowance or reimbursements	7%	8%	8%
Stock purchase plan	25%	22%	24%
Other compensation	7%	8%	8%
No additional compensation	10%	7%	6%

1.  $\chi^2 = 26.72$ ; df = 2;  $p \leq .05$     2.  $\chi^2 = 32.71$ ; df = 2;  $p \leq .05$     3.  $\chi^2 = 18.41$ ; df = 2;  $p \leq .05$   
4.  $\chi^2 = 12.13$ ; df = 2;  $p \leq .05$     5.  $\chi^2 = 13.55$ ; df = 2;  $p \leq .05$     6.  $\chi^2 = 23.65$ ; df = 2;  $p \leq .05$   
Items in bold in the contingency table significantly affect the overall  $\chi^2$  statistic.  
† Responses add to more than 100% because of multiple selections.

Respondents from the United States were more likely than other respondents to have received a benefits package, profit sharing, and tuition reimbursement in the past year. Respondents from Latin America and Europe were more likely than other respondents to have received a car allowance. European and Asian respondents were more likely than other respondents to have received a housing allowance. However, about one in ten respondents from Asia reported that they did not receive additional compensation in the past year, a higher percentage compared with other respondents.

Additional Compensation, by Citizenship					
Response†	Asia (n = 292)	United States (n = 1,9116)	Canada (n = 180)	Latin America (n = 136)	Europe (n = 355)
Stock options	22%	22%	17%	19%	18%
Benefits package <sup>1</sup>	44%	<b>72%</b>	66%	51%	51%
Signing bonus	14%	16%	16%	13%	14%
Moving allowance	19%	16%	14%	15%	17%
Performance-based bonus	66%	67%	64%	62%	69%
First-year bonus	10%	9%	11%	10%	10%
Profit sharing <sup>2</sup>	14%	<b>24%</b>	15%	16%	17%
Commissions	4%	5%	3%	5%	4%
Tuition reimbursement <sup>3</sup>	13%	<b>20%</b>	18%	13%	10%
Car or car allowance <sup>4</sup>	12%	8%	17%	<b>30%</b>	<b>35%</b>
Housing allowance or reimbursements <sup>5</sup>	<b>13%</b>	6%	7%	10%	<b>11%</b>
Stock purchase plan <sup>6</sup>	22%	24%	<b>30%</b>	16%	18%

Additional Compensation, by Citizenship					
Response†	Asia (n = 292)	United States (n = 1,9116)	Canada (n = 180)	Latin America (n = 136)	Europe (n = 355)
Other compensation <sup>7</sup>	<b>5%</b>	8%	11%	7%	<b>11%</b>
No additional compensation <sup>8</sup>	<b>11%</b>	6%	8%	9%	8%
1. $\chi^2 = 135.86$ ; df = 4; p ≤ .05    2. $\chi^2 = 29.99$ ; df = 4; p ≤ .05    3. $\chi^2 = 24.82$ ; df = 4; p ≤ .05    4. $\chi^2 = 234.04$ ; df = 4; p ≤ .05 5. $\chi^2 = 24.64$ ; df = 4; p ≤ .05    6. $\chi^2 = 15.73$ ; df = 4; p ≤ .05    7. $\chi^2 = 10.57$ ; df = 4; p ≤ .05    8. $\chi^2 = 9.94$ ; df = 4; p ≤ .05 Items in bold in the contingency table significantly affect the overall $\chi^2$ statistic. † Responses add to more than 100% because of multiple selections.					

There was only one significant difference by U.S. subgroup with regard to additional compensation. African Americans were less likely than other U.S. respondents to have reported receiving a benefits package in the past year—59% of African Americans reported receiving a benefits package compared with 65% of Asian Americans, 73% of whites, and 69% of Hispanics.

## Employment Satisfaction

This section explores employment satisfaction among MBA graduate respondents who were working in an organization, including respondent satisfaction with their employer and job. Additionally, this section examines attributes of the employer, the job, the organizational culture, and respondent career orientation.

### Employer Satisfaction

Respondents were asked to indicate their level of satisfaction with their current employer. Overall, 16% of the respondents were extremely satisfied with their employer and 45% were very satisfied. Slightly more than a quarter (29%) was somewhat satisfied with their employer, and one in ten respondents was either not very satisfied (8%) or not at all satisfied (2%) with their current employer.

<b>Employer Satisfaction</b>	
<b>Response</b>	<b>Percentage (n = 2,978)</b>
Extremely satisfied	16%
Very satisfied	45%
Somewhat satisfied	29%
Not very satisfied	8%
Not at all satisfied	2%
Total	100%

Respondents in the class of 2000 were slightly, yet significantly less satisfied with their employer compared with other respondents. Respondents ages 35 and older were more likely than respondents ages 27 and younger to have indicated that they were not very satisfied with their employer. Asian respondents were less likely than other respondents to have reported being extremely satisfied with their employer, but they were more likely than other to have indicated they were somewhat satisfied with their employer. Respondents from Latin America were more likely than other respondents to have indicated they were very satisfied with their employer. Among U.S. respondents, African Americans were less likely than other respondents to be satisfied with their current employer.

Statistically, there were no differences in respondent satisfaction with their employer by industry group, MBA program type, and gender.

Employer Satisfaction, by Demographic Characteristics							
Characteristic	Number	Extremely Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Not Very Satisfied	Not At All Satisfied	Total
<b>Graduation Year<sup>1</sup></b>							
2000	131	<b>9%</b>	52%	25%	8%	<b>5%</b>	100%
2001	219	15%	43%	35%	6%	1%	100%
2002	214	12%	42%	<b>36%</b>	8%	1%	100%
2003	295	16%	44%	29%	9%	1%	100%
2004	523	16%	44%	32%	7%	2%	100%
2005	671	17%	45%	27%	9%	2%	100%
2006	925	18%	45%	26%	9%	3%	100%
<b>Age<sup>2</sup></b>							
27 and younger	191	19%	49%	25%	<b>4%</b>	3%	100%
28 to 34	1,668	17%	45%	29%	8%	2%	100%
35 and older	1,113	14%	43%	30%	<b>10%</b>	3%	100%
<b>Citizenship<sup>3</sup></b>							
Asia	292	<b>10%</b>	39%	<b>40%</b>	9%	2%	100%
United States	1,916	18%	45%	28%	8%	2%	100%
Canada	180	17%	42%	29%	10%	2%	100%
Latin America	136	11%	<b>55%</b>	26%	6%	2%	100%
Europe	355	15%	46%	26%	10%	3%	100%
<b>U.S. Subgroup<sup>4</sup></b>							
Asian American	140	17%	44%	34%	4%	1%	100%
African American	68	4%	50%	28%	<b>15%</b>	3%	100%
White	1,510	19%	43%	28%	7%	3%	100%
Hispanic	71	13%	52%	24%	11%	0%	100%

1.  $\chi^2 = 37.91$ ; df = 24;  $p \leq .05$     2.  $\chi^2 = 21.19$ ; df = 8;  $p \leq .05$     3.  $\chi^2 = 35.36$ ; df = 16;  $p \leq .05$     4.  $\chi^2 = 24.63$ ; df = 12;  $p \leq .05$   
 Items in bold in the contingency table significantly affect the overall  $\chi^2$  statistic.

## Job Satisfaction

Respondents were asked to indicate their level of satisfaction with their current job. Overall, 14% of the respondents were extremely satisfied with their job and 40% were very satisfied. About a third (32%) was somewhat satisfied with their employer, and about one in eight respondents was either not very satisfied (10%) or not at all satisfied (3%) with their current job. There was a statistically significant correlation ( $r = .66$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ) between job satisfaction and employer satisfaction.

Job Satisfaction	
Response	Percentage ( <i>n</i> = 2,978)
Extremely satisfied	14%
Very satisfied	40%
Somewhat satisfied	32%
Not very satisfied	10%
Not at all satisfied	3%
Total	100%

Respondents in general management positions were the most likely of the respondents to have indicated that they were extremely satisfied with their job. On the other hand, respondents in operations/logistics positions were more likely than other respondents to have indicated that they were not very satisfied, and respondents in IT/MIS positions were the most likely to have indicated that they were not at all satisfied with their current job.

Graduates of full-time MBA programs were more likely compared to part-time MBA graduates to have reported that they were extremely satisfied with their job.

Respondents ages 35 and older were less likely than younger respondents to have indicated that they were extremely satisfied with their current job.

Statistically, there were no differences in respondent satisfaction with their job by graduation year, gender, citizenship, or U.S. subgroup.

Job Satisfaction, by Demographic Characteristics							
Characteristic	Number	Extremely Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Not Very Satisfied	Not At All Satisfied	Total
<b>Job Function<sup>1</sup></b>							
Marketing/sales	667	12%	40%	35%	9%	3%	100%
Operations/logistics	332	13%	37%	33%	<b>14%</b>	4%	100%
Consulting	472	14%	41%	32%	11%	3%	100%
General management	369	<b>21%</b>	44%	<b>25%</b>	8%	2%	100%
Finance/accounting	832	14%	40%	33%	11%	2%	100%
Human resources	69	10%	48%	29%	10%	3%	100%
IT/MIS	195	11%	33%	37%	10%	<b>9%</b>	100%
<b>MBA Program Type<sup>2</sup></b>							
Full-Time	1,968	<b>16%</b>	41%	31%	10%	3%	100%
Part-Time	730	<b>10%</b>	39%	36%	11%	4%	100%
Executive	241	12%	40%	32%	12%	4%	100%
<b>Age<sup>3</sup></b>							
27 and younger	191	16%	40%	34%	6%	4%	100%
28 to 34	1,668	15%	40%	32%	10%	3%	100%
35 and older	1,113	<b>12%</b>	41%	32%	11%	4%	100%
1. $\chi^2 = 64.63$ ; $df = 24$ ; $p \leq .05$ 2. $\chi^2 = 22.55$ ; $df = 8$ ; $p \leq .05$ 3. $\chi^2 = 15.59$ ; $df = 8$ ; $p \leq .05$							
Items in bold in the contingency table significantly affect the overall $\chi^2$ statistic.							

## Employer and Job Assessment

Respondents were asked to indicate the truthfulness of various statements related to their employer and job on a five-point scale, where “definitely true” equals 2 and “definitely not true” equals -2. The following analysis presents the mean truthfulness for each of the statements by various characteristics.

Respondents overall were most likely, on average, to feel that their “employer promotes and upholds ethical business practices,” they “have opportunities to learn new things,” and that their “work has visibility with the executive team.” The only statement considered not true among the respondents was, “I spend too much time in meetings that are not productive.”

<b>Employer and Job Assessment</b>	
<b>Statement</b>	<b>Mean†</b>
My employer promotes and upholds ethical business practices.	1.22
I have opportunities to learn new things.	1.10
My work has visibility with the executive team.	1.04
My supervisor is competent in doing his/her job.	0.97
I have job autonomy.	0.97
My work is challenging and interesting.	0.92
My job security is good.	0.86
I am given opportunities for professional development.	0.81
The physical surroundings are pleasant.	0.79
The problems I am expected to solve are hard enough.	0.78
I have had equal opportunity in promotions and salary.	0.78
I am given a chance to do the things I do best.	0.69
I am achieving something I personally value.	0.65
My employer really cares about individuals and wants them to succeed.	0.61
My pay is good.	0.61
My chances for promotion are good.	0.60
My employer emphasizes community and inclusion.	0.60
I have enough time to get the job done.	0.50
I have the opportunity to use my skills to the maximum.	0.46
My employer emphasizes work-life balance.	0.45
I am not asked to do excessive amounts of work.	0.16
I spend too much time in meetings that are not productive.	-0.28
† Scale: +2 = definitely true through -2 = definitely not true	

The following table presents the key employer and job assessment statements that drive employer satisfaction (shown previously). Two statements accounted for one-third of the explanatory power of the model. These statements were “My employer really cares about individuals and wants them to succeed,” and “My pay is good.”

<b>Key Drivers of Satisfaction with Current Employer Using Employer and Job Assessment Statements as Independent Variables</b>	
<b>Statement</b>	<b>Pratt Index Score† (Multiple R = <math>\sqrt{.60}</math>)</b>
My employer really cares about individuals and wants them to succeed.*	22.6%
My pay is good.*	10.7%
I am achieving something I personally value.*	9.2%
My employer promotes and upholds ethical business practices.*	8.2%
I am given a chance to do the things I do best.*	5.9%
My chances for promotion are good.*	5.6%
I have the opportunity to use my skills to the maximum.*	5.2%
My supervisor is competent in doing his/her job.*	4.2%
My work is challenging and interesting.*	4.1%
The physical surroundings are pleasant.*	3.6%

<b>Key Drivers of Satisfaction with Current Employer</b> <b>Using Employer and Job Assessment Statements as Independent Variables</b>	
<b>Statement</b>	<b>Pratt Index Score† (Multiple R = <math>\sqrt{.60}</math>)</b>
I have opportunities to learn new things.*	3.4%
My employer emphasizes work-life balance.*	3.3%
My employer emphasizes community and inclusion.*	2.9%
The problems I am expected to solve are hard enough.*	2.2%
I have job autonomy.*	2.1%
I am given opportunities for professional development.	1.7%
I spend too much time in meetings that are not productive.*	1.5%
My job security is good.*	1.5%
I have had equal opportunity in promotions and salary.	0.7%
My work has visibility with the executive team.	0.5%
I am not asked to do excessive amounts of work.	0.5%
I have enough time to get the job done.	0.4%
† Pratt index score = $(\beta * r) / \text{Multiple R}$ .	
*indicates a statistically significant contribution to the overall model where $p \leq .05$ .	

The following table presents the key employer and job assessment statements that drive job satisfaction. Four statements accounted for nearly 75% of the explanatory power of the model. These statements were “My work is challenging and interesting,” “I am achieving something I personally value,” “I have the opportunity to use my skills to the maximum,” and “I am given a chance to do the things I do best.”

<b>Key Drivers of Satisfaction with Current Job</b> <b>Using Employer and Job Assessment Statements as Independent Variables</b>	
<b>Statement</b>	<b>Pratt Index Score† (Multiple R = <math>\sqrt{.61}</math>)</b>
My work is challenging and interesting.*	30.3%
I am achieving something I personally value.*	16.1%
I have the opportunity to use my skills to the maximum.*	14.8%
I am given a chance to do the things I do best.*	11.4%
My supervisor is competent in doing his/her job.*	5.3%
I have opportunities to learn new things.*	3.5%
My pay is good.*	3.5%
My chances for promotion are good.*	3.1%
I have job autonomy.*	2.8%
My work has visibility with the executive team.*	2.2%
My employer promotes and upholds ethical business practices.	1.4%
I spend too much time in meetings that are not productive.*	1.1%
I am not asked to do excessive amounts of work.*	0.8%
I am given opportunities for professional development.	0.8%
My employer emphasizes community and inclusion.	0.7%
My employer emphasizes work-life balance.	0.6%
My employer really cares about individuals and wants them to succeed.	0.4%

<b>Key Drivers of Satisfaction with Current Job</b>	
<b>Using Employer and Job Assessment Statements as Independent Variables</b>	
<b>Statement</b>	<b>Pratt Index Score<sup>†</sup></b> <b>(Multiple R = <math>\sqrt{.61}</math>)</b>
The problems I am expected to solve are hard enough.	0.3%
I have had equal opportunity in promotions and salary.	0.3%
I have enough time to get the job done.	0.3%
The physical surroundings are pleasant.	0.3%
My job security is good.	0.0%
<sup>†</sup> Pratt index score = $(\beta * r) / \text{Multiple R}$ . *indicates a statistically significant contribution to the overall model where $p \leq .05$ .	

