Graduate Management Admission Council®

Creating Access to Graduate Business Education®

MBA Alumni Perspectives Survey

April 2006

Comprehensive Data Report

Table Of Contents

I. Overview

The Graduate Management Admission Council® (GMAC®), the global association of leading graduate business schools and provider of the Graduate Management Admission Test® (GMAT®), has tabulated the results of the April 2006 MBA Alumni Perspectives Survey. This report summarizes the results.

The MBA Alumni Perspectives Surveys are biannual follow-up studies of past participants of the Global MBA® Graduate Surveys. Each year a majority of the 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 is organized in terms of key topic areas addressed in the survey, as follows:

- Chapter II examines the current employment status of the MBA alumni. Additionally, this section describes the industry type, location of employment, the scope and size of the organization, and the length of time the respondent has been employed with the organization.
- Chapter III explores the current jobs of MBA alumni, including job function, job level, work hours, skill use, and promotions. This section also examines the respondent's job responsibility, autonomy, motivation, and the amount of feedback provided by their boss or supervisor. Salary and additional compensation are reported in this section as well.
- Chapter IV examines various aspects of job satisfaction among MBA alumni. The relative importance of one's career is explored, in addition to satisfaction with aspects of one's employer, job, and career development opportunities.
- Chapter V explores a retrospective look at the MBA degree program. MBA alumni are 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. Additionally, respondents are asked to rate their career services office if they used them after graduation.
- 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 class (year-to-year), program type, gender, citizenship of respondents, and U.S. subgroup.

Survey Sample

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

An e-mail was sent on April 19, 2006, to the 14,139 members of the sample. A reminder e-mail was sent on May 3 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 19 to May 17. As an incentive to participate, GMAC® offered to place respondents in a drawing for one US$500 and four US$100 gift checks.

Of the 14,139 contacts initiated for the April 2006 MBA Alumni Perspectives Survey, 778 contacts were undeliverable (5.5%). Of the remaining contacts, 2,828 people responded—a 21% response rate.

Response Rates				
Graduation Year	**Sample**	**Adjusted Sample**	**Respondents**	**Adjusted Response Rate**
2000	936	892	187	21.0%
2001	2,055	1,944	267	13.7%
2002	1,692	1,611	249	15.5%
2003	2,165	2,053	366	17.8%
2004	3,398	3,201	721	22.5%
2005	3,893	3,660	1,038	28.4%
Overall	**14,139**	**13,361**	**2,828**	**21.2%**

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 for additional details.)

Key Findings

Key findings of the survey include the following:

- The vast majority of MBA alumni are currently employed and working inside their country of citizenship—91% are employed by an organization and 6% are self-employed. (Chapter II)
- Graduates of executive programs (72%) are more likely than graduates of full-time (60%) and part-time (63%) programs to have worked for only one organization since completing the MBA degree. (Chapter II)
- About 80% of graduates of part-time and executive programs have been employed with their current organization for more than one year. (Chapter II)
- Nearly three-quarters (74%) of MBA alumni are employed as managers. (Chapter III)
- The median number of hours worked per week by MBA alumni is 50. On average, they earn $87,170 in base salary and their total compensation package equals $113,959. (Chapter III)

- Since completing the MBA degree, 45% of respondents have received a promotion. About two-thirds of graduates from the class of 2000 (68%), 2001 (64%), and 2002 (60%) have received a promotion. (Chapter III)
- The top five skills respondents use on the job include interpersonal skills, the ability to think analytically, the ability to integrate information from a wide variety of sources, oral communication skills, and the ability to adapt or change to new situations. (Chapter III)
- Nine out of ten (90%) employed respondents have access to career development support from their employers. (Chapter III)
- Three-fifths (60%) of employed respondents are extremely or very satisfied with the organization with which they are employed, and 64% are extremely or very satisfied with their job function. (Chapter IV)
- More than half (58%) report that the value of the MBA is outstanding or excellent and 94% state that they made the right decision in pursuing the MBA degree. (Chapter IV)

II. Employment Status

This chapter of the report explores the current employment status of the MBA alumni. Respondents are categorized and analysis is conducted by whether the respondent is currently employed by an organization, self-employed, or not employed. Additionally, this chapter describes various characteristics of the organizations in which MBA alumni are employed, such as industry type, location of employment, the scope and size of the organization, and the length of time the respondent has been employed with the organization.

Current Employment Status

Respondents are asked to indicate their current employment status by choosing between four response categories. The four categories are: Yes, I am employed; Yes, I am self-employed; Yes, I am involved in an internship/unpaid work project; or No, I am currently not working. The vast majority of respondents (91%) are employed by an organization, and 6% are self-employed. Three percent of respondents are currently not working. Due to a small sample size, respondents involved in an internship/unpaid work project ($N = 6$; 0.2%) are excluded from further analysis.

Current Employment Status	
Status	**Percentage (*n* = 2,828)**
Employed	91%
Self-employed	6%
Internship/unpaid work project	<1%
Not working	3%
Total	100%

The graduating class of 2000 is statistically the most likely of the respondents to be self-employed in 2006. However, the class of 2000 is also significantly the most likely to not be currently working. A more detailed analysis of respondents who are not currently working is presented later in this chapter.

Current Employment Status, by Graduation Year*						
Status	**2000 (*n* = 185)**	**2001 (*n* = 267)**	**2002 (*n* = 249)**	**2003 (*n* = 365)**	**2004 (*n* = 720)**	**2005 (*n* = 1,036)**
Employed	84%	88%	92%	93%	92%	91%
Self-employed	**9%**	8%	6%	4%	5%	6%
Not working	**7%**	4%	2%	3%	3%	3%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.						

Respondents who graduated from an executive MBA program (11%) are about twice as likely as respondents who graduated from a full-time MBA program (6%) and nearly three times as likely as respondents who graduated from a part-time MBA program (4%) to be self-employed. Statistically, respondents from part-time MBA programs are the least likely to be unemployed at the time of the survey.

Current Employment Status, by Program Type*			
Status	**Full-time (*n* = 2,043)**	**Part-time (*n* = 533)**	**Executive (*n* = 214)**
Employed	91%	94%	87%
Self-employed	6%	4%	**11%**
Not working	4%	**2%**	2%
Total	100%	100%	100%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.			

Women (6%) are three times as likely as men (2%) to be currently unemployed.

Current Employment Status, by Gender*		
Status	**Male (*n* = 2,016)**	**Female (*n* = 798)**
Employed	92%	90%
Self-employed	6%	5%
Not working	**2%**	**6%**
Total	100%	100%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.		

There are no statistically significant differences in the current employment status of respondents by citizenship or U.S. subgroup.

Employed Respondents

The following section explores the current employment situations of respondents who work for an organization. This section represents the 91% of respondents who are currently working but are not self-employed.

Industry of Employment

Respondents are asked to indicate the type of industry in which they are currently employed. The following table provides a detailed account of the industries in which respondents are working. About one in ten (11%) of the respondents work in consulting services—the most common industry among the MBA graduate respondents. Banking (6%), finance/insurance (6%), consumer goods (5%), and other manufacturing (5%), in addition to consulting services, form the top five industries in which MBA graduate respondents are employed. These five industries employ a third (33%) of all the employed MBA graduate respondents.

The detailed industry table is collapsed into eight industry groups. (Refer to the category definitions in the methodology to see how individual industries are collapsed.) Once the industries are grouped, the products/services industry (21%) represents the most popular industry among the MBA graduate respondents. One in five (20%) MBA graduate respondents are employed in the finance/accounting industry. About one in 12 work in each of the consulting (13%) and technology (13%) industries. Additionally, 10% work in the healthcare/ pharmaceutical industry, 9% in manufacturing, 6% in nonprofit/government, and 4% in the energy/utility industry.

Detailed Industry List	
Industry	**Percentage (*n* = 2,570)**
Consulting Services	11%
Banking	6%
Finance and Insurance	6%
Consumer Goods	5%
Other Manufacturing	5%
Healthcare	4%
Information Technology or Services	4%
Investment Banking or Management	4%
Telecommunications	4%
Education or Educational Services	3%
Energy and Utilities	3%
Government (Non-military)	3%
Pharmaceutical	3%
Retail/Wholesale	3%
Aerospace and Defense	2%
Automotive	2%
Engineering (High Technology)	2%
Engineering (Products and Services)	2%
Food, Beverage, and Tobacco	2%
Insurance	2%
Marketing Services	2%
Real Estate and Rental and/or Leasing	2%
Other High Technology	2%
Accounting	1%
Advertising	1%
Arts and Entertainment	1%
Aviation and Airlines	1%
Biotechnology	1%
Construction and Installation	1%
Health Insurance	1%

Detailed Industry List	
Industry	**Percentage (*n* = 2,570)**
Hotel, Gaming, Leisure, and Travel	1%
Information Technology Consulting	1%
Internet and/or E-commerce	1%
Management Consulting	1%
Mining	1%
Nonprofit or Not-for-profit	1%
Science and Research (High Technology)	1%
Other Finance	1%
Other Healthcare or Pharmaceutical	1%
Other Products and Services	1%
Architecture	<1%
Customer Services	<1%
Healthcare Consulting	<1%
Health Managed Care (Provider)	<1%
Human Resource Services	<1%
Military	<1%
Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services	<1%
Restaurant and Food Services	<1%
Science and Research (Healthcare/Pharmaceutical)	<1%
Sports and Recreation	<1%
Utilities	<1%
Venture Capital	<1%
Other Consulting	<1%
Other Energy and Utilities	<1%
Other Industry	2%
Total	100%

Industry Group	
Industry Group	**Percentage (*n* = 2,570)**
Products/Services	21%
Finance/Accounting	20%
Consulting	13%
Technology	13%
Healthcare/Pharmaceuticals	10%
Manufacturing	9%
Nonprofit/Government	6%
Energy/Utilities	4%
Other	2%
Total	100%

There are few differences by graduation year in the type of industry in which MBA graduate respondents are currently working. The graduating class of 2002 is statistically the least likely of the graduation classes to be working in the finance/accounting industry. The class of 2003 is statistically the least likely to be working in the technology industry. The class of 2000 is the most likely, statistically, to be working in the manufacturing industry—nearly twice as likely compared with the class of 2005.

Industry Group, by Graduation Year*						
Industry Group	**2000 (*n* = 155)**	**2001 (*n* = 236)**	**2002 (*n* = 230)**	**2003 (*n* = 339)**	**2004 (*n* = 664)**	**2005 (*n* = 946)**
Products/services	15%	16%	26%	23%	22%	20%
Finance/accounting	23%	19%	**13%**	18%	21%	22%
Consulting	16%	13%	11%	15%	13%	14%
Technology	14%	14%	10%	**8%**	15%	15%
Healthcare/pharmaceuticals	9%	11%	13%	12%	10%	9%
Manufacturing	**15%**	10%	13%	9%	9%	8%
Nonprofit/government	5%	9%	7%	9%	6%	5%
Energy/utilities	3%	4%	6%	3%	4%	4%
Other	1%	4%	2%	4%	1%	3%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.						

Respondents who graduated from an executive MBA program are statistically the least likely to be working in the product/services industry, but they are the most likely to be working in the healthcare/pharmaceutical and energy/utilities industries.

Respondents who graduated from full-time MBA programs (15%) are statistically more likely than respondents who graduated from part-time MBA programs (9%) to be working in the consulting industry. However, respondents who graduated from part-time MBA programs are statistically more likely than all other respondents to be working in the nonprofit/government industry.

Industry Group, by Program Type*			
Industry Group	**Full-time (*n* = 1,852)**	**Part-time (*n* = 502)**	**Executive (*n* = 187)**
Products/services	22%	18%	**14%**
Finance/accounting	21%	21%	19%
Consulting	**15%**	**9%**	9%
Technology	12%	15%	18%
Healthcare/pharmaceuticals	9%	10%	**14%**
Manufacturing	9%	12%	11%
Nonprofit/government	6%	**9%**	4%
Energy/utilities	4%	3%	**9%**
Other	3%	2%	2%
Total	100%	100%	100%
*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.			

Among the MBA graduate respondents, women are significantly more likely than men to be working in the healthcare/pharmaceutical and nonprofit/government industries. Women are significantly less likely than men to be working in the consulting, technology, and energy/utility industries.

Industry Group, by Gender*		
Industry Group	**Male (*n* = 1.845)**	**Female (*n* = 718)**
Products/services	20%	24%
Finance/accounting	21%	19%
Consulting	15%	**10%**
Technology	14%	**11%**
Healthcare/pharmaceuticals	9%	**13%**
Manufacturing	10%	8%
Nonprofit/government	5%	**10%**
Energy/utilities	5%	**2%**
Other	2%	**4%**
Total	100%	100%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.		

There are very few differences by citizenship in the type of industry in which MBA graduate respondents are currently working. Respondents from Canada are significantly less likely than respondents from all other world regions to be working in the manufacturing industry. Respondents from Europe are significantly less likely than respondents from all other world regions to be working in the nonprofit/government industry.

Industry Group, by Citizenship*					
Industry Group	**Asia (*n* = 266)**	**United States (*n* = 1,554)**	**Canada (*n* = 185)**	**Latin America (*n* = 130)**	**Europe (*n* = 331)**
Products/services	**15%**	22%	21%	25%	19%
Finance/accounting	25%	19%	21%	19%	23%
Consulting	13%	12%	18%	14%	17%
Technology	13%	13%	11%	11%	15%
Healthcare/pharmaceuticals	9%	11%	9%	7%	7%
Manufacturing	12%	10%	**5%**	12%	9%
Nonprofit/government	6%	7%	8%	5%	**3%**
Energy/utilities	3%	4%	5%	6%	4%
Other	4%	2%	3%	2%	3%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.					

Among respondents from the United States, Hispanics are significantly less likely than other U.S. respondents to be working in the consulting industry. All other respondents are about four times more likely than Hispanics to be working in that field. In contrast, Hispanics are between two and three times more likely than all other respondents to be working in the technology industry.

Industry Group, by U.S. Subgroup*				
Industry Group	**Asian American (*n* = 110)**	**African American (*n* = 43)**	**White (*n* = 1,229)**	**Hispanic (*n* = 60)**
Products/services	22%	16%	23%	15%
Finance/accounting	19%	16%	19%	18%
Consulting	12%	16%	12%	**3%**
Technology	16%	9%	12%	**27%**
Healthcare/pharmaceuticals	14%	16%	11%	12%
Manufacturing	6%	12%	10%	10%
Nonprofit/government	6%	7%	8%	3%
Energy/utilities	6%	5%	4%	3%
Other	0%	2%	2%	8%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.				

Location of Employment

Respondents are asked to indicate whether they are working inside or outside their country of citizenship. Overall, one in five (20%) respondents is working outside their country of citizenship. To provide some context, among the respondents, 63% are U.S. citizens, 14% are from Europe, 11% are from Asia, 7% are Canadian, and 5% are from Latin America. During the 2004-05 GMAT® testing year, 57% of test takers were from the United States, 24% were from Asia, 10% were from Europe, and 3% each were from Canada and Latin America.

Location of Current Job	
Location	**Percentage (*n* = 2,570)**
Inside country of citizenship	80%
Outside country of citizenship	20%
Total	100%

Citizenship of Respondents	
World Region	**Percentage (*n* = 2,711)**
Asia	11%
United States	63%
Canada	7%
Latin America	5%
Europe	14%
Total	100%

Respondents who graduated from full-time MBA programs (23%) are more than twice as likely as respondents who graduated from part-time MBA programs (11%) to be working outside their country of citizenship.

Location of Current Job, by Program Type*			
Location	**Full-time (*n* = 1,852)**	**Part-time (*n* = 502)**	**Executive (*n* = 187)**
Inside country of citizenship	77%	**89%**	86%
Outside country of citizenship	**23%**	**11%**	14%
Total	100%	100%	100%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.			

Women (16%) are significantly less likely than men (21%) to be working outside their country of citizenship.

Location of Current Job, by Gender*		
Location	**Male (*n* = 1,845)**	**Female (*n* = 718)**
Inside country of citizenship	79%	84%
Outside country of citizenship	21%	**16%**
Total	100%	100%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.		

United States respondents (4%) are more than 11 times less likely than respondents from Asia (54%), Latin America (55%), and Europe (45%) to be working outside their country of citizenship.

Location of Current Job, by Citizenship*					
Location	**Asia (*n* = 266)**	**United States (*n* = 1,554)**	**Canada (*n* = 185)**	**Latin America (*n* = 130)**	**Europe (*n* = 331)**
Inside country of citizenship	**46%**	**96%**	80%	**45%**	**55%**
Outside country of citizenship	**54%**	**4%**	20%	**55%**	**45%**
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.					

There are no statistically significant differences in the percentage of respondents working outside their country of citizenship by graduation year or U.S. subgroup.

Scope of Organization

Respondents are asked to indicate whether the organization for which they work primarily has a local, regional, national, or multinational focus. A majority (61%) of MBA graduate respondents work for a company with multinational focus. Nearly a quarter (23%) work for a company with a

national focus. One in 10 (10%) work for a company with a regional focus, and 6% work for a company with a local focus.

Scope of Organization	
Scope	**Percentage (*n* = 2,570)**
Local	6%
Regional	10%
National	23%
Multinational	61%
Total	100%

Nearly three-quarters (73%) of respondents who graduated in 2000 work for a multinational company, which is a statistically higher percentage compared with respondents from other graduation years. Graduates in 2000 are also statistically the least likely to be working for an organization with a regional focus. Respondents who graduated in 2001 are statistically the most likely of respondents to work for an organization with a local focus.

Scope of Organization, by Graduation Year*						
Scope	**2000 (*n* = 155)**	**2001 (*n* = 236)**	**2002 (*n* = 230)**	**2003 (*n* = 339)**	**2004 (*n* = 664)**	**2005 (*n* = 946)**
Local	3%	**10%**	5%	4%	6%	6%
Regional	**5%**	9%	11%	12%	9%	11%
National	19%	26%	26%	26%	24%	20%
Multinational	**73%**	56%	58%	58%	61%	63%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.						

Half (50%) of the respondents who graduated from part-time MBA programs work for organizations with a multinational focus, which is significantly fewer than the percentage who graduated from full-time (64%) and executive programs (65%). Respondents from part-time programs are more likely than other respondents to work for an organization with a national or regional focus. Respondents from full-time programs (5%) are the least likely of the respondents to work for an organization with a local focus.

Scope of Organization, by Program Type*			
Scope	**Full-time (*n* = 1,852)**	**Part-time (*n* = 502)**	**Executive (*n* = 187)**
Local	**5%**	10%	7%
Regional	9%	**14%**	10%
National	22%	**27%**	19%
Multinational	64%	**50%**	65%
Total	100%	100%	100%
*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.			

Respondents from Latin America (75%) and Europe (73%) are significantly more likely than all other respondents to work for an organization with a multinational focus, and they are the least likely to work for an organization with a regional focus. European respondents are the least likely of all respondents to work for an organization with a local focus.

Scope of Organization, by Citizenship*					
Scope	**Asia (*n* = 266)**	**United States (*n* = 1,554)**	**Canada (*n* = 185)**	**Latin America (*n* = 130)**	**Europe (*n* = 331)**
Local	6%	7%	5%	5%	**3%**
Regional	11%	11%	11%	**5%**	**5%**
National	18%	24%	27%	15%	19%
Multinational	65%	58%	57%	**75%**	**73%**
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.					

There are no statistically significant differences by gender or U.S. subgroup in the organizational scope of the respondents' employers.

Size of Organization

Respondents are asked to indicate the number of employees their organization employs. About a third (34%) of the respondents state that their organization employs 25,000 or more. One in five (20%) work in organizations with 5,000 to 24,999 employees. Additionally, 15% work for organizations with 1,000 to 4,999 employees, 16% work for organizations with 100 to 999 employees, and 15% work in organizations with fewer than 100 employees. According to Census Bureau data, 98% of all firms in the United States have fewer than 100 employees, 1.5% have between 100 and 499 employees, and 0.3% have more than 499 employees.[1] Based on this data, MBA graduates are disproportionately employed with larger organizations.

Size of Organization	
Size	**Percentage (*n* = 2,570)**
Fewer than 100	15%
100 to 999	16%
1,000 to 4,999	15%
5,000 to 24,999	20%
25,000 or more	34%
Total	100%
Median	5,000-24,999

There are no statistically significant differences by any of the demographic characteristics in the size of the organization for which respondents work.

[1] SOURCE: 2003 County Business Patterns. http://www.census.gov/epcd/susb/introusb.htm.

Length of Time with Current Organization

Respondents are asked to indicate the length of time they have been employed with their current organization. The median length of time among all employed respondents is one year, but less than two years. One in eight (12%) employed respondents have been with their organization for less than six months. More than half (56%) have been with their organization less than two years. About one in seven (14%) have been employed with their organization for six years or more.

Length of Time with Current Organization	
Length of Time	**Percentage (*n* = 2,570)**
Less than six months	12%
Six months, but less than one year	23%
One year, but less than two years	22%
Two years, but less than three years	13%
Three years, but less than four years	7%
Four years, but less than six years	9%
Six years, but less than eight years	5%
Eight years, but less than ten years	3%
Ten years or longer	6%
Total	100%
Median	One year, but less than two years

Not surprisingly, respondents who graduated in 2005 are three times more likely than all other respondents to have been at their organizations for less than one year. Respondents who graduated in 2004 are more likely than other graduating classes, except for the class of 2002, to have worked for their organization for one year but less than two years. Respondents in the classes of 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003 are more likely than respondents in the classes of 2004 and 2005 to be employed by their organizations for two years but less than six years. The class of 2003 is the least likely of the respondents to be employed with their organization for six years or longer. Interestingly, there are no differences in the percentage of respondents employed for six or more years between the classes of 2000 to 2002 and the classes of 2004 and 2005.

Length of Time with Current Organization, by Graduation Year*						
Length of Time	**2000 (*n* = 155)**	**2001 (*n* = 236)**	**2002 (*n* = 230)**	**2003 (*n* = 339)**	**2004 (*n* = 664)**	**2005 (*n* = 946)**
Less than one year	**20%**	**18%**	**18%**	**21%**	**22%**	**60%**
One year, but less than two years	**16%**	**16%**	17%	**16%**	**44%**	**13%**
Two years, but less than six year	**47%**	**51%**	**51%**	**53%**	**20%**	**13%**
Six years or longer	17%	15%	14%	**9%**	13%	14%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.

Respondents of full-time MBA programs are about twice as likely as respondents from part-time and executive programs to be employed for less than one year with their current organization. Additionally, respondents from full-time programs (26%) are more likely than respondents from part-time (16%) and executive (11%) programs to be employed with their organization for one

year but less than two years. Respondents from executive programs are more likely than respondents from other programs to be employed with their organization for two years but less than six years. Respondents from part-time (33%) and executive (47%) programs are more likely than respondents from full-time programs (5%) to be employed with their organization for six years or longer.

Length of Time with Current Organization, by Program Type*			
Length of Time	**Full-time (*n* = 1,852)**	**Part-time (*n* = 502)**	**Executive (*n* = 187)**
Less than one year	**40%**	**23%**	**21%**
One year, but less than two years	**26%**	**16%**	**11%**
Two years, but less than six year	30%	28%	**21%**
Six years or longer	**5%**	**33%**	**47%**
Total	100%	100%	100%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.			

Canadian respondents (45%) are more likely than all other respondents to be employed for less than one year with their current organization. Asian respondents (29%) are more likely than all other respondents to be employed for one year but less than two years with their current organization.

Length of Time with Current Organization, by Citizenship*					
Length of Time	**Asia (*n* = 266)**	**United States (*n* = 1,554)**	**Canada (*n* = 185)**	**Latin America (*n* = 130)**	**Europe (*n* = 331)**
Less than one year	30%	34%	**45%**	35%	40%
One year, but less than two years	**29%**	22%	20%	21%	19%
Two years, but less than six year	30%	29%	23%	33%	29%
Six years or longer	12%	15%	12%	11%	12%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.					

There are no statistically significant differences in the length of time respondents have been employed with their current organization by gender or U.S. subgroup.

Self-Employed Respondents

The following section explores the current employment situation of respondents who are self-employed. This section provides an in-depth analysis of the 162 respondents who are currently self-employed. This group represents 6% of all respondents.

Industry of Employment

Respondents are asked to indicate the type of industry in which they are self-employed. Nearly one-fifth (19%) of self-employed respondents are working in the consulting services industry—the most common industry of the self-employed respondents. Rounding out the top five industries among self-employed respondents are real estate and rental and/or leasing (7%), marketing services (6%), information technology or services (5%), and retail/wholesale (5%).