Respondents in the consulting and healthcare industries were more likely than respondents in the manufacturing industry to feel that their employer really cares and wants them to succeed.

Respondents in the nonprofit/government industry were less likely than all other respondents, with the exception of those in the technology industry, to indicate that their chances for promotion were good. Additionally, respondents in the technology industry were less likely than all others, except those in the nonprofit/government and products/services industries, to have considered this statement true.

Respondents in the healthcare and nonprofit/government industries were more likely than respondents in the consulting industry to report that they were not asked to do excessive amounts of work. Respondents in the consulting industry were the only respondents, on average, to consider this statement not true.

Respondents in the energy/utility industry were more likely than respondents in the consulting and technology industries to feel that their job security was good. Additionally, respondents in the nonprofit/government industry were more likely than respondents in the consulting, finance/accounting, technology, and products/services industries to feel that their job security was good.

Respondents in the nonprofit industry were the least likely of the respondents to have indicated that their pay was good.

Respondents in the manufacturing industry were less likely than respondents in the consulting, energy/utility, finance/accounting, healthcare, and products/services industries to have considered their physical surrounding pleasant.

Respondents in the healthcare, technology, manufacturing, and nonprofit/government industries were more likely to indicate that they spend too much time in unproductive meetings compared with respondents in the consulting industry. Additionally, respondents in the healthcare and technology industries were more likely than respondents in the finance/accounting and energy/utility industries to have felt they spent too much time in unproductive meetings.

Respondents in the energy/utility industries were more likely than respondents in the consulting, technology and manufacturing industries to have indicated that their employer upholds ethical business practices.

Respondents in the energy/utility industry were more likely than respondents in the finance/accounting and manufacturing industries to have felt that their employer emphasizes community and inclusion.

Respondents in the nonprofit/government industry were more likely than respondents in the consulting, finance/accounting, manufacturing, and products/services industries to have felt their employer emphasizes work-life balance.

Respondents in the healthcare and nonprofit/government industries were more likely than respondents in the technology and manufacturing industries to indicate that they had achieved something they personally value.

Respondents in the technology industry were more likely than respondents in the finance/accounting industry to report job autonomy.

Respondents in the manufacturing and products/services industries were more likely than respondents in the nonprofit/government industry to have felt they had more visibility with the executive team.

Respondents in the finance/accounting industry were more likely than respondents in the technology industry to have been given opportunities for professional development.

Mean Employer and Job Assessment Ratings, by Industry Group†								
Statement	Industry Group‡							
	C	E	F	H	T	M	N	P
I am given a chance to do the things I do best.	.68	.70	.69	.75	.67	.58	.76	.69
My employer really cares about individuals and wants them to succeed. <sup>1</sup>	<b>.73</b>	.67	.64	<b>.74</b>	.50	<b>.44</b>	.51	.62
I have enough time to get the job done.	.47	.51	.53	.59	.52	.37	.54	.48
My supervisor is competent in doing his/her job.	1.01	1.05	1.02	.94	.90	.92	.86	1.00
My chances for promotion are good. <sup>2</sup>	<b>.69</b>	<b>.82</b>	<b>.69</b>	<b>.68</b>	<b>.40</b>	<b>.63</b>	<b>.25</b>	<b>.61</b>
My work is challenging and interesting.	.96	1.02	.90	.91	.87	.90	.90	.94
I am not asked to do excessive amounts of work. <sup>3</sup>	<b>-.01</b>	.23	.14	<b>.32</b>	.19	.05	<b>.36</b>	.17
The problems I am expected to solve are hard enough.	.87	.80	.79	.71	.70	.83	.71	.79
I have had equal opportunity in promotions and salary.	.91	.79	.81	.81	.71	.79	.64	.75
My job security is good. <sup>4</sup>	<b>.75</b>	<b>1.15</b>	<b>.85</b>	.91	<b>.71</b>	.88	<b>1.13</b>	<b>.88</b>
My pay is good. <sup>5</sup>	<b>.72</b>	<b>.82</b>	<b>.65</b>	<b>.66</b>	<b>.61</b>	<b>.64</b>	<b>.12</b>	<b>.58</b>
The physical surroundings are pleasant. <sup>6</sup>	<b>.81</b>	<b>.87</b>	<b>.89</b>	<b>.89</b>	.73	<b>.52</b>	.76	<b>.79</b>
I spend too much time in meetings that are not productive. <sup>7</sup>	<b>-.49</b>	<b>-.21</b>	<b>-.38</b>	<b>-.12</b>	<b>-.14</b>	<b>-.22</b>	<b>-.19</b>	<b>-.28</b>
My employer promotes and upholds ethical business practices. <sup>8</sup>	<b>1.19</b>	<b>1.48</b>	1.26	1.33	<b>1.14</b>	<b>1.13</b>	1.19	1.19
My employer emphasizes community and inclusion. <sup>9</sup>	.67	<b>.80</b>	<b>.68</b>	.59	.52	<b>.43</b>	.69	.54
My employer emphasizes work-life balance. <sup>10</sup>	<b>.37</b>	.40	<b>.45</b>	.59	.45	<b>.28</b>	<b>.74</b>	<b>.44</b>

Mean Employer and Job Assessment Ratings, by Industry Group†								
Statement	Industry Group‡							
	C	E	F	H	T	M	N	P
I have the opportunity to use my skills to the maximum.	.53	.41	.45	.47	.43	.45	.44	.48
I am achieving something I personally value. <sup>11</sup>	.61	.65	.65	<b>.85</b>	<b>.53</b>	<b>.54</b>	<b>.85</b>	.65
I have job autonomy. <sup>12</sup>	.98	.95	<b>.87</b>	1.05	<b>1.08</b>	.99	1.05	.93
My work has visibility with the executive team. <sup>13</sup>	1.03	1.11	.96	1.10	1.01	<b>1.15</b>	<b>.82</b>	<b>1.14</b>
I am given opportunities for professional development. <sup>14</sup>	.87	.90	<b>.87</b>	.88	<b>.65</b>	.71	.83	.78
I have opportunities to learn new things. <sup>15</sup>	1.24	1.20	1.08	1.11	1.04	1.02	1.05	1.09
1. F = 3.33; df = 7, 2958, p ≤ .05		2. F = 7.04; df = 7, 2958, p ≤ .05		3. F = 3.28; df = 7, 2958, p ≤ .05		4. F = 6.01; df = 7, 2958, p ≤ .05		
5. F = 8.68; df = 7, 2958, p ≤ .05		6. F = 4.43; df = 7, 2958, p ≤ .05		7. F = 5.30; df = 7, 2958, p ≤ .05		8. F = 3.34; df = 7, 2958, p ≤ .05		
9. F = 3.26; df = 7, 2958, p ≤ .05		10. F = 3.72; df = 7, 2958, p ≤ .05		11. F = 3.81; df = 7, 2958, p ≤ .05		12. F = 2.61; df = 7, 2958, p ≤ .05		
13. F = 3.24; df = 7, 2958, p ≤ .05		14. F = 2.46; df = 7, 2958, p ≤ .05		15. F = 2.25; df = 7, 2958, p ≤ .05				
Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.								
† Scale: +2 = definitely true through -2 = definitely not true								
‡ C = consulting; E = energy/utility; F = finance/accounting; H = healthcare; T = technology; M = manufacturing; N = nonprofit/government; P = products/services								

Respondents in consulting, manufacturing, finance/accounting and general management positions were more likely than respondents in IT/MIS positions to have felt they were given the chance to do the things they do best. Additionally, respondents in general management positions were more likely than respondents in manufacturing, operations/logistics, and finance/accounting positions to report that they were given the chance to do the things they do best.

Respondents in finance/accounting and consulting positions were more likely than respondents in IT/MIS to have considered that their supervisor was competent. Additionally, respondents in finance/accounting positions were more likely to have felt this statement was true compared with the respondents in marketing/sales positions.

Respondents in IT/MIS positions were the least likely of the respondents to have considered the statement, “My chances for promotion are good,” true.

Respondents in general management and consulting positions were more likely than respondents in marketing/sales and IT/MIS positions to have considered their work interesting and challenging. Additionally, respondents in general management were more likely than respondents in finance/accounting to have considered this true.

Respondents in consulting were more likely than respondents in IT/MIS to have felt the problems they were expected to solve were hard enough.

Respondents in finance/accounting were more likely than respondents in operations/logistics to indicate that their physical surrounding were pleasant.

Respondents in marketing/sales were more likely than respondents in consulting and finance/accounting to report that they spent too much time in unproductive meetings. Additionally, respondents in operation/logistics were more likely to indicate this was true compared with respondents in finance/accounting.

Respondents in marketing/sales, consulting, general management, and finance/accounting were more likely than respondents in IT/MIS to report that they had the opportunity to use their skills to the maximum.

Respondents in general management were more likely than all other respondents, except those in human resource positions, to have felt that they were achieving something they personally value.

Respondents in general management were more likely than respondents in finance/accounting and marketing/sales to report job autonomy, and respondents in consulting were also more likely than respondents in finance/accounting to report job autonomy.

Respondents in general management were more likely than respondents in finance/accounting, consulting, operations/logistics, and marketing/sales, who were in turn more likely than respondents in IT/MIS, to report visibility with the executive team.

Respondents in marketing/sales, consulting, general management, and finance/accounting were more likely than respondents in IT/MIS to indicate that they were given opportunities for professional development.

Respondents in consulting, general management, and finance/accounting were more likely than respondents in IT/MIS to report they had opportunities to learn new things.

Mean Employer and Job Assessment Ratings, by Job Function†							
Statement	Job Function‡						
	M	O	C	G	F	H	I
I am given a chance to do the things I do best. <sup>1</sup>	.68	.60	.71	.88	.69	.72	.43
My employer really cares about individuals and wants them to succeed.	.57	.52	.63	.72	.65	.62	.50
I have enough time to get the job done.	.47	.48	.50	.42	.55	.36	.58
My supervisor is competent in doing his/her job. <sup>2</sup>	.91	.98	1.02	.90	1.08	.94	.72
My chances for promotion are good. <sup>3</sup>	.59	.61	.71	.60	.67	.62	.19
My work is challenging and interesting. <sup>4</sup>	.86	.88	1.05	1.09	.89	.87	.65
I am not asked to do excessive amounts of work.	.13	.17	.09	.14	.19	.00	.38
The problems I am expected to solve are hard enough. <sup>5</sup>	.76	.74	.91	.86	.75	.72	.61
I have had equal opportunity in promotions and salary. <sup>6</sup>	.74	.80	.85	.89	.80	.62	.62
My job security is good.	.80	.85	.86	.89	.87	1.01	1.02
My pay is good.	.59	.64	.65	.69	.59	.61	.58
The physical surroundings are pleasant. <sup>7</sup>	.76	.65	.78	.84	.85	.94	.77
I spend too much time in meetings that are not productive. <sup>8</sup>	-.09	-.18	-.37	-.28	-.43	-.26	-.19
My employer promotes and upholds ethical business practices.	1.23	1.21	1.22	1.14	1.28	1.20	1.11
My employer emphasizes community and inclusion.	.59	.56	.64	.65	.59	.77	.58
My employer emphasizes work-life balance.	.45	.37	.47	.41	.50	.20	.51
I have the opportunity to use my skills to the maximum. <sup>9</sup>	.43	.40	.60	.62	.46	.41	.11
I am achieving something I personally value. <sup>10</sup>	.59	.65	.64	.92	.63	.77	.38
I have job autonomy. <sup>11</sup>	.94	1.01	1.03	1.16	.85	.94	1.03
My work has visibility with the executive team. <sup>12</sup>	1.02	1.05	1.13	1.30	1.05	1.04	.56

Mean Employer and Job Assessment Ratings, by Job Function†							
Statement	Job Function‡						
	M	O	C	G	F	H	I
I am given opportunities for professional development. <sup>13</sup>	<b>.81</b>	.77	<b>.89</b>	<b>.83</b>	<b>.82</b>	.91	<b>.53</b>
I have opportunities to learn new things. <sup>14</sup>	1.07	1.06	<b>1.19</b>	<b>1.18</b>	<b>1.10</b>	1.17	<b>.87</b>
1. F = 5.00; df = 6, 2929, p ≤ .05	2. F = 4.22; df = 6, 2929, p ≤ .05	3. F = 5.75; df = 6, 2929, p ≤ .05					
4. F = 6.03; df = 6, 2929, p ≤ .05	5. F = 2.95; df = 6, 2929, p ≤ .05	6. F = 2.17; df = 6, 2929, p ≤ .05					
7. F = 2.10; df = 6, 2929, p ≤ .05	8. F = 7.25; df = 6, 2929, p ≤ .05	9. F = 5.81; df = 6, 2929, p ≤ .05					
10. F = 6.80; df = 6, 2929, p ≤ .05	11. F = 5.36; df = 6, 2929, p ≤ .05	12. F = 10.60; df = 6, 2929, p ≤ .05					
13. F = 2.86; df = 6, 2929, p ≤ .05	14. F = 3.49; df = 6, 2929, p ≤ .05						
Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.							
† Scale: +2 = definitely true through -2 = definitely not true							
‡ M = marketing/sales; O = operations/logistics; C = consulting; G = general management; F = finance/accounting; H = human resources; I = IT/MIS							

Graduates in 2001 were more likely than graduates in 2006 to have considered the following statements true: “I am given a chance to do the things I do best,” “I have the opportunity to use my skills to the maximum,” “I am achieving something I personally value,” and “My work has visibility with the executive team.”

Graduates in 2006 were more likely than graduates in 2002 to respond that they have enough time to get the job done.

Graduates in the classes of 2004 through 2006 were more likely than the class of 2001 to have felt that they have the opportunity to use their skills to the maximum. Additionally, respondents in the class of 2004 and 2006 were more likely than respondents in the class of 2002 to have considered their employer emphasizes work-life balance.