The detailed industry table is collapsed into eight industry groups. The top two industry groups represent more than half (59%) of all self-employed respondents. These industry groups are products/services (32%) and consulting (27%). About one in ten self-employed respondents work in the technology (11%) and finance/accounting (10%) industries. Additionally, 5% of self-employed respondents work in the healthcare/pharmaceutical industry, 4% work in the manufacturing industry, and 3% work in the nonprofit/government industry.

Detailed Industry List	
Industry	**Percentage (*n* = 162)**
Consulting Services	19%
Real Estate and Rental and/or Leasing	7%
Marketing Services	6%
Information Technology or Services	5%
Retail/Wholesale	5%
Construction and Installation	3%
Education or Educational Services	3%
Finance and Insurance	3%
Food, Beverage, and Tobacco	3%
Healthcare	3%
Healthcare Consulting	3%
Internet and/or E-commerce	3%
Investment Banking or Management	3%
Arts and Entertainment	2%
Automotive	2%
Customer Services	2%
Energy and Utilities	2%
Management Consulting	2%
Restaurant and Food Services	2%
Other Consulting	2%

Detailed Industry List	
Industry	**Percentage (*n* = 162)**
Accounting	1%
Aviation and Airlines	1%
Consumer Goods	1%
Engineering (High Technology)	1%
Engineering (Products and Services)	1%
Human Resource Services	1%
Information Technology Consulting	1%
Insurance	1%
Pharmaceutical	1%
Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services	1%
Telecommunications	1%
Venture Capital	1%
Other Healthcare or Pharmaceutical	1%
Other Manufacturing	1%
Other Products and Services	1%
Other Industry	7%
Total	100%

Industry Group	
Industry Group	**Percentage (*n* = 162)**
Products/Services	32%
Consulting	27%
Technology	11%
Finance/Accounting	10%
Healthcare/Pharmaceuticals	5%
Manufacturing	4%
Nonprofit/Government	3%
Energy/Utilities	2%
Other	7%
Total	100%

Size of Organization

Self-employed respondents are asked to indicate the number of individuals they employ in their business. About a fifth (21%) do not have any employees and almost two-thirds (64%) have fewer than 10 employees. One in eight (12%) of the self-employed respondents have 10 to 50 employees, and 3% have more than 50 employees. On average, self-employed MBA graduates employ eight individuals in their business.

Size of Organization (Number of Employees)	
Size	**Percentage (*n* = 162)**
None	21%
Fewer than 10	64%
10 to 50	12%
More than 50	3%
Total	100%
Mean	8

Annual Revenues

Self-employed respondents are asked to indicate the total annual revenue for their business. About half (51%) the respondents state they have less than a quarter of a million dollars in revenue annually. Nearly one in eight (11%) have between $250,000 and $499,999 in annual revenues, 7% have $500,000 to $999,999 in revenues, and 18% have between $1 million and $4,999,999 in revenue annually. Additionally, 2% state that their business generated $10 million or more in revenue annually.

Annual Revenues	
Response	**Percentage (*n* = 162)**
Less than $250,000	51%
$250,000-$499,999	11%
$500,000 to $999,999	7%
$1,000,000 to $4,999,999	18%
$5,000,000 to $9,999,999	0%
$10,000,000 or more	2%
Prefer not to say	12%
Total	100%

Length of Time Self-Employed

Respondents are asked to specify the length of time they have been self-employed. More than half (58%) of the self-employed respondents have been self-employed for less than two years. Another 18% of respondents have been self-employed for two years but less than three years, and 20% have been self-employed for three years but less than 10 years. Furthermore, 6% of respondents have been self-employed for 10 years or longer.

Length of Time with Self-Employed	
Length of Time	**Percentage (*n* = 162)**
Less than six months	19%
Six months, but less than one year	18%
One year, but less than two years	21%
Two years, but less than three years	18%
Three years, but less than four years	9%
Four years, but less than six years	6%
Six years, but less than eight years	4%
Eight years, but less than ten years	1%
Ten years or longer	6%
Total	100%

Unemployment Status

The following section explores the status of the 90 respondents who state they are currently not working. This group represents 3% of the respondents.

Status of Respondents Currently Not Working

About three-quarters (74%) of respondents who are currently not working are looking for work, and 26% are currently not looking for work.

Employment Status	
Response	**Percentage (*n* = 90)**
Currently looking for work	74%
Not currently looking for work	26%
Total	100%

Current Length of Time Out of Work

On average, respondents who are not looking for work have been unemployed for 56 weeks, which is significantly longer than the length of time respondents who are looking for work have been out of work (29 weeks).

Number of Weeks Not Working*		
Response	**Looking for Work (*n* = 67)**	**Not Looking for Work (*n* = 23)**
Less than 26 weeks	52%	9%
26 weeks, but less than one year	27%	35%
One year or longer	21%	57%
Total	100%	100%
Mean	**29 weeks**	**56 weeks**
* $p \leq .05$; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.		

Reasons for Not Currently Working

Respondents not looking for work (43%) are more than 10 times more likely not to be working due to family reasons compared with respondents looking for work (4%). Respondents who are not looking for work (39%) are twice as likely as respondents looking for work (18%) to be out of work because they are continuing their education.

Reasons Not Working			
	Response	**Looking for Work (*n* = 67)**	**Not Looking for Work (*n* = 23)**
Laid off (14%)	I was laid off due to a weak economy	1%	0%
	I was laid off due to company instability	18%	0%
Terminated (3%)	I was terminated	4%	0%
Quit (80%)	I quit because I was dissatisfied with the work itself and/or the quality of clients	15%	9%
	I quit because I was dissatisfied with my hours, pay, benefits, and/or my co-workers/boss	13%	9%
	I quit for family reasons*	**4%**	**43%**
	I quit for health reasons	3%	0%
	I quit to start my own business	1%	9%
	I quit to move elsewhere	15%	9%
	I quit to continue my education*	**18%**	**39%**
Other (24%)	Other	28%	13%
	Total	100%	100%
*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.			

Organizational Changes

The following section explores MBA graduates' experiences in switching organizations and their propensity to switch organizations in the future.

Number of Different Organizations

Eighty-nine percent of respondents have worked for only one or two organizations.

Number of Organizations Worked for since Completing the MBA (or equivalent) Degree (All Respondents)	
Response	**Percentage (*n* = 2,828)**
None, I haven't worked since graduating	1%
One	61%
Two	28%
Three	7%
Four or more	3%
Total	100%

Respondents who are self-employed have worked for significantly more organizations compared with respondents who are currently employed for an organization, who in turn have worked for more organizations than respondents who are currently not working.

Number of Organizations Worked for since Completing the MBA (or equivalent) Degree, by Current Employment Status*			
Response	**Employed (*n* = 2,570)**	**Self-Employed (*n* = 162)**	**Not Working (*n* = 90)**
None, I haven't worked since graduating	0%	0%	**29%**
One	64%	**39%**	**37%**
Two	27%	**39%**	26%
Three	7%	**15%**	8%
Four or more	2%	**7%**	1%
Total	100%	100%	100%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.			

Not surprisingly, the longer a respondent has been out of school, the greater the number of organizations with whom the respondent has been employed since completing his or her degree. Nevertheless, regardless of when they graduated, the majority of MBAs have only worked for one or two organizations.

Number of Organizations Worked for since Completing the MBA (or equivalent) Degree, by Graduation Year*						
Number of Organizations	**2000 (*n* = 187)**	**2001 (*n* = 267)**	**2002 (*n* = 249)**	**2003 (*n* = 366)**	**2004 (*n* = 721)**	**2005 (*n* = 1,038)**
None, I haven't worked since graduating	1%	<1%	0%	1%	1%	**2%**
One	**37%**	**36%**	**44%**	**54%**	63%	**78%**
Two	30%	**38%**	33%	**36%**	31%	**18%**
Three	**18%**	**19%**	**18%**	9%	**4%**	**2%**
Four or more	**15%**	**6%**	**5%**	1%	**1%**	**<1%**
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.						

Respondents who graduated from executive MBA programs are significantly more likely than other respondents to have only worked for one organization since completing their MBA (or equivalent) degree.

Number of Organizations Worked for since Completing the MBA (or equivalent) Degree, by Program Type*			
Number of Organizations	**Full-time (*n* = 2,048)**	**Part-time (*n* = 533)**	**Executive (*n* = 215)**
None, I haven't worked since graduating	1%	1%	0%
One	60%	63%	**72%**
Two	28%	29%	**21%**
Three	8%	6%	6%
Four or more	3%	2%	2%
Total	100%	100%	100%
Mean number of organizations	1.5	1.5	1.4
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.			

There are no statistically significant differences by gender, citizenship, or U.S. subgroup in the number of organizations for whom respondents have worked since completing their degree.

Likelihood of Switching Organizations

Respondents who are currently working for an organization are asked to indicate their likelihood of switching organizations in the next six months, in the next year, and in the next five years. Overall, only 8% of respondents are extremely likely to switch organizations in the next six months and only 10% within the next year. However, nearly a third (31%) state they are extremely likely to switch organizations in the next five years.

Likelihood of Switching Organizations (Respondents Currently Employed)						
	(*n* = 2,570)					
What is the likelihood that you will switch organizations…	**Extremely Likely**	**Very Likely**	**Somewhat Likely**	**Not Very Likely**	**Not at all Likely**	**Total**
In the next six months	8%	5%	13%	30%	43%	100%
In the next year?	10%	10%	22%	32%	26%	100%
In the next five years?	31%	24%	29%	12%	4%	100%

Respondents from Latin America are significantly more likely than respondents from Canada to state they are extremely likely to switch organizations in the next six months. However, respondents from Canada are significantly the most likely of all respondents to indicate they are extremely likely to switch organizations in the next five years.

Likelihood of Switching Organizations--Percentage Extremely Likely, by Citizenship (Respondents Currently Employed)					
What is the likelihood that you will switch organizations…	**Asia (*n* = 266)**	**United States (*n* = 1,554)**	**Canada (*n* = 185)**	**Latin America (*n* = 130)**	**Europe (*n* = 331)**
In the next six months*	9%	8%	**3%**	**13%**	10%
In the next year?	10%	10%	7%	9%	13%
In the next five years?*	30%	28%	**39%**	34%	34%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.					

It appears that the longer a respondent has been employed with an organization, the less likely the respondent will state they are extremely likely to switch organizations.

Likelihood of Switching Organizations--Percentage Extremely Likely, by Length of Time in Current Job (Respondents Currently Employed)				
What is the likelihood that you will switch organizations…	**Less Than One Year (*n* = 903)**	**One Year, But Less Than Two Years (*n* = 575)**	**Two Years, But Less Than Six Years (*n* = 742)**	**Six years or Longer (*n* = 350)**
In the next six months*	**6%**	**11%**	9%	7%
In the next year?*	**8%**	**13%**	10%	10%
In the next five years?*	28%	**35%**	32%	27%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.				

There are no statistically significant differences in the percentage of employed respondents who state that they are extremely likely to switch organizations in each of the time frames by graduation year, program type, gender, or U.S. subgroup.

III. Current Job

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

Current Job Function

Respondents are asked to specify their current job function. Overall, the most common job functions of the MBA graduates include product/project management (9%), strategy (8%), general management (8%), and corporate finance (6%).

The detailed job function table is collapsed into seven functional groups. Overall, 28% of the respondents are working in the finance/accounting field, 25% in marketing/sales, 18% in consulting, 10% in general management, 10% in operations/logistics, 6% in information technology/MIS, and 2% in human resources.

Detailed Current Job Function		
Job Function		**Percent (*n*=2,576)**
Marketing/ Sales	Public relations	<1%
	Product/project management	9%
	Market research	3%
	Advertising	1%
	Sales	3%
	Sales management	3%
	Communications	1%
	Other marketing/sales	5%
Operations/ Logistics	Logistics	1%
	Purchasing	2%
	Engineering	1%
	Production/ manufacturing	1%
	Operations	3%
	Product development	1%
	Other operations/ logistics	2%
Consulting	Strategy	8%
	Change management	1%
	Product management	<1%
	Business development	3%
	Other consulting	4%
General Management	General management	8%
	Entrepreneurial	1%
	Other general management	1%

Detailed Current Job Function		
Job Function		**Percent (*n*=2,576)**
Finance/ Accounting	Accounting/auditing	4%
	Banking	2%
	Corporate finance	6%
	Investments	4%
	Mergers & acquisitions	2%
	Treasury/financial analysis	3%
	Public finance	<1%
	Real estate	2%
	Other finance/accounting	5%
Human Resources	Industrial/labor relations	<1%
	Staffing and training	1%
	Compensations and benefits	1%
	Change management	<1%
	Other human resources	1%
Information Technology/ MIS	Systems analysis	1%
	Systems consulting	1%
	Telecommunication	<1%
	Electronic commerce	<1%
	Other information technology/MIS	3%
Other function		2%
Total		100%

Job Function	
Job Function	**Percentage (*n* = 2,526)**
Finance/accounting	28%
Marketing/sales	25%
Consulting	18%
General management	10%
Operations/logistics	10%
Information technology/MIS	6%
Human resources	2%
Total	100%

Respondents who graduated from full-time programs (21%) are significantly more likely than respondents from part-time (10%) and executive (12%) programs to hold a consulting job position. On the other hand, respondents from part-time (14%) and executive (18%) programs are significantly more likely than respondents from full-time (8%) programs to have an operations/logistics position. Additionally, respondents from part-time (12%) programs are three times as likely as respondents from full-time (4%) programs to have an information technology/MIS position—a statistically significant difference.

Job Function, by Program Type*			
Job Function	**Full-time (*n* = 1,827)**	**Part-time (*n* = 488)**	**Executive (*n* = 184)**
Finance/accounting	29%	27%	21%
Marketing/sales	26%	23%	23%
Consulting	**21%**	**10%**	**12%**
General management	9%	11%	**16%**
Operations/logistics	**8%**	**14%**	**18%**
Information technology/MIS	**4%**	**12%**	7%
Human resources	2%	4%	2%
Total	100%	100%	100%
*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.			

Women are significantly more likely than men to be employed in a marketing/sales or human resources position. However, women are significantly less likely than men to hold a consulting or information technology/MIS position.

Job Function, by Gender*		
Job Function	**Male (*n* = 1,820)**	**Female (*n* = 700)**
Finance/accounting	29%	26%
Marketing/sales	**22%**	**34%**
Consulting	19%	**14%**
General management	10%	10%
Operations/logistics	11%	8%
Information technology/MIS	7%	**4%**
Human resources	**2%**	**5%**
Total	100%	100%
*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.		

Respondents from Asia and Latin America are more likely than all other respondents to have a finance/accounting position. Canadian and European respondents are more likely than U.S. respondents to have a consulting position. Additionally, Asian respondents are more likely than all other respondents to have an information technology/MIS position and are the least likely of the respondents to have a human resources position.

Job Function, by Citizenship*					
Job Function	**Asia (*n* = 266)**	**United States (*n* = 1,523)**	**Canada (*n* = 180)**	**Latin America (*n* = 128)**	**Europe (*n* = 329)**
Finance/accounting	**35%**	28%	24%	**40%**	24%
Marketing/sales	21%	27%	23%	20%	24%
Consulting	15%	**15%**	**25%**	15%	**26%**
General management	12%	10%	9%	11%	10%
Operations/logistics	9%	11%	9%	9%	10%
Information technology/MIS	**9%**	6%	5%	3%	5%
Human resources	**<1%**	3%	3%	2%	2%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.					

Not surprisingly, respondents employed in the finance/accounting industry are the most likely of all respondents to have a finance/accounting position, and respondents in the consulting industry are the most likely to have a consulting position.

Respondents in the products/services, technology, and healthcare/pharmaceutical industries are more likely than respondents in consulting and finance/accounting industries to have a marketing/sales position. Respondents in the product/services, healthcare/pharmaceutical, and nonprofit/government industries are more likely than respondents in the consulting and finance/accounting industries to have a general management position.

Respondents employed in the manufacturing or energy/utilities industries are more likely than respondents employed in the consulting, finance/accounting, or products/services industries to have an operations/logistics position. Respondents in the technology or nonprofit/government industries are more likely to have an information technology/MIS position than those in the products/services industry.

Job Function, by Industry*								
Job Function	**Consulting (*n* = 344)**	**Finance/ Accounting (*n* = 520)**	**Products/ Services (*n* = 530)**	**Manu-facturing (*n* = 241)**	**Tech-nology (*n* = 340)**	**Healthcare/ Pharm-aceuticals (*n* = 245)**	**Energy/ Utilities (*n* = 102)**	**Nonprofit/ Government (*n* = 142)**
Finance/accounting	**6%**	**63%**	**21%**	27%	**17%**	**14%**	34%	29%
Marketing/sales	**6%**	**14%**	**40%**	23%	**40%**	**36%**	17%	18%
Consulting	**75%**	**8%**	**8%**	**7%**	**10%**	**11%**	12%	**5%**
General management	**3%**	**4%**	**13%**	11%	10%	**19%**	11%	**23%**
Operations/logistics	**1%**	**5%**	**13%**	**22%**	11%	11%	**22%**	10%
Information technology/ MIS	8%	5%	**3%**	7%	**11%**	7%	2%	**11%**
Human resources	2%	2%	3%	4%	3%	2%	3%	4%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.

There are no statistically significant differences in job function by graduation year or U.S. subgroup.

Current Job Level

Respondents are asked to indicate the job level for their current job position. About three-quarters (74%) state they are managers or supervisors in their organization. A fifth (20%) are first- or entry-level managers/supervisors. About a third (34%) are middle-level managers/associates, and about one in eight (12%) are senior-level managers/partners. Additionally, 6% of the respondents are executives in their organization.

Job Level	
Level	**Percentage (*n* = 2,570)**
Not a manager/supervisor	26%
First-/entry-level manager/supervisor	20%
Middle-level manager/associate	34%
Senior-level manager/partner	12%
Executive in the organization	6%
Other	<1%
Total	100%

About a third (32%) of the respondents in the class of 2005 are not managers or supervisors in their organization, which is a statistically higher percentage compared with the classes of 2000 (17%), 2001 (16%), and 2002 (18%). Respondents in the class of 2005 are also the least likely of the respondents to hold a middle-level manager/associate position. Respondents in the classes of 2000 and 2001 are significantly more likely than all other respondents to have senior-level manager/partner positions. Additionally, the respondents in the class of 2001 are the most likely of the respondents to be executives in their organization.

Job Level, by Graduation Year*						
Level	**2000 (*n* = 154)**	**2001 (*n* = 235)**	**2002 (*n* = 229)**	**2003 (*n* = 339)**	**2004 (*n* = 664)**	**2005 (*n* = 942)**
Not a manager/supervisor	**17%**	**16%**	**18%**	25%	28%	**32%**
First-/entry-level manager/supervisor	14%	15%	19%	20%	22%	21%
Middle-level manager/associate	42%	40%	41%	37%	34%	**30%**
Senior-level manager/partner	**21%**	**19%**	14%	12%	10%	11%
Executive in the organization	7%	**10%**	8%	6%	6%	5%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.						

Respondents who graduated from executive programs are the least likely to hold a non-managerial position and a first- or entry-level manager position. Additionally, graduates of executive programs are significantly more likely than graduates of full-time programs to have a senior-level or an executive position.

Job Level, by Program Type*			
Level	**Full-time (*n* = 1,847)**	**Part-time (*n* = 501)**	**Executive (*n* = 186)**
Not a manager/supervisor	29%	26%	**10%**
First-/entry-level manager/supervisor	21%	20%	**10%**
Middle-level manager/associate	35%	35%	31%
Senior-level manager/partner	**11%**	13%	**28%**
Executive in the organization	**5%**	6%	**21%**
Total	100%	100%	100%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.			

Women are more likely than men to hold a non-managerial position. Furthermore, women are less likely than men to have a senior-level or an executive position.

Job Level, by Gender*		
Level	**Male (*n* = 1,843)**	**Female (*n* = 713)**
Not a manager/supervisor	24%	**32%**
First-/entry-level manager/supervisor	20%	21%
Middle-level manager/associate	35%	33%
Senior-level manager/partner	14%	**9%**
Executive in the organization	7%	**4%**
Total	100%	100%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.		

Respondents from Latin America and Europe are the least likely of the respondents to have non-managerial positions. On the other hand, respondents from Latin America and Europe are more likely than respondents from the U.S. to have a senior-level position—almost twice as likely.

Job Level, by Citizenship*					
Level	**Asia (*n* = 266)**	**United States (*n* = 1,549)**	**Canada (*n* = 185)**	**Latin America (*n* = 130)**	**Europe (*n* = 330)**
Not a manager/supervisor	29%	29%	31%	**18%**	**16%**
First-/entry-level manager/supervisor	20%	21%	17%	19%	19%
Middle-level manager/associate	32%	34%	34%	38%	39%
Senior-level manager/partner	12%	**10%**	14%	**19%**	**20%**
Executive in the organization	8%	6%	4%	6%	7%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.					

Respondents working in the finance/accounting and nonprofit/government industries are more likely than respondents in the products/services industries to have non-managerial positions. Respondents in the finance/accounting industry are the least likely of all respondents to have a first- or entry-level position, and they are more likely than respondents in the nonprofit/ government industry to have a middle-level position. Additionally, respondents in the healthcare/pharmaceutical industry are three times as likely as respondents in the finance/accounting industry to be executives in their organization.

Job Level, by Industry*								
Level	**Consulting (*n* = 343)**	**Finance/ Accounting (*n* = 522)**	**Products/ Services (*n* = 530)**	**Manu-facturing (*n* = 244)**	**Tech-nology (*n* = 341)**	**Healthcare/ Pharm-aceuticals (*n* = 258)**	**Energy/ Utilities (*n* = 102)**	**Nonprofit/ Government (*n* = 161)**
Not a manager/ supervisor	30%	**31%**	**20%**	23%	26%	23%	28%	**36%**
First-/entry-level manager/supervisor	23%	**15%**	22%	25%	24%	18%	17%	19%
Middle-level manager/associate	31%	**40%**	37%	31%	34%	35%	30%	**24%**
Senior-level manager/partner	10%	12%	14%	13%	11%	15%	16%	13%
Executive in the organization	6%	**3%**	7%	8%	5%	**9%**	9%	9%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.								

Respondents with finance/accounting and IT/MIS positions are more likely than respondents with general management positions to have non-managerial positions. Respondents in marketing/ sales positions are more than twice as likely as respondents with general management positions to have entry-level positions. Additionally, respondents with marketing/sales positions are more likely than respondents with IT/MIS positions to have middle-level positions. Furthermore, respondents with general management positions are significantly the most likely to have senior-level or executive positions.

Job Level, by Job Function*							
Level	**Marketing/ Sales (*n* = 638)**	**Operations/ Logistics (*n* = 257)**	**Consulting (*n* = 447)**	**General Management (*n* = 254)**	**Finance/ Accounting (*n* = 707)**	**Human Resources (*n* = 60)**	**It/MIS (*n* = 153)**
Not a manager/ supervisor	23%	28%	25%	**7%**	**33%**	30%	**42%**
First-/entry-level manager/supervisor	**24%**	21%	22%	**11%**	18%	25%	22%
Middle-level manager/ associate	**39%**	34%	37%	30%	34%	35%	**20%**
Senior-level manager/ partner	12%	13%	11%	**23%**	11%	7%	11%
Executive in the organization	2%	4%	4%	**30%**	4%	3%	6%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.

There are no statistically significant differences in job level by U.S. subgroup.

Highest Anticipated Job Level

Respondents are asked to indicate the highest job level they will strive to achieve in their career. Nearly one in 10 (9%) respondents has already reached the level in the organization that they want to achieve. More than half (58%) of the respondents will strive to become an executive in an organization and a quarter (25%) want to become a senior-level manager/partner in an organization.

Highest Anticipated Job Level	
Anticipated Level	**Percentage (*n* = 2,570)**
First-/entry-level manager/supervisor	2%
Middle-level manager/associate	5%
Senior-level manager/partner	25%
Executive in the organization	58%
Already reached highest position	9%
Other	2%
Total	100%

Respondents from the class of 2003 are the least likely or all the respondents to aspire to a middle-level position. Respondents from the class of 2001 are the most likely of all respondents to state they have already reached the highest level for which they strive in the organization.

Highest Anticipated Job Level, by Graduation Year*						
Anticipated Level	**2000 (*n* = 154)**	**2001 (*n* = 232)**	**2002 (*n* = 224)**	**2003 (*n* = 335)**	**2004 (*n* = 653)**	**2005 (*n* = 928)**
First-/entry-level manager/supervisor	1%	1%	<1%	3%	2%	2%
Middle-level manager/associate	8%	3%	5%	**2%**	6%	4%
Senior-level manager/partner	28%	22%	22%	27%	28%	24%
Executive in the organization	53%	56%	60%	60%	55%	63%
Already reached highest position	10%	**17%**	12%	8%	9%	8%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.						