Mean Employer and Job Assessment Ratings, by Graduation Year†							
Statement	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
I am given a chance to do the things I do best. <sup>1</sup>	.69	<b>.88</b>	.68	.76	.74	.67	<b>.60</b>
My employer really cares about individuals and wants them to succeed. <sup>2</sup>	.44	.63	.44	.54	.62	.65	.66
I have enough time to get the job done. <sup>3</sup>	.42	.35	<b>.30</b>	.54	.51	.48	<b>.58</b>
My supervisor is competent in doing his/her job.	.90	.93	.97	.96	.97	.99	.99
My chances for promotion are good.	.44	.49	.54	.55	.65	.69	.59
My work is challenging and interesting.	.94	.99	.85	.99	.97	.95	.85
I am not asked to do excessive amounts of work.	.09	.14	.11	.11	.15	.11	.25
The problems I am expected to solve are hard enough.	.82	.84	.72	.81	.85	.81	.70
I have had equal opportunity in promotions and salary.	.63	.82	.72	.79	.82	.82	.75
My job security is good.	.81	.86	.75	.76	.91	.90	.87
My pay is good.	.68	.67	.53	.61	.61	.57	.63
The physical surroundings are pleasant.	.73	.83	.71	.81	.83	.80	.77
I spend too much time in meetings that are not productive.	-.23	-.23	-.22	-.28	-.30	-.28	-.31
My employer promotes and upholds ethical business practices.	1.17	1.30	1.15	1.22	1.27	1.19	1.21
My employer emphasizes community and inclusion. <sup>4</sup>	.50	.60	<b>.32</b>	.52	<b>.65</b>	<b>.62</b>	<b>.66</b>
My employer emphasizes work-life balance. <sup>5</sup>	.50	.41	<b>.16</b>	.40	<b>.47</b>	.43	<b>.55</b>
I have the opportunity to use my skills to the maximum. <sup>6</sup>	.41	<b>.64</b>	.36	.52	.53	.49	<b>.38</b>

Mean Employer and Job Assessment Ratings, by Graduation Year†							
Statement	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
I am achieving something I personally value. <sup>7</sup>	.66	<b>.83</b>	.65	.70	.72	.63	<b>.58</b>
I have job autonomy.	1.06	1.06	.92	1.04	1.01	.97	.90
My work has visibility with the executive team. <sup>8</sup>	1.03	<b>1.18</b>	.98	1.13	1.11	1.08	<b>.93</b>
I am given opportunities for professional development.	.66	.81	.63	.77	.84	.82	.85
I have opportunities to learn new things.	.99	1.03	1.04	1.06	1.14	1.13	1.11
1. F = 2.93; df = 6, 2971, p ≤ .05      2. F = 2.26; df = 6, 2971, p ≤ .05      3. F = 3.22; df = 6, 2971, p ≤ .05 4. F = 3.80; df = 6, 2971, p ≤ .05      5. F = 3.72; df = 6, 2971, p ≤ .05      6. F = 2.56; df = 6, 2971, p ≤ .05 7. F = 2.42; df = 6, 2971, p ≤ .05      8. F = 3.13; df = 6, 2971, p ≤ .05 Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA. † Scale: +2 = definitely true through -2 = definitely not true							

Graduates of full-time programs considered the following statements about their employer and job truer than did graduates of part-time programs: “I am given a chance to do the things I do best,” “My work is challenging and interesting,” “The problems I am expected to solve are hard enough,” “I have had equal opportunity in promotions and salary,” “My employer promotes and upholds ethical business practices,” “I have the opportunity to use my skills to the maximum,” “I am achieving something I personally value,” and “I am given opportunities for professional development.”

Graduates of full-time programs were more likely than other graduates to have considered the following statements as true: “My employer really cares about individuals and wants them to succeed,” and “My chances for promotion are good.” Additionally, respondents from full-time programs were less likely than other respondents to have felt they spent too much time in unproductive meetings.

Graduates of full-time programs considered to following statement truer than did respondents from executive programs: “I have enough time to get the job done,” “My supervisor is competent in doing his/her job,” “I am not asked to do excessive amounts of work,” and “My employer emphasizes work-life balance.”

Mean Employer and Job Assessment Ratings, by MBA Program Type†			
Statement	Full-Time	Part-Time	Executive
I am given a chance to do the things I do best. <sup>1</sup>	.72	<b>.59</b>	.76
My employer really cares about individuals and wants them to succeed. <sup>2</sup>	.67	.51	.47
I have enough time to get the job done. <sup>3</sup>	<b>.53</b>	.46	<b>.35</b>
My supervisor is competent in doing his/her job. <sup>4</sup>	<b>1.00</b>	.96	<b>.80</b>
My chances for promotion are good. <sup>5</sup>	<b>.69</b>	.42	.49
My work is challenging and interesting. <sup>6</sup>	<b>.97</b>	<b>.79</b>	.93
I am not asked to do excessive amounts of work. <sup>7</sup>	<b>.20</b>	.14	<b>-.02</b>
The problems I am expected to solve are hard enough. <sup>8</sup>	<b>.83</b>	<b>.68</b>	.71
I have had equal opportunity in promotions and salary. <sup>9</sup>	<b>.83</b>	<b>.67</b>	.73
My job security is good.	.85	.89	.90
My pay is good.	.60	.61	.68
The physical surroundings are pleasant.	.81	.73	.85

Mean Employer and Job Assessment Ratings, by MBA Program Type†			
Statement	Full-Time	Part-Time	Executive
I spend too much time in meetings that are not productive. <sup>10</sup>	<b>-.35</b>	-.17	-.08
My employer promotes and upholds ethical business practices. <sup>11</sup>	<b>1.25</b>	<b>1.13</b>	1.18
My employer emphasizes community and inclusion. <sup>12</sup>	.63	.56	.47
My employer emphasizes work-life balance. <sup>13</sup>	<b>.49</b>	.42	<b>.25</b>
I have the opportunity to use my skills to the maximum. <sup>14</sup>	<b>.51</b>	<b>.35</b>	.44
I am achieving something I personally value. <sup>15</sup>	<b>.71</b>	<b>.51</b>	.66
I have job autonomy.	.97	.92	1.08
My work has visibility with the executive team. <sup>16</sup>	1.08	<b>.90</b>	1.14
I am given opportunities for professional development. <sup>17</sup>	<b>.86</b>	<b>.70</b>	.74
I have opportunities to learn new things. <sup>18</sup>	<b>1.17</b>	.94	.98
1. F = 4.89; df = 2, 2936, p ≤ .05      2. F = 8.49; df = 2, 2936, p ≤ .05      3. F = 3.63; df = 2, 2936, p ≤ .05 4. F = 4.07; df = 2, 2936, p ≤ .05      5. F = 17.79; df = 2, 2936, p ≤ .05      6. F = 8.94; df = 2, 2936, p ≤ .05 7. F = 3.85; df = 2, 2936, p ≤ .05      8. F = 6.58; df = 2, 2936, p ≤ .05      9. F = 6.27; df = 2, 2936, p ≤ .05 10. F = 11.99; df = 2, 2936, p ≤ .05      11. F = 4.95; df = 2, 2936, p ≤ .05      12. F = 3.14; df = 2, 2936, p ≤ .05 13. F = 5.28; df = 2, 2936, p ≤ .05      14. F = 5.70; df = 2, 2936, p ≤ .05      15. F = 9.88; df = 2, 2936, p ≤ .05 16. F = 7.74; df = 2, 2936, p ≤ .05      17. F = 6.10; df = 2, 2936, p ≤ .05      18. F = 19.96; df = 2, 2936, p ≤ .05 Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA. † Scale: +2 = definitely true through -2 = definitely not true			

Men were more likely than women to have considered the following statements true: “My chances for promotion are good,” “My work is challenging and interesting,” “I have had equal opportunity in promotions and salary,” “My pay is good,” and “My work has visibility with the executive team.” There were no statements that women felt were more true than men did.

Older respondents were less likely than younger respondents to have felt that their employer really cares and wants them to succeed. Additionally, respondents ages 35 and older were less likely than younger respondents to indicate the following statements were true: “I have enough time to get the job done,” “My chances for promotion are good,” “My employer emphasizes work-life balance,” and “I have opportunities to learn new things.”

Respondents ages 28 to 34 were more likely than older respondents to have considered the following statements as true: “I am not asked to do excessive amounts of work,” “I have had equal opportunity in promotions and salary,” “The physical surroundings are pleasant,” “My employer emphasizes community and inclusion,” and “I am given opportunities for professional development.”

Respondents age 27 and younger were more likely than older respondents to have considered their job security as good and less likely to report that they spent too much time in unproductive meetings.

Mean Employer and Job Assessment Ratings, by Age†			
Statement	27 and Younger	28 to 34	35 and Older
I am given a chance to do the things I do best.	.73	.71	.66
My employer really cares about individuals and wants them to succeed. <sup>1</sup>	<b>.80</b>	<b>.65</b>	<b>.52</b>
I have enough time to get the job done. <sup>2</sup>	.66	.57	<b>.36</b>
My supervisor is competent in doing his/her job.	1.12	.98	.93
My chances for promotion are good. <sup>3</sup>	.75	.71	<b>.42</b>
My work is challenging and interesting.	.93	.94	.89
I am not asked to do excessive amounts of work. <sup>4</sup>	.26	<b>.20</b>	<b>.08</b>
The problems I am expected to solve are hard enough.	.80	.81	.74
I have had equal opportunity in promotions and salary. <sup>5</sup>	.87	<b>.83</b>	<b>.69</b>
My job security is good. <sup>6</sup>	<b>1.09</b>	.88	.80
My pay is good.	.60	.60	.62
The physical surroundings are pleasant. <sup>7</sup>	.86	<b>.83</b>	<b>.72</b>
I spend too much time in meetings that are not productive. <sup>8</sup>	<b>-.61</b>	-.28	-.24
My employer promotes and upholds ethical business practices.	1.21	1.24	1.17
My employer emphasizes community and inclusion. <sup>9</sup>	.72	<b>.64</b>	<b>.53</b>
My employer emphasizes work-life balance. <sup>10</sup>	.64	.50	<b>.36</b>
I have the opportunity to use my skills to the maximum.	.47	.49	.43
I am achieving something I personally value.	.60	.67	.65
I have job autonomy.	.83	.97	1.00
My work has visibility with the executive team.	1.01	1.06	1.02
I am given opportunities for professional development. <sup>11</sup>	.90	<b>.85</b>	<b>.72</b>
I have opportunities to learn new things. <sup>12</sup>	1.21	1.16	<b>1.00</b>
1. F = 8.47; df = 2, 2969, p ≤ .05      2. F = 15.12; df = 2, 2969, p ≤ .05      3. F = 25.52; df = 2, 2969, p ≤ .05 4. F = 4.24; df = 2, 2969, p ≤ .05      5. F = 6.02; df = 2, 2969, p ≤ .05      6. F = 7.29; df = 2, 2969, p ≤ .05 7. F = 4.71; df = 2, 2969, p ≤ .05      8. F = 9.73; df = 2, 2969, p ≤ .05      9. F = 4.70; df = 2, 2969, p ≤ .05 10. F = 7.72; df = 2, 2969, p ≤ .05      11. F = 5.63; df = 2, 2969, p ≤ .05      12. F = 10.92; df = 2, 2969, p ≤ .05 Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA. † Scale: +2 = definitely true through -2 = definitely not true			

Respondents from the United States and Latin America were more likely than respondents from Asia to indicate their employer cares and wants them to succeed. Additionally, respondents from the United States were more likely than respondents from Europe to have felt this statement was true.

Respondents from the United States and Latin America were more likely than Asian respondents to have felt the problems they are expected to solve were hard enough.

Respondents from the United States were more likely than Asian and European respondents to have felt their job security was good. Additionally, respondents from the United States were more likely than respondents from Asia to have considered their pay was good, but respondents from the United States were more likely than respondents from Asia to indicate they spent too much time in unproductive meetings.

Respondents from Latin American and the United States were more likely than European respondents to have felt their employer promotes and upholds ethical business practices. Respondents from Latin America were also more likely than respondents from Asia to have felt this statement was true.

Respondents from Canada and the United States were more likely than European respondents to have felt that their employer emphasizes community and inclusion. Additionally, respondents from the United States were more likely than European respondents to have felt that their employer emphasizes work-life balance.

Respondents from Latin America and Asia were more likely than respondents from the United States and Canada to have felt that they were achieving something they personally value.

Canadian and European respondents were more likely than Asian respondents to have felt that they had job autonomy.

Asian respondents were the least likely of the respondents to have felt that the following statement was true: “My work has visibility with the executive team.”

**Mean Employer and Job Assessment Ratings, by Citizenship†**

<b>Statement</b>	<b>Asia</b>	<b>United States</b>	<b>Canada</b>	<b>Latin American</b>	<b>Europe</b>
I am given a chance to do the things I do best.	.73	.69	.67	.85	.65
My employer really cares about individuals and wants them to succeed. <sup>1</sup>	<b>.40</b>	<b>.66</b>	.61	<b>.74</b>	<b>.46</b>
I have enough time to get the job done.	.47	.51	.53	.56	.39
My supervisor is competent in doing his/her job. <sup>2</sup>	.86	1.02	.89	1.01	.86
My chances for promotion are good. <sup>3</sup>	.45	.64	.68	.74	.50
My work is challenging and interesting. <sup>4</sup>	.88	.90	.92	1.14	1.01
I am not asked to do excessive amounts of work.	.13	.20	.13	.06	.06
The problems I am expected to solve are hard enough. <sup>5</sup>	<b>.62</b>	<b>.80</b>	.78	<b>.97</b>	.80
I have had equal opportunity in promotions and salary.	.66	.79	.81	.86	.81
My job security is good. <sup>6</sup>	<b>.73</b>	<b>.92</b>	.86	.82	<b>.67</b>
My pay is good. <sup>7</sup>	<b>.42</b>	<b>.65</b>	.57	.65	.59
The physical surroundings are pleasant.	.81	.79	.86	.79	.76
I spend too much time in meetings that are not productive. <sup>8</sup>	<b>-.45</b>	<b>-.26</b>	-.32	-.18	-.30
My employer promotes and upholds ethical business practices. <sup>9</sup>	<b>1.14</b>	<b>1.26</b>	1.22	<b>1.41</b>	<b>1.00</b>
My employer emphasizes community and inclusion. <sup>10</sup>	.59	<b>.65</b>	<b>.66</b>	.63	<b>.39</b>
My employer emphasizes work-life balance. <sup>11</sup>	.42	<b>.51</b>	.38	.40	<b>.27</b>
I have the opportunity to use my skills to the maximum.	.56	.45	.44	.65	.49
I am achieving something I personally value. <sup>12</sup>	<b>.84</b>	<b>.61</b>	<b>.56</b>	<b>.91</b>	.72
I have job autonomy. <sup>13</sup>	<b>.82</b>	.96	<b>1.13</b>	1.08	<b>1.07</b>
My work has visibility with the executive team. <sup>14</sup>	<b>.80</b>	<b>1.06</b>	<b>1.11</b>	<b>1.24</b>	<b>1.09</b>

Mean Employer and Job Assessment Ratings, by Citizenship†					
Statement	Asia	United States	Canada	Latin American	Europe
I am given opportunities for professional development.	.67	.84	.78	.90	.75
I have opportunities to learn new things.	1.03	1.10	1.07	1.18	1.14
1. F = 6.31; df = 4, 2874, p ≤ .05	2. F = 3.21; df = 4, 2874, p ≤ .05	3. F = 3.27; df = 4, 2874, p ≤ .05	4. F = 2.59; df = 4, 2874, p ≤ .05		
5. F = 3.39; df = 4, 2874, p ≤ .05	6. F = 6.22; df = 4, 2874, p ≤ .05	7. F = 3.47; df = 4, 2874, p ≤ .05	8. F = 2.49; df = 4, 2874, p ≤ .05		
9. F = 8.31; df = 4, 2874, p ≤ .05	10. F = 4.60; df = 4, 2874, p ≤ .05	11. F = 3.93; df = 4, 2874, p ≤ .05	12. F = 6.03; df = 4, 2874, p ≤ .05		
13. F = 4.75; df = 4, 2874, p ≤ .05	14. F = 5.07; df = 4, 2874, p ≤ .05				
Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.					
† Scale: +2 = definitely true through -2 = definitely not true					

Among respondents from the United States, the following statements were statistically significant.

- African Americans were less likely than whites to have considered that they had an equal opportunity in promotions and salary.
- Hispanics and whites were more likely than African Americans to have considered their job security good and to indicate that their employer promotes and uphold ethical business practices.
- Whites were more likely than African Americans to have felt that their work had visibility with the executive team.

## Organizational Culture

Respondents were asked to describe their organizational culture by choosing the point between pairs of cultural descriptions that most closely reflects their organization's culture.

Overall, the majority of respondents worked for an organization that had centralized decision-making, a cooperative and informal atmosphere, flexible career opportunities, varied and fluid responsibilities, formalized procedures, a clear and well-communicated vision, a focus on company success, and individual performance-based rewards.

Organizational Culture Ratings					
Item	(n = 2,978)				Item
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	
Centralized decision-making	23%	34%	33%	10%	Decentralized decision-making
Internal competition	9%	24%	43%	24%	Cooperative atmosphere
Well-defined career path	8%	22%	46%	24%	Flexible career opportunities
Formal atmosphere	9%	29%	44%	19%	Informal atmosphere
Clearly defined responsibilities	10%	30%	42%	19%	Varied and fluid responsibilities
Formalized procedures	21%	32%	31%	16%	Loosely defined procedures
Clear, well –communicated vision	17%	40%	34%	10%	Flexible, adaptable corporate goals
Focus on company success	40%	45%	10%	5%	Focus on public good
Individual performance-based reward	22%	44%	26%	8%	Team-based reward

Respondents in the consulting industry were more likely than respondents in the manufacturing industry to have reported working for an organization with decentralized decision-making.

Respondents in the finance/accounting industry were slightly, yet significantly more likely than all other respondents to have been working for an organization that promotes internal competition and clearly defined responsibilities.

Respondents in consulting and finance/accounting were more likely than respondents in technology and products/services to have had well-defined career paths.

Respondents in finance/accounting were more likely than respondents in technology and products/services to have reported working for an organization with a formal atmosphere.

Respondents in consulting were more likely than all other respondents to have worked for an organization with loosely defined procedures.

Respondents in healthcare and nonprofit/government reported working for an organization that focuses on the public good at a higher percentage compared with respondents in all other industries except for energy/utilities.

Respondents in products/services were more likely than respondents in finance/accounting and consulting to have had team-based performance rewards.

The four point scales were collapsed into dichotomous variables for the following analyses.

Organizational Culture Ratings, by Industry Group									
Item	Cultural Item	Industry Group†							
		C	E	F	H	T	M	N	P
<i>Decision-making</i> <sup>1</sup>	Centralized decision-making	<b>41%</b>	63%	60%	59%	56%	65%	63%	60%
	Decentralized decision-making	<b>59%</b>	37%	40%	41%	44%	<b>35%</b>	37%	40%
	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<i>Competition-cooperation</i> <sup>2</sup>	Internal competition	30%	34%	<b>38%</b>	32%	36%	34%	28%	29%
	Cooperative atmosphere	70%	66%	62%	68%	64%	66%	72%	71%
	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<i>Career path</i> <sup>3</sup>	Well-defined career path	<b>46%</b>	23%	<b>36%</b>	25%	<b>19%</b>	21%	35%	<b>25%</b>
	Flexible career opportunities	<b>54%</b>	77%	<b>64%</b>	75%	81%	79%	65%	75%
	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<i>Atmosphere</i> <sup>4</sup>	Formal atmosphere	34%	43%	<b>49%</b>	43%	<b>26%</b>	38%	39%	<b>33%</b>
	Casual atmosphere	66%	57%	<b>51%</b>	57%	<b>74%</b>	62%	61%	67%
	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<i>Responsibilities</i> <sup>5</sup>	Clearly defined responsibilities	34%	39%	<b>45%</b>	39%	35%	37%	44%	39%
	Varied/fluid responsibilities	66%	61%	<b>55%</b>	61%	65%	63%	56%	61%
	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Organizational Culture Ratings, by Industry Group									
Item	Cultural Item	Industry Group†							
		C	E	F	H	T	M	N	P
<i>Procedures</i> <sup>6</sup>	Formalized procedures	<b>44%</b>	57%	58%	59%	49%	54%	62%	53%
	Loosely defined procedures	<b>56%</b>	43%	42%	41%	51%	46%	38%	47%
	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<i>Goals</i> <sup>7</sup>	Clear, well-communicated vision	54%	63%	60%	62%	51%	52%	56%	55%
	Flexible, adaptable corporate goals	46%	37%	40%	38%	49%	48%	44%	45%
	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<i>Focus</i> <sup>8</sup>	Focus on company success	91%	87%	91%	72%	90%	97%	25%	93%
	Focus on public good	<b>9%</b>	13%	<b>9%</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>7%</b>
	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<i>Rewards</i> <sup>9</sup>	Individual performance-based reward	<b>77%</b>	64%	71%	62%	64%	63%	65%	<b>57%</b>
	Team-based reward	<b>23%</b>	36%	<b>29%</b>	38%	36%	37%	35%	<b>43%</b>
	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

1.  $\chi^2 = 60.39$ ; df = 7; p ≤ .05    2.  $\chi^2 = 17.35$ ; df = 7; p ≤ .05    3.  $\chi^2 = 112.06$ ; df = 7; p ≤ .05    4.  $\chi^2 = 73.14$ ; df = 7; p ≤ .05    5.  $\chi^2 = 20.68$ ; df = 7; p ≤ .05  
6.  $\chi^2 = 35.36$ ; df = 7; p ≤ .05    7.  $\chi^2 = 18.65$ ; df = 7; p ≤ .05    8.  $\chi^2 = 754.44$ ; df = 7; p ≤ .05    9.  $\chi^2 = 55.98$ ; df = 7; p ≤ .05  
Items in bold in the contingency table significantly affect the overall  $\chi^2$  statistic.  
† C = consulting; E = energy/utility; F = finance/accounting; H = healthcare; T = technology; M = manufacturing; N = nonprofit/government; P = products/services

Respondents in consulting positions were more likely than all other respondents to have reported working in an organization with decentralized decision-making.

Respondents in general management were more likely than all other respondents to have reported working in an organization that promotes both a cooperative atmosphere and an informal atmosphere.

Respondents in consulting and finance/accounting were more likely than other respondents to have had well-defined career paths.

Respondents in finance/accounting were more likely than respondents in consulting and general management to have had clearly defined responsibilities.

Respondents in general management and IT/MIS reported a greater emphasis on the public good compared with respondents in marketing/sales.

Respondents in consulting and human resources were the least likely of the respondents to have received team-based performance rewards.

Organizational Culture Ratings, by Job Function								
Item	Cultural Item	Job Function†						
		M	O	C	G	F	H	I
<i>Decision-making</i> <sup>1</sup>	Centralized decision-making	58%	58%	<b>49%</b>	59%	61%	54%	57%
	Decentralized decision-making	42%	42%	<b>51%</b>	41%	39%	46%	43%
	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<i>Competition-cooperation</i> <sup>2</sup>	Internal competition	37%	36%	31%	<b>25%</b>	34%	26%	34%
	Cooperative atmosphere	63%	64%	69%	<b>75%</b>	66%	74%	66%
	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<i>Career path</i> <sup>3</sup>	Well-defined career path	<b>25%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>34%</b>	25%	<b>25%</b>
	Flexible career opportunities	75%	77%	<b>59%</b>	77%	66%	75%	75%
	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<i>Atmosphere</i> <sup>4</sup>	Formal atmosphere	40%	36%	39%	<b>29%</b>	41%	35%	34%
	Casual atmosphere	60%	64%	61%	<b>71%</b>	59%	65%	66%
	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<i>Responsibilities</i> <sup>5</sup>	Clearly defined responsibilities	41%	40%	<b>33%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>43%</b>	45%	36%
	Varied/fluid responsibilities	59%	60%	67%	67%	57%	55%	64%
	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<i>Procedures</i> <sup>6</sup>	Formalized procedures	55%	58%	50%	49%	55%	67%	49%
	Loosely defined procedures	45%	42%	50%	51%	45%	33%	51%
	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<i>Goals</i> <sup>7</sup>	Clear, well-communicated vision	57%	58%	52%	51%	59%	70%	52%
	Flexible, adaptable corporate goals	43%	42%	48%	49%	41%	30%	48%
	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<i>Focus</i> <sup>8</sup>	Focus on company success	88%	88%	86%	<b>77%</b>	88%	86%	76%
	Focus on public good	<b>12%</b>	12%	14%	<b>23%</b>	12%	14%	<b>24%</b>
	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<i>Rewards</i> <sup>9</sup>	Individual performance-based reward	64%	62%	71%	61%	66%	78%	66%
	Team-based reward	36%	38%	<b>29%</b>	39%	34%	<b>22%</b>	34%
	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

1.  $\chi^2 = 18.18$ ; df = 6;  $p \leq .05$     2.  $\chi^2 = 18.87$ ; df = 6;  $p \leq .05$     3.  $\chi^2 = 66.12$ ; df = 6;  $p \leq .05$     4.  $\chi^2 = 19.74$ ; df = 6;  $p \leq .05$   
5.  $\chi^2 = 22.84$ ; df = 6;  $p \leq .05$     6.  $\chi^2 = 15.31$ ; df = 6;  $p \leq .05$     7.  $\chi^2 = 16.78$ ; df = 6;  $p \leq .05$     8.  $\chi^2 = 45.80$ ; df = 6;  $p \leq .05$   
9.  $\chi^2 = 18.24$ ; df = 6;  $p \leq .05$

Items in bold in the contingency table significantly affect the overall  $\chi^2$  statistic.  
† M = marketing/sales; O = operations/logistics; C = consulting; G = general management; F = finance/accounting; H = human resources; I = IT/MIS

Graduates of full-time programs were more likely than other respondents to have worked for an organization that had well-defined career paths but less likely to have worked for an organization that promotes internal competition. These were the only statistically significant differences for organizational culture by MBA program type.

Men were slightly, yet significantly more likely to have worked for an organization with varied and fluid responsibilities, loosely defined procedures, and flexible and adaptable corporate goals. On the other hand, women were more likely to have worked for an organization that focuses on the public good.

Respondents ages 27 and younger were less likely than older respondents to have worked for an organization with decentralized decision-making. Younger respondents were more likely than older respondents to have worked for an organization with a cooperative atmosphere and well-defined career paths. These were the only statistically significant differences for organizational culture by age.

Only one significant difference in organizational culture was noted by U.S. subgroup; Asian American respondents were less likely compared with other U.S. subgroups to have reported working for an organization that emphasized internal competition.

There were no significant differences in organizational culture by graduation year and citizenship.

### Organizational Culture of Self-Employed Respondents

Respondents who were self-employed were asked to describe their organizational culture. MBA graduates who started a business indicated that they run a business that typically has centralized decision-making, a cooperative atmosphere, an informal atmosphere, flexible career opportunities, varied and fluid responsibilities, loosely defined procedures, flexible and adaptable corporate goals, a focus on company success, and individual performance-based rewards.

Statistically, businesses started by MBA graduates differed from the organizations that other MBA graduates worked for in a number of attributes related to organizational culture. Self-employed respondents were more likely than other employed respondents to indicate they worked in an organization with a cooperative atmosphere, flexible career opportunities, an informal atmosphere, varied and fluid responsibilities, loosely defined procedures, flexible and adaptable corporate goals, and a focus on the public good.

Organizational Culture Ratings					
Item	(n = 192)				Item
Centralized decision-making	32%	29%	26%	14%	Decentralized decision-making
Internal competition	3%	7%	27%	64%	Cooperative atmosphere
Well-defined career path	5%	11%	34%	49%	Flexible career opportunities
Formal atmosphere	2%	10%	33%	55%	Informal atmosphere
Clearly defined responsibilities	14%	16%	38%	32%	Varied and fluid responsibilities
Formalized procedures	6%	27%	40%	27%	Loosely defined procedures
Clear, well –communicated vision	16%	28%	34%	22%	Flexible, adaptable corporate goals
Focus on company success	44%	35%	16%	5%	Focus on public good
Individual performance-based reward	34%	28%	24%	14%	Team-based reward

### Career Goal Orientation

Respondents were asked to describe their career goal orientation by indicating how well each item reflects their orientation. Respondents were asked to rate technical and functional competence, managerial competence, security and stability, autonomy and independence, service and dedication to a cause, pure challenge, creativity, and lifestyle and work-life balance.

Additionally, respondents who were employed were asked to indicate how well their current job matches their career goals based on their previous ratings.

About a third of the respondents indicated that their career goal orientation was managerial competence, autonomy and independence, and lifestyle and work-life balance. This was followed by pure challenge, technical and functional competence, and creativity. Ten percent of the employed respondents reported that their current job perfectly matched their career goals and 49% reported the next highest response category. Only 3% reported that their job did not match their career goals at all.

Career Goal Orientation Ratings							
Item	(n = 3,269)						
	Mean	Best Describes (2)	(1)	(0)	(-1)	Least Describes (-2)	Total
Managerial competence	1.12	34%	50%	13%	3%	1%	100%
Autonomy/independence	1.08	31%	51%	15%	3%	1%	100%
Lifestyle/work-life balance	.92	32%	40%	20%	7%	2%	100%
Pure challenge	.86	23%	49%	21%	6%	2%	100%
Technical/functional competence	.63	17%	44%	25%	11%	3%	100%
Creativity	.63	19%	42%	25%	12%	3%	100%
Security and stability	.54	17%	41%	26%	13%	4%	100%
Service/dedication to a cause	.21	13%	31%	28%	20%	8%	100%
Does Your Current Job Match Your Career Goal	(n = 3,179)						
	Mean	Perfectly (2)	(1)	(0)	(-1)	Not at all (-2)	Total
Response	.51	10%	49%	25%	13%	3%	100%

Respondents who were self-employed were more likely than other employed respondents to have considered their current job a match with their career goals.

Employed respondents were more likely than other respondents to have indicated that their career goal orientation hinged on security and stability. Respondents who were self-employed were more likely than other respondents to have reported that their orientation hinged on autonomy and independence, and creativity. Furthermore, respondents who were self-employed were more likely than respondents who were employed by an organization to have rested their orientation on lifestyle and work-life balance. Respondents who were not currently employed were less likely than other respondents to have indicated that their orientation hinged on technical competence, managerial competence, and pure challenge. There were no significant differences by employment status for dedication to a cause.

Respondents in finance/accounting were more likely than respondents in consulting and products/services to have rested their orientation on technical competence. Respondents in products/services and manufacturing were more likely than respondents in finance/accounting to have rested their orientation on managerial competence. Respondents in healthcare and nonprofit/government were more likely than respondents in consulting to have rested their orientation on security and stability. Additionally, respondents in nonprofit/government were

more likely than respondents in technology to have rested their orientation on security and stability. Respondents in healthcare and nonprofit/government were more likely than all other respondents to have rested their orientation on dedication to a cause. Respondents in consulting, finance/accounting, and technology were more likely than respondents in nonprofit/government to have rested their orientation on a pure challenge. Respondents in technology were more likely than respondents in finance/accounting to have rested their orientation on creativity. Respondents in nonprofit/government were more likely than respondents in energy/utility, finance/accounting, and manufacturing to have rested their orientation on lifestyle and work-life balance. There were no significant differences by industry for autonomy and their current job as a match with their career goals.