Respondents who graduated from an executive program are the least likely to aspire to a senior-level position. About a quarter (24%) of the respondents from executive programs have already reached the highest position they seek to attain, which is a significantly greater percentage compared with respondents from full-time programs (7%).

Highest Anticipated Job Level, by Program Type*			
Anticipated Level	**Full-time (*n* = 1,821)**	**Part-time (*n* = 493)**	**Executive (*n* = 185)**
First-/entry-level manager/supervisor	2%	1%	1%
Middle-level manager/associate	5%	6%	3%
Senior-level manager/partner	27%	25%	**10%**
Executive in the organization	60%	56%	62%
Already reached highest position	**7%**	12%	**24%**
Total	100%	100%	100%
*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.			

Women are more likely than men to aspire to middle- and senior-level positions. Men are more likely than women to aspire to executive positions.

Highest Anticipated Job Level, by Gender*		
Anticipated Level	**Male (*n* = 1,813)**	**Female (*n* = 707)**
First-/entry-level manager/supervisor	1%	2%
Middle-level manager/associate	**4%**	**7%**
Senior-level manager/partner	**21%**	**35%**
Executive in the organization	**64%**	**47%**
Already reached highest position	10%	9%
Total	100%	100%
*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.		

Asian respondents are the most likely of all respondents to aspire to entry- or middle-level positions.

Highest Anticipated Job Level, by Citizenship*					
Anticipated Level	**Asia (*n* = 260)**	**United States (*n* = 1,531)**	**Canada (*n* = 184)**	**Latin America (*n* = 126)**	**Europe (*n* = 327)**
First-/entry-level manager/supervisor	**4%**	1%	1%	1%	2%
Middle-level manager/associate	**7%**	5%	5%	3%	3%
Senior-level manager/partner	24%	27%	22%	18%	23%
Executive in the organization	55%	58%	66%	68%	63%
Already reached highest position	10%	10%	7%	10%	10%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.					

There are no statistically significant differences in the highest anticipated job level by U.S. subgroup.

Work Hours

Respondents are asked to indicate the average number of hours they work each week. On average, MBA graduate respondents work 51 hours per week.

Average Number of Hours Worked Per Week	
Number of Hours	**Percentage (*n* = 2,570)**
Less than 40 hours/week	3%
40 hours/week	13%
41 to 50 hours/week	50%
More than 50 hours per week	33%
Total	100%
Mean number of hours/week	51
Median number of hours/week	50

Respondents who graduated from executive programs work longer hours (53 hours), on average, compared with graduates of full-time programs (51 hours). Additionally, respondents who graduated from full-time programs work longer hours compared with graduates of part-time programs (48 hours).

Average Number of Hours Worked Per Week, by Program Type*			
Number of Hours	**Full-time (*n* = 1,852)**	**Part-time (*n* = 502)**	**Executive (*n* = 187)**
Less than 40 hours/week	3%	**6%**	3%
40 hours/week	13%	**19%**	**8%**
41 to 50 hours/week	50%	51%	46%
More than 50 hours per week	34%	**25%**	**43%**
Total	100%	100%	100%

Average Number of Hours Worked Per Week, by Program Type*			
Number of Hours	**Full-time (*n* = 1,852)**	**Part-time (*n* = 502)**	**Executive (*n* = 187)**
Mean number of hours/week**	**51**	**48**	**53**
Median number of hours/week	50	50	50

*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.
**p ≤ .05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.

Men, on average, work longer hours per week (51 hours) compared with women (48 hours).

Average Number of Hours Worked Per Week, by Gender*		
Number of Hours	**Male (*n* = 1,845)**	**Female (*n* = 718)**
Less than 40 hours/week	3%	**5%**
40 hours/week	**11%**	**19%**
41 to 50 hours/week	50%	50%
More than 50 hours per week	**36%**	**26%**
Total	100%	100%
Mean number of hours/week**	**51**	**48**
Median number of hours/week	50	50

*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.
**p ≤ .05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.

Asian respondents work fewer hours per week on average compared with respondents of all other regions of the world. Respondents from Latin America work longer hours compared with respondents from the United States.

Average Number of Hours Worked Per Week, by Citizenship*					
Number of Hours	**Asia (*n* = 266)**	**United States (*n* = 1,554)**	**Canada (*n* = 185)**	**Latin America (*n* = 130)**	**Europe (*n* = 331)**
Less than 40 hours/week	5%	3%	**9%**	2%	2%
40 hours/week	16%	14%	12%	10%	12%
41 to 50 hours/week	50%	52%	42%	46%	52%
More than 50 hours per week	29%	32%	38%	42%	35%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Mean number of hours/week**	**49**	**50**	51	**52**	51
Median number of hours/week	50	50	50	50	50

*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.
**p ≤ .05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.

Those who work at higher levels of an organization are significantly more likely to work longer hours compared with individuals at lower levels of the organization.

Average Number of Hours Worked Per Week, by Current Job Level*					
	Current Job Level				
Number of Hours	Not a manager/ supervisor (*n* = 680)	First-/ entry-level manager/ supervisor (*n* = 517)	Middle-level manager/ associate (*n* = 884)	Senior-level manager/ partner (*n* = 321)	Executive in the organization (*n* = 161)
Less than 40 hours/week	**5%**	3%	3%	3%	1%
40 hours/week	**21%**	15%	**10%**	**8%**	**9%**
41 to 50 hours/week	52%	53%	50%	48%	**38%**
More than 50 hours per week	**23%**	29%	**38%**	**41%**	**52%**
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Mean number of hours/week**	**48**	**50**	**52**	**52**	**54**
Median number of hours/week	47	50	50	50	55

*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.
**p ≤ .05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.

On average, respondents in the consulting industry work the longest number of hours per week compared with respondents in all other industries, followed by respondents in the finance/accounting industry. Respondents in the nonprofit/government industry work the fewest number of hours per week, on average, compared with respondents in all other industries.

Average Number of Hours Worked Per Week, by Industry*								
Number of Hours	Consulting (*n* = 343)	Finance/ Accounting (*n* = 522)	Products/ Services (*n* = 530)	Manu-facturing (*n* = 244)	Tech-nology (*n* = 341)	Healthcare/ Pharm-aceuticals (*n* = 258)	Energy/ Utilities (*n* = 102)	Nonprofit/ Government (*n* = 161)
Less than 40 hours/week	2%	4%	2%	2%	2%	5%	3%	**11%**
40 hours/week	**6%**	11%	12%	14%	14%	13%	18%	**32%**
41 to 50 hours/week	**41%**	46%	54%	58%	**57%**	50%	56%	42%
More than 50 hours per week	**51%**	**39%**	32%	**26%**	28%	32%	23%	**16%**
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Mean number of hours/week**	**54**	**52**	**50**	**49**	**50**	**50**	**49**	**46**
Median number of hours/week	52	50	50	50	50	50	50	45

*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.
**p ≤ .05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.

There are no statistically significant differences in the average number of hours worked per week by graduation year or U.S. subgroup.

Promotions

Respondents are asked to indicate whether they have received a promotion since completing their MBA (or equivalent) degree. Since completing the MBA (or equivalent) degree, 45% of respondents have received a promotion.

Have You Received a Promotion?	
Promotion?	**Percentage (*n* = 2,570)**
Yes	45%
No	55%
Total	100%

Respondents in the classes of 2000 through 2003 are significantly more likely than respondents in the class of 2005 to have received a promotion.

Have You Received a Promotion?, by Graduation Year*						
Promotion?	**2000 (*n* = 155)**	**2001 (*n* = 236)**	**2002 (*n* = 230)**	**2003 (*n* = 339)**	**2004 (*n* = 664)**	**2005 (*n* = 946)**
Yes	**68%**	**64%**	**60%**	**56%**	46%	**28%**
No	**32%**	**36%**	**40%**	**44%**	54%	**72%**
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.						

Respondents who are middle-level (51%) or senior-level (63%) managers are significantly more likely than respondents who are not managers (29%) to have received a promotion.

Have You Received a Promotion?, by Current Job Level*					
Promotion?	**Not a manager/ supervisor (*n* = 680)**	**First-/entry-level manager/ supervisor (*n* = 517)**	**Middle-level manager/ associate (*n* = 884)**	**Senior-level manager/ partner (*n* = 321)**	**Executive in the organization (*n* = 161)**
Yes	**29%**	43%	**51%**	**63%**	49%
No	**71%**	57%	**49%**	**37%**	51%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.					

There are no statistically significant differences in the percentage of respondents receiving a promotion by program type, gender, citizenship, and U.S. subgroup.

Length of Time to Receive Promotion

Respondents are asked to indicate how they feel about the length of time it took to receive their most recent promotion. Nearly a third (31%) felt they received their promotion faster than expected. About half (49%) felt that just the right amount of time elapsed before receiving their promotion. Additionally, 17% felt it took a little too long, and 2% felt that it took a very long time before receiving a promotion.

Length of Time to Receive Most Recent Promotion	
For your most recent promotion, do you feel that it took…	**Percentage (*n* = 1,149)**
Faster than expected	31%
Just the right amount of time	49%
A little too long	17%
A very long time	2%
Total	100%

Respondents who graduated in 2005 are more than twice as likely as respondents from the class of 2000 to state that they received their promotion faster than expected. On the contrary, respondents in the class of 2000 were about three times as likely as respondents in the class of 2005 to feel that it took a little too long to receive a promotion. Additionally, respondents in the class of 2001 were more likely than respondents in the class of 2004 to indicate that it took a very long time before receiving a promotion.

Length of Time to Receive Most Recent Promotion, by Graduation Year*						
For your most recent promotion, do you feel that it took…	**2000 (*n* = 105)**	**2001 (*n* = 150)**	**2002 (*n* = 137)**	**2003 (*n* = 188)**	**2004 (*n* = 308)**	**2005 (*n* = 261)**
Faster than expected	**15%**	23%	31%	28%	32%	**41%**
Just the right amount of time	51%	51%	46%	54%	48%	48%
A little too long	**31%**	19%	19%	16%	19%	**10%**
A very long time	3%	**7%**	4%	3%	**1%**	1%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.						

Respondents in senior-level or executive positions are more likely to feel that their promotion came faster than expected compared with all other respondents. Respondents in entry-level positions are more likely than respondents in executive positions to feel that the promotion took a little too long. Furthermore, respondents in entry-level positions were the most likely of respondents to indicate that the promotion took a very long time.

Length of Time to Receive Most Recent Promotion, by Current Job Level*					
	Current Job Level				
For your most recent promotion, do you feel that it took…	**Not a manager/ supervisor (*n* = 194)**	**First-/ entry-level manager/ supervisor (*n* = 220)**	**Middle-level manager/ associate (*n* = 454)**	**Senior-level manager/ partner (*n* = 201)**	**Executive in the organization (*n* = 79)**
Faster than expected	26%	24%	29%	**40%**	**51%**
Just the right amount of time	50%	48%	52%	46%	47%
A little too long	22%	**23%**	18%	12%	**1%**
A very long time	3%	**5%**	2%	2%	1%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.					

There are no statistically significant differences in the length of time it took to receive their most recent promotion by program type, gender, citizenship, and U.S. subgroup.

Promotion Details

Respondents who received a promotion are asked to identify the details of their promotion. A vast majority of respondents who received a promotion received a pay increase (90%), a change in job titles (82%), and an increase in responsibilities (81%). Additionally, more than a third of respondents who received a promotion received an increase in the number of subordinates they manage (38%), became a team leader (36%), and received an increase in budgetary authority (35%).

Promotion Details	
Did your most recent promotion involve…	**Percentage (*n* = 1,149)**
A pay increase	90%
A change in job title	82%
An increase in responsibility	81%
An increase in the number of subordinates you manage	38%
Becoming a team leader	36%
An increase in budgetary authority	35%
Other	4%
Responses add to more than 100% due to multiple selections.	

Respondents who graduated from executive programs are more likely than all other respondents to have had an increase in the number of subordinates managed and an increase in budgetary authority.

Promotion Details, by Program Type			
Did your most recent promotion involve…	**Full-time (*n* = 810)**	**Part-time (*n* = 239)**	**Executive (*n* = 89)**
A pay increase	90%	90%	90%
A change in job title	81%	86%	83%
An increase in responsibility	80%	82%	81%
An increase in the number of subordinates you manage*	36%	41%	**54%**
Becoming a team leader	36%	32%	40%
An increase in budgetary authority*	32%	35%	**55%**
Other	4%	4%	4%
Responses add to more than 100% due to multiple selections *$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.			

The only significant difference by gender among respondents who received a promotion is that men are more likely than women to have become a team leader.

Promotion Details, by Gender		
Did your most recent promotion involve…	**Male (*n* = 839)**	**Female (*n* = 307)**
A pay increase	90%	91%
A change in job title	83%	81%
An increase in responsibility	81%	80%
An increase in the number of subordinates you manage	40%	36%
Becoming a team leader*	39%	**27%**
An increase in budgetary authority	36%	30%
Other	4%	5%
Responses add to more than 100% due to multiple selections *$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.		

Respondents from Europe are more likely than all other respondents to have received an increase in budgetary authority as a part of their promotion.

Promotion Details, by Citizenship					
Did your most recent promotion involve…	**Asia (*n* = 125)**	**United States (*n* = 708)**	**Canada (*n* = 68)**	**Latin America (*n* = 68)**	**Europe (*n* = 135)**
A pay increase	89%	91%	90%	94%	88%
A change in job title	82%	83%	91%	79%	76%
An increase in responsibility	85%	81%	85%	79%	75%
An increase in the number of subordinates you manage	34%	38%	32%	44%	47%
Becoming a team leader	38%	34%	40%	43%	41%
An increase in budgetary authority*	27%	34%	28%	40%	**45%**
Other	2%	5%	4%	3%	2%
Responses add to more than 100% due to multiple selections *p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.					

Respondents who are currently in non-managerial positions are the least likely to have received a change in job title and an increase in responsibility as a part of their most recent promotion. Respondents who are in middle-level positions or higher are more likely than respondents in non-managerial positions to have received an increase in the number of subordinates managed. Senior-level managers are more likely than non-managerial respondents to have become a team leader. Respondents in senior-level or executive positions are more likely than respondents in non-managerial positions to have received an increase in budgetary authority.

Promotion Details, by Current Job Level					
	Current Job Level				
Did your most recent promotion involve…	**Not a manager/ supervisor (*n* = 194)**	**First/entry-level manager/ supervisor (*n* = 220)**	**Middle level manager/ associate (*n* = 454)**	**Senior level manager/ partner (*n* = 201)**	**Executive in the organization (*n* = 79)**
A pay increase	95%	90%	89%	88%	90%
A change in job title*	**70%**	83%	85%	87%	80%
An increase in responsibility*	**68%**	81%	84%	84%	78%
An increase in the number of subordinates you manage*	**5%**	39%	**45%**	**49%**	**56%**
Becoming a team leader*	**12%**	38%	40%	**44%**	42%
An increase in budgetary authority*	**7%**	28%	39%	**50%**	**59%**
Other	4%	5%	3%	4%	5%
Responses add to more than 100% due to multiple selections *p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.					

There are no statistically significant differences in the details of the promotion by graduation year and U.S. subgroup.

Skills/Abilities Used on the Job

Respondents are asked to indicate the extent to which they use the following skills and abilities in their current job. The top five skills respondents use on the job include interpersonal skills, the ability to think analytically, the ability to integrate information, and oral communication skills. Each of the top four skills/abilities is used a great deal on the job by half or more of the respondents.

The skills and abilities used less than a great deal by employed respondents include recruiting, managing, and maintaining staff; skills in corporate ethical conduct, cultural sensitivity, and awareness; technological skills; and initiative and risk-taking abilities.

Nearly a quarter (24%) of respondents state they do not use the skills of recruiting, managing, and maintaining staff at all in their current job.

Skills/Abilities Used on the Job						
	(*n* = 2,570)					
Skills/Abilities	**A Great Deal**	**A Good Amount**	**Some**	**A Little**	**Not At All**	**Total**
Interpersonal skills	58%	33%	8%	2%	0%	100%
Ability to think analytically	53%	33%	11%	3%	0%	100%
Ability to integrate information from a wide variety of sources	51%	35%	11%	3%	1%	100%
Oral communication skills	50%	35%	11%	3%	0%	100%
Ability to adapt/change to new situations	47%	35%	13%	4%	1%	100%
Ability to make decisions with imperfect information	45%	37%	13%	4%	1%	100%
Written communication skills	42%	36%	15%	5%	1%	100%
Ability to think strategically	40%	33%	18%	6%	3%	100%
Project management/implementation skills	39%	34%	18%	7%	3%	100%
Creative problem-solving skills	38%	40%	17%	6%	1%	100%
Quantitative skills	32%	32%	23%	10%	2%	100%
Leadership skills	29%	34%	24%	9%	3%	100%
Ability to think globally	25%	26%	22%	17%	10%	100%
Initiative/risk-taking ability	21%	36%	28%	12%	4%	100%
Technological skills for your specialty	21%	32%	30%	14%	4%	100%
Cultural sensitivity and awareness	20%	26%	29%	18%	6%	100%
Skills in corporate ethical conduct	17%	30%	29%	17%	7%	100%
Recruiting, managing, and maintaining staff	11%	18%	22%	24%	24%	100%

Respondents who graduated in 2003 are significantly the least likely among the respondents to use the ability to adapt/change to new situations and their written communication skills a great deal on their current job. Leadership skills are used more often by respondents from the class of 2000 compared with all other respondents. Respondents in the class of 2004 are the least likely to use cultural sensitivity and awareness a great deal on the job compared with all other respondents.

Skills/Abilities Used on the Job (Percentage Use a Great Deal), by Graduation Year						
Skills/Abilities	**2000 (*n* = 155)**	**2001 (*n* = 236)**	**2002 (*n* = 230)**	**2003 (*n* = 339)**	**2004 (*n* = 664)**	**2005 (*n* = 946)**
Interpersonal skills	61%	61%	57%	59%	58%	56%
Ability to think analytically	61%	51%	51%	48%	56%	52%
Ability to integrate information from a wide variety of sources	51%	48%	48%	50%	50%	52%
Oral communication skills	57%	56%	47%	52%	47%	50%
Ability to adapt/change to new situations*	49%	44%	**37%**	45%	48%	50%
Ability to make decisions with imperfect information	52%	47%	40%	45%	43%	45%
Written communication skills*	48%	39%	**33%**	46%	44%	42%
Ability to think strategically	41%	42%	40%	42%	40%	37%
Project management/implementation skills	42%	38%	40%	42%	38%	37%
Creative problem-solving skills	41%	42%	34%	37%	39%	36%
Quantitative skills	34%	30%	28%	29%	34%	34%
Leadership skills*	**41%**	31%	33%	28%	27%	28%
Ability to think globally	28%	25%	28%	24%	24%	25%
Initiative/risk-taking ability	22%	20%	20%	19%	21%	22%
Technological skills for your specialty	16%	19%	19%	17%	23%	22%
Cultural sensitivity and awareness*	22%	19%	20%	22%	**16%**	23%
Skills in corporate ethical conduct	15%	16%	17%	18%	20%	16%
Recruiting, managing, and maintaining staff	16%	15%	10%	11%	10%	10%
*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.						

The following table lists the top five skills currently used a great deal by MBA graduate respondents in each of the six graduating years. The number one skill for each year is interpersonal skills.

Top 5 Skills Currently Used a Great Deal on the Job, by Graduation Year						
Rank	**2000**	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**
1	Interpersonal skills	Interpersonal skills	Interpersonal skills	Interpersonal skills	Interpersonal skills	Interpersonal skills
2	Ability to think analytically	Oral communication	Ability to think analytically	Oral communication	Ability to think analytically	Ability to think analytically
3	Oral communication skills	Ability to think analytically	Ability to integrate information	Ability to integrate information	Ability to integrate information	Ability to integrate information
4	Ability to make decisions	Ability to integrate information	Oral communication	Ability to think analytically	Ability to adapt	Oral communication skills
5	Ability to integrate information	Ability to make decisions	Ability to make decisions	Written communication	Oral communication	Ability to adapt

Respondents who graduated from part-time programs are significantly less likely than other respondents to use project management/implementation skills a great deal on their current job.

Creative problem-solving skills, leadership skills, the ability to think globally, and skills in corporate ethical conduct are used more often by respondents who graduated from executive programs compared with all other graduates. Additionally, respondents who graduated from executive programs are more likely than respondents from part-time programs to use initiative/risk-taking ability and cultural sensitivity and awareness in their current job. Furthermore, respondents from executive programs are more likely than respondents from full-time programs to recruit, manage, and maintain staff. Respondents who graduated from part-time programs are more likely than respondents who graduated from full-time programs to use technological skills for their specialty in their current job.

Skills/Abilities Used on the Job (Percentage Use a Great Deal), by Program Type			
Skills/Abilities	**Full-time (*n* = 1,852)**	**Part-time (*n* = 502)**	**Executive (*n* = 187)**
Interpersonal skills	58%	55%	58%
Ability to think analytically	54%	48%	52%
Ability to integrate information from a wide variety of sources	52%	45%	50%
Oral communication skills	51%	45%	59%
Ability to adapt/change to new situations	47%	43%	52%
Ability to make decisions with imperfect information	45%	41%	47%
Written communication skills	42%	45%	42%
Ability to think strategically	40%	38%	39%
Project management/implementation skills*	40%	**33%**	37%
Creative problem-solving skills*	37%	35%	**47%**
Quantitative skills	34%	30%	29%
Leadership skills*	27%	30%	**46%**
Ability to think globally*	25%	22%	**33%**
Initiative/risk-taking ability*	21%	**17%**	**30%**
Technological skills for your specialty*	**18%**	**29%**	27%
Cultural sensitivity and awareness*	20%	**16%**	**32%**
Skills in corporate ethical conduct*	16%	18%	**29%**
Recruiting, managing, and maintaining staff*	**9%**	13%	**22%**
*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.			

The following table lists the top five skills used a great deal by MBA graduate respondents in each of the MBA program types.

Top 5 Skills Currently Used a Great Deal on the Job, by Program Type			
Rank	**Full-time**	**Part-time**	**Executive**
1	Interpersonal skills	Interpersonal skills	Oral communication skills
2	Ability to think analytically	Ability to think analytically	Interpersonal skills
3	Ability to integrate information	Ability to integrate information	Ability to think analytically
4	Oral communication skills	Oral communication skills	Ability to adapt
5	Ability to adapt	Written communication skills	Ability to integrate information

Women are more likely than men to use the following skills a great deal on their current job: interpersonal skills, oral communication skills, written communication skills, project management/implementation skills, and cultural sensitivity and awareness.

Skills/Abilities Used on the Job (Percentage Use a Great Deal), by Gender		
Skills/Abilities	**Male (*n* = 1,845)**	**Female (*n* = 718)**
Interpersonal skills*	55%	**65%**
Ability to think analytically	53%	53%
Ability to integrate information from a wide variety of sources	50%	53%
Oral communication skills*	48%	**56%**
Ability to adapt/change to new situations	46%	49%
Ability to make decisions with imperfect information	45%	44%
Written communication skills*	**39%**	**51%**
Ability to think strategically	40%	38%
Project management/implementation skills*	**36%**	**46%**
Creative problem-solving skills	37%	39%
Quantitative skills	34%	30%
Leadership skills	29%	30%
Ability to think globally	25%	24%
Initiative/risk-taking ability	22%	20%
Technological skills for your specialty	21%	19%
Cultural sensitivity and awareness*	19%	**24%**
Skills in corporate ethical conduct	17%	18%
Recruiting, managing, and maintaining staff	10%	13%
*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.		

The following table lists the top five skills used a great deal by MBA graduate respondents by gender. The number one skill is interpersonal skills for both men and women.

Top 5 Skills Currently Used a Great Deal on the Job, by Gender		
Rank	**Male**	**Female**
1	Interpersonal skills	Interpersonal skills
2	Ability to think analytically	Oral communication skills
3	Ability to integrate information	Ability to think analytically
4	Oral communication skills	Ability to integrate information
5	Ability to adapt	Written communication skills

Respondents from Asia and Europe are the least likely to use interpersonal skills a great deal on their job compared with all other respondents. Canadian respondents are the most likely of all respondents to use the ability to think analytically. Asian respondents are the least likely of all respondents to use the following skills on their current job: ability to adapt; written communication skills; and project management/implementation skills.

U.S. respondents are more likely than Asian respondents to use the ability to make decisions with imperfect information. Additionally, respondents from the U.S. are more likely than respondents from Latin America and Europe to use technological skills for their specialty.

Respondents from Latin America are more than twice as likely to use leadership skills compared with respondents from Asia. Latin American and European respondents are the most likely to use the ability to think globally compared with all other respondents. Additionally, respondents from Latin America are more likely than all other respondents to use cultural sensitivity and awareness on their job. Furthermore, respondents from Latin America are more likely than respondents from Europe to use skills in corporate ethical conduct.