Respondents in general management were more likely than other respondents, except those in human resources, to have considered their current job a match with their career goals. Additionally, respondents in finance/accounting and consulting were more likely than respondents in IT/MIS to have considered their current job a match with their career goals.

Respondents in marketing/sales, general management, and consulting were less likely than respondents in operations/logistics, finance/accounting, and IT/MIS to have focused their orientation on technical competence. Respondents in marketing/sales and general management were more likely to have focused their orientation on managerial competence. Additionally, respondents in general management were more likely than respondents in consulting, finance/accounting, and IT/MIS to have rested their orientation on managerial competence. Respondents in finance/accounting and operations/logistics were more likely to have focused their orientation on security and stability compared with respondents in consulting and general management. Respondents in general management were more likely than other respondents to have focused their orientation on autonomy and independence. Respondents in general management were also more likely than respondents in operations/logistics, consulting, and finance/accounting to have focused their orientation on dedication to a cause. Respondents in general management, consulting, and marketing/sales were more likely than respondents in operations/logistics, finance/accounting, and healthcare to have focused their orientation on creativity. Additionally, respondents in IT/MIS were more likely than respondents in finance/accounting to have focused their orientation on creativity. There were no significant differences by industry for lifestyle and work-life balance, and pure challenge.

Mean Career Goal Orientation Ratings†, by Employment Characteristics*										
Characteristics	Career Goal Orientation‡									
	Number	T	M	S	A	D	P	C	L	Match
<i>Employment Status</i>										
Employed	2,978	.65	1.13	<b>.58</b>	1.06	.20	.86	.61	<b>.91</b>	<b>.47</b>
Self-employed	192	.56	1.10	-.02	<b>1.53</b>	.31	.93	<b>.95</b>	<b>1.10</b>	<b>1.18</b>
Not employed	90	<b>.22</b>	<b>.80</b>	.33	.83	.32	<b>.61</b>	.58	1.03	<b>**</b>

Mean Career Goal Orientation Ratings†, by Employment Characteristics*										
Characteristics	Career Goal Orientation‡									
	Number	T	M	S	A	D	P	C	L	Match
<b>Industry Group</b>										
Consulting	485	<b>.60</b>	1.15	<b>.40</b>	1.15	<b>.14</b>	<b>.90</b>	.65	.92	.57
Energy/utility	121	.59	1.16	.50	1.03	<b>.00</b>	.87	.56	<b>.82</b>	.51
Finance/accounting	671	<b>.78</b>	<b>1.01</b>	.59	1.03	<b>.12</b>	<b>.92</b>	<b>.55</b>	<b>.85</b>	.49
Healthcare	277	.58	1.18	<b>.66</b>	1.13	<b>.50</b>	.82	.56	1.03	.48
Technology	447	.64	1.10	<b>.42</b>	1.14	<b>.18</b>	<b>.95</b>	<b>.74</b>	.94	.49
Manufacturing	274	.66	<b>1.19</b>	.59	1.04	<b>.05</b>	.82	.55	<b>.78</b>	.46
Nonprofit/government	222	.68	1.10	<b>.79</b>	1.05	<b>.98</b>	<b>.68</b>	.69	<b>1.16</b>	.49
Products/services	667	<b>.56</b>	<b>1.20</b>	.56	1.08	<b>.11</b>	.85	.68	.94	.52
<b>Job Function</b>										
Marketing/Sales	683	<b>.45</b>	<b>1.15</b>	.56	<b>1.08</b>	.24	.83	<b>.78</b>	.99	.43
Operations/Logistics	336	<b>.74</b>	1.16	.65	<b>1.04</b>	<b>.10</b>	.92	<b>.51</b>	.85	.45
Consulting	509	<b>.56</b>	1.12	.43	<b>1.12</b>	<b>.11</b>	.94	<b>.73</b>	.85	.55
General Management	473	<b>.46</b>	<b>1.31</b>	.38	<b>1.28</b>	<b>.40</b>	.93	<b>.74</b>	.92	.80
Finance/Accounting	858	<b>.82</b>	<b>1.02</b>	.61	<b>1.01</b>	<b>.11</b>	.85	<b>.44</b>	.90	.47
Human Resources	73	.77	1.23	.73	<b>.95</b>	.52	.74	<b>.32</b>	1.01	.45
IT/MIS	200	<b>.99</b>	<b>1.06</b>	.61	<b>.99</b>	.34	.79	<b>.70</b>	.96	.21
† Scale: +2 (Best describes) through -2 (Least describes)										
‡ T = technical/functional competence; M = managerial competence; S = security/stability; A = autonomy/independence; D = service/dedication to a cause; P = pure challenge; C = creativity; L = lifestyle/work-life balance; Match = Does your current job match your career goals.										
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.										
**indicates that the question was not asked of these respondents.										

The class of 2005 was more likely than the class of 2000 and 2001 to have focused their orientation on pure challenge. The class of 2006 was more likely than the class of 2000 to have focused their orientation on creativity. These were the only statistically significant differences by graduation year.

Graduates of full-time programs were more likely than graduates of part-time programs to have considered their current job a match with their career goals. Graduates of part-time programs were more likely than graduates of full-time programs to have rested their orientation on technical competence. Graduates of executive programs were more likely than other graduates to have rested their orientation on managerial competence, autonomy/independence, dedication to a cause, and pure challenge. Graduates of part-time programs were more likely than other respondents to have rested their orientation on security and stability, but they were less likely to have rested their orientation on creativity. Graduates of part-time programs were more likely than graduates of full-time programs, who were more likely than graduates of executive programs, to have rested their orientation on lifestyle and work-life balance.

Men were more likely than women to have rested their orientation on technical and managerial competence, pure challenge, and creativity. Women were more likely than men to have rested their orientation on security and stability, dedication to a cause, and lifestyle/work-life balance. There were no significant differences by gender for autonomy and their current job as a match with their career goals.

Respondents ages 28 to 34 were more likely than respondents ages 35 and older to have considered their current job a match with their career goals. Respondents ages 35 and older were more likely than respondents ages 28 to 34 to have focused their orientation on technical competence, autonomy, and pure challenge. Respondents ages 27 and younger were more likely than older respondents to have focused their orientation on security and stability, and they were more likely than respondents ages 35 and older to have rested their orientation on lifestyle/work-life balance. There were no significant differences by age for managerial competence and pure challenge.

Respondents from Asia and the United States were more likely than respondents from Canada and Europe to have focused their orientation on technical competence. Respondents from Latin American were more likely than other respondents to have rested their orientation on managerial competence. Respondents from Latin America, Asia, and the United States were more likely than respondents from Canada and Europe to have focused their orientation on security and stability. Asian respondents were more likely than respondents from the United States, Canada, and Europe to have focused their orientation on a dedication to a cause. Additionally, respondents from the United States were more likely than respondents from Canada to have focused their orientation on a dedication to a cause. Respondents from Latin American were more likely than respondents from the United States to have focused their orientation on creativity. Respondents from the United States were more likely than respondents from Asia and Europe to have focused their orientation on lifestyle/work-life balance. There were no significant differences by citizenship when considering their current job as a match with their career goals.

Asian Americans and whites were more likely than African Americans to have considered their current job a match with their career goals. Asian American respondents were more likely than whites to have focused their orientation on technical competence. African American respondents were more likely than Asian American and white respondents to have focused their orientation on autonomy and independence. Asian American and African American respondents were more likely than whites to have focused their orientation on a dedication to a cause. Hispanics were more likely than whites to have focused their orientation on lifestyle/work-life balance. There were no significant differences by U.S. subgroup for managerial competence, security and stability, pure challenge, and creativity.

Mean Career Goal Orientation Ratings <sup>†</sup> , by Demographic Characteristics*										
Characteristics	Career Goal Orientation <sup>‡</sup>									
	Number	T	M	S	A	D	P	C	L	Match
<i>Graduation Year</i>										
2000	153	.71	1.00	.55	1.05	.10	<b>.69</b>	<b>.40</b>	.96	.50
2001	246	.63	1.02	.57	1.17	.18	<b>.72</b>	.65	1.01	.60
2002	246	.65	1.11	.41	1.07	.15	.80	.63	.89	.48
2003	315	.64	1.15	.48	1.09	.19	.81	.53	.83	.50
2004	566	.63	1.08	.63	1.11	.17	.85	.64	.92	.60
2005	728	.63	1.15	.48	1.09	.26	<b>.95</b>	.63	.90	.49
2006	1,015	.60	1.15	.57	1.04	.26	.90	<b>.68</b>	.96	.46

Mean Career Goal Orientation Ratings <sup>†</sup> , by Demographic Characteristics*										
Characteristics	Career Goal Orientation <sup>‡</sup>									
	Number	T	M	S	A	D	P	C	L	Match
<b><i>MBA Program Type</i></b>										
Full-Time	2,180	<b>.59</b>	1.11	.48	1.06	.18	.86	.64	<b>.91</b>	<b>.55</b>
Part-Time	773	<b>.72</b>	1.08	<b>.73</b>	1.07	.23	.80	<b>.52</b>	<b>1.04</b>	<b>.41</b>
Executive	273	.62	<b>1.25</b>	.48	<b>1.23</b>	<b>.43</b>	<b>1.01</b>	.77	<b>.73</b>	.49
<b><i>Gender</i></b>										
Male	2,311	<b>.65</b>	<b>1.14</b>	<b>.45</b>	1.08	<b>.18</b>	<b>.92</b>	<b>.69</b>	<b>.84</b>	.52
Female	950	<b>.56</b>	<b>1.07</b>	<b>.75</b>	1.06	<b>.29</b>	<b>.71</b>	<b>.47</b>	<b>1.14</b>	.48
<b><i>Age</i></b>										
27 and younger	204	.67	1.11	<b>.96</b>	1.05	.36	.86	.63	<b>1.09</b>	.42
28 to 34	1,798	<b>.58</b>	1.10	.51	<b>1.03</b>	.17	.87	<b>.57</b>	.93	<b>.55</b>
35 and older	1,258	<b>.69</b>	1.14	.52	<b>1.15</b>	.26	.85	<b>.71</b>	<b>.88</b>	<b>.47</b>
<b><i>Citizenship</i></b>										
Asia	319	<b>.73</b>	<b>1.06</b>	<b>.54</b>	1.06	<b>.45</b>	.78	.72	.77	.52
United States	2,086	<b>.68</b>	<b>1.10</b>	<b>.64</b>	1.05	<b>.21</b>	.83	<b>.56</b>	1.01	.49
Canada	210	<b>.40</b>	<b>1.11</b>	<b>.28</b>	1.11	<b>-.04</b>	.98	.73	.87	.52
Latin America	147	.58	<b>1.37</b>	<b>.63</b>	1.18	.22	1.00	<b>.87</b>	.86	.63
Europe	393	<b>.42</b>	<b>1.12</b>	<b>.16</b>	1.16	<b>.15</b>	.93	.70	.66	.58
<b><i>U.S. Subgroup</i></b>										
Asian American	153	<b>.91</b>	1.19	.65	<b>1.07</b>	<b>.46</b>	.90	.62	1.00	<b>.58</b>
African American	77	.73	1.01	.84	<b>1.36</b>	<b>.55</b>	.64	.65	1.13	<b>.03</b>
White	1,637	<b>.66</b>	1.08	.64	<b>1.03</b>	<b>.19</b>	.82	.54	<b>1.00</b>	<b>.50</b>
Hispanic	80	.63	1.24	.70	1.18	.25	.89	.60	<b>1.33</b>	.35

<sup>†</sup> Scale: +2 (Best describes) through -2 (Least describes)  
<sup>‡</sup> T = technical/functional competence; M = managerial competence; S = security/stability; A = autonomy/independence; D = service/dedication to a cause; P = pure challenge; C = creativity; L = lifestyle/work-life balance; Match = Does your current job match your career goals.  
 \*p ≤ .05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.  
 \*\*indicates that the question was not asked of these respondents.

## The MBA Degree

This section explores a retrospective look at the MBA degree program. MBA alumni were asked to rate the value of the degree, their satisfaction with their graduate management education, and how helpful their education was in obtaining their job. Additionally, this section explores return on investment and whether they would decide to pursue an MBA degree knowing what they know now.

### Satisfaction with Graduate Management Education

Respondents were asked to indicate their satisfaction that their graduate management education was rewarding personally, professionally, and financially. Overall, 97% of the respondents were satisfied to extremely satisfied that their education was personally rewarding, to the credit of the MBA degree, and 43% were extremely satisfied. Overall, 74% felt extremely or very satisfied their education was professionally rewarding, and 58% were extremely or very satisfied their education was financially rewarding. Statistically, respondents were significantly more satisfied that their education was rewarding personally than professionally or financially. Respondents were also more satisfied that their degree was rewarding professionally than financially.

Satisfaction with Graduate Management Education							
How satisfied are you that your graduate management education was rewarding...	(n = 3,269)						
	Mean <sup>1,2,3,†</sup>	Extremely Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Not Very Satisfied	Not At All Satisfied	Total
Personally	4.2	43%	41%	13%	3%	1%	100%
Professionally	4.0	30%	44%	20%	5%	1%	100%
Financially	3.6	21%	37%	29%	9%	3%	100%

1. personally—professionally:  $t = 18.09$ ;  $df = 3268$ ;  $p \leq .05$ ;  
 2. personally—financially:  $t = 32.84$ ;  $df = 3268$ ;  $p \leq .05$   
 3. professionally—financially:  $t = 24.03$ ;  $df = 3268$ ;  $p \leq .05$   
 † Scale: 5 = extremely satisfied; 4 = very satisfied; 3 = somewhat satisfied; 2 = not very satisfied; 1 = not at all satisfied.

Respondents who were not working at the time of the survey were significantly less satisfied than other respondents that their education was rewarding personally, professionally, and financially.

Respondents were equally satisfied, statistically, that their education was rewarding personally and professionally by current industry of employment. However, respondents in the nonprofit/government industry were significantly less satisfied than all other employed respondents that their education was financially rewarding. Additionally, respondents in the products/services industry were less satisfied than respondents in the finance/accounting industry that their education was financially rewarding.

Respondents were equally satisfied, statistically, that their education was personally rewarding by current job function. Yet, respondents in IT/MIS positions were significantly less satisfied that their degree was rewarding professionally compared with responses from respondents in

marketing/sales, consulting, general management, and finance/accounting positions. Furthermore, respondents in finance/accounting and consulting positions were significantly more satisfied that their education was rewarding financially compared with ratings from those in IT/MIS and human resources positions.