Skills/Abilities Used on the Job (Percentage Use a Great Deal), by Citizenship					
Skills/Abilities	**Asia (*n* = 266)**	**United States (*n* = 1,554)**	**Canada (*n* = 185)**	**Latin America (*n* = 130)**	**Europe (*n* = 331)**
Interpersonal skills*	**44%**	61%	67%	55%	**50%**
Ability to think analytically*	49%	53%	**64%**	51%	51%
Ability to integrate information from a wide variety of sources	44%	52%	52%	55%	49%
Oral communication skills	46%	53%	57%	48%	44%
Ability to adapt/change to new situations*	**35%**	50%	45%	51%	45%
Ability to make decisions with imperfect information*	**28%**	**49%**	45%	46%	41%
Written communication skills*	**30%**	45%	50%	38%	36%
Ability to think strategically	33%	40%	43%	47%	37%
Project management/implementation skills*	**30%**	41%	39%	42%	35%
Creative problem-solving skills	34%	38%	41%	43%	32%
Quantitative skills	32%	33%	38%	36%	28%
Leadership skills*	**19%**	31%	29%	**43%**	27%
Ability to think globally*	23%	24%	19%	**36%**	**31%**
Initiative/risk-taking ability	18%	22%	23%	25%	18%
Technological skills for your specialty*	18%	**23%**	17%	**12%**	**15%**
Cultural sensitivity and awareness*	23%	19%	16%	**32%**	22%
Skills in corporate ethical conduct*	15%	19%	12%	**28%**	**11%**
Recruiting, managing, and maintaining staff	9%	12%	11%	12%	9%
*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.					

The following table lists the top five skills used a great deal by MBA graduate respondents in each of the world regions.

Top 5 Skills Currently Used a Great Deal on the Job, by Citizenship					
Rank	**Asia**	**United States**	**Canada**	**Latin America**	**Europe**
1	Ability to think analytically	Interpersonal skills	Interpersonal skills	Interpersonal skills	Ability to think analytically
2	Oral communication skills	Ability to think analytically	Ability to think analytically	Ability to integrate information	Interpersonal skills
3	Interpersonal skills	Ability to integrate information	Oral communication skills	Ability to think analytically	Ability to integrate information
4	Ability to integrate information	Oral communication skills	Ability to integrate information	Ability to adapt	Ability to adapt
5	Ability to adapt	Ability to adapt	Written communication skills	Oral communication skills	Oral communication skills

The only statistically significant difference in the skills/abilities used on the job a great deal by U.S. subgroup is as follows. Hispanics are more likely than all other U.S. subgroups to use the ability to think globally.

Skills/Abilities Used on the Job (Percentage Use a Great Deal), by U.S. Subgroup				
Skills/Abilities	**Asian American (*n* = 110)**	**African American (*n* = 43)**	**White (*n* = 1,229)**	**Hispanic (*n* = 60)**
Interpersonal skills	61%	67%	62%	65%
Ability to think analytically	55%	49%	52%	52%
Ability to integrate information from a wide variety of sources	55%	58%	50%	65%
Oral communication skills	45%	60%	53%	55%
Ability to adapt/change to new situations	56%	60%	48%	62%
Ability to make decisions with imperfect information	53%	30%	49%	58%
Written communication skills	42%	49%	46%	50%
Ability to think strategically	43%	42%	40%	50%
Project management/implementation skills	45%	49%	40%	52%
Creative problem-solving skills	43%	35%	37%	47%
Quantitative skills	33%	26%	33%	40%
Leadership skills	32%	47%	31%	42%
Ability to think globally*	21%	23%	23%	**43%**
Initiative/risk-taking ability	22%	28%	21%	30%
Technological skills for your specialty	25%	19%	24%	17%
Cultural sensitivity and awareness	22%	26%	18%	25%
Skills in corporate ethical conduct	24%	30%	18%	23%
Recruiting, managing, and maintaining staff	8%	16%	12%	17%
*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.				

The following table lists the top five skills used a great deal by MBA graduate respondents in each major U.S. subgroup. The number one skill for each group is interpersonal skills.

Top 5 Skills Currently Used a Great Deal on the Job, by U.S. Subgroup				
Rank	**Asian American**	**African American**	**White**	**Hispanic**
1	Interpersonal skills	Interpersonal skills	Interpersonal skills	Interpersonal skills
2	Ability to adapt	Oral communication skills	Oral communication skills	Ability to integrate information
3	Ability to think analytically	Ability to adapt	Ability to think analytically	Ability to adapt
4	Ability to integrate information	Ability to integrate information	Ability to integrate information	Ability to make decisions
5	Ability to make decisions	Ability to think analytically	Ability to make decisions	Oral communication skills

Respondents who are not managers are the least likely of all respondents to use interpersonal skills on their job. Middle- and senior-level managers are more likely than all other respondents to use oral communication skills. Senior-level managers and executives are more likely than respondents who are not managers to use the following skills: ability to adapt/change; ability to make decisions with imperfect information; creative problem-solving skills; and initiative and risk-taking ability. The ability to think strategically and recruiting, managing, and maintaining staff are used more often by senior managers and executives compared with entry-level managers and respondents who are not managers.

Middle-level managers are more likely than respondents who are not managers to use project management/implementation skills. Senior-level managers are more likely than respondents who are not managers to use the ability to think globally. Executives are more likely than respondents who are not managers to use cultural sensitivity and awareness, and executives are more likely than all other respondents to use skills in corporate ethical conduct.

The use of leadership skills increases as the level of employment increases in an organization.

Skills/Abilities Used on the Job (Percentage Use a Great Deal), by Current Job Level

Skills/Abilities	Current Job Level: Not a manager/ supervisor (*n* = 680)	First/entry-level manager/ supervisor (*n* = 517)	Middle-level manager/ associate (*n* = 884)	Senior-level manager/ partner (*n* = 321)	Executive in the organization (*n* = 161)
Interpersonal skills*	**50%**	58%	60%	65%	61%
Ability to think analytically	50%	52%	54%	54%	58%
Ability to integrate information from a wide variety of sources	46%	47%	52%	57%	58%
Oral communication skills*	44%	45%	**55%**	**58%**	57%
Ability to adapt/change to new situations*	**40%**	48%	46%	**55%**	**57%**
Ability to make decisions with imperfect information*	**35%**	42%	47%	**56%**	**62%**
Written communication skills	39%	43%	45%	43%	42%
Ability to think strategically*	**26%**	**34%**	43%	**55%**	**64%**
Project management/implementation skills*	**27%**	43%	**44%**	39%	43%
Creative problem-solving skills*	**29%**	38%	39%	**47%**	**50%**
Quantitative skills	34%	34%	32%	29%	29%
Leadership skills*	**12%**	**24%**	**33%**	**49%**	**61%**
Ability to think globally*	**19%**	23%	26%	**34%**	30%
Initiative/risk-taking ability*	**13%**	17%	22%	**31%**	**39%**
Technological skills for your specialty	24%	20%	18%	21%	22%
Cultural sensitivity and awareness*	**14%**	21%	21%	24%	**30%**
Skills in corporate ethical conduct*	15%	15%	18%	18%	**27%**
Recruiting, managing, and maintaining staff*	**2%**	**8%**	11%	**22%**	**37%**

*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.

The following table lists the top five skills used a great deal by MBA graduate respondents by job level.

Top 5 Skills Currently Used a Great Deal on the Job, by Job level

Rank	Not a manager/ supervisor	First-/entry-level manager/ supervisor	Middle-level manager/ associate	Senior-level manager/ partner	Executive in the organization
1	Interpersonal skills	Interpersonal skills	Interpersonal skills	Interpersonal skills	Ability to think strategically
2	Ability to think analytically	Ability to think analytically	Oral communication skills	Oral communication skills	Ability to make decisions
3	Ability to integrate information	Ability to adapt	Ability to think analytically	Ability to integrate information	Interpersonal skills
4	Oral communication skills	Ability to integrate information	Ability to integrate information	Ability to make decisions	Leadership skills
5	Ability to adapt	Oral communication skills	Ability to make decisions	Ability to adapt	Ability to think analytically

There is a statistically significant difference by job function for each of the skills and abilities listed.

Skills/Abilities Used on the Job (Percentage Use a Great Deal), by Job Function							
Skills/Abilities	**Marketing/ Sales (*n* = 638)**	**Operations/ Logistics (*n* = 257)**	**Consulting (*n* = 447)**	**General Management (*n* = 255)**	**Finance/ Accounting (*n* = 708)**	**Human Resources (*n* = 61)**	**It/MIS (*n* = 154)**
Interpersonal skills*	**66%**	53%	62%	65%	**46%**	70%	51%
Ability to think analytically*	**47%**	47%	**66%**	**40%**	**58%**	44%	47%
Ability to integrate information from a wide variety of sources*	47%	43%	**61%**	49%	51%	52%	48%
Oral communication skills*	**58%**	46%	55%	56%	**41%**	**67%**	**32%**
Ability to adapt/change to new situations*	43%	46%	**59%**	52%	**39%**	51%	47%
Ability to make decisions with imperfect information*	44%	44%	**53%**	51%	**39%**	52%	37%
Written communication skills*	46%	36%	**55%**	40%	**34%**	52%	34%
Ability to think strategically*	40%	**31%**	**56%**	**49%**	**31%**	33%	**29%**
Project management/ implementation skills*	41%	41%	**50%**	**47%**	**25%**	46%	36%
Creative problem-solving skills*	34%	33%	**50%**	44%	**30%**	39%	44%
Quantitative skills*	**25%**	27%	37%	**17%**	**48%**	**18%**	**19%**
Leadership skills*	30%	33%	26%	**53%**	**21%**	39%	21%
Ability to think globally*	23%	26%	**30%**	27%	22%	33%	26%
Initiative/risk-taking ability*	22%	20%	20%	**28%**	19%	13%	23%
Technological skills for your specialty*	**16%**	23%	18%	15%	19%	18%	**55%**
Cultural sensitivity and awareness*	20%	23%	20%	**29%**	**13%**	**49%**	20%
Skills in corporate ethical conduct*	16%	14%	**13%**	20%	19%	**28%**	17%
Recruiting, managing, and maintaining staff*	**6%**	14%	9%	**28%**	**7%**	**36%**	12%

*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.

Top 5 Skills Currently Used a Great Deal on the Job, by Job Function							
Rank	**Marketing/ Sales**	**Operations/ Logistics**	**Consulting**	**General Management**	**Finance/ Accounting**	**Human Resources**	**IT/MIS**
1	Interpersonal skills	Interpersonal skills	Ability to think analytically	Interpersonal skills	Ability to think analytically	Interpersonal skills	Technological skills
2	Oral communication skills	Ability to think analytically	Interpersonal skills	Oral communication skills	Ability to integrate information	Oral communication skills	Interpersonal skills
3	Ability to think analytically	Oral communication skills	Ability to integrate information	Ability to adapt	Quantitative skills	Ability to integrate information	Ability to integrate information
4	Ability to integrate information	Ability to adapt	Ability to adapt	Ability to make decisions	Interpersonal skills	Ability to make decisions	Ability to think analytically
5	Written communication skills	Ability to make decisions	Ability to think strategically	Ability to integrate information	Oral communication skills	Written communication skills	Ability to adapt

Job Autonomy

Respondents are asked to specify among three statements for each item the one that best reflects their involvement in various aspects of their job.

The majority of respondents indicated that they work with their boss to develop goals, while a third (32%) develops their own goals at work. Only 7% indicate that their boss develops their goals for them.

It is a relatively even split between respondents who indicate that they control the types of tasks they do (45%) and those who work with their boss to develop tasks (46%). About one in 10 (9%) have their boss tell them the types of tasks to do.

The majority of respondents, about four out of five (82%), control how they do their work. About one in six (16%) work with their boss to determine how work is to be completed and only 2% have their boss tell them how to do their work.

More than three-quarters (78%) of the respondents control when they do their tasks. About one in five (19%) work with their boss to determine when to do their tasks and 3% have their boss tell them when to do their tasks.

Job Autonomy	
Goal-Setting	**Percentage (*n* = 2,570)**
I develop my own goals at work.	32%
I work with my boss to develop my goals.	61%
My boss develops my goals for me.	7%
Total	100%
Task Development	
I control the types of tasks I do.	45%
I work with my boss to develop they type of tasks I do.	46%
My boss tells me the type of tasks to do.	9%
Total	100%
Work Process	
I control how I do my work.	82%
I work with my boss to determine how I do my work.	16%
My boss tells me how to do my work.	2%
Total	100%
Work Schedule	
I control when I do my tasks.	78%
I work with my boss to determine when to do my tasks.	19%
My boss tells me when to do my tasks.	3%
Total	100%

There are no statistically significant differences for goal setting, work processes, and work schedule by graduation year.

Respondents who graduated in 2000 are significantly more likely than those who graduated in 2005 to control the types of tasks they do at work. Respondents who graduated only recently in 2005 are more likely than those from the class of 2001 to have their boss tell them the types of tasks they do.

Job Autonomy, by Graduation Year						
Goal-Setting	**2000 (*n* = 155)**	**2001 (*n* = 236)**	**2002 (*n* = 230)**	**2003 (*n* = 339)**	**2004 (*n* = 664)**	**2005 (*n* = 946)**
I develop my own goals at work	41%	37%	32%	29%	32%	31%
I work with my boss to develop my goals	54%	56%	60%	64%	61%	61%
My boss develops my goals for me	5%	6%	8%	7%	6%	8%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Task Development*						
I control the types of tasks I do	**59%**	52%	45%	44%	46%	**41%**
I work with my boss to develop they type of tasks I do	**36%**	43%	45%	47%	47%	47%
My boss tells me the type of tasks to do	6%	**5%**	10%	9%	7%	**12%**
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Work Process						
I control how I do my work	84%	81%	86%	84%	82%	80%
I work with my boss to determine how I do my work	15%	18%	11%	14%	16%	18%
My boss tells me how to do my work	1%	1%	3%	2%	2%	3%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Work Schedule						
I control when I do my tasks	84%	81%	78%	77%	79%	76%
I work with my boss to determine when to do my tasks	15%	17%	18%	20%	19%	20%
My boss tells me when to do my tasks	1%	3%	4%	4%	3%	4%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.						

Respondents who graduated from executive programs are more likely than all other respondents to develop their own goals at work. Additionally, respondents who graduated from executive programs are more likely than those who graduated from full-time programs to control the types of tasks they do.

Respondents from full-time and part-time programs are more likely than respondents from executive programs to work with their boss to determine how they do their work. Additionally, respondents from full-time and part-time programs are more likely than respondents from executive programs to work with their boss to determine when to do their work.

Job Autonomy, by Program Type			
Goal-Setting*	**Full-time (*n* = 1,852)**	**Part-time (*n* = 502)**	**Executive (*n* = 187)**
I develop my own goals at work	31%	33%	**49%**
I work with my boss to develop my goals	63%	60%	**47%**
My boss develops my goals for me	7%	8%	4%
Total	100%	100%	100%
Task Development*			
I control the types of tasks I do	**42%**	50%	**67%**
I work with my boss to develop they type of tasks I do	**49%**	41%	**28%**
My boss tells me the type of tasks to do	10%	9%	**4%**
Total	100%	100%	100%
Work Process*			
I control how I do my work	81%	81%	93%
I work with my boss to determine how I do my work	17%	16%	**6%**
My boss tells me how to do my work	2%	3%	1%
Total	100%	100%	100%
Work Schedule*			
I control when I do my tasks	78%	75%	88%
I work with my boss to determine when to do my tasks	19%	22%	**10%**
My boss tells me when to do my tasks	3%	3%	2%
Total	100%	100%	100%
*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.			

There are no statistically significant differences by gender for goal setting, task development, and work process. However, women are slightly, yet significantly, less likely than men to work with their boss to determine when they do their tasks.

Job Autonomy, by Gender		
Goal-Setting	**Male (*n* = 1,845)**	**Female (*n* = 718)**
I develop my own goals at work	33%	30%
I work with my boss to develop my goals	60%	64%
My boss develops my goals for me	7%	6%
Total	100%	100%
Task Development		
I control the types of tasks I do	46%	44%
I work with my boss to develop they type of tasks I do	45%	47%
My boss tells me the type of tasks to do	9%	10%
Total	100%	100%
Work Process		
I control how I do my work	81%	83%
I work with my boss to determine how I do my work	16%	14%
My boss tells me how to do my work	2%	2%
Total	100%	100%

Job Autonomy, by Gender		
Work Schedule*		
I control when I do my tasks	77%	82%
I work with my boss to determine when to do my tasks	21%	**15%**
My boss tells me when to do my tasks	3%	3%
Total	100%	100%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.		

Respondents from Asia are the most likely of all respondents to develop their own goals at work. European respondents are more likely than all other respondents except for respondents from Latin America, to control the types of tasks they do at work. Asian respondents are more likely than European respondents to work with their boss to determine how they will do their work. Asian respondents are more likely than all other respondents to work with their boss to determine when to do their work.

Job Autonomy, by Citizenship					
Goal-Setting*	**Asia (*n* = 266)**	**United States (*n* = 1,554)**	**Canada (*n* = 185)**	**Latin America (*n* = 130)**	**Europe (*n* = 331)**
I develop my own goals at work	**40%**	31%	34%	27%	32%
I work with my boss to develop my goals	**50%**	62%	59%	66%	61%
My boss develops my goals for me	9%	7%	8%	7%	6%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Task Development*					
I control the types of tasks I do	47%	43%	41%	55%	**52%**
I work with my boss to develop they type of tasks I do	43%	47%	48%	40%	41%
My boss tells me the type of tasks to do	10%	10%	11%	5%	6%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Work Process*					
I control how I do my work	76%	82%	77%	82%	87%
I work with my boss to determine how I do my work	**20%**	15%	21%	16%	**11%**
My boss tells me how to do my work	3%	2%	2%	2%	2%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Work Schedule*					
I control when I do my tasks	70%	79%	80%	75%	83%
I work with my boss to determine when to do my tasks	**25%**	18%	17%	22%	16%
My boss tells me when to do my tasks	5%	3%	3%	3%	1%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.					

The only statistically significant difference by U.S. subgroup is that Asian American respondents are significantly less likely than all other respondents to state that their boss tells them the type of tasks to do.

Job Autonomy, by U.S. Subgroup				
Goal-Setting	**Asian American (*n* = 110)**	**African American (*n* = 43)**	**White (*n* = 1,229)**	**Hispanic (*n* = 60)**
I develop my own goals at work	26%	37%	32%	20%
I work with my boss to develop my goals	68%	58%	62%	73%
My boss develops my goals for me	6%	5%	6%	7%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
Task Development*				
I control the types of tasks I do	36%	37%	44%	53%
I work with my boss to develop they type of tasks I do	62%	51%	46%	37%
My boss tells me the type of tasks to do	**3%**	12%	10%	10%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
Work Process				
I control how I do my work	82%	79%	82%	82%
I work with my boss to determine how I do my work	17%	19%	15%	18%
My boss tells me how to do my work	1%	2%	2%	0%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
Work Schedule				
I control when I do my tasks	82%	77%	79%	78%
I work with my boss to determine when to do my tasks	17%	16%	18%	18%
My boss tells me when to do my tasks	1%	7%	3%	3%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.				

Respondents who work in the nonprofit/government industry are the most likely of all respondents to indicate that they develop their own goals at work. Respondents in the consulting and finance/accounting industries are the least likely to control the types of tasks they do at work. Respondents in the finance/accounting industry are more likely than those in the technology and healthcare industries to have their boss tell them the types of tasks to do at work.

Respondents in the consulting and finance/accounting industries are more likely than those in the technology industry to work with their boss to determine how to do the tasks. Additionally, respondents in the finance/accounting industry are more likely than those in the technology industry to work with their boss to determine when to do their work.

Job Autonomy, by Industry								
Goal-Setting*	**Consulting (*n* = 343)**	**Finance/ Accounting (*n* = 522)**	**Products/ Services (*n* = 531)**	**Manu-facturing (*n* = 244)**	**Tech-nology (*n* = 341)**	**Healthcare/ Pharm-aceuticals (*n* = 259)**	**Energy/ Utilities (*n* = 103)**	**Nonprofit/ Government (*n* = 165)**
I develop my own goals at work	37%	28%	31%	34%	30%	33%	29%	**45%**
I work with my boss to develop my goals	58%	64%	62%	58%	65%	61%	62%	**47%**
My boss develops my goals for me	5%	7%	8%	7%	5%	7%	9%	9%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Task Development*								
I control the types of tasks I do	**39%**	**37%**	48%	53%	52%	50%	45%	47%
I work with my boss to develop they type of tasks I do	50%	51%	45%	39%	43%	45%	45%	42%
My boss tells me the type of tasks to do	11%	**13%**	8%	8%	**5%**	**5%**	11%	11%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Work Process*								
I control how I do my work	77%	78%	82%	86%	86%	87%	82%	85%
I work with my boss to determine how I do my work	**20%**	**19%**	17%	12%	**11%**	12%	17%	12%
My boss tells me how to do my work	3%	3%	2%	3%	2%	2%	2%	3%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Work Schedule*								
I control when I do my tasks	74%	73%	80%	81%	83%	82%	76%	76%
I work with my boss to determine when to do my tasks	22%	**23%**	18%	16%	**14%**	16%	24%	21%
My boss tells me when to do my tasks	4%	4%	2%	3%	2%	2%	0%	3%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.

Job Feedback

Respondents are asked to report how often their boss or supervisor provides them with positive feedback and constructive criticism. Overall, 39% of respondents indicate that their boss provides positive feedback very often. The majority (54%) receives positive feedback sometimes and 8% state that they never receive positive feedback.

About one-fifth (22%) receive constructive criticism very often and two-thirds (66%) receive constructive criticism sometimes. One in eight (12%) reports that they never receive constructive criticism.

Job Feedback	
How often does your boss/supervisor provide you with…	**Percentage (*n* = 2,570)**
Positive Feedback	
Very often	39%
Sometimes	54%
Never	8%
Total	100%
Constructive criticism	
Very often	22%
Sometimes	66%
Never	12%
Total	100%

Respondents who graduated from executive programs are the least likely of all respondents to indicate they receive positive feedback very often, and they are the most likely to state that they never receive positive feedback from their boss or supervisor.

Respondents who graduated from part-time programs are the least likely of all respondents to indicate that they receive constructive criticism very often from their boss or supervisor.

Job Autonomy, by Program Type			
How often does your boss/supervisor provide you with…	**Full-time (*n* = 1,852)**	**Part-time (*n* = 502)**	**Executive (*n* = 187)**
Positive Feedback*			
Very often	41%	36%	**31%**
Sometimes	53%	55%	57%
Never	7%	9%	**12%**
Total	100%	100%	100%
Constructive criticism*			
Very often	24%	**17%**	19%
Sometimes	66%	70%	66%
Never	11%	14%	15%
Total	100%	100%	100%
*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.			

Respondents from Europe are the least likely of all respondents to indicate that they receive positive feedback from their boss/supervisor very often. Respondents from Latin America are the most likely of the respondents to indicate that they receive constructive criticism very often. Asian respondents, on the other hand, are more likely than respondents from Latin America to state that they never receive constructive criticism from their boss or supervisor.

Job Autonomy, by Citizenship					
How often does your boss/supervisor provide you with…	**Asia (*n* = 266)**	**United States (*n* = 1,554)**	**Canada (*n* = 185)**	**Latin America (*n* = 130)**	**Europe (*n* = 331)**
Positive Feedback*					
Very often	35%	41%	44%	39%	**29%**
Sometimes	58%	52%	50%	55%	60%
Never	8%	7%	7%	6%	10%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Constructive criticism*					
Very often	20%	22%	24%	**32%**	21%
Sometimes	64%	67%	68%	61%	67%
Never	**16%**	11%	8%	**7%**	12%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.					

Statistically, there is no difference in the amount of positive feedback respondents receive by their industry type. However, respondents in the consulting industry are more likely than all other respondents to receive constructive criticism very often, and respondents in the manufacturing industry are the most likely to state that they never receive constructive criticism.

Job Autonomy, by Industry								
Positive Feedback	**Consulting (*n* = 343)**	**Finance/ Accounting (*n* = 522)**	**Products/ Services (*n* = 531)**	**Manu-facturing (*n* = 244)**	**Tech-nology (*n* = 341)**	**Healthcare/ Pharm-aceuticals (*n* = 259)**	**Energy/ Utilities (*n* = 103)**	**Nonprofit/ Government (*n* = 165)**
Very often	38%	39%	38%	39%	39%	39%	35%	44%
Sometimes	54%	55%	53%	55%	54%	56%	55%	46%
Never	8%	7%	9%	6%	7%	6%	10%	10%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Constructive criticism*								
Very often	**29%**	21%	21%	24%	21%	21%	20%	15%
Sometimes	63%	67%	68%	61%	69%	69%	63%	71%
Never	9%	12%	10%	**16%**	11%	10%	17%	14%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.								

Respondents working in IT/MIS are the least likely to report receiving positive feedback from their boss or supervisor. Respondents working in consulting are most likely to receive constructive criticism. Respondents in finance/accounting, on the other hand, are almost twice as likely as those in consulting to state that they never receive constructive criticism from their boss or supervisor.

Job Autonomy, by Job Function							
Positive Feedback*	**Marketing/ Sales (*n* = 638)**	**Operations/ Logistics (*n* = 257)**	**Consulting (*n* = 447)**	**General Management (*n* = 255)**	**Finance/ Accounting (*n* = 708)**	**Human Resources (*n* = 61)**	**It/MIS (*n* = 154)**
Very often	42%	34%	41%	36%	39%	39%	**27%**
Sometimes	52%	58%	52%	55%	53%	48%	**66%**
Never	6%	8%	7%	9%	8%	13%	7%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Constructive criticism*							
Very often	23%	17%	**29%**	22%	21%	21%	16%
Sometimes	68%	74%	63%	67%	64%	62%	71%
Never	9%	10%	**8%**	12%	**15%**	16%	14%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.							

There are no statistically significant differences in the amount of positive feedback and constructive criticism received from their boss or supervisor by graduation year, gender, and U.S. subgroup.

Job Motivation

In order to gauge job motivation, respondents were asked to distribute 100 points among six statements in terms of how important each is to their personal motivation at work. If they were not motivated at work, they were asked to indicate 100 points for the statement, "I am not motivated by my work." This question set is based on an adaptation of the self-determination continuum that ranges from amotivation to intrinsic motivation[2]. The tables in this section provide the mean number of points assigned to each statement.

On average, respondents assigned 21 points to the statement, "the possibility of pay raises and promotions," 16 points to each of the following statements, "my performance and evaluation at work," "the perceived importance of my work," and "the work I perform is integral to my personal goals," and 26 points to the statement, "my work is interesting and enjoyable." Overall, respondents assigned five points, on average to the statement, "I am not motivated by my work."

[2] Gagne, M and Deci, E.L. (2005) Self-determination theory and work motivation. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 26, 331-262.

Job Motivation (Mean Number of Points Allotted)	
Statement	**Points (*n* = 2,570)**
My work is interesting and enjoyable	26
The possibility of pay raises and promotions	21
My performance and evaluation at work	16
The perceived importance of my work	16
The work I perform is integral to my personal goals	16
I am not motivated by my work	5
Total	100

Respondents who graduated in 2004 are slightly, yet significantly, more likely to have assigned a higher number of points to the statement, "my performance and evaluation at work," compared with respondents in the class of 2002.

Job Motivation (Mean Number of Points Allotted), by Graduation Year						
Statement	**2000 (*n* = 155)**	**2001 (*n* = 236)**	**2002 (*n* = 230)**	**2003 (*n* = 339)**	**2004 (*n* = 664)**	**2005 (*n* = 946)**
My work is interesting and enjoyable	26	28	26	27	25	26
The possibility of pay raises and promotions	23	21	21	21	21	21
My performance and evaluation at work*	15	17	**14**	15	**17**	16
The perceived importance of my work	18	16	16	15	16	16
The work I perform is integral to my personal goals	14	14	16	17	16	17
I am not motivated by my work	4	4	7	4	5	5
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100
* $p \leq .05$; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.						

Respondents who graduated from part-time programs are significantly more likely than respondents who graduated from executive programs to have assigned points to the statement, "I am not motivated by my work." This statement corresponds to a feeling of amotivation.

Job Motivation (Mean Number of Points Allotted), by Program Type			
Statement	**Full-time (*n* = 1,852)**	**Part-time (*n* = 502)**	**Executive (*n* = 187)**
My work is interesting and enjoyable	26	24	28
The possibility of pay raises and promotions	21	21	20
My performance and evaluation at work	16	16	17
The perceived importance of my work	16	16	16
The work I perform is integral to my personal goals	16	15	17
I am not motivated by my work*	4	**7**	**3**
Total	100	100	100
* $p \leq .05$; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.			

Women are slightly, yet significantly, more likely than men to have assigned points to the following statements, "my performance and evaluation at work" and "my work is interesting and enjoyable." Whereas, men are slightly, yet significantly, more likely than women to have assigned points to the statement, "the work I perform is integral to my personal goals."

Job Motivation (Mean Number of Points Allotted), by Gender		
Statement	**Male (*n* = 1,845)**	**Female (*n* = 718)**
My work is interesting and enjoyable*	**25**	**27**
The possibility of pay raises and promotions	22	20
My performance and evaluation at work*	**16**	**17**
The perceived importance of my work	16	17
The work I perform is integral to my personal goals*	**16**	**15**
I am not motivated by my work	5	4
Total	100	100
* $p \leq .05$; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.		

Respondents from Asia are more likely than respondents from the U.S. to have assigned points to the statement, "the work I perform is integral to my personal goals," but respondents from Asia are less likely than respondents from the U.S., Canada, and Europe to have assigned points to the statement, "my work is interesting and enjoyable." Respondents from Europe are more likely than respondents from the U.S. and Latin America to have assigned points to the statement, "my work is interesting and enjoyable."

Job Motivation (Mean Number of Points Allotted), by Citizenship					
Statement	**Asia (*n* = 266)**	**United States (*n* = 1,554)**	**Canada (*n* = 185)**	**Latin America (*n* = 130)**	**Europe (*n* = 331)**
My work is interesting and enjoyable*	**21**	**26**	**27**	**24**	**29**
The possibility of pay raises and promotions	20	22	21	20	20
My performance and evaluation at work	17	16	15	16	16
The perceived importance of my work	16	16	15	15	16
The work I perform is integral to my personal goals*	**19**	**15**	17	17	17
I am not motivated by my work	7	5	4	7	3
Total	100%	100%	100	100	100
* $p \leq .05$; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.					

Respondents working in the nonprofit/government industry are less likely than respondents in the finance/accounting, products/services, manufacturing, and technology to have assigned points to the statement, "the possibility of pay raises and promotions." Additionally, respondents in the finance/accounting industry are more likely than respondents in the consulting, manufacturing, and healthcare industries to assign points to that statement.

Respondents in the products/services industry are more likely than respondents in the finance/accounting industry to have assigned points to the statement, "the work I perform is integral to my personal goals."

Respondents in the finance/accounting industry are more likely than respondents in the consulting industry to have assigned points to the statement, "my performance and evaluation at work." Yet, respondents in the consulting industry are more likely than respondents in the finance/accounting industry to assign points to the statement, "my work is interesting and enjoyable." Respondents in the technology industry are more likely than respondents in the consulting industry to have assigned points to the statement, "the perceived importance of my work."

Job Motivation (Mean Number of Points Allotted), by Industry*

Statement	Consulting (*n* = 343)	Finance/ Accounting (*n* = 522)	Products/ Services (*n* = 531)	Manu-facturing (*n* = 244)	Tech-nology (*n* = 341)	Healthcare/ Pharm-aceuticals (*n* = 259)	Energy/ Utilities (*n* = 103)	Nonprofit/ Government (*n* = 165)
My work is interesting and enjoyable*	**28**	**25**	25	25	25	26	28	28
The possibility of pay raises and promotions*	**19**	**24**	**22**	**21**	**21**	**20**	**21**	**17**
My performance and evaluation at work*	**14**	**17**	16	16	16	16	16	15
The perceived importance of my work*	**15**	15	15	17	**17**	17	16	18
The work I perform is integral to my personal goals*	17	**14**	**17**	16	16	16	15	17
I am not motivated by my work	7	4	5	5	4	5	4	5
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

* $p \leq .05$; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.

Respondents who work in finance/accounting are more likely to have assigned points to the statement, "the possibility of pay raises and promotions," compared with respondents in consulting and general management. Respondents in general management are more likely than respondents in operations/logistics, finance/accounting, and IT/MIS to have assigned points to the statement, "the work I perform is integral to my personal goals."

Job Motivation (Mean Number of Points Allotted), by Job Function							
Statement	**Marketing/ Sales (*n* = 638)**	**Operations/ Logistics (*n* = 257)**	**Consulting (*n* = 447)**	**General Management (*n* = 255)**	**Finance/ Accounting (*n* = 708)**	**Human Resources (*n* = 61)**	**It/MIS (*n* = 154)**
My work is interesting and enjoyable	27	24	27	26	25	27	25
The possibility of pay raises and promotions*	22	22	**20**	**19**	**23**	18	21
My performance and evaluation at work	17	17	15	15	16	15	15
The perceived importance of my work	15	16	16	16	16	17	16
The work I perform is integral to my personal goals*	16	**14**	16	**19**	**15**	17	**14**
I am not motivated by my work*	4	7	5	6	4	7	9
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
* $p \leq .05$; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.							

There are no statistically significant differences in the allocation of points among the various motivation statements by U.S. subgroup.

Annual Base Salary

Respondents are asked to report their annual base salary for their current job. Overall, on average, respondents earn $87,170 per year. Also shown in the table are the upper and lower 95% confidence intervals of the mean, which is an indicator of the precision of the mean and not the range of values, and the 25th, 50th (median), and 75th percentiles.

Annual Base Salary	
Statistic	**Percentage (*n* = 2,265)**
Lower 95% confidence interval	$85,709
Mean	$87,170
Upper 95% confidence interval	$88,632
25th percentile	$65,000
Median	$85,000
75th percentile	$101,950

Not surprisingly, respondents who have been out of school longer earn significantly more than those who have recently finished school. Respondents who graduated in 2000 and 2001 earn significantly more than all other respondents.

Annual Base Salary, by Graduation Year						
Statistic	**2000 (*n* = 135)**	**2001 (*n* = 209)**	**2002 (*n* = 203)**	**2003 (*n* = 307)**	**2004 (*n* = 589)**	**2005 (*n* = 825)**
Lower 95% confidence interval	$101,460	$95,852	$85,718	$83,367	$80,159	$80,118
Mean*	**$107,694**	**$101,319**	**$90,263**	**$87,874**	**$82,578**	**$82,466**
Upper 95% confidence interval	$113,927	$106,785	$94,808	$92,380	$84,998	$84,814
25th percentile	$85,000	$77,000	$70,000	$65,000	$65,000	$60,000
Median	$105,000	$95,000	$88,000	$85,000	$83,000	$80,000
75th percentile	$130,000	$120,000	$110,000	$100,200	$100,000	$97,500
* $p \leq .05$; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.						

Respondents who have worked full-time for two years or more earn significantly more than respondents who have worked for less than two years.

Annual Base Salary, by Years of Work Experience				
Statistic	**Less than one year (*n* = 798)**	**One year, but less than two years (*n* = 506)**	**Two years, but less than six years (*n* = 654)**	**Six years or longer (*n* = 307)**
Lower 95% confidence interval	$79,930	$80,484	$88,777	$92,356
Mean*	**$82,190**	**$83,289**	**$91,524**	**$97,238**
Upper 95% confidence interval	$84,449	$86,093	$94,272	$102,120
25th percentile	$62,000	$63,375	$70,000	$70,000
Median	$80,000	$82,500	$90,000	$90,000
75th percentile	$96,340	$98,000	$108,275	$115,000
* $p \leq .05$; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.				

Respondents who graduated from executive program earn significantly more than respondents who graduated from full-time or part-time programs. When controlling for length of time on the current job, respondents of executive programs earn significantly more than graduates of other programs. Controlling for the number of years since graduation, graduates of executive programs earn significantly more compared with other graduates among graduates of 2003, 2004, and 2005. Additionally, there are significant differences between the mean earnings for the class of 2000 and 2001.

Annual Base Salary, by Program Type			
Statistic	**Full-time (*n* = 1,626)**	**Part-time (*n* = 446)**	**Executive (*n* = 166)**
Lower 95% confidence interval	$83,780	$79,168	$108,663
Mean*	$85,311	$82,281	**$116,667**
Upper 95% confidence interval	$86,842	$85,393	$124,672
25th percentile	$65,000	$60,000	$85,000
Median	$84,046	$79,000	$109,500
75th percentile	$100,000	$100,000	$130,875
* $p \leq .05$; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.			

Annual Base Salary, by Program Type and Length of Time in Current Job				
Length of Time in Current Job	**Statistic**	**Full-time (*n* = 1,626)**	**Part-time (*n* = 446)**	**Executive (*n* = 166)**
Less than one year	Mean*	**$81,167**	**$77,461**	**$115,614**
	Median	$80,000	$74,500	$107,500
One year, but less than two year	Mean*	**$81,987**	**483,894**	**$114,686**
	Median	$81,500	$80,000	$97,500
Two years, but less than six years	Mean*	**$92,299**	**$82,731**	**$117,069**
	Median	$90,000	$83,000	$101,350
Six years or longer	Mean*	**$93,668**	**$84,657**	**$117,404**
	Median	$90,000	$80,000	$110,000
* $p \leq .05$; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.				

Annual Base Salary, by Program Type and Graduation Year				
Graduation Year	**Statistic**	**Full-time (*n* = 1,626)**	**Part-time (*n* = 446)**	**Executive (*n* = 166)**
2000	Mean*	$109,572	$87,838	$133,125
	Median	$105,341	$88,100	$145,000
2001	Mean*	$97,609	$110,406	$119,808
	Median	$92,250	$94,500	$120,000
2002	Mean	$90,692	$89,431	$91,143
	Median	$90,000	$85,103	$85,000
2003	Mean*	**$86,156**	**$84,758**	**$131,929**
	Median	$86,400	$75,750	$82,000
2004	Mean*	**$81,063**	**$79,095**	**$110,674**
	Median	$82,000	$75,000	$109,000
2005	Mean*	**$77,664**	**$76,809**	**$118,740**
	Median	$78,000	$75,000	$110,000
* $p \leq .05$; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.				

Men earn significantly more than women on average, even when controlling for length of time on the current job. Controlling for the number of years since graduation, men earn significantly more compared with women, except for the graduates of 2000.

Annual Base Salary, by Gender		
Statistic	**Male (*n* = 1,641)**	**Female (*n* = 617)**
Lower 95% confidence interval	$89,397	$74,317
Mean*	**$91,203**	**$76,483**
Upper 95% confidence interval	$93,010	$78,648
25th percentile	$69,000	$57,800
Median	$87,500	$75,000
75th percentile	$107,050	$91,958
* $p \leq .05$; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.		

Annual Base Salary, by Gender and Length of Time in Current Job*			
Length of Time in Current Job	**Statistic**	**Male (*n* = 1,641)**	**Female (*n* = 617)**
Less than one year	Mean	**$85,816**	**$73,383**
	Median	$81,900	$75,000
One year, but less than two years	Mean	**$86,078**	**$75,304**
	Median	$85,000	$74,000
Two years, but less than six years	Mean	**$95,974**	**$79,951**
	Median	$92,250	$80,000
Six years or longer	Mean	**$102,761**	**$79,847**
	Median	$95,000	$74,000
* p ≤ .05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.			

Annual Base Salary, by Gender and Graduation Year			
Graduation Year	**Statistic**	**Male (*n* = 1,641)**	**Female (*n* = 617)**
2000	Mean	$111,717	$98,468
	Median	$110,000	$98,000
2001	Mean*	**$106,460**	**$87,608**
	Median	$100,000	$85,000
2002	Mean*	**$93,704**	**$79,733**
	Median	$91,500	$80,000
2003	Mean*	**$91,395**	**$78,675**
	Median	$87,988	$78,264
2004	Mean*	**$86,509**	**$72,464**
	Median	$86,000	$71,500
2005	Mean*	**$86,726**	**$71,109**
	Median	$82,000	$72,000
* p ≤ .05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.			

European respondents earn significantly more than respondents in Asia, the U.S., and Canada. Additionally, respondents from the U.S. earn significantly more than respondents from Canada. When controlling for time since graduation, there are significant differences by citizenship for graduates of 2002, 2003, and 2005.

Annual Base Salary, by Citizenship					
Statistic	**Asia (*n* = 211)**	**United States (*n* = 1,402)**	**Canada (*n* = 166)**	**Latin America (*n* = 108)**	**Europe (*n* = 287)**
Lower 95% confidence interval	$76,832	$85,678	$73,945	$78,144	$90,794
Mean*	**$82,098**	**$87,451**	**$78,304**	$84,773	**$95,776**
Upper 95% confidence interval	$87,365	$89,225	$82,668	$91,402	$100,758
25th percentile	$57,500	$66,875	$61,750	$60,000	$68,000
Median	$77,000	$85,000	$74,281	$81,250	$90,000
75th percentile	$100,000	$100,000	$90,000	$102,000	$118,000
* p ≤ .05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.					

Annual Base Salary, by Citizenship and Graduation Year						
Graduation Year	**Statistic**	**Asia (*n* = 211)**	**United States (*n* = 1,402)**	**Canada (*n* = 166)**	**Latin America (*n* = 108)**	**Europe (*n* = 287)**
2000	Mean	$113,841	$106,303	$108,500	$119,750	$110,325
	Median	$120,000	$100,000	$122,500	$107,000	$107,500
2001	Mean	$103,971	$102,474	$75,898	$106,625	$96,300
	Median	$100,000	$95,000	$80,000	$98,500	$92,000
2002	Mean*	$86,946	$91,984	**$66,343**	**$106,100**	$91,643
	Median	$94,000	$90,000	$75,000	$101,000	$90,500
2003	Mean*	$77,154	$88,859	$77,024	**$72,662**	**$101,156**
	Median	$80,000	$87,500	$76,500	$65,000	$92,900
2004	Mean	$78,269	$82,494	$85,722	$80,354	$85,194
	Median	$75,000	$84,092	$76,546	$82,500	$87,000
2005	Mean*	**$73,099**	**$81,519**	**$74,836**	$81,799	**$99,137**
	Median	$65,000	$80,000	$70,000	$80,000	$96,000

* $p \leq .05$; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.

Respondents at higher levels of the organization earn significantly more than respondents at lower levels of the organization, except for respondents in senior-level or executive positions, who statistically earn the same.

Annual Base Salary, by Current Job Level					
	Current Job Level				
Statistic	**Not a manager/ supervisor (*n* = 606)**	**First/entry-level manager/ supervisor (*n* = 464)**	**Middle level manager/ associate (*n* = 782)**	**Senior level manager/ partner (*n* = 273)**	**Executive in the organization (*n* = 136)**
Lower 95% confidence interval	$70,462	$77,701	$87,354	$105,148	$107,454
Mean*	**$72,498**	**$79,940**	**$89,459**	**$110,112**	**$118,349**
Upper 95% confidence interval	$74,535	$82,179	$91,564	$115,076	$129,244
25th percentile	$55,000	$64,000	$70,000	$83,000	$80,000
Median	$72,000	$82,000	$88,000	$105,000	$100,000
75th percentile	$88,242	$95,000	$105,000	$130,000	$137,250

* $p \leq .05$; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.

Respondents in the consulting industry earn significantly more than respondents in the finance/accounting, products/services, manufacturing, healthcare, and nonprofit/government industries. Respondents in the finance/accounting, technology, healthcare, and energy/utility industries earn significantly more than respondents in the products/services and nonprofit/ government industries. Additionally, respondents in the manufacturing industry earn significantly more than respondents in the nonprofit/government industry.

When controlling for years since graduation, the 2002 graduates in the nonprofit/government industry earn significantly less than all other industries, the 2000 and 2003 graduates in the nonprofit/government industry earn significantly less than those in consulting, and in all other years, they earn significantly less than those in other industries. Graduates in 2004 who work in energy/utilities earn significantly more than those in all other industries. Graduates in 2000,

2001, 2003, and 2005 who work in consulting earn significantly more than those in other industries.

Annual Base Salary, by Industry								
Statistic	**Consulting (*n* = 306)**	**Finance/ Accounting (*n* = 455)**	**Products/ Services (*n* = 472)**	**Manu-facturing (*n* = 215)**	**Tech-nology (*n* = 312)**	**Healthcare/ Pharm-aceuticals (*n* = 226)**	**Energy/ Utilities (*n* = 88)**	**Nonprofit/ Government (*n* = 137)**
Lower 95% confidence interval	$95,425	$84,325	$77,615	$82,631	$87,855	$83,495	$91,511	$59,365
Mean*	**$99,672**	**$87,604**	**$80,429**	**$86,436**	$91,305	**$89,377**	$98,788	**$63,565**
Upper 95% confidence interval	$103,919	$90,883	$83,243	$90,241	$94,754	$95,259	$106,066	$67,766
25th percentile	$75,000	$65,000	$60,000	$70,000	$75,000	$61,375	$78,500	$45,070
Median	$96,000	$85,000	$80,000	$83,000	$89,300	$84,000	$97,800	$61,000
75th percentile	$120,000	$105,000	$93,875	$100,000	$102,000	$108,250	$120,000	$78,500
* $p \leq .05$; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.								

Annual Base Salary, by Industry and Graduation Year					
Graduation Year	**Statistic**	**Consulting (*n* = 306)**	**Finance/ Accounting (*n* = 455)**	**Products/ Services (*n* = 472)**	**Manu-facturing (*n* = 215)**
2000	Mean*	**$122,527**	$110,327	$108,960	$104,522
	Median	$120,000	$110,900	$101,500	$95,990
2001	Mean*	**$115,096**	**$113,935**	**$82,969**	$90,473
	Median	$111,000	$110,000	$81,750	$91,000
2002	Mean*	$104,488	$92,967	$87,953	$91,339
	Median	$98,000	$93,100	$85,677	$84,000
2003	Mean*	**$101,603**	$85,956	$85,739	$86,041
	Median	$97,000	$87,500	$83,000	$82,500
2004	Mean*	$89,037	$80,878	$76,456	$80,667
	Median	$89,000	$80,000	$79,975	$82,000
2005	Mean*	**$96,622**	**$82,248**	$74,625	$82,533
	Median	$91,916	$77,625	$75,000	$80,700
Graduation Year	**Statistic**	**Tech-nology (*n* = 312)**	**Healthcare/ Pharm-aceuticals (*n* = 226)**	**Energy/ Utilities (*n* = 88)**	**Nonprofit/ Government (*n* = 137)**
2000	Mean*	$103,000	$94,167	$146,667	**$71,914**
	Median	$99,000	$90,000	$150,000	$74,400
2001	Mean*	$104,652	$113,720	$111,122	**$78,172**
	Median	$100,000	$107,000	$120,000	$78,500
2002	Mean*	$88,477	$93,261	$86,283	**$56,846**
	Median	$89,750	$89,600	$93,000	$63,500
2003	Mean*	$82,565	$94,771	$106,333	**$68,389**
	Median	$90,000	$87,988	$95,000	$65,000
2004	Mean	$86,591	$84,694	**$111,095**	$62,460
	Median	$85,500	$86,400	$107,000	$59,200
2005	Mean*	$92,251	**$80,686**	$85,357	**$55,517**
	Median	$87,500	$74,250	$85,000	$50,000

Respondents working in consulting and general management earn significantly more than respondents in the marketing/sales, operations/logistics, finance/accounting, and human resources fields. Additionally, respondents in consulting earn significantly more than respondents in the IT/MIS field.

Annual Base Salary, by Job Function							
Statistic	**Marketing/ Sales (*n* = 561)**	**Operations/ Logistics (*n* = 223)**	**Consulting (*n* = 404)**	**General Management (*n* = 221)**	**Finance/ Accounting (*n* = 625)**	**Human Resources (*n* = 53)**	**IT/MIS (*n* = 140)**
Lower 95% confidence interval	$79,778	$76,922	$94,353	$91,100	$82,093	$66,023	$81,793
Mean*	**$82,321**	**$80,601**	**$97,803**	**$97,805**	**$84,748**	**$73,324**	**$86,662**
Upper 95% confidence interval	$84,864	$84,280	$101,253	$104,509	$87,402	$80,625	$91,532
25th percentile	$62,500	$62,500	$75,000	$68,000	$63,000	$53,500	$65,000
Median	$83,000	$80,000	$93,250	$90,000	$80,000	$75,000	$82,250
75th percentile	$97,000	$95,000	$115,000	$116,250	$100,000	$89,300	$104,125
* $p \leq .05$; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.							

Respondents who work outside their country of citizenship earn significantly more than respondents who work inside their country of citizenship.

Annual Base Salary, by Location of Employment		
Statistic	**In Country of Citizenship (*n* = 1,827)**	**Outside Country of Citizenship (*n* = 438)**
Lower 95% confidence interval	$84,182	$89,402
Mean*	**$85,768**	**$93,020**
Upper 95% confidence interval	$87,354	$96,637
25th percentile	$65,000	$68,375
Median	$83,000	$89,700
75th percentile	$100,000	$110,075
* $p \leq .05$; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.		