Satisfaction with Graduate Management Education, by Job Characteristics				
Characteristic	Number	Mean†		
		Personally <sup>1</sup>	Professionally <sup>2</sup>	Financially <sup>3</sup>
<b>Employment status</b>				
Currently employed	2,978	<b>4.2</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>3.7</b>
Self-employed	192	<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>3.6</b>
Not currently employed	90	<b>4.0</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>3.0</b>
<b>Industry</b>				
		<b>Personally</b>	<b>Professionally</b>	<b>Financially<sup>4</sup></b>
Consulting	485	4.3	4.0	<b>3.7</b>
Energy/utility	121	4.2	4.0	<b>3.7</b>
Finance/accounting	671	4.2	4.0	<b>3.8</b>
Healthcare	277	4.2	4.1	<b>3.7</b>
Technology	447	4.2	4.0	<b>3.7</b>
Manufacturing	274	4.2	3.9	<b>3.7</b>
Nonprofit/government	222	4.2	3.8	<b>3.3</b>
Products/services	667	4.2	4.0	<b>3.6</b>
<b>Job Function</b>				
		<b>Personally</b>	<b>Professionally<sup>5</sup></b>	<b>Financially<sup>6</sup></b>
Marketing/sales	683	4.2	<b>4.0</b>	3.6
Operations/logistics	336	4.2	3.9	3.6
Consulting	509	4.3	<b>4.1</b>	<b>3.8</b>
General management	473	4.3	<b>4.0</b>	3.6
Finance/accounting	858	4.2	<b>4.0</b>	<b>3.7</b>
Human resources	73	4.2	3.8	<b>3.3</b>
IT/MIS	200	4.2	<b>3.7</b>	<b>3.4</b>
1. F = 3.67; df = 2,3257; p ≤ .05      2. F = 18.60; df = 2,3257; p ≤ .05      3. F = 19.65; df = 2,3257; p ≤ .05 4. F = 5.87; df = 7,3156; p ≤ .05      5. F = 6.03; df = 6,3125; p ≤ .05      6. F = 4.97; df = 6,3125; p ≤ .05 Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA. † Scale: 5 = extremely satisfied; 4 = very satisfied; 3 = somewhat satisfied; 2 = not very satisfied; 1 = not at all satisfied.				

Statistically, there were no differences in the satisfaction ratings among respondents by graduation year when considering whether the education was rewarding personally or professionally. However, there was a significant difference in satisfaction ratings by graduation year when considering whether the education was rewarding financially. Yet, based on Bonferroni comparisons, there were no individual differences for graduation year.

Respondents who graduated from executive programs were significantly more satisfied that their education was rewarding personally compared with the satisfaction among other respondents, and respondents who graduated from full-time programs were more satisfied than respondents who graduated from part-time programs. Additionally, respondents who graduated from full-time and executive programs were significantly more satisfied than respondents who graduated from part-time programs that their education was rewarding professionally and financially.

Men were significantly more satisfied with the personal, professional, and financial rewards of their education than women were.

Statistically, there were no differences in the satisfaction rating among respondents by age group when considering whether the education was rewarding personally. However, respondents ages 28 to 34 were significantly more satisfied than respondents ages 35 and older that their education was rewarding professionally and financially.

Respondents from Asia were significantly less satisfied than respondents from Latin America and Europe that their education was rewarding personally. Additionally, respondents from Latin America were more satisfied compared with respondents from the United States that their education was rewarding personally. Furthermore, respondents from Latin America were significantly more satisfied than Asian respondents that their education was rewarding professionally. There was no statistical difference in the satisfaction level of respondents by citizenship with regard to the financial rewards of their education.

Statistically, there was no difference in the satisfaction level of respondents by U.S. subgroup with regard to the personal, professional, and financial rewards of their education.

Satisfaction with Graduate Management Education, by Demographic Characteristics*				
Characteristic	Number	Mean†		
		Personally <sup>1</sup>	Professionally <sup>2</sup>	Financially <sup>3</sup>
<b>MBA Program Type</b>				
Full-Time	2,180	<b>4.2</b>	4.0	3.7
Part-Time	773	<b>4.1</b>	<b>3.7</b>	<b>3.4</b>
Executive	273	<b>4.4</b>	4.0	3.6
<b>Gender</b>				
Male	2,311	<b>4.3</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>3.7</b>
Female	950	<b>4.2</b>	<b>3.9</b>	<b>3.6</b>
<b>Age</b>				
27 and younger	204	4.1	3.9	3.6
28 to 34	1,798	4.2	<b>4.0</b>	<b>3.7</b>
35 and older	1,258	4.2	<b>3.9</b>	<b>3.5</b>
<b>Citizenship</b>				
Asia	319	<b>4.1</b>	<b>3.8</b>	3.6
United States	2,086	<b>4.2</b>	4.0	3.7
Canada	210	4.3	4.0	3.5
Latin America	147	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.1</b>	3.7
Europe	393	<b>4.3</b>	4.0	3.6
1. F = 18.31; df = 2,3223; p ≤ .05      2. F = 30.76; df = 2,3223; p ≤ .05      3. F = 25.62; df = 2,3223; p ≤ .05				
4. F = 9.07; df = 1,3259; p ≤ .05      5. F = 7.98; df = 1,3259; p ≤ .05      6. F = 8.13; df = 1,3259; p ≤ .05				
7. F = 10.19; df = 2,3257; p ≤ .05      8. F = 11.44; df = 2,3257; p ≤ .05      9. F = 6.18; df = 4,3150; p ≤ .05				
10. F = 3.09; df = 4,3150; p ≤ .05				
Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.				
† Scale: 5 = extremely satisfied; 4 = very satisfied; 3 = somewhat satisfied; 2 = not very satisfied; 1 = not at all satisfied.				

## Helpfulness of Graduate Business Education in Obtaining Job

Respondents were asked to indicate how helpful their graduate business education was in obtaining their current job, and respondents who were self-employed were asked to indicate how helpful their graduate business education was in transitioning to self-employment. Overall, 89% of the employed respondents felt that their graduate business education was helpful to extremely helpful in obtaining their current job. Among the self-employed, 73% of respondents felt their graduate business education was extremely helpful or very helpful in their transition to becoming self-employed. Statistically, there was a difference in the average helpfulness rating between employed and self-employed respondents—self-employed respondents were more likely to consider their education helpful.

Helpfulness of Graduate Business Education								
Group	Number	Mean†	Extremely Helpful	Very Helpful	Somewhat Helpful	Not Very Helpful	Not At All Helpful	Total
Employed	2,978	3.9	39%	30%	20%	5%	7%	100%
Self-employed	192	4.1	41%	32%	21%	4%	2%	100%

† Scale: 5 = extremely helpful; 4 = very helpful; 3 = somewhat helpful; 2 = not very helpful; 1 = not at all helpful.

Respondents in the consulting industry were more likely than respondents in the finance/accounting, technology, manufacturing, nonprofit/government, and products/services industries to have considered their education helpful in obtaining their current job. Additionally, respondents in the finance/accounting, healthcare, and products/services industries were more likely than respondents in the nonprofit/government industry to have considered their education helpful in obtaining their current job.

Respondents in marketing/sales positions were more likely than respondents in operations/logistics, who were more likely than respondents in IT/MIS positions, to feel that their education was helpful in obtaining their current job. Respondents in consulting positions were more likely than respondents in marketing/sales, operations/logistics, general management, human resources, and IT/MIS to have felt that their education was helpful in obtaining their job. Respondents in general management positions were more likely than respondents in IT/MIS positions to have felt their education was helpful in obtaining their job. Additionally, respondents in finance/accounting were more likely than respondents in operations/logistics to have felt their education was helpful in obtaining their job.

Helpfulness of Graduate Business Education, by Job Characteristics (Employed Respondents)		
Characteristic	Number	Mean
<i>Industry<sup>1</sup></i>		
Consulting	411	<b>4.2</b>
Energy/utility	120	3.9
Finance/accounting	645	<b>3.9</b>
Healthcare	268	<b>3.9</b>
Technology	421	<b>3.7</b>
Manufacturing	271	<b>3.9</b>

<b>Helpfulness of Graduate Business Education, by Job Characteristics (Employed Respondents)</b>		
<b>Characteristic</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Mean</b>
Nonprofit/government	218	<b>3.6</b>
Products/services	612	<b>3.9</b>
<b>Job Function<sup>2</sup></b>		
Marketing/sales	667	<b>3.9</b>
Operations/logistics	332	<b>3.6</b>
Consulting	472	<b>4.2</b>
General management	369	<b>3.8</b>
Finance/accounting	832	<b>4.0</b>
Human resources	69	<b>3.5</b>
IT/MIS	195	<b>3.2</b>
1. F = 6.97; df = 7,2958; p ≤ .05      2. F = 22.55; df = 6,2929; p ≤ .05 Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA. † Scale: 5 = extremely helpful; 4 = very helpful; 3 = somewhat helpful; 2 = not very helpful; 1 = not at all helpful.		

Respondents who graduated in 2000, 2001, 2003, 2004, and 2005 were more likely than respondents who graduated in 2006 to have felt their education was helpful in obtaining their current job.

Graduates of full-time programs were more likely than other respondents to have felt their education was helpful in obtaining their current job. Additionally, respondents who graduated from executive programs were more likely than respondents who graduated from part-time programs to have felt their education was helpful in obtaining their current job.

Respondents ages 28 to 34 were more likely than other respondents to have felt their education was helpful in obtaining their current job.

Respondents from Latin America were more likely than respondents from the United States to have felt their education was helpful in obtaining their current job.

Statistically, there was no difference in the average helpfulness rating by gender or U.S. subgroup.

<b>Helpfulness of Graduate Business Education, by Demographic Characteristics(Employed Respondents)</b>		
<b>Characteristic</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Mean</b>
<b>Graduation Year<sup>1</sup></b>		
2000	131	<b>4.1</b>
2001	219	<b>4.0</b>
2002	214	3.9
2003	295	<b>4.1</b>
2004	523	<b>4.0</b>
2005	671	<b>3.9</b>
2006	925	<b>3.7</b>

<b>Helpfulness of Graduate Business Education, by Demographic Characteristics (Employed Respondents)</b>		
<b>Characteristic</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Mean</b>
<b><i>MBA Program Type<sup>2</sup></i></b>		
Full-Time	1,968	<b>4.2</b>
Part-Time	730	<b>3.3</b>
Executive	241	<b>3.5</b>
<b><i>Age<sup>3</sup></i></b>		
27 and younger	191	3.7
28 to 34	1,668	<b>4.0</b>
35 and older	1,113	3.7
<b><i>Citizenship<sup>4</sup></i></b>		
Asia	292	4.0
United States	1,916	<b>3.8</b>
Canada	180	3.9
Latin America	136	<b>4.2</b>
Europe	355	4.0
1. F = 6.86; df = 6,2971; p ≤ .05      2. F = 195.82; df = 2,2936; p ≤ .05 3. F = 29.14; df = 2,2969; p ≤ .05      4. F = 4.22; df = 4,2874; p ≤ .05 Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA. † Scale: 5 = extremely helpful; 4 = very helpful; 3 = somewhat helpful; 2 = not very helpful; 1 = not at all helpful.		

## Overall Value of Graduate Business Degree

Respondents were asked to rate the overall value of their graduate business degree by comparing the total monetary cost of the degree to the career opportunities they have received as a result of obtaining the degree. Overall, 28% of the respondents consider their degree to have been an outstanding value and 33% considered the degree an excellent value. Additionally, slightly more than a quarter (26%) considered the degree a good value. About one in ten (9%) felt the degree was only a fair value and 5% considered the degree a poor value.

<b>Overall Value</b>	
<b>Response</b>	<b>Percentage (n = 3,267)</b>
Outstanding	28%
Excellent	33%
Good	26%
Fair	9%
Poor	5%
Total	100%
Mean†	3.7
† Scale: 5 = outstanding; 4 = excellent; 3 = good; 2 = fair; 1 = poor.	

Statistically, the graduating class of 2000 considered the overall value of their degree considerably higher compared with the rating provided by the class of 2006.

Graduates of full-time programs rated the overall value of their degree significantly higher compared with all other respondents. Additionally, graduates of executive programs rated the overall value of their degree higher compared with graduates of part-time programs.

Men rated the overall value of their degree slightly, yet significantly, higher compared with the rating given by women.

Respondents ages 28 to 34 rated the overall value of the degree slightly, yet significantly, higher compared with the rating given by respondents ages 35 and older.

Statistically, there was no difference in the average rating of overall value by citizenship and U.S. subgroup.

Overall Value, by Demographic Characteristics		
Characteristic	Number	Mean†
<b>Graduation Year<sup>1</sup></b>		
2000	153	<b>3.9</b>
2001	246	3.8
2002	246	3.7
2003	315	3.7
2004	566	3.7
2005	727	3.7
2006	1,014	<b>3.6</b>
<b>MBA Program Type<sup>2</sup></b>		
Full-Time	2,178	<b>3.8</b>
Part-Time	773	<b>3.4</b>
Executive	273	<b>3.6</b>
<b>Gender<sup>3</sup></b>		
Male	2,310	3.7
Female	949	3.6
<b>Age<sup>4</sup></b>		
27 and younger	204	3.6
28 to 34	1,796	<b>3.7</b>
35 and older	1,258	<b>3.6</b>
1. F = 2.47; df = 6,3260; p ≤ .05      2. F = 37.06; df = 2,3221; p ≤ .05 3. F = 16.26 df = 1,3257; p ≤ .05      4. F = 6.68; df = 2,3255; p ≤ .05 Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA. † Scale: 5 = outstanding; 4 = excellent; 3 = good; 2 = fair; 1 = poor.		

## Cost and Financing of a Graduate Business Education

Respondents were asked to estimate the total cost of their graduate business education. On average, respondents indicated that the total cost of their graduate business education was \$63,843.

Cost of a Graduate Business Education	
Statistic	U.S. Dollars (n = 3,135)
Mean	\$63,843
25 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	\$35,000
Median	\$55,000
75 <sup>th</sup> Percentile	\$80,000

Graduates of full-time and executive programs reported significantly higher costs associated with their graduate business education compared with graduates of part-time programs.

Men reported significantly higher costs compared with the costs reported by women.

Respondents ages 27 and younger reported significantly lower costs compared with older respondents.

Respondents from Latin America and Europe reported significantly higher costs compared with respondents from the United States and Canada.

Asian American respondents reported significantly higher costs compared with whites.

<b>Cost of a Graduate Business Education, by Demographic Characteristics</b>			
<b>Characteristic</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Median</b>	<b>Mean</b>
<b><i>MBA Program Type<sup>1</sup></i></b>			
Full-Time	2,097	\$60,000	<b>\$71,391</b>
Part-Time	727	\$37,000	<b>\$41,191</b>
Executive	271	\$67,500	<b>\$70,206</b>
<b><i>Gender<sup>2</sup></i></b>			
Male	2,240	\$60,000	<b>\$65,703</b>
Female	887	\$50,000	<b>\$59,294</b>
<b><i>Age<sup>3</sup></i></b>			
27 and younger	185	\$32,000	<b>\$39,971</b>
28 to 34	1,725	\$60,000	<b>\$66,542</b>
35 and older	1,216	\$54,000	<b>\$63,765</b>
<b><i>Citizenship<sup>4</sup></i></b>			
Asia	308	\$55,000	\$65,671
United States	2,010	\$50,000	<b>\$61,191</b>
Canada	193	\$50,000	<b>\$59,003</b>
Latin America	144	\$67,500	<b>\$77,100</b>
Europe	371	\$60,000	<b>\$73,563</b>
<b><i>U.S. Subgroup<sup>5</sup></i></b>			
Asian American	147	\$70,000	<b>\$70,251</b>
African American	73	\$60,000	\$66,767
White	1,574	\$50,000	<b>\$59,207</b>
Hispanic	78	\$62,500	\$66,667
1. F = 148.16; df = 2,3092; p ≤ .05      2. F = 14.14; df = 1,3125; p ≤ .05 3. F = 32.47; df = 2,3123; p ≤ .05      4. F = 11.14; df = 4,3021; p ≤ .05 5. F = 4.96; df = 3,1868; p ≤ .05 Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.			