Respondents who work for multinational organizations earn significantly more than respondents who work in national or regional organizations, who in turn earn significantly more than respondents who work in local organizations.

Annual Base Salary, by Scope of Organization				
Statistic	**Local (*n* = 124)**	**Regional (*n* = 217)**	**National (*n* = 523)**	**Multinational (*n* = 1,401)**
Lower 95% confidence interval	$62,744	$73,061	$80,987	$89,540
Mean*	**$68,411**	**$79,300**	**$83,747**	**$91,328**
Upper 95% confidence interval	$74,079	$85,540	$86,506	$93,115
25th percentile	$48,125	$50,000	$64,000	$70,200
Median	$62,750	$70,000	$80,000	$88,000
75th percentile	$85,000	$93,000	$100,000	$105,000
* $p \leq .05$; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.				

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

Additional Compensation

Respondents are asked to indicate the various types of additional compensation they received in the past year.

Overall, 8% of respondents do not receive additional compensation on top of their annual base salary. Two-thirds (67%) of respondents have benefits packages, and about three-fifths (61%) receive performance-based bonuses. All other types of additional compensation are less common. About one-fifth receives stock options (21%), a moving allowance (20%), profit-sharing (20%), and/or a stock purchase plan (20%).

Additional Compensation	
Item	**Percentage (*n* = 2,570)**
Benefits package	67%
Performance-based bonus	61%
Stock options	21%
Moving allowance	20%
Profit sharing	20%
Stock purchase plan	20%
Signing bonus	18%
Tuition reimbursement	17%
Car or car allowance	13%
First-year signing bonus	6%
Housing allowance or reimbursement	6%
Commissions	5%
Other compensation	9%
No additional compensation	8%
Responses may add to more than 100% due to multiple selections.	

Nearly one in eight (11%) respondents from the class of 2003 reports no additional compensation, which is a significantly higher percentage compared with respondents from the class of 2000. Respondents from the class of 2000 are significantly the most likely of all respondents to receive performance-based bonuses. Additionally, respondents from the class of 2000 are more likely than respondents from the class of 2005 to receive stock options. Respondents from the class of 2005 are more likely than all other respondents to have received a moving allowance and are more likely than respondents from the class of 2000 to have received a first-year signing bonus. Respondents from the class of 2004 are more likely than the class of 2005 to receive a stock purchase plan. Respondents from the class of 2002 are the most likely of all respondents to have received a car or car allowance.

Additional Compensation, by Graduation Year						
Item	**2000 (*n* = 155)**	**2001 (*n* = 236)**	**2002 (*n* = 230)**	**2003 (*n* = 339)**	**2004 (*n* = 664)**	**2005 (*n* = 946)**
Benefits package	68%	72%	69%	60%	64%	70%
Performance-based bonus*	**74%**	70%	66%	63%	59%	57%
Stock options*	**33%**	25%	21%	20%	23%	**18%**
Moving allowance*	**13%**	**13%**	**13%**	**14%**	**17%**	**28%**
Profit sharing	19%	22%	20%	17%	20%	21%
Stock purchase plan*	23%	22%	25%	16%	**24%**	**17%**
Signing bonus*	**6%**	**10%**	**7%**	**12%**	**15%**	**29%**
Tuition reimbursement*	**8%**	13%	13%	**9%**	16%	**24%**
Car or car allowance*	10%	17%	**20%**	13%	13%	12%
First year signing bonus*	**3%**	3%	3%	4%	6%	**9%**
Housing allowance or reimbursement	7%	4%	4%	6%	6%	6%
Commissions	7%	3%	5%	3%	5%	5%
Other compensation	11%	10%	6%	11%	9%	9%
No additional compensation*	**4%**	7%	7%	**11%**	9%	7%

Responses may add to more than 100% due to multiple selections

*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.

Respondents who graduated from executive programs are more likely than all other respondents to receive stock options, profit-sharing, and a car or car allowance. Additionally, respondents who graduated from executive or part-time programs are more likely than respondents who graduated from full-time programs to receive tuition reimbursement.

Respondents who graduated from full-time programs are more likely than other respondents to receive a signing bonus, and they are more likely than respondents who graduated from part-time programs to receive a moving allowance and a first-year signing bonus.

Additional Compensation, by Program Type			
Item	**Full-time (*n* = 1,852)**	**Part-time (*n* = 502)**	**Executive (*n* = 187)**
Benefits package	67%	68%	70%
Performance-based bonus	61%	62%	65%
Stock options*	21%	21%	**31%**
Moving allowance*	**23%**	**8%**	17%
Profit sharing*	19%	20%	**29%**
Stock purchase plan	21%	19%	22%
Signing bonus*	**22%**	**8%**	**12%**
Tuition reimbursement*	**11%**	**32%**	**34%**
Car or car allowance*	13%	11%	**27%**
First year signing bonus*	**8%**	**3%**	4%
Housing allowance or reimbursement	6%	4%	5%
Commissions	4%	5%	7%
Other compensation	9%	9%	13%
No additional compensation	8%	7%	6%

Responses may add to more than 100% due to multiple selections

*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.

Women are less likely than men to receive a moving allowance, car or car allowance, and commissions.

Additional Compensation, by Gender		
Item	**Male (*n* = 1,845)**	**Female (*n* = 718)**
Benefits package	65%	73%
Performance-based bonus	63%	58%
Stock options	22%	19%
Moving allowance*	21%	**16%**
Profit sharing	21%	18%
Stock purchase plan	21%	19%
Signing bonus	19%	17%
Tuition reimbursement	16%	19%
Car or car allowance*	**15%**	**8%**
First year signing bonus	7%	5%
Housing allowance or reimbursement	6%	4%
Commissions*	5%	**3%**
Other compensation	10%	8%
No additional compensation	8%	8%

Responses may add to more than 100% due to multiple selections

*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.

Asian and European respondents are almost twice as likely as U.S. respondents not to receive additional compensation. Respondents from the U.S. are more likely than respondents from Asia, Latin America, and Europe to receive a benefits package. Additionally, respondents from the U.S. are more likely than Canadian and European respondents to receive stock options, and U.S. respondents are more likely than respondents from Asia and Europe to receive profit-sharing. On the other hand, respondents from the U.S. are less likely than Latin American and European respondents to receive a car or car allowance, and U.S. respondents are less likely than Asian and Latin American respondents to receive a housing allowance or reimbursement.

Additional Compensation, by Citizenship					
Item	**Asia (*n* = 266)**	**United States (*n* = 1,554)**	**Canada (*n* = 185)**	**Latin America (*n* = 130)**	**Europe (*n* = 331)**
Benefits package*	**50%**	**75%**	73%	**52%**	**52%**
Performance-based bonus	55%	63%	58%	58%	66%
Stock options*	20%	**24%**	**13%**	18%	**17%**
Moving allowance	18%	20%	22%	24%	19%
Profit sharing*	**15%**	**23%**	18%	18%	**14%**
Stock purchase plan*	20%	22%	24%	17%	**15%**
Signing bonus	17%	18%	21%	25%	16%
Tuition reimbursement*	17%	19%	15%	14%	**13%**
Car or car allowance*	14%	**7%**	14%	**24%**	**33%**
First-year signing bonus	6%	6%	8%	9%	8%
Housing allowance or reimbursement*	**12%**	**5%**	4%	**12%**	5%
Commissions	5%	5%	6%	4%	4%
Other compensation	9%	9%	10%	9%	10%
No additional compensation*	**11%**	**6%**	7%	9%	**11%**

Responses may add to more than 100% due to multiple selections

*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.

Asian American respondents are more likely than all other U.S. subgroups to receive a moving allowance and a signing bonus. Hispanics are more likely than all other respondents to receive a housing allowance or reimbursement.

Additional Compensation, by U.S. Subgroup				
Item	**Asian American (*n* = 110)**	**African American (*n* = 43)**	**White (*n* = 1,229)**	**Hispanic (*n* = 60)**
Benefits package	71%	67%	77%	72%
Performance-based bonus	71%	65%	62%	62%
Stock options	31%	23%	23%	33%
Moving allowance*	**30%**	26%	19%	22%
Profit sharing	25%	30%	23%	25%
Stock purchase plan	24%	12%	22%	30%
Signing bonus*	**29%**	28%	17%	15%
Tuition reimbursement	23%	12%	20%	13%
Car or car allowance	4%	14%	8%	3%
First-year signing bonus	11%	7%	5%	7%
Housing allowance or reimbursement*	6%	9%	4%	**12%**
Commissions	1%	5%	5%	5%
Other compensation	5%	14%	8%	10%
No additional compensation	1%	7%	7%	10%

Responses may add to more than 100% due to multiple selections

*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.

Respondents who are not managers are the most likely to report not receiving any additional compensation. Middle-level managers are more likely than respondents who are not managers to receive benefits packages, and respondents who are middle-level managers and higher are significantly more likely than respondents who are not managers to receive stock options. Senior-level managers are the most likely to receive profit-sharing. Interestingly, respondents who are middle-level managers are almost three times as likely as executives to receive a stock purchase plan. Senior-level managers and executives are significantly more likely than entry-level managers and respondents who are not managers to receive a car or car allowance. Respondents who are not managers are the least likely of all respondents to receive a housing allowance or reimbursement. Executives are the most likely of all respondents to receive commissions.

Additional Compensation, by Current Job Level					
	Current Job Level				
Item	**Not a manager/ supervisor (*n* = 680)**	**First-/entry-level manager/ supervisor (*n* = 517)**	**Middle-level manager/ associate (*n* = 884)**	**Senior-level manager/ partner (*n* = 321)**	**Executive in the organization (*n* = 161)**
Benefits package	67%	68%	68%	66%	64%
Performance-based bonus*	**55%**	60%	**68%**	68%	51%
Stock options*	**15%**	18%	**24%**	**27%**	**30%**
Moving allowance	21%	22%	20%	18%	13%
Profit sharing*	19%	21%	18%	**26%**	25%
Stock purchase plan*	21%	21%	**23%**	16%	**8%**
Signing bonus*	20%	21%	18%	14%	**10%**
Tuition reimbursement	15%	16%	18%	19%	19%

Additional Compensation, by Current Job Level					
	Current Job Level				
Item	Not a manager/ supervisor (*n* = 680)	First-/entry-level manager/ supervisor (*n* = 517)	Middle-level manager/ associate (*n* = 884)	Senior-level manager/ partner (*n* = 321)	Executive in the organization (*n* = 161)
Car or car allowance*	**6%**	**10%**	13%	**27%**	**28%**
First year signing bonus	8%	6%	7%	5%	2%
Housing allowance or reimbursement*	**3%**	6%	7%	8%	9%
Commissions*	5%	3%	4%	4%	**9%**
Other compensation	9%	7%	9%	11%	12%
No additional compensation*	**11%**	7%	6%	7%	10%

Responses may add to more than 100% due to multiple selections.

*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.

About one in five (21%) respondents who work for local companies and one in eight (13%) who work for regional companies reports not receiving additional compensation, which is a significantly higher percentage compared to respondents who work for multinational companies (64%).

Respondents who work for local companies are the least likely of all respondents to receive a benefits package. Performance-based bonuses are more likely to be given to respondents who work in national and multinational organizations compared with respondents who work in local and regional organizations. Respondents who work in multinational organizations are more likely to receive stock options and a stock purchase plan compared with respondents who work for local and regional organizations. Additionally, respondents who work in multinational organizations are more likely than all other respondents to receive a moving allowance and a signing bonus. Furthermore, respondents who work for multinational organizations are more likely than respondents who work for regional organizations to receive a housing allowance or reimbursement.

Additional Compensation, by Scope of Organization*				
Item	Local (*n* = 154)	Regional (*n* = 254)	National (*n* = 589)	Multinational (*n* = 1,573)
Benefits package*	**51%**	63%	68%	69%
Performance-based bonus*	**36%**	**49%**	65%	65%
Stock options*	**4%**	**9%**	20%	**25%**
Moving allowance*	**8%**	**11%**	**14%**	**25%**
Profit sharing	16%	17%	20%	21%
Stock purchase plan*	**2%**	**9%**	17%	**25%**
Signing bonus*	**4%**	**11%**	**14%**	**22%**
Tuition reimbursement	18%	21%	17%	16%
Car or car allowance	14%	11%	11%	15%
First year signing bonus	4%	5%	6%	7%
Housing allowance or reimbursement*	3%	**2%**	5%	**7%**
Commissions	5%	4%	4%	5%
Other compensation	8%	11%	8%	9%
No additional compensation*	**21%**	**13%**	7%	**6%**

Responses may add to more than 100% due to multiple selections.

*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.

Total Compensation Package

Respondents are asked to indicate the amount of additional compensation they received in the past year. The following tables combine annual base salary and the amount of any additional compensation to derive the sum of the respondent's total compensation package. On average, employed MBA graduate respondents earned $113,959 in total compensation in the past year.

Total Compensation Package	
Statistic	**Percentage (*n* = 1,890)**
Lower 95% confidence interval	$110,901
Mean	$113,959
Upper 95% confidence interval	$117,018

Not surprisingly, respondents who have been out of school longer earn significantly more than those who have recently finished school. Respondents who graduated in 2000 and 2001 earn significantly more than all other respondents.

Total Compensation Package, by Graduation Year						
Statistic	**2000 (*n* = 118)**	**2001 (*n* = 177)**	**2002 (*n* = 171)**	**2003 (*n* = 249)**	**2004 (*n* = 490)**	**2005 (*n* = 685)**
Lower 95% confidence interval	$139,990	$122,547	$105,649	$105,334	$102,539	$100,988
Mean*	**$157,821**	**$134,759**	**$113,347**	**$113,208**	**$109,161**	**$104,888**
Upper 95% confidence interval	$175,651	$146,971	$121,045	$121,082	$115,784	$108,787
* $p \leq .05$; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.						

Respondents who graduated from executive programs earn significantly more compared with respondents who graduated from full-time and part-time programs.

Total Compensation Package, by Program Type			
Statistic	**Full-time (*n* = 1,357)**	**Part-time (*n* = 372)**	**Executive (*n* = 143)**
Lower 95% confidence interval	$108,621	$98,857	$138,845
Mean*	$112,092	$104,181	**$155,462**
Upper 95% confidence interval	$115,563	$109,506	$172,079
* $p \leq .05$; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.			

Men earn significantly more compared with women.

Total Compensation Package, by Gender		
Statistic	**Male (*n* = 1,389)**	**Female (*n* = 496)**
Lower 95% confidence interval	$117,288	$90,371
Mean*	**$121,164**	**$94,081**
Upper 95% confidence interval	$125,040	$97,792
* $p \leq .05$; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.		

European respondents earn significantly more compared with respondents from Asia, the U.S., and Canada.

Total Compensation Package, by Citizenship					
Statistic	**Asia (*n* = 169)**	**United States (*n* = 1,202)**	**Canada (*n* = 143)**	**Latin America (*n* = 87)**	**Europe (*n* = 220)**
Lower 95% confidence interval	$95,105	$109,395	$93,895	$96,189	$118,885
Mean*	**$106,881**	**$113,040**	**$103,939**	$108,548	**$129,100**
Upper 95% confidence interval	$118,657	$116,684	$113,984	$120,908	$139,316
* p ≤ .05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.					

Respondents in higher levels of an organization earn significantly more compared with respondents in lower levels of an organization. However, respondents in entry-level manager positions and respondents who are not managers have statistically similar earnings.

Total Compensation Package, by Current Job Level					
	Current Job Level				
Statistic	**Not a manager/ supervisor (*n* = 487)**	**First-/ entry-level manager/ supervisor (*n* = 394)**	**Middle-level manager/ associate (*n* = 670)**	**Senior-level manager/ partner (*n* = 227)**	**Executive in the organization (*n* = 109)**
Lower 95% confidence interval	$88,370	$93,179	$113,472	$138,429	$148,420
Mean*	**$92,269**	**$96,612**	**$118,338**	**$149,381**	**$173,592**
Upper 95% confidence interval	$96,167	$100,046	$123,204	$160,332	$198,764
* p ≤ .05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.					

Respondents who work in the nonprofit/government industry earn significantly less compared with all other respondents. Respondents in the energy/utility industry earn significantly more than respondents in the consulting, products/services, manufacturing, technology, and healthcare industries. Respondents in the finance/accounting industry earn significantly more than respondents in the products/services, manufacturing, technology, and healthcare industries. Additionally, respondents in the consulting industry earn significantly more than respondents in the products/services industry.

Total Compensation Package, by Industry								
Statistic	**Consulting (*n* = 247)**	**Finance/ Accounting (*n* = 412)**	**Products/ Services (*n* = 388)**	**Manu-facturing (*n* = 184)**	**Tech-nology (*n* = 264)**	**Healthcare/ Pharm-aceuticals (*n* = 179)**	**Energy/ Utilities (*n* = 76)**	**Nonprofit/ Government (*n* = 99)**
Lower 95% confidence interval	$114,828	$121,386	$95,015	$98,779	$107,610	$101,628	$124,349	$68,536
Mean*	**$121,851**	**$130,155**	**$99,662**	**$105,861**	**$113,091**	**$109,131**	**$151,906**	**$74,976**
Upper 95% confidence interval	$128,874	$138,924	$104,310	$112,942	$118,572	$116,635	$179,464	$81,415
* p ≤ .05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.								

Respondents working in general management earn significantly more than respondents who work in marketing/sales, operations/logistics, human resources, and IT/MIS. Respondents who work in finance/accounting earn significantly more than respondents who work in marketing/ sales and operations/logistics. Additionally, respondents who work in the consulting field earn significantly more compared with respondents who work in operations/logistics.

Total Compensation Package, by Job Function							
Statistic	**Marketing/ Sales (*n* = 476)**	**Operations/ Logistics (*n* = 177)**	**Consulting (*n* = 339)**	**General Management (*n* = 187)**	**Finance/ Accounting (*n* = 535)**	**Human Resources (*n* = 39)**	**IT/MIS (*n* = 109)**
Lower 95% confidence interval	$101,509	$92,327	$113,759	$117,383	$113,876	$77,579	$95,557
Mean*	**$106,425**	**$99,810**	**$119,686**	**$129,231**	**$121,233**	**$89,030**	**$103,037**
Upper 95% confidence interval	$111,340	$107,294	$125,612	$141,079	$128,590	$100,480	$110,517
* $p \leq .05$; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.							

Respondents who work outside their country of citizenship earn significantly more compared with respondents who work inside their country of citizenship.

Total Compensation Package, by Location of Employment		
Statistic	**In Country of Citizenship (*n* = 1,527)**	**Outside Country of Citizenship (*n* = 363)**
Lower 95% confidence interval	$108,113	$116,613
Mean*	**$111,301**	**$125,141**
Upper 95% confidence interval	$114,489	$133,669
* $p \leq .05$; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.		

Respondents who work for multinational organizations earn significantly more compared with respondents who work for all other organizations. Additionally, respondents who work for national organizations earn significantly more compared with respondents who work for local organizations.

Total Compensation Package, by Scope of Organization				
Statistic	**Local (*n* = 92)**	**Regional (*n* = 163)**	**National (*n* = 432)**	**Multinational (*n* = 1,203)**
Lower 95% confidence interval	$73,979	$85,580	$103,474	$116,207
Mean*	**$83,439**	**$97,665**	**$108,748**	**$120,373**
Upper 95% confidence interval	$92,898	$105,750	$114,023	$124,538
* $p \leq .05$; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.				

There are no statistically significant differences in total compensation packages by U.S. subgroup.

Self-Employed Respondents

This section describes some employment characteristics of the 162 respondents who are self-employed, including the number of hours worked each week and skills/abilities used on their current jobs. On average, self-employed respondents work 52 hours per week. The average number of hours worked each week among self-employed respondents does not significantly differ from other employed respondents who work 51 hours per week, on average.

Average Number of Hours Worked Per Week	
Number of Hours	**Percentage (*n* = 162)**
Less than 40 hours/week	12%
40 hours/week	12%
41 to 50 hours/week	33%
More than 50 hours per week	43%
Total	100%
Mean number of hours/week	52
Median number of hours/week	50

The top five skills used a great deal on the job among self-employed respondents include oral communication skills, interpersonal skills, the ability to make decisions, the ability to think strategically, and the ability to adapt.

The following skills are used significantly more among self-employed respondents compared with other employed respondents:

- Ability to adapt
- Ability to think strategically
- Ability to make decisions
- Technological skills
- Initiative/risk-taking ability
- Interpersonal skills
- Oral communication skills
- Creative problem-solving
- Leadership skills
- Project management/implementation skills
- Recruiting, managing, and maintaining staff

Skills/Abilities Used on the Job						
	(*n* = 162)					
Skills/Abilities	**A Great Deal**	**A Good Amount**	**Some**	**A Little**	**Not At All**	**Total**
Oral communication skills	68%	27%	3%	2%	0%	100%
Interpersonal skills	68%	26%	4%	2%	1%	100%
Ability to make decisions with imperfect information	63%	29%	7%	1%	0%	100%
Ability to think strategically	62%	33%	4%	1%	0%	100%
Ability to adapt/change to new situations	62%	27%	10%	1%	0%	100%
Initiative/risk-taking ability	61%	25%	11%	2%	1%	100%
Ability to think analytically	60%	32%	7%	1%	0%	100%
Creative problem-solving skills	59%	31%	9%	1%	0%	100%
Ability to integrate information from a wide variety of sources	52%	33%	14%	0%	0%	100%
Written communication skills	51%	32%	10%	6%	1%	100%
Project management/implementation skills	49%	33%	10%	7%	0%	100%
Leadership skills	44%	28%	22%	6%	0%	100%
Technological skills for your specialty	35%	17%	30%	15%	3%	100%
Ability to think globally	32%	25%	22%	13%	8%	100%
Quantitative skills	29%	38%	26%	6%	1%	100%
Cultural sensitivity and awareness	24%	27%	27%	18%	5%	100%
Skills in corporate ethical conduct	23%	25%	27%	16%	9%	100%
Recruiting, managing, and maintaining staff	21%	19%	17%	24%	19%	100%

IV. Job Satisfaction

This section examines various aspects of job satisfaction among MBA alumni. The relative importance of one's career is explored, in addition to satisfaction with aspects of one's employer, job, and career development opportunities.

Career Importance

Respondents are asked to indicate the importance of their career in relation to their life as a whole. There is no statistically significant difference in career importance between respondents who work for an employer and self-employed respondents. Self-employed respondents rate the importance of their career slightly, yet significantly, higher compared with respondents employed by an organization.

Career Importance		
Considering your life as a whole, how important is your career?	**Employed (*n* = 2,570)**	**Self-Employed (*n* = 162)**
One of the most important things in my life (7)	13%	17%
(6)	34%	41%
(5)	33%	27%
Of medium importance in my life (4)	16%	14%
(3)	3%	1%
(2)	1%	0%
One of the least important things in my life	<1%	0%
Total	100%	100%
Mean*	**5.4**	**5.6**
* $p \leq .05$; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.		

Respondents from Asia (24%) and Latin America (20%) are twice as likely as respondents from the U.S. (10%) to consider their career as one of the most important things in their life. Respondents from the U.S rate the importance of their career to their life significantly lower compared with respondents from all other world regions.

Career Importance, by Citizenship* **(Percentage Reporting Career as One of the Most Important Things in My Life)**			
Citizenship	**N**	**Percentage***	**Mean****
Asia	266	**24%**	5.7
United States	1,554	**10%**	**5.3**
Canada	185	18%	5.5
Latin America	130	**20%**	5.6
Europe	331	14%	5.5
*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table. ** $p \leq .05$; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.			

Respondents who are executives in organizations are significantly more likely than all other respondents to consider their careers as one of the most important things in their lives. Respondents who are middle-level managers and above rate the importance of their careers higher compared with respondents who are not managers.

Career Importance, by Current Job Level (Percentage Reporting Career as One of the Most Important Things in My Life)			
Current Job Level	**N**	**Percentage***	**Mean****
Not a manager/supervisor	680	11%	**5.2**
First-/entry-level manager/supervisor	517	12%	5.3
Middle-level manager/associate	884	13%	**5.4**
Senior-level manager/partner	321	17%	**5.5**
Executive in the organization	161	**22%**	**5.6**
*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table. ** $p \leq .05$; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.			

There are no statistically significant differences in career importance by graduation year, program type, gender, U.S. subgroup, industry type, and job function.

Description about Current Employer/Position

Respondents are asked to indicate how true various descriptions about their current employer and position are to them. The top five descriptions that respondents feel are the most true include the following: my employer promotes and upholds ethical business practices, my supervisor is competent in doing his/her job, the work is interesting, I have had equal opportunity in promotions and salary, and the job security is good.