Respondents were asked to estimate the percentage of their graduate business education they financed with each source. The data was reported as the mean percentage of the costs financed with each source. Overall, the typical MBA graduate respondent financed their education with loans (31%), personal savings (17%), and employer reimbursement (17%), which accounts for 65% of the cost of a graduate business education. Additionally, 13% of the education was

financed with grants, fellowships, scholarships, or governmental benefits; 10% with the support from parents; 9% with personal earnings; and 2% with spouse's earnings.

<b>Financing of a Graduate Business Education</b>	
<b>Method of Financing</b>	<b>Mean Percentage (n = 3,135)</b>
Grants, fellowships, scholarships, or governmental benefits	13%
Loans	31%
Personal earnings	9%
Spouse's/partner's earnings	2%
Personal savings	17%
Employer reimbursement	17%
Support from parents	10%
Other	1%
Total	100%

Respondents from the class of 2000 financed a greater proportion of their education compared with respondents from the class of 2001, 2005, and 2006 using grants, fellowships, scholarships or governmental benefits. Additionally, respondents from the class of 2004 financed a greater proportion of their education compared with respondents from the class of 2006 using grants, fellowships, scholarships or governmental benefits.

Respondents from the class of 2005 reportedly financed a greater amount of their education compared with respondents from the class of 2001 using loans.

Respondents from the class of 2002 financed a greater amount of their education compared with respondents from the class of 2006 using personal savings.

Respondents from the class of 2006 reported that they financed nearly three times more of the education with employer reimbursements compared with the class of 2000. Additionally, the class of 2006 reportedly financed a greater proportion of the education with employer reimbursements compared with the class of 2002, 2003, 2004, and 2005. The class of 2001 was significantly more likely than the class of 2003 to have financed a greater proportion of their education with employer reimbursements.

<b>Financing of a Graduate Business Education, by Graduation Year</b>							
<b>Method of Financing</b>	<b>Mean Percentage</b>						
	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>	<b>2003</b>	<b>2004</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>
Grants, fellowships, scholarships, or governmental benefits <sup>1</sup>	<b>21%</b>	<b>13%</b>	14%	14%	<b>15%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>10%</b>
Loans <sup>2</sup>	31%	<b>26%</b>	30%	35%	31%	<b>34%</b>	30%
Personal earnings	8%	9%	10%	10%	8%	8%	11%
Spouse's/partner's earnings	2%	3%	3%	4%	2%	2%	2%
Personal savings <sup>3</sup>	19%	17%	<b>21%</b>	18%	17%	17%	<b>14%</b>
Employer reimbursement <sup>4</sup>	<b>8%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>23%</b>
Support from parents	10%	13%	11%	12%	11%	10%	9%

Financing of a Graduate Business Education, by Graduation Year							
Method of Financing	Mean Percentage						
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Other	0%	1%	0%	1%	1%	1%	1%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
1. F = 5.95; df = 6,3253; p ≤ .05      2. F = 2.42; df = 6,3253; p ≤ .05 3. F = 3.07; df = 6,3253; p ≤ .05      4. F = 13.50; df = 6,3253; p ≤ .05 Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.							

Graduates of full-time programs reportedly financed a greater proportion of their education compared with other respondents using grants, fellowships, scholarships, or governmental benefits; loans; spouse's earnings; personal savings; and support from their parents.

Graduates of part-time and executive program financed a greater proportion of their education compared with graduates of full-time programs using employer reimbursements.

Graduates of part-time programs financed a greater proportion of their education compared with other respondents using personal earnings. Additionally, graduates of executive programs financed a greater proportion of their education compared with graduates of full-time programs with personal earnings.

Financing of a Graduate Business Education, by MBA Program Type			
Method of Financing	Mean Percentage		
	Full-Time	Part-Time	Executive
Grants, fellowships, scholarships, or governmental benefits <sup>1</sup>	<b>18%</b>	2%	1%
Loans <sup>2</sup>	<b>36%</b>	21%	27%
Personal earnings <sup>3</sup>	<b>6%</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>12%</b>
Spouse's/partner's earnings <sup>4</sup>	<b>3%</b>	1%	1%
Personal savings <sup>5</sup>	<b>20%</b>	9%	13%
Employer reimbursement <sup>6</sup>	3%	<b>46%</b>	<b>42%</b>
Support from parents <sup>7</sup>	<b>14%</b>	3%	3%
Other	1%	0%	1%
Total	100%	100%	100%
1. F = 168.34; df = 2,3214; p ≤ .05      2. F = 47.55; df = 2,3214; p ≤ .05 3. F = 109.70; df = 2,3214; p ≤ .05      4. F = 16.94; df = 2,3214; p ≤ .05 5. F = 48.79; df = 2,3214; p ≤ .05      6. F = 896.35; df = 2,3214; p ≤ .05 7. F = 68.48; df = 2,3214; p ≤ .05 Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.			

Men reportedly financed a greater percentage of their education compared with women using personal savings and employer reimbursements. On the other hand, women financed a greater proportion of their education compared with men using grants, fellowships, scholarships, or government benefits and support from their parents.

Financing of a Graduate Business Education, by Gender		
Method of Financing	Mean Percentage	
	Male	Female
Grants, fellowships, scholarships, or governmental benefits <sup>1</sup>	<b>11%</b>	<b>16%</b>
Loans	31%	32%
Personal earnings	9%	10%
Spouse's/partner's earnings	2%	2%
Personal savings <sup>2</sup>	<b>18%</b>	<b>12%</b>
Employer reimbursement <sup>3</sup>	<b>18%</b>	<b>15%</b>
Support from parents <sup>4</sup>	<b>9%</b>	<b>13%</b>
Other	1%	0%
Total	100%	100%

1. F = 28.02; df = 1,3250; p ≤ .05      2. F = 37.95; df = 1,3250; p ≤ .05  
3. F = 5.02; df = 1,3250; p ≤ .05      4. F = 11.48; df = 1,3250; p ≤ .05  
Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.

Younger respondents financed a greater portion of their education than older respondents using grants, fellowships, scholarships, or government benefits and with the support from their parents. On the other hand, older respondents financed a greater percentage of their education compared with younger respondents using personal savings and employer reimbursements. Respondents ages 28 to 34 financed a greater percentage of their education compared with respondents ages 35 and older using loans. On the other hand, respondents ages 35 and older financed a greater percentage of their education compared with respondents ages 28 to 34 using personal earnings.

Financing of a Graduate Business Education, by Age			
Method of Financing	Mean Percentage		
	27 and Younger	28 to 34	35 and Older
Grants, fellowships, scholarships, or governmental benefits <sup>1</sup>	<b>23%</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>9%</b>
Loans <sup>2</sup>	29%	<b>35%</b>	<b>27%</b>
Personal earnings <sup>3</sup>	8%	<b>8%</b>	<b>11%</b>
Spouse's/partner's earnings <sup>4</sup>	<b>1%</b>	2%	<b>3%</b>
Personal savings <sup>5</sup>	<b>6%</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>20%</b>
Employer reimbursement <sup>6</sup>	<b>7%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>25%</b>
Support from parents <sup>7</sup>	<b>26%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>5%</b>
Other	1%	1%	1%
Total	100%	100%	100%

1. F = 37.98; df = 2,3248; p ≤ .05      2. F = 19.29; df = 2,3248; p ≤ .05  
3. F = 9.44; df = 2,3248; p ≤ .05      4. F = 3.76; df = 2,3248; p ≤ .05  
5. F = 30.08; df = 2,3248; p ≤ .05      6. F = 63.49; df = 2,3248; p ≤ .05  
7. F = 74.50; df = 2,3248; p ≤ .05  
Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.

Respondents from the United States reportedly financed a greater proportion of their education compared with all other respondents using loans. Additionally, Canadian respondents financed a greater percentage of their education compared with Asian and European respondents using loans. Asian and European respondents financed a greater percentage of their education

compared with respondents from Latin America and the United States using personal earnings. European respondents financed a greater percentage of their education compared with respondents from the United States using personal savings. Respondents from the United States financed a greater proportion of their education compared with respondents from Asia and Latin America using employer reimbursements. European, Latin American, and Asian respondents financed a greater percentage of their education compared with respondents from the United States using support from their parents. Additionally, respondents from Latin America financed a greater percentage of their education compared with respondents from Canada and Europe using the support from their parents.

<b>Financing of a Graduate Business Education, by Citizenship</b>					
<b>Method of Financing</b>	<b>Mean Percentage</b>				
	<b>Asia</b>	<b>United States</b>	<b>Canada</b>	<b>Latin America</b>	<b>Europe</b>
Grants, fellowships, scholarships, or governmental benefits	15%	13%	9%	11%	13%
Loans <sup>1</sup>	<b>14%</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>16%</b>
Personal earnings <sup>2</sup>	<b>11%</b>	<b>8%</b>	10%	<b>5%</b>	<b>12%</b>
Spouse's/partner's earnings	3%	2%	2%	1%	3%
Personal savings <sup>3</sup>	28%	11%	24%	29%	27%
Employer reimbursement <sup>4</sup>	<b>9%</b>	<b>20%</b>	13%	<b>9%</b>	16%
Support from parents <sup>5</sup>	<b>17%</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>13%</b>
Other	2%	1%	0%	0%	1%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

1. F = 58.58; df = 4,3141; p ≤ .05      2. F = 5.49; df = 4,3141; p ≤ .05  
3. F = 72.07; df = 4,3141; p ≤ .05      4. F = 11.36; df = 4,3141; p ≤ .05  
5. F = 20.63; df = 4,3141; p ≤ .05

Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.

African Americans and Hispanics reportedly financed a greater proportion of their education compared with Asian Americans and whites using grants, fellowships, scholarships, or governmental benefits. African Americans financed a greater percentage of their education compared with whites using loans. On the other hand, whites financed a greater percentage of their education compared with African Americans using personal earnings. Asian Americans financed a greater percentage of their education compared with other U.S. subgroups using personal savings.

<b>Financing of a Graduate Business Education, by U.S. Subgroup</b>				
<b>Method of Financing</b>	<b>Mean Percentage</b>			
	<b>Asian American</b>	<b>African American</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Hispanic</b>
Grants, fellowships, scholarships, or governmental benefits <sup>1</sup>	<b>13%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>23%</b>
Loans <sup>2</sup>	37%	<b>50%</b>	<b>38%</b>	38%
Personal earnings <sup>3</sup>	9%	<b>3%</b>	<b>9%</b>	4%

Financing of a Graduate Business Education, by U.S. Subgroup				
Method of Financing	Mean Percentage			
	Asian American	African American	White	Hispanic
Spouse's/partner's earnings	1%	1%	2%	2%
Personal savings <sup>4</sup>	<b>16%</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>5%</b>
Employer reimbursement	15%	12%	21%	20%
Support from parents	8%	2%	8%	6%
Other	1%	1%	1%	1%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
1. F = 13.92; df = 3,1937; p ≤ .05      2. F = 2.68; df = 3,1937; p ≤ .05 3. F = 4.13; df = 3,1937; p ≤ .05      4. F = 7.25; df = 3,1937; p ≤ .05 Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.				

## Return on Investment

Respondents were asked to indicate the percentage of their investment in the MBA degree they had recouped at the time of the survey using an eleven-point scale where 0 equals 0% and 11 equals 100%, and each point representing 10% increments. On average, respondents indicated they had recouped 60% of their investment in the MBA degree. Slightly more than a quarter (28%) reported that they recouped 100% of their investment.

Return on Investment	
ROI	Percentage (n = 3,259)
0%	7%
10%	5%
20%	8%
30%	8%
40%	5%
50%	16%
60%	4%
70%	6%
80%	8%
90%	4%
100%	28%
Total	100%
Mean	59.6
Median	60.0

There was a significant negative correlation between return on investment and the cost of graduate business education. This indicates that the higher the education cost the less return respondents had received by the time of the survey. Additionally, there were significant negative correlations with financing using loans. However, there were significant positive correlations with financing through grants, fellowships, scholarships, or governmental benefits; spouse's earnings; and employer reimbursements.

Correlation of Return on Investment and the Cost and Methods of Financing the Graduate Business Education	
Item	Pearson Correlation Coefficient (r)
Cost of graduate business education*	-.152
Grants, fellowships, scholarships, or governmental benefits*	.164
Loans*	-.329
Personal earnings	.034
Spouse's/partner's earnings*	.039
Personal savings	.019
Employer reimbursement*	.192
Support from parents	.007
Other	-.006
* $p \leq .05$	

Not surprisingly, the longer a respondent had been out of graduate business school, the greater the percentage of investment they had recouped. Men reportedly have recouped a greater percentage of their investment compared with the percentage recouped by women. Asian and European respondents reportedly have recouped a greater percentage of their investment compared with that recouped by respondents from the United States.

There was no statistical difference in the mean percentage of the investment in an education recouped by MBA program type, age, or U.S. subgroup.

Return on Investment, by Demographic Characteristics			
Characteristic	Number	Median	Mean
<b>Graduation Year<sup>1</sup></b>			
2000	153	100.0%	<b>77.6%</b>
2001	246	100.0%	<b>76.7%</b>
2002	245	80.0%	<b>70.7%</b>
2003	314	70.0%	<b>67.3%</b>
2004	566	70.0%	<b>63.4%</b>
2005	726	50.0%	<b>57.8%</b>
2006	1,009	50.0%	<b>46.8%</b>
<b>Gender<sup>2</sup></b>			
Male	2,306	60.0%	<b>60.7%</b>
Female	945	50.0%	<b>57.0%</b>
<b>Citizenship<sup>3</sup></b>			
Asia	319	70.0%	<b>67.4%</b>
United States	2,079	50.0%	<b>57.1%</b>
Canada	207	60.0%	61.2%
Latin America	147	60.0%	62.8%
Europe	393	70.0%	<b>64.4%</b>
1. $F = 55.26$ ; $df = 6,3252$ ; $p \leq .05$ 2. $F = 7.85$ ; $df = 1,3249$ ; $p \leq .05$ 3. $F = 9.59$ ; $df = 4,3140$ ; $p \leq .05$ Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.			

## Decision to Pursue a Graduate Business Degree

Respondents were asked, “Knowing what you know now, would you still have pursued a graduate business degree?” Overall, nearly three out of four (74%) respondents indicated that they would definitely have pursued a graduate business degree, and an additional 21% would probably still have pursued a graduate business degree. Only 4% reported that they probably would not, and only 1% definitely would not have pursued a graduate business degree knowing what they know now.

Decision to Pursue a Graduate Business Degree	
Response	Percentage (n = 3,259)
Definitely yes	74%
Probably yes	21%
Probably no	4%
Definitely no	1%
Total	100%

Respondents who were not working at the time of the survey were significantly less likely than employed respondents to have indicated that they definitely would still have pursued a graduate business degree.

Respondents employed in the nonprofit/government industry were less likely than all other employed respondents to have indicated that they definitely would still have pursued the graduate business degree. However, about two-thirds of the respondents in the nonprofit/government industry reported that they definitely still would have pursued the graduate business degree.

Statistically, there was no difference by job function in the percentage of respondents indicating that they definitely would have still pursued the degree.

Decision to Pursue a Graduate Business Degree, by Job Characteristics		
Characteristic	Number	Percentage Definitely Yes
<i>Current Employment Status</i> <sup>1</sup>		
Employed	2,971	75%
Self-employed	191	73%
Not employed	88	<b>58%</b>
<i>Industry</i> <sup>2</sup>		
Consulting	485	73%
Energy/utility	121	76%
Finance/accounting	671	77%
Healthcare	277	72%
Technology	447	75%
Manufacturing	274	78%

<b>Decision to Pursue a Graduate Business Degree, by Job Characteristics</b>		
<b>Characteristic</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage Definitely Yes</b>
Nonprofit/government	222	<b>65%</b>
Products/services	667	75%
1. $\chi^2 = 12.57$ ; $df = 2$ ; $p \leq .05$ 2. $\chi^2 = 14.91$ ; $df = 7$ ; $p \leq .05$ Items in bold in the contingency table significantly affect the overall $\chi^2$ statistic.		

Respondents who graduated from executive programs were significantly more likely than respondents from part-time programs to have indicated that they definitely would still have pursued the degree.

Men were slightly, yet significantly, more likely than women to have reported that they definitely would still have pursued the degree.

Respondents ages 27 and younger were significantly less likely than older respondents to have indicated that they definitely would still have pursued the degree.

Statistically, there was no difference in the percentage of respondents indicating that they definitely would have still pursued the degree by graduation year, citizenship, or U.S. subgroup.

<b>Decision to Pursue a Graduate Business Degree, by Demographic Characteristics</b>		
<b>Characteristic</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage Definitely Yes</b>
<b><i>MBA Program Type<sup>1</sup></i></b>		
Full-Time	2,175	74%
Part-Time	769	<b>70%</b>
Executive	272	<b>81%</b>
<b><i>Gender<sup>2</sup></i></b>		
Male	2,306	75%
Female	945	71%
<b><i>Age<sup>3</sup></i></b>		
27 and younger	204	<b>65%</b>
28 to 34	1,790	75%
35 and older	1,256	74%
1. $\chi^2 = 11.92$ ; $df = 2$ ; $p \leq .05$ 2. $\chi^2 = 4.72$ ; $df = 1$ ; $p \leq .05$ 3. $\chi^2 = 9.98$ ; $df = 2$ ; $p \leq .05$ Items in bold in the contingency table significantly affect the overall $\chi^2$ statistic.		

## School Recommendation Intention

Respondents were asked to indicate the likelihood that they would recommend their graduate business school to someone who has decided to pursue a graduate business degree. Overall, nearly two-thirds (65%) of the respondents would definitely recommend their school and 28% would probably recommend their school. Only 5% indicated that they probably or definitely would not recommend their school.

<b>School Recommendation Intention</b>	
<b>Response</b>	<b>Percentage (n = 3,259)</b>
Definitely yes	65%
Probably yes	28%
Uncertain	2%
Probably no	4%
Definitely no	1%
Total	100%

Graduates of executive programs were significantly more likely than other respondents to have indicated that they definitely would recommend their school. Statistically, there was no difference in the percentage of respondents who indicated they definitely would recommend their school by graduation year, gender, age, citizenship, or U.S. subgroup.

<b>School Recommendation Intention, by Demographic Characteristics</b>		
<b>Characteristic</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage Definitely Yes</b>
<b><i>MBA Program Type<sup>1</sup></i></b>		
Full-Time	2,175	64%
Part-Time	769	61%
Executive	272	79%
1. $\chi^2 = 29.56$ ; $df = 2$ ; $p \leq .05$ Items in bold in the contingency table significantly affect the overall $\chi^2$ statistic.		

## Methodology

This section presents the methodology behind the MBA Alumni Perspectives Survey. Sample selection and response, methods of data analysis, demographic characteristics of the respondents, and a list of participating schools are included.

## Background

In order to reach graduates from around the world and make participation convenient, the MBA Alumni Perspectives Surveys were conducted over the Internet. Background for the survey design was provided by (1) prior GMAC<sup>®</sup> research on graduates from MBA programs; (2) prior GMAC<sup>®</sup> experience in surveying this audience; and (3) ongoing input from alumni, schools, and corporate recruiters on their information needs.

## Survey Sample

The survey sample for this report includes the respondents who agreed to further follow-up in the Global MBA<sup>®</sup> Graduate Surveys administered among the MBA classes of 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, and 2006.

An e-mail was sent on April 11, 2007, to the 16,803 members of the sample. A reminder e-mail was sent on April 25 to the sample members who had not responded to the survey or had only partially completed the survey by that date. The questionnaire was available at the online survey site from April 11 to May 9, 2007. As an incentive to participate, GMAC<sup>®</sup> offered to place respondents in a drawing for one US\$500 and four US\$100 gift checks.

Of the 16,803 contacts initiated for the April 2007 MBA Alumni Perspectives Survey, 917 contacts were undeliverable (5%). Of the remaining contacts, 3,269 people responded—a 21% response rate.

<b>Response Rates</b>				
<b>Graduation Year</b>	<b>Sample</b>	<b>Adjusted Sample</b>	<b>Respondents</b>	<b>Adjusted Response Rate</b>
2000	855	813	153	19%
2001	1,872	1,783	246	14%
2002	1,559	1,484	246	17%
2003	1,987	1,883	315	17%
2004	3,073	2,915	566	19%
2005	3,566	3,370	728	22%
2006	3,891	3,638	1,015	28%
<b>Overall</b>	<b>16,803</b>	<b>15,886</b>	<b>3,269</b>	<b>21%</b>

## Sample Demographics

This section of the report presents the demographic characteristics of the survey respondents. The analysis of these characteristics acquaints the reader to the respondents of the April 2007 MBA Alumni Perspectives Survey.

The respondents to the April 2007 MBA Alumni Perspectives Survey represent about 10% of all the respondents to the Global MBA<sup>®</sup> Graduate Surveys. However, among the available sample from the Global MBA<sup>®</sup> Graduate Survey who indicated a willingness to participate, the April 2007 MBA Alumni Perspectives represents a 21% response rate.

Respondents in the class of 2000 through 2003 were slightly underrepresented, and respondents in the class of 2004 through 2006 were slightly overrepresented in the current survey when comparing to the population of Global MBA<sup>®</sup> Graduate Survey respondents.

<b>Graduation Year</b>		
<b>Graduation Year</b>	<b>Respondents (n = 3,269)</b>	<b>Global MBA<sup>®</sup> Graduate Survey (n = 31,959)</b>
2000	5%	8%
2001	8%	14%
2002	8%	15%
2003	10%	13%
2004	17%	12%
2005	22%	18%
2006	31%	19%
Total	100%	100%

Respondents from full-time programs were slightly underrepresented, and respondents from executive programs were slightly overrepresented. There was a statistically equal representation among respondents from part-time programs between the current survey and the population of Global MBA<sup>®</sup> Graduate Survey respondents.

<b>Program Type</b>		
<b>Program Type</b>	<b>Respondents (n = 3,226)</b>	<b>Global MBA<sup>®</sup> Graduate Survey (n = 31,629)</b>
Full-time	68%	71%
Part-time	24%	23%
Executive	9%	7%
Total	100%	100%

Men were slightly overrepresented and women were slightly underrepresented in the current survey when comparing to the population of Global MBA<sup>®</sup> Graduate Survey respondents.

<b>Gender</b>		
<b>Gender</b>	<b>Respondents (n = 3,261)</b>	<b>Global MBA® Graduate Survey (n = 31,959)</b>
Male	71%	67%
Female	29%	33%
Total	100%	100%

Asian respondents were slightly underrepresented in the current survey, and respondents from the United States and Europe were slightly overrepresented in the current survey. There was a statistically equal representation among Latin American and Canadian respondents between the current survey and the population of Global MBA® Graduate Survey respondents.

<b>Citizenship</b>		
<b>World Region</b>	<b>Respondents (n = 3,155)</b>	<b>Global MBA® Graduate Survey (n = 30,771)</b>
Asia	10%	18%
United States	66%	61%
Canada	7%	6%
Latin America	5%	5%
Europe	13%	10%
Total	100%	100%

Among respondents from the United States, there was a statistically equal representation among U.S. subgroups between the current survey and the population of Global MBA® Graduate Survey respondents.

<b>U.S. Subgroup</b>		
<b>U.S. Subgroup</b>	<b>Respondents (n = 1,947)</b>	<b>Global MBA® Graduate Survey (n = 17,489)</b>
Asian American	8%	9%
African American	4%	4%
White	84%	83%
Hispanic	4%	4%
Total	100%	100%

## Online Questionnaire Administration

Administering the questionnaire online offered several advantages over a paper-and-pencil format. First, because responses were entered in a database that was available for analysis at all times, survey progress could be monitored, and the time and cost associated with data entry, eliminated. Second, the site was programmed to check for the accurate completion of each question before the respondent could proceed to the next question, which eliminated the typical problems associated with item non-response. Third, skip patterns allowed respondents to move quickly and appropriately through the questionnaire. Respondents never saw questions that did not pertain to them, such as race/ethnicity questions for non-U.S. citizens.

## Data Analysis

Frequency distributions were initially examined both for topical questions and for classification questions. Based on this examination, response categories for some questions were collapsed in order to make the final analysis more robust. In this preliminary analysis, variations to all topical questions were cross-tabulated with each classification question. This made it possible to determine which classification questions offered the most promise in the interpretation of survey responses. Percentages in charts and tables might not always add exactly to 100% because of rounding.

Statistical tests were performed on the sample of respondents to determine differences between various characteristics. A chi-squared test was used to evaluate whether two variables in a contingency table were independent. For the purpose of this report, if the  $X^2$  value had a  $p \leq .05$ , then the null hypothesis, which states the two variables were independent, was rejected. Rejecting the null hypothesis indicated that there was a relationship between the variables and that one variable contributed to the differences in proportions of another variable—one variable was dependent upon the other. To further understand the relationship when rejecting the null hypothesis, standardized residuals were used to determine which cells in the contingency table were specifically significant in the chi-square test. Values in the contingency table appear in bold if the standardized residual was  $\pm 1.8$ .

An analysis of variance (ANOVA) test was used to evaluate the difference between two or more means. If the F-statistic in the ANOVA had a  $p \leq .05$ , then the null hypothesis, which states the population means were equal, was rejected. Rejecting the null hypothesis indicated that the data show there were differences in the mean value between groups. The Bonferroni post-hoc correction was used to raise the threshold to reject the null hypothesis when making multiple group comparisons. Items in the ANOVA tables that appear in bold indicate that even with the Bonferroni correction the difference in means was still statistically significant.

### Category Definition

Survey respondents identified their employing industry from the list shown in the following table.

<b>Industry and Industry Groups</b>			
<b>Consulting</b>		<b>High technology (continued)</b>	
	Consulting services		Internet and/or e-commerce
	Human resource services		Professional, scientific, and technical services
	Health care consulting		Science and research
	Information technology consulting		Telecommunications
	Management consulting		Other technology
	Other consulting	<b>Manufacturing</b>	
<b>Energy/utilities</b>			Aerospace and defense
	Energy and utilities		Automotive
	Mining		Other manufacturing
	Utilities	<b>Nonprofit or government</b>	
	Other energy and utilities		Education or educational services
<b>Finance</b>			Government, nonmilitary
	Accounting	<b>Products and services</b>	
	Banking		Advertising
	Finance and insurance		Architecture
	Insurance		Arts and entertainment
	Investment banking or management		Aviation and airlines
	Venture capital		Construction and installation
	Other finance		Consumer goods
<b>Healthcare</b>			Customer services
	Biotechnology		Engineering
	Healthcare		Food, beverage, and tobacco
	Health insurance		Hotel, gaming, leisure, and travel
	Health managed care (provider)		Marketing services
	Pharmaceutical		Real estate and rental, leasing
	Other healthcare or pharmaceutical		Restaurant and food services
<b>High technology</b>			Retail, wholesale
	Engineering		Other products and services
	Information technology or services	<b>Other industry</b>	

Survey respondents identified their job function from the list shown in the following table.

<b>Job Function</b>	
<b><i>Marketing/Sales</i></b>	<b><i>Finance/Accounting</i></b>
Public relations	Accounting/auditing
Product management	Banking
Market research	Corporate finance
Advertising	Investments
Sales	M&A (Mergers and Acquisitions)
Sales management	Treasury and financial analysis
Communications	Public finance
Other marketing/sales	Real estate
<b><i>Operations/Logistics</i></b>	Other finance/accounting
Logistics	<b><i>Human Resources</i></b>
Purchasing	Industrial/labor relations
Engineering	Staffing and training
Production/manufacturing	Compensation and benefits
Operations	Change management
Product development	Other human resources
Other operations/logistics	<b><i>Information Technology/MIS</i></b>
<b><i>Consulting</i></b>	Systems analysis
Strategy	Systems consulting
Change management	Telecommunications
Product management	Electronic commerce
Business development	Other information technology/MIS
Other consulting	<b>Other job function</b>
<b><i>General Management</i></b>	
General management	
Entrepreneurial	
Other general management	

## Contact Information

For questions or comments regarding study findings, methodology or data, please contact the GMAC<sup>®</sup> Research and Development department at [research@gmac.com](mailto:research@gmac.com).

## Authorship

The following individual(s) made significant contributions to the concept and design or analysis and interpretation of data, drafting/revising of the manuscript for intellectual content, and final approval of the manuscript to be published:

Gregg Schoenfeld, Manager, Applied Research, Graduate Management Admission Council<sup>®</sup>.

## Acknowledgements

Lawrence Rudner, Vice President, Research and Development, GMAC<sup>®</sup>, manuscript review; Rachel Edgington, Director, Market Research and Analysis, GMAC<sup>®</sup>, survey questionnaire development and editing of the manuscript for intellectual content and final approval of the manuscript; Sabeen Sheikh, Research Coordinator, Graduate Management Admission Council<sup>®</sup>, report production; Veronica Sinz, Research Writer/Editor, GMAC<sup>®</sup>, writing and editorial services.

GMAC<sup>®</sup> would like to thank the 3,269 graduate business alumni who completed the questionnaire. Without you, this report would not have been possible.

© 2007 Graduate Management Admission Council® (GMAC®). All rights reserved.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, distributed or transmitted in any form by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior written permission of GMAC®. For permission contact the GMAC® legal department at [legal@gmac.com](mailto:legal@gmac.com).

Creating Access to Graduate Business Education®, Global MBA®, GMAC®, GMAT®, Graduate Management Admission Council®, and Graduate Management Admission Test® are registered trademarks of the Graduate Management Admission Council® in the United States and other countries.