Description about Current Employer/Position						
	(*n* = 2,750)					
How true is each of the items?	**Definitely True (5)**	**(4)**	**(3)**	**(2)**	**Definitely Not True (1)**	**Total**
My employer promotes and upholds ethical business practices.	41%	35%	17%	5%	2%	100%
My supervisor is competent in doing his/her job.	38%	35%	15%	8%	4%	100%
The work is interesting.	34%	39%	17%	8%	3%	100%
I have had equal opportunity in promotions and salary.	29%	34%	24%	8%	5%	100%
The job security is good.	27%	37%	22%	9%	5%	100%
The problems I am expected to solve are hard enough.	25%	44%	19%	9%	3%	100%
The physical surroundings are pleasant.	24%	39%	24%	9%	3%	100%
My chances for promotion are good.	24%	35%	24%	10%	6%	100%
I am given a chance to do the things I do best.	22%	41%	22%	11%	4%	100%
My employer really cares about individuals and wants them to succeed.	22%	35%	25%	12%	6%	100%
The pay is good.	19%	39%	26%	12%	5%	100%

Description about Current Employer/Position						
	(*n* = 2,750)					
How true is each of the items?	**Definitely True (5)**	**(4)**	**(3)**	**(2)**	**Definitely Not True (1)**	**Total**
I have enough time to get the job done.	17%	34%	27%	17%	6%	100%
My responsibilities are clearly defined.	14%	38%	26%	16%	6%	100%
I am not asked to do excessive amounts of work.	14%	27%	27%	20%	11%	100%
I spend too much time in meetings that are not productive.	8%	20%	29%	30%	13%	100%

Respondents who graduated in 2005 are more likely than respondents who graduated in 2003 to feel that the statement "my employer really cares about individuals and wants them to succeed" is true. Graduates in 2001 are the most likely to feel the following statement is true: the pay is good.

Description about Current Employer/Position (Percentage Definitely True), by Graduation Year						
How true is each of the items?	**2000 (*n* = 155)**	**2001 (*n* = 236)**	**2002 (*n* = 230)**	**2003 (*n* = 339)**	**2004 (*n* = 664)**	**2005 (*n* = 946)**
My employer promotes and upholds ethical business practices.	43%	44%	47%	36%	38%	42%
My supervisor is competent in doing his/her job.	37%	36%	37%	36%	35%	41%
The work is interesting.	37%	35%	32%	33%	33%	35%
I have had equal opportunity in promotions and salary.	25%	28%	29%	28%	28%	30%
The job security is good.	21%	31%	25%	23%	28%	28%
The problems I am expected to solve are hard enough.	28%	28%	24%	24%	25%	24%
The physical surroundings are pleasant.	28%	29%	18%	23%	23%	25%
My chances for promotion are good.	22%	22%	23%	21%	25%	27%
I am given a chance to do the things I do best.	24%	27%	22%	18%	23%	21%
My employer really cares about individuals and wants them to succeed.*	20%	21%	20%	**17%**	21%	**27%**
The pay is good.*	18%	**26%**	15%	16%	19%	18%
I have enough time to get the job done.	18%	19%	13%	14%	18%	17%
My responsibilities are clearly defined.	13%	11%	12%	14%	12%	16%
I am not asked to do excessive amounts of work.	13%	15%	17%	12%	11%	15%
I spend too much time in meetings that are not productive.	8%	11%	8%	8%	7%	8%
*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.						

Respondents who graduated from part-time programs are the least likely of all respondents to feel that the following statements are true: the work is interesting and the problems I am expected to solve are hard enough. Graduates of executive programs are the most likely to state that the physical surroundings are pleasant. Respondents who graduated from full-time programs are more likely than respondents who graduated from part-time programs to feel that their chances for promotion are good.

Description about Current Employer/Position (Percentage Definitely True), by Program Type			
How true is each of the items?	**Full-time (*n* = 1,852)**	**Part-time (*n* = 502)**	**Executive (*n* = 187)**
My employer promotes and upholds ethical business practices.	41%	38%	47%
My supervisor is competent in doing his/her job.	39%	36%	34%
The work is interesting.*	36%	**27%**	39%
I have had equal opportunity in promotions and salary.	29%	26%	32%
The job security is good.	26%	30%	27%
The problems I am expected to solve are hard enough.*	26%	**20%**	27%
The physical surroundings are pleasant.*	24%	24%	**33%**
My chances for promotion are good.*	**27%**	**17%**	21%
I am given a chance to do the things I do best.	22%	21%	27%
My employer really cares about individuals and wants them to succeed.	23%	21%	22%
The pay is good.	18%	17%	25%
I have enough time to get the job done.	18%	14%	16%
My responsibilities are clearly defined.	13%	14%	19%
I am not asked to do excessive amounts of work.	14%	14%	10%
I spend too much time in meetings that are not productive.	7%	10%	12%
*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.			

Respondents from the U.S. are more likely than respondents from Asia and Europe to feel that their employer promotes and upholds ethical business practices and that their employer really cares about individuals and want them to succeed. Respondents from Europe are more likely than respondents from Asia to feel that their work is interesting. Respondents from Asia are the least likely of all respondents to feel that the pay is good.

Respondents from Latin America are four times as likely as respondents from Canada to state that they spend too much time in meetings that are not productive.

Description about Current Employer/Position (Percentage Definitely True), by Citizenship					
How true is each of the items?	**Asia (*n* = 266)**	**United States (*n* = 1,554)**	**Canada (*n* = 185)**	**Latin America (*n* = 130)**	**Europe (*n* = 331)**
My employer promotes and upholds ethical business practices.*	**32%**	**46%**	34%	43%	**29%**
My supervisor is competent in doing his/her job.	32%	41%	38%	30%	33%
The work is interesting.*	**24%**	34%	35%	40%	**41%**
I have had equal opportunity in promotions and salary.	22%	30%	31%	27%	27%
The job security is good.	23%	29%	24%	22%	24%
The problems I am expected to solve are hard enough.	20%	26%	24%	23%	23%
The physical surroundings are pleasant.	23%	25%	23%	25%	23%

Description about Current Employer/Position (Percentage Definitely True), by Citizenship					
How true is each of the items?	**Asia (*n* = 266)**	**United States (*n* = 1,554)**	**Canada (*n* = 185)**	**Latin America (*n* = 130)**	**Europe (*n* = 331)**
My chances for promotion are good.	21%	26%	26%	21%	20%
I am given a chance to do the things I do best.	23%	23%	21%	20%	18%
My employer really cares about individuals and wants them to succeed.*	**14%**	**26%**	22%	21%	**16%**
The pay is good.*	**12%**	20%	22%	17%	18%
I have enough time to get the job done.	13%	19%	14%	16%	14%
My responsibilities are clearly defined.	15%	14%	13%	16%	13%
I am not asked to do excessive amounts of work.	12%	15%	14%	14%	10%
I spend too much time in meetings that are not productive.*	6%	9%	**3%**	**13%**	6%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.					

The only significant difference by U.S. subgroup is that Hispanics are the most likely of all U.S. respondents to indicate that they have had equal opportunity in promotions and salary.

Description about Current Employer/Position (Percentage Definitely True), by U.S. Subgroup				
How true is each of the items?	**Asian American (*n* = 110)**	**African American (*n* = 43)**	**White (*n* = 1,229)**	**Hispanic (*n* = 60)**
My employer promotes and upholds ethical business practices.	51%	28%	47%	48%
My supervisor is competent in doing his/her job.	36%	33%	41%	47%
The work is interesting.	27%	37%	34%	42%
I have had equal opportunity in promotions and salary.*	24%	23%	31%	**45%**
The job security is good.	35%	23%	29%	33%
The problems I am expected to solve are hard enough.	24%	26%	26%	33%
The physical surroundings are pleasant.	24%	26%	24%	35%
My chances for promotion are good.	28%	23%	26%	33%
I am given a chance to do the things I do best.	25%	23%	23%	28%
My employer really cares about individuals and wants them to succeed.	27%	23%	26%	32%
The pay is good.	19%	16%	19%	28%
I have enough time to get the job done.	17%	19%	18%	23%
My responsibilities are clearly defined.	14%	9%	14%	22%
I am not asked to do excessive amounts of work.	17%	9%	15%	13%
I spend too much time in meetings that are not productive.	10%	7%	9%	7%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.				

Respondents in senior-level or executive positions are more likely than respondents who are not managers to state that the following statements are true: the work is interesting, I have had an equal opportunity in promotions and salary, the problems I am expected to solve are hard

enough, and the physical surroundings are pleasant. Additionally, senior-level managers and executives are more likely than entry-level managers to state that they are given a chance to do the things they do best. Furthermore, executives are more likely than all other respondents to indicate that their employer really cares about individuals and wants them to succeed.

Senior-level managers are the most likely to feel that their chances for promotion are good and that they spend too much time in meetings that are not productive, but they are the least likely to state that they have enough time to get the job done. Executives are more likely than entry-level managers to feel their responsibilities are clearly defined.

Description about Current Employer/Position (Percentage Definitely True), by Current Job Level					
How true is each of the items?	**Not a manager/ supervisor (*n* = 680)**	**First- /entry-level manager/ supervisor (*n* = 517)**	**Middle-level manager/ associate (*n* = 884)**	**Senior-level manager/ partner (*n* = 321)**	**Executive in the organization (*n* = 161)**
My employer promotes and upholds ethical business practices.	42%	38%	41%	41%	48%
My supervisor is competent in doing his/her job.	38%	38%	36%	41%	39%
The work is interesting.*	**25%**	30%	36%	**45%**	**54%**
I have had equal opportunity in promotions and salary.*	**23%**	26%	29%	**39%**	**43%**
The job security is good.	27%	26%	26%	29%	27%
The problems I am expected to solve are hard enough.*	**18%**	24%	25%	**31%**	**40%**
The physical surroundings are pleasant.*	**22%**	23%	23%	**32%**	**30%**
My chances for promotion are good.*	21%	24%	24%	**30%**	29%
I am given a chance to do the things I do best.*	19%	**15%**	21%	**31%**	**43%**
My employer really cares about individuals and wants them to succeed.*	20%	20%	23%	23%	**35%**
The pay is good.	14%	15%	19%	26%	31%
I have enough time to get the job done.*	20%	18%	16%	**12%**	16%
My responsibilities are clearly defined.*	14%	**10%**	13%	15%	**24%**
I am not asked to do excessive amounts of work.	16%	15%	13%	10%	14%
I spend too much time in meetings that are not productive.*	8%	7%	8%	**10%**	9%
*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.					

Respondents in the healthcare industry are more likely than those in the products/services industry to feel their employer promotes and upholds ethical business practices. Respondents in the nonprofit/government sector are the most likely to state that their job security is good. Respondents in the consulting industry are more likely than those in the products/services industry to state the problems they are expected to solve are hard enough.

Respondents in the manufacturing industry are the least likely to report that their physical surroundings are pleasant. Respondents in the healthcare industry are the most likely to be given

a chance to do the things they do best. Respondents in the consulting industry are more likely than respondents in the products/services and nonprofit/government industry to state that the pay is good.

Description about Current Employer/Position (Percentage Definitely True), by Industry								
How true is each of the items?	**Consulting (*n* =343)**	**Finance/ Accounting (*n* = 522)**	**Products/ Services (*n* = 531)**	**Manu-facturing (*n* = 244)**	**Tech-nology (*n* = 341)**	**Healthcare/ Pharm-aceuticals (*n* = 259)**	**Energy/ Utilities (*n* = 103)**	**Nonprofit/ Government (*n* = 165)**
My employer promotes and upholds ethical business practices.*	42%	40%	**33%**	41%	43%	**50%**	52%	40%
My supervisor is competent in doing his/her job.	36%	38%	38%	35%	39%	39%	41%	38%
The work is interesting.	40%	33%	33%	34%	31%	37%	33%	37%
I have had equal opportunity in promotions and salary.	35%	29%	27%	29%	26%	29%	26%	32%
The job security is good.*	22%	28%	25%	24%	22%	31%	22%	**48%**
The problems I am expected to solve are hard enough.*	**33%**	21%	**19%**	25%	29%	27%	27%	23%
The physical surroundings are pleasant.*	24%	27%	23%	**17%**	26%	21%	32%	27%
My chances for promotion are good.	29%	24%	24%	27%	21%	20%	27%	22%
I am given a chance to do the things I do best.*	17%	19%	21%	24%	21%	**29%**	23%	28%
My employer really cares about individuals and wants them to succeed.	26%	22%	21%	22%	19%	25%	21%	27%
The pay is good.*	**25%**	21%	**14%**	14%	18%	19%	24%	**12%**
I have enough time to get the job done.	12%	19%	17%	16%	17%	17%	20%	21%
My responsibilities are clearly defined.	13%	15%	11%	16%	11%	18%	10%	16%
I am not asked to do excessive amounts of work.	10%	14%	15%	12%	16%	13%	19%	18%
I spend too much time in meetings that are not productive.	5%	8%	8%	9%	10%	9%	5%	9%
*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.								

Respondents working in consulting are more likely than those in operations/logistics to state that the work is interesting. Respondents in consulting and general management are more likely than respondents in operations/logistics to state that they have had equal opportunity in promotions and salary, and they are more likely than those in finance/accounting to state that the problems they are expected to solve are hard enough. Additionally, respondents in consulting are more likely than respondents in IT/MIS to state their chances for promotion are good.

Respondents in general management are more likely than all other respondents to indicate that job security is good, they are given a chance to do the things they do best, and their employer really cares about individuals and wants them to succeed. Respondents in human resources are more than twice as likely as respondents in operations/logistics to state their physical surroundings are pleasant.

Description about Current Employer/Position (Percentage Definitely True), by Job Function							
How true is each of the items?	**Marketing/ Sales (*n* = 638)**	**Operations/ Logistics (*n* = 257)**	**Consulting (*n* = 447)**	**General Management (*n* = 255)**	**Finance/ Accounting (*n* = 708)**	**Human Resources (*n* = 61)**	**IT/MIS (*n* = 154)**
My employer promotes and upholds ethical business practices.	41%	39%	42%	45%	40%	41%	38%
My supervisor is competent in doing his/her job.	38%	32%	38%	40%	38%	41%	33%
The work is interesting.*	33%	**25%**	**41%**	40%	32%	34%	30%
I have had equal opportunity in promotions and salary.*	26%	**22%**	**36%**	**37%**	27%	34%	22%
The job security is good.*	24%	26%	24%	**35%**	28%	30%	29%
The problems I am expected to solve are hard enough.*	23%	21%	**31%**	**32%**	**20%**	21%	27%
The physical surroundings are pleasant.*	24%	**17%**	23%	28%	26%	**38%**	21%
My chances for promotion are good.*	23%	21%	**29%**	27%	24%	28%	**17%**
I am given a chance to do the things I do best.*	22%	20%	20%	**33%**	19%	31%	23%
My employer really cares about individuals and wants them to succeed.*	22%	18%	26%	**30%**	20%	23%	17%
The pay is good.	17%	13%	22%	20%	19%	23%	17%
I have enough time to get the job done.	16%	15%	17%	17%	18%	21%	18%
My responsibilities are clearly defined.	13%	11%	12%	19%	14%	18%	13%
I am not asked to do excessive amounts of work.	15%	13%	13%	16%	14%	16%	13%
I spend too much time in meetings that are not productive.*	10%	9%	**5%**	7%	7%	11%	12%
*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.							

There are no statistically significant differences in the description of the respondents' current employers and positions by gender.

Employer Support of Career Development

Respondents are asked to indicate the ways their company supports their career development. Overall, one in 10 (10%) respondents report that their company does not support career development. More than half of the respondents indicate that their companies provide in-house training (64%), professional performance appraisals (57%), and education support/ reimbursement (55%). Fewer companies provide mentoring (39%), coaching (37%), and development work assignments (32%). Only 21% provide rotational assignments, 14% provide fast-track development programs, and 12% provide company-sponsored career advice/guidance.

Employer Support of Career Development	
Ways Company Supports Career Development	**Percentage (*n* = 2,570)**
In-house training	64%
Professional performance appraisals	57%
Education support/reimbursement	55%
Mentoring	39%
Coaching	37%
Developmental work assignments	32%
Rotational assignments	21%
Fast-track development programs	14%
Company-sponsored career advice/guidance	12%
Other	2%
Company does not support career development	10%
Responses may add to more than 100% due to multiple selections.	

Respondents from the class of 2005 are more likely than respondents from the class of 2001 to have access to mentoring. Additionally, respondents from the class of 2001 are the least likely of the respondents to have access to developmental work assignments as a part of their career development.

Employer Support of Career Development, by Graduation Year						
Ways Company Supports Career Development	**2000 (*n* = 155)**	**2001 (*n* = 236)**	**2002 (*n* = 230)**	**2003 (*n* = 339)**	**2004 (*n* = 664)**	**2005 (*n* = 946)**
In-house training	66%	61%	67%	64%	65%	64%
Professional performance appraisals	67%	56%	56%	56%	55%	57%
Education support/reimbursement	55%	58%	57%	51%	55%	57%
Mentoring*	38%	**31%**	33%	37%	40%	**43%**
Coaching	37%	33%	36%	35%	37%	40%
Developmental work assignments*	35%	**24%**	29%	33%	33%	35%
Rotational assignments	23%	20%	20%	17%	20%	24%
Fast-track development programs	12%	14%	14%	14%	15%	15%
Company-sponsored career advice/guidance	17%	16%	14%	10%	12%	12%
Other	1%	3%	1%	3%	2%	2%
Company does not support career development	12%	11%	11%	12%	10%	9%
Responses may add to more than 100% due to multiple selections *$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.						

Respondents of part-time and executive programs are more likely than respondents of full-time programs to receive education support and reimbursement, but full-time graduates are more likely than part-time and executive program graduates to have access to mentoring. Full-time program graduates are more likely than part-time graduates to have access to coaching. Graduates of part-time programs are the least likely of all respondents to have access to developmental work assignments and fast-track development programs.

Employer Support of Career Development, by Program Type			
Ways Company Supports Career Development	**Full-time (*n* = 1,852)**	**Part-time (*n* = 502)**	**Executive (*n* = 187)**
In-house training	65%	60%	65%
Professional performance appraisals	58%	55%	52%
Education support/reimbursement*	**50%**	**70%**	**70%**
Mentoring*	**43%**	**31%**	**30%**
Coaching*	**40%**	**28%**	33%
Developmental work assignments*	35%	**24%**	35%
Rotational assignments	22%	16%	24%
Fast track development programs*	16%	**9%**	17%
Company-sponsored career advice/guidance	13%	10%	13%
Other	2%	2%	1%
Company does not support career development	10%	10%	13%
Responses may add to more than 100% due to multiple selections *$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.			

Women are slightly, yet significantly, more likely than men to have received professional performance appraisals. There are no other differences in employer support of career development by gender.

Employer Support of Career Development, by Gender		
Ways Company Supports Career Development	**Male (*n* = 1,845)**	**Female (*n* = 718)**
In-house training	63%	68%
Professional performance appraisals*	**55%**	**61%**
Education support/reimbursement	54%	59%
Mentoring	39%	40%
Coaching	38%	37%
Developmental work assignments	32%	34%
Rotational assignments	21%	22%
Fast track development programs	15%	14%
Company-sponsored career advice/guidance	12%	14%
Other	2%	3%
Company does not support career development	11%	9%
Responses may add to more than 100% due to multiple selections *$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.		

Although more than half (51%) of respondents from Asia have access to in-house training, they are the least likely of all respondents to report that their company supports the career development with in-house training. Respondents from Asia are significantly less likely than

respondents from the U.S. to have access to professional performance appraisals. U.S. respondents are more likely than respondents from Asia, Latin America, and Europe to have access to education support or reimbursements. Canadian respondents are more likely than Asian respondents to have access to coaching as a part of their career development. European respondents are slightly, yet significantly, less likely than all other respondents to have access to developmental work assignments and company-sponsored career advice/guidance. Respondents from Asia and Europe are more likely than all other respondents to report that their company does not support their career development.

Employer Support of Career Development, by Citizenship

Ways Company Supports Career Development	Asia (*n* = 266)	United States (*n* = 1,554)	Canada (*n* = 185)	Latin America (*n* = 130)	Europe (*n* = 331)
In-house training*	**51%**	68%	65%	62%	61%
Professional performance appraisals*	**38%**	**63%**	54%	53%	52%
Education support/reimbursement*	**41%**	**62%**	61%	**43%**	**43%**
Mentoring*	34%	42%	44%	38%	**32%**
Coaching*	**30%**	38%	**50%**	45%	33%
Developmental work assignments*	32%	35%	32%	32%	**26%**
Rotational assignments	23%	21%	22%	26%	18%
Fast-track development programs	12%	15%	10%	15%	17%
Company-sponsored career advice/guidance	13%	13%	15%	15%	**8%**
Other	2%	2%	2%	2%	3%
Company does not support career development*	**15%**	9%	6%	11%	**14%**

Responses may add to more than 100% due to multiple selections

*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.

Asian American respondents are more likely than all other U.S. respondents to have access to coaching. Additionally, Hispanic and Asian American respondents are more likely than whites to have access to fast-track development programs.

Employer Support of Career Development, by U.S. Subgroup

Ways Company Supports Career Development	Asian American (*n* = 110)	African American (*n* = 43)	White (*n* = 1,229)	Hispanic (*n* = 60)
In-house training	73%	72%	68%	63%
Professional performance appraisals	70%	63%	63%	60%
Education support/reimbursement	66%	63%	62%	63%
Mentoring	53%	47%	40%	52%
Coaching*	**51%**	47%	37%	43%
Developmental work assignments	43%	47%	34%	38%
Rotational assignments	29%	28%	20%	25%
Fast-track development programs*	**25%**	23%	**13%**	**33%**
Company-sponsored career advice/guidance	13%	14%	13%	17%
Other	1%	0%	2%	0%
Company does not support career development	6%	7%	9%	10%

Responses may add to more than 100% due to multiple selections

*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.

Respondents who are entry-level managers are more likely than senior-level managers and executives to have access to in-house training and mentoring. Additionally, entry-level managers are more likely than executives to have access to professional performance appraisals and rotational assignments. Senior-level managers are the least likely of all respondents to have access to developmental work assignments. Executives are the least likely to have access to a fast-track development program, which is not surprising, considering executives are already in the upper echelon of their organizations. Senior-level managers and executives are about twice as likely as entry-level managers to report not having access to company-sponsored career development support.

Employer Support of Career Development, by Current Job Level

Ways Company Supports Career Development	Not a manager/ supervisor (*n* = 680)	First-/ entry-level manager/ supervisor (*n* = 517)	Middle-level manager/ associate (*n* = 884)	Senior-level manager/ partner (*n* = 321)	Executive in the organization (*n* = 161)
In-house training*	69%	**71%**	65%	**53%**	**40%**
Professional performance appraisals*	56%	**63%**	59%	50%	**40%**
Education support/reimbursement	56%	56%	57%	54%	47%
Mentoring*	41%	**45%**	39%	**32%**	**29%**
Coaching	35%	39%	40%	36%	30%
Developmental work assignments*	33%	37%	33%	**25%**	25%
Rotational assignments*	23%	**26%**	20%	17%	**11%**
Fast-track development programs*	12%	16%	15%	17%	**6%**
Company sponsored career advice/guidance	13%	14%	12%	11%	9%
Other	2%	2%	1%	3%	4%
Company does not support career development*	10%	**7%**	9%	**14%**	**17%**

Responses may add to more than 100% due to multiple selections

*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.

Respondents in the products/services industry are the least likely of all respondents to have access to in-house training. Respondents in the finance/accounting industry are more likely than respondents in the consulting and products/services industries to have access to education support and reimbursement programs. Respondents in the consulting industry are the most likely of all respondents to have access to mentoring and coaching. Additionally, respondents in the consulting and manufacturing industries are more likely than respondents in the products/ services industry to have access to developmental work assignments.

Respondents in the manufacturing industry are more likely than respondents in the products/ services and nonprofit/government industries to have access to rotational assignments. Respondents in manufacturing and the energy/utility industries are more than three times as likely to have access to a fast-track development program compared with respondents in the consulting industry. However, respondents in the consulting industry are more likely than respondents in the products/services industry to have access to company-sponsored career advice/guidance.

Description about Current Employer/Position (Percentage Definitely True), by Industry*								
Ways Company Supports Career Development	**Consulting (*n* =343)**	**Finance/ Accounting (*n* = 522)**	**Products/ Services (*n* = 531)**	**Manu-facturing (*n* = 244)**	**Tech-nology (*n* = 341)**	**Healthcare/ Pharm-aceuticals (*n* = 259)**	**Energy/ Utilities (*n* = 103)**	**Nonprofit/ Government (*n* = 165)**
In-house training*	68%	70%	**58%**	61%	64%	68%	61%	61%
Professional performance appraisals	63%	58%	52%	57%	56%	61%	59%	53%
Education support/ reimbursement*	**45%**	**62%**	**48%**	61%	54%	63%	64%	58%
Mentoring*	**57%**	39%	36%	41%	38%	36%	42%	28%
Coaching*	**51%**	37%	35%	39%	35%	37%	38%	**22%**
Developmental work assignments*	**41%**	**25%**	30%	**42%**	31%	38%	40%	25%
Rotational assignments*	19%	23%	**17%**	**35%**	17%	19%	34%	**16%**
Fast-track development programs*	**8%**	14%	11%	**26%**	16%	15%	**26%**	10%
Company-sponsored career advice/ guidance*	**17%**	13%	**8%**	13%	13%	14%	13%	12%
Other	1%	3%	2%	1%	2%	2%	2%	4%
Company does not support career development	8%	9%	14%	9%	10%	9%	7%	12%

Responses may add to more than 100% due to multiple selections

*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.

Respondents working in general management are the most likely of all respondents to report not having access to company sponsored-support for career development. Additionally, they are the least likely of all respondents to have access to in-house training, and they are less likely than respondents in consulting to receive professional performance appraisals. Respondents in operations/logistics and IT/MIS are more likely than respondents in consulting to have access to education support/reimbursement. Respondents in consulting are more likely than respondents in general management to have access to mentoring and developmental work assignments, and they are more likely than respondents in general management and finance/accounting to have access to coaching. Furthermore, respondents in consulting are more likely than respondents in finance/accounting to have access to company-sponsored career advice or support.

Description about Current Employer/Position (Percentage Definitely True), by Job Function							
Ways Company Supports Career Development	**Marketing/ Sales (*n* = 638)**	**Operations/ Logistics (*n* = 257)**	**Consulting (*n* = 447)**	**General Management (*n* = 255)**	**Finance/ Accounting (*n* = 708)**	**Human Resources (*n* = 61)**	**IT/MIS (*n* = 154)**
In-house training*	67%	66%	69%	**49%**	62%	74%	64%
Professional performance appraisals*	58%	53%	**64%**	**48%**	56%	70%	51%
Education support/ reimbursement*	53%	**65%**	**46%**	50%	57%	62%	**68%**
Mentoring*	37%	39%	**49%**	**30%**	37%	54%	42%
Coaching*	42%	36%	**44%**	**30%**	**32%**	46%	35%
Developmental work assignments*	31%	33%	**40%**	**24%**	30%	46%	34%
Rotational assignments	19%	25%	21%	17%	23%	18%	23%
Fast-track development programs	14%	19%	13%	15%	14%	15%	15%
Company-sponsored career advice/guidance*	13%	13%	**17%**	10%	**10%**	11%	13%
Other	3%	2%	2%	3%	2%	0%	1%
Company does not support career development*	9%	11%	9%	**17%**	9%	8%	12%

Responses may add to more than 100% due to multiple selections

*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.

Satisfaction with Organization

Respondents are asked to indicate their satisfaction with the organization with which they are current employed. Overall, a fifth (20%) report being extremely satisfied with their organization and two-fifths (40%) report being very satisfied. More than a quarter (29%) report they are somewhat satisfied with their organizations. Additionally, 9% are not very satisfied and 2% are not at all satisfied with their current organization.

Satisfaction with Organization	
Response	**Percentage (*n* = 2,570)**
Extremely satisfied	20%
Very satisfied	40%
Somewhat satisfied	29%
Not very satisfied	9%
Not at all satisfied	2%
Total	100%

Respondents from the U.S. are almost twice as likely as respondents from Asia to report being extremely satisfied with their current organization. Respondents from Asia are three times as likely as respondents from Latin America to report being not very satisfied. Additionally, respondents from Asia are the most likely of all respondents to indicate they are not at all satisfied with their employer.

Satisfaction with Organization, by Citizenship*					
Response	**Asia (*n* = 266)**	**United States (*n* = 1,554)**	**Canada (*n* = 185)**	**Latin America (*n* = 130)**	**Europe (*n* = 331)**
Extremely satisfied	**12%**	**23%**	18%	17%	18%
Very satisfied	37%	39%	45%	40%	44%
Somewhat satisfied	33%	27%	29%	37%	28%
Not very satisfied	**14%**	9%	7%	**4%**	8%
Not at all satisfied	**5%**	2%	1%	2%	2%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.					

Respondents who have worked for an organization for less than one year are more likely to be extremely satisfied than respondents who have worked for an organization for two years or longer. Respondents who have worked for an organization less than one year are the least likely to indicate they are somewhat satisfied, and they are less likely to report being not very satisfied compared with respondents who worked for one year but less than two years. Respondents who have worked for an organization for six years or longer are more likely than all other respondents to report being not at all satisfied with their organization.

Satisfaction with Organization, by Length of Time in Current Job*				
Response	**Less Than One Year (*n* = 903)**	**One Year, But Less Than Two Years (*n* = 575)**	**Two Years, But Less Than Six Years (*n* = 742)**	**Six years or Longer (*n* = 350)**
Extremely satisfied	**28%**	18%	**16%**	**14%**
Very satisfied	42%	39%	40%	38%
Somewhat satisfied	**24%**	29%	32%	33%
Not very satisfied	**5%**	**12%**	10%	11%
Not at all satisfied	2%	2%	2%	**5%**
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.				

Executives in an organization are the most likely of all respondents to report being extremely satisfied, and they are the least likely to report being somewhat satisfied. Respondents who are not managers are more likely than middle-level managers to report being not very satisfied with their organization.

Satisfaction with Organization, by Current Job Level*					
Response	**Not a manager/ supervisor (*n* = 680)**	**First-/ entry-level manager/ supervisor (*n* = 517)**	**Middle-level manager/ associate (*n* = 884)**	**Senior-level manager/ partner (*n* = 321)**	**Executive in the organization (*n* = 161)**
Extremely satisfied	20%	19%	18%	20%	**39%**
Very satisfied	37%	41%	42%	42%	36%
Somewhat satisfied	29%	28%	31%	26%	**19%**
Not very satisfied	**12%**	10%	**7%**	8%	6%
Not at all satisfied	2%	2%	2%	3%	1%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.					

Respondents in the consulting industry are more likely than respondents in the manufacturing industry to be extremely satisfied with their organization. Respondents in the products/services industry are more likely than respondents in the finance/accounting industry to be somewhat satisfied.

Satisfaction with Organization, by Industry*								
Response	**Consulting (*n* =343)**	**Finance/ Accounting (*n* = 522)**	**Products/ Services (*n* = 531)**	**Manu-facturing (*n* = 244)**	**Tech-nology (*n* = 341)**	**Healthcare/ Pharm-aceuticals (*n* = 259)**	**Energy/ Utilities (*n* = 103)**	**Nonprofit/ Government (*n* = 165)**
Extremely satisfied	**26%**	22%	18%	**14%**	18%	24%	21%	17%
Very satisfied	38%	45%	37%	41%	38%	43%	43%	38%
Somewhat satisfied	25%	**23%**	**35%**	30%	29%	24%	26%	32%
Not very satisfied	10%	7%	8%	11%	11%	7%	9%	9%
Not at all satisfied	1%	2%	2%	3%	3%	2%	1%	4%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.								

Respondents in consulting are twice as likely as respondents in operations/logistics to be extremely satisfied with their organization. Respondents in IT/MIS are the most likely of all respondents to report being somewhat satisfied. Respondents who are in operations/logistics positions are the most likely to report being not at all satisfied with their organization.

Satisfaction with Organization, by Job Function*							
Response	**Marketing/ Sales (*n* = 638)**	**Operations/ Logistics (*n* = 257)**	**Consulting (*n* = 447)**	**General Management (*n* = 255)**	**Finance/ Accounting (*n* = 708)**	**Human Resources (*n* = 61)**	**IT/MIS (*n* = 154)**
Extremely satisfied	20%	**12%**	**25%**	23%	20%	20%	19%
Very satisfied	38%	42%	38%	44%	43%	38%	31%
Somewhat satisfied	32%	30%	26%	23%	26%	28%	**38%**
Not very satisfied	9%	11%	9%	8%	8%	10%	9%
Not at all satisfied	2%	**5%**	1%	3%	3%	5%	3%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.							

There are no statistically significant differences in the respondent's level of satisfaction with the organization by graduation year, program type, gender, and U.S. subgroup.

Satisfaction with Current Job Function

Respondents are asked to indicate their level of satisfaction with their current job function. Overall, a fifth (20%) is extremely satisfied, 44% are very satisfied, and 27% are somewhat satisfied. Additionally, 7% are not very satisfied and 2% are not at all satisfied with their current job function.

Satisfaction with Current Job Function	
Response	**Percentage (*n* = 2,570)**
Extremely satisfied	20%
Very satisfied	44%
Somewhat satisfied	27%
Not very satisfied	7%
Not at all satisfied	2%
Total	100%

Respondents who graduated from part-time programs are less likely than all other respondents to report being extremely satisfied with their current job function. Additionally, respondents from part-time programs are more likely than all other respondents to report being somewhat satisfied and not very satisfied with their current job function.

Satisfaction with Current Job Function, by Program Type*			
Response	**Full-time (*n* = 1,852)**	**Part-time (*n* = 502)**	**Executive (*n* = 187)**
Extremely satisfied	22%	**15%**	22%
Very satisfied	46%	38%	37%
Somewhat satisfied	25%	**34%**	30%
Not very satisfied	6%	**10%**	7%
Not at all satisfied	1%	2%	3%
Total	100%	100%	100%
*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.			

Respondents from Asia are the most likely of all respondents to indicate they are somewhat satisfied or not very satisfied with their current job function.

Satisfaction with Current Job Function, by Citizenship*					
Response	**Asia (*n* = 266)**	**United States (*n* = 1,554)**	**Canada (*n* = 185)**	**Latin America (*n* = 130)**	**Europe (*n* = 331)**
Extremely satisfied	16%	22%	17%	16%	20%
Very satisfied	38%	43%	46%	53%	48%
Somewhat satisfied	**33%**	27%	29%	25%	26%
Not very satisfied	**10%**	7%	7%	4%	5%
Not at all satisfied	3%	2%	1%	2%	1%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.					

Respondents who have worked in their current job for less than one year are more likely than respondents who have worked for two or more years to be extremely satisfied with their current job function. On the other hand, respondents who have worked for two or more years are more likely than those who have worked for less than a year to be not very satisfied. Additionally, respondents who have worked for six years or longer in their current job are the most likely to report being not at all satisfied with their current job function.

Satisfaction with Current Job Function, by Length of Time in Current Job*				
Response	**Less Than One Year (*n* = 903)**	**One Year, But Less Than Two Years (*n* = 575)**	**Two Years, But Less Than Six Years (*n* = 742)**	**Six years or Longer (*n* = 350)**
Extremely satisfied	**26%**	19%	**17%**	**16%**
Very satisfied	44%	46%	43%	38%
Somewhat satisfied	**23%**	25%	**31%**	**35%**
Not very satisfied	6%	9%	7%	7%
Not at all satisfied	1%	2%	1%	**4%**
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.				

Respondents who are senior-level managers or executives are more likely than respondents who are not managers to be extremely satisfied with their current job function. Respondents who are not managers are the least likely of all respondents to be very satisfied with their job function. Additionally, respondents who are not managers are nearly three times as likely as executives to report being somewhat satisfied, and they are more likely than senior-level managers and executives to report being not very satisfied. Furthermore, respondents who are not managers are the most likely of all respondents to report being not at all satisfied with their current job function.

Satisfaction with Current Job Function, by Current Job Level*					
Response	**Not a manager/ supervisor (*n* = 680)**	**First-/ entry-level manager/ supervisor (*n* = 517)**	**Middle-level manager/ associate (*n* = 884)**	**Senior-level manager/ partner (*n* = 321)**	**Executive in the organization (*n* = 161)**
Extremely satisfied	**16%**	18%	18%	**27%**	**44%**
Very satisfied	**38%**	44%	47%	45%	42%
Somewhat satisfied	**33%**	29%	27%	22%	**12%**
Not very satisfied	**10%**	8%	7%	**3%**	**2%**
Not at all satisfied	**3%**	2%	1%	2%	0%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.					

Respondents in general management are more likely than respondents in operations/logistics to report being extremely satisfied with their current job function. Respondents in IT/MIS are the least likely of all respondents to be very satisfied and are the most likely to be not very satisfied. Respondents in operations/logistics are the most likely to be somewhat satisfied, and they are more likely than respondents in marketing/sales to be not at all satisfied with their current job function.

Satisfaction with Current Job Function, by Job Function*							
Response	**Marketing/ Sales (*n* = 638)**	**Operations/ Logistics (*n* = 257)**	**Consulting (*n* = 447)**	**General Management (*n* = 255)**	**Finance/ Accounting (*n* = 708)**	**Human Resources (*n* = 61)**	**IT/MIS (*n* = 154)**
Extremely satisfied	19%	**12%**	21%	**29%**	20%	21%	21%
Very satisfied	47%	41%	46%	40%	43%	41%	**31%**
Somewhat satisfied	26%	**37%**	25%	23%	28%	31%	34%
Not very satisfied	8%	5%	6%	5%	7%	7%	**14%**
Not at all satisfied	**<1%**	**5%**	1%	3%	2%	0%	1%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.							

There are no statistically significant differences in the respondent's level of satisfaction with their job function by graduation year, gender, U.S. subgroup, and industry of employment.

Satisfaction with Various Aspects of the Job

Respondents are asked to indicate their level of satisfaction with various aspects of their job. The results show that they are the most satisfied with the following aspects of their job: the opportunity to learn new things, their job autonomy, challenging and interesting work, job security, and benefits.

Satisfaction with Various Aspects of the Job						
	(*n* = 2,750)					
Aspect of the Job	**Extremely Satisfied**	**Very Satisfied**	**Somewhat Satisfied**	**Not Very Satisfied**	**Not At All Satisfied**	**Total**
Opportunity to learn new things	27%	39%	22%	8%	3%	100%
Job autonomy	25%	45%	22%	6%	2%	100%
Challenging and interesting work	24%	40%	23%	9%	3%	100%
Job security	20%	39%	30%	8%	4%	100%
Benefits	18%	36%	32%	10%	3%	100%
Achieving something that you personally value	14%	36%	31%	14%	4%	100%
Opportunity to use your skills to the maximum	14%	35%	29%	16%	6%	100%
Opportunity for advancement	13%	36%	31%	14%	6%	100%
Pay	11%	34%	37%	13%	5%	100%

Respondents who graduated in the class of 2005 are the most likely to report being satisfied with their opportunity for advancement. There are no other statistically significant differences by graduation year.

Satisfaction with Various Aspects of the Job (Percentage Extremely Satisfied), by Graduation Year						
Aspect of the Job	**2000 (*n* = 155)**	**2001 (*n* = 236)**	**2002 (*n* = 230)**	**2003 (*n* = 339)**	**2004 (*n* = 664)**	**2005 (*n* = 946)**
Opportunity to learn new things	23%	23%	23%	26%	27%	30%
Job autonomy	31%	27%	25%	21%	26%	24%
Challenging and interesting work	24%	25%	22%	24%	24%	25%
Job security	17%	21%	17%	15%	20%	21%
Benefits	19%	19%	13%	17%	17%	21%
Achieving something that you personally value	14%	18%	16%	16%	13%	14%
Opportunity to use your skills to the maximum	12%	14%	13%	16%	15%	13%
Opportunity for advancement*	11%	14%	9%	11%	13%	**16%**
Pay	9%	13%	10%	12%	11%	10%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.						

Respondents who graduated from part-time programs are the least likely of all respondents to be satisfied with their opportunity to learn new things, challenging and interesting work, the opportunity to use their skills to the maximum, and the opportunity for advancement. Respondents who graduated from executive programs are the most likely of all respondents to indicate that they are extremely satisfied with their job autonomy and pay. Additionally, respondents who graduated from executive programs are twice as likely to be extremely satisfied that they are achieving something they personally value compared with graduates of part-time programs.

Satisfaction with Various Aspects of the Job (Percentage Extremely Satisfied), by Program Type			
Aspect of the Job	**Full-time (*n* = 1,852)**	**Part-time (*n* = 502)**	**Executive (*n* = 187)**
Opportunity to learn new things*	29%	**19%**	29%
Job autonomy	25%	22%	**36%**
Challenging and interesting work*	26%	**16%**	28%
Job security	19%	23%	22%
Benefits	17%	21%	21%
Achieving something that you personally value*	15%	**10%**	**20%**
Opportunity to use your skills to the maximum*	15%	**11%**	18%
Opportunity for advancement*	15%	**8%**	12%
Pay*	11%	9%	**17%**
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.			

Women are less likely than men to be extremely satisfied with their pay.

Satisfaction with Various Aspects of the Job (Percentage Extremely Satisfied), by Gender		
Aspect of the Job	**Male (*n* = 1,845)**	**Female (*n* = 718)**
Opportunity to learn new things	26%	29%
Job autonomy	25%	26%
Challenging and interesting work	25%	22%
Job security	20%	19%
Benefits	18%	20%
Achieving something that you personally value	14%	15%
Opportunity to use your skills to the maximum	14%	14%
Opportunity for advancement	14%	11%
Pay*	12%	**8%**
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.		

Respondents from Asia are the least likely of all respondents to be extremely satisfied with their job autonomy. Canadian respondents are the least likely of all respondents to be extremely satisfied with their job security. Respondents from the U.S. are twice as likely as respondents from Europe to be extremely satisfied with their benefits.

Satisfaction with Various Aspects of the Job (Percentage Extremely Satisfied), by Citizenship					
Aspect of the Job	**Asia (*n* = 266)**	**United States (*n* = 1,554)**	**Canada (*n* = 185)**	**Latin America (*n* = 130)**	**Europe (*n* = 331)**
Opportunity to learn new things	24%	28%	29%	23%	26%
Job autonomy*	**18%**	28%	23%	25%	22%
Challenging and interesting work	19%	24%	26%	27%	25%
Job security*	17%	22%	**12%**	18%	16%
Benefits*	14%	**22%**	15%	12%	**11%**
Achieving something that you personally value	15%	15%	15%	10%	11%
Opportunity to use your skills to the maximum	13%	15%	13%	15%	13%
Opportunity for advancement	11%	14%	12%	18%	12%
Pay	7%	12%	12%	7%	10%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.					

Hispanic respondents are the most likely of U.S. respondents to be extremely satisfied with the opportunity for advancement.

Satisfaction with Various Aspects of the Job (Percentage Extremely Satisfied), by U.S. Subgroup				
Aspect of the Job	**Asian American (*n* = 110)**	**African American (*n* = 43)**	**White (*n* = 1,229)**	**Hispanic (*n* = 60)**
Opportunity to learn new things	30%	23%	28%	27%
Job autonomy	31%	26%	27%	32%
Challenging and interesting work	24%	16%	24%	33%
Job security	25%	16%	22%	25%
Benefits	22%	16%	23%	22%
Achieving something that you personally value	18%	19%	14%	18%
Opportunity to use your skills to the maximum	15%	16%	14%	17%
Opportunity for advancement*	14%	7%	14%	**25%**
Pay	8%	7%	12%	13%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.				

Respondents who are executives are more likely than all other respondents to be extremely satisfied with the opportunity to learn new things in their job. Respondents who are senior-level managers or executives are more likely than respondents who are not managers or who are entry-level managers to be extremely satisfied with the following aspects of their job: job autonomy, achieving something they personally value, and the opportunity to use their skills to the maximum. Additionally, respondents who are senior-level managers or executives are more likely than respondents who are not managers to be extremely satisfied with the following aspects of their job: challenging and interesting work, the opportunity for advancement, and pay.

Satisfaction with Various Aspects of the Job (Percentage Extremely Satisfied), by Current Job Level*					
Aspect of the Job	**Not a manager/ supervisor (*n* = 680)**	**First-/ entry-level manager/ supervisor (*n* = 517)**	**Middle-level manager/ associate (*n* = 884)**	**Senior-level manager/ partner (*n* = 321)**	**Executive in the organization (*n* = 161)**
Opportunity to learn new things*	24%	25%	28%	30%	**38%**
Job autonomy*	**19%**	**17%**	24%	**37%**	**57%**
Challenging and interesting work*	**17%**	21%	24%	**34%**	**45%**
Job security	19%	19%	19%	23%	22%
Benefits	20%	17%	18%	19%	20%
Achieving something that you personally value*	**11%**	**11%**	12%	**23%**	**35%**
Opportunity to use your skills to the maximum*	**9%**	**11%**	15%	**19%**	**34%**
Opportunity for advancement*	**9%**	12%	12%	**19%**	**26%**
Pay*	**8%**	10%	11%	**16%**	**16%**
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.					

Respondents in the consulting industry are most likely to be satisfied with the opportunity to learn new things, whereas respondents in the healthcare industry are the most likely to be satisfied with their job autonomy. Respondents in consulting are more likely than respondents in products/services to be extremely satisfied that their job offers challenging and interesting work. Additionally, respondents in consulting and finance/accounting are more likely to be extremely satisfied with their pay compared with respondents in the products/services and manufacturing industries.

Respondents in the nonprofit/government industry are more likely than respondents in consulting to be extremely satisfied with their job security, and respondents in the nonprofit/government industry are the most likely of all respondents to be extremely satisfied with their benefits. Respondents in the healthcare and nonprofit/government industries are more likely than respondents in finance/accounting and products/services to be extremely satisfied that they are achieving something they personally value. Respondents in nonprofit/government and consulting are more likely than respondents in finance/accounting to be extremely satisfied that they have the opportunity to use their skills to the maximum.

Satisfaction with Various Aspects of the Job (Percentage Extremely Satisfied), by Industry

Aspect of the Job	Consulting (*n* =343)	Finance/ Accounting (*n* = 522)	Products/ Services (*n* = 531)	Manu-facturing (*n* = 244)	Tech-nology (*n* = 341)	Healthcare/ Pharm-aceuticals (*n* = 259)	Energy/ Utilities (*n* = 103)	Nonprofit/ Government (*n* = 165)
Opportunity to learn new things*	**35%**	24%	25%	26%	24%	31%	24%	28%
Job autonomy*	23%	22%	23%	27%	25%	**36%**	19%	28%
Challenging and interesting work*	**31%**	24%	**20%**	23%	23%	28%	17%	27%
Job security*	**10%**	18%	20%	18%	19%	24%	21%	**39%**
Benefits*	17%	19%	16%	14%	18%	23%	23%	**25%**
Achieving something that you personally value*	17%	**11%**	**11%**	14%	13%	**24%**	9%	**25%**
Opportunity to use your skills to the maximum*	**19%**	**11%**	11%	16%	13%	18%	12%	**20%**
Opportunity for advancement	16%	13%	13%	14%	12%	13%	12%	14%
Pay*	**15%**	**14%**	**8%**	**7%**	11%	11%	9%	7%

*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.

Respondents in consulting are more likely than respondents in operations/logistics to be extremely satisfied with the opportunity to learn new things. Respondents in general management are more likely than those in operations/logistics and finance/accounting to be extremely satisfied with the amount of job autonomy they have on the job. Respondents in consulting and general management are more likely to be extremely satisfied compared with all other respondents that their job offers challenging and interesting work. Respondents in general management are twice as likely as those in consulting to be extremely satisfied with their job security and opportunity for advancement.

Respondents in general management are more likely to be extremely satisfied that they are achieving something they personally value compared with respondents in operations/logistics and finance/accounting. Additionally, respondents in general management are more likely than respondents in marketing/sales and operations/logistics to be extremely satisfied that they are given the opportunity to use their skills to the maximum. Finally, respondents in operations/logistics are the least likely of all respondents to be extremely satisfied with their pay.

Satisfaction with Various Aspects of the Job (Percentage Extremely Satisfied), by Job Function*							
Aspect of the Job	**Marketing/ Sales (*n* = 638)**	**Operations/ Logistics (*n* = 257)**	**Consulting (*n* = 447)**	**General Management (*n* = 255)**	**Finance/ Accounting (*n* = 708)**	**Human Resources (*n* = 61)**	**IT/MIS (*n* = 154)**
Opportunity to learn new things*	27%	**19%**	**34%**	31%	24%	28%	28%
Job autonomy*	26%	**18%**	24%	**44%**	**20%**	23%	20%
Challenging and interesting work*	21%	19%	**30%**	**33%**	22%	25%	23%
Job security*	20%	18%	**13%**	**26%**	20%	26%	21%
Benefits	18%	15%	19%	18%	18%	26%	21%
Achieving something that you personally value*	13%	**8%**	16%	**26%**	**11%**	20%	12%
Opportunity to use your skills to the maximum*	**11%**	**9%**	17%	**24%**	12%	18%	14%
Opportunity for advancement*	11%	11%	**17%**	**21%**	11%	16%	11%
Pay*	11%	**5%**	13%	11%	10%	15%	10%
*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.							

V. The MBA Degree

This section explores the retrospective look at the MBA degree program. MBA alumni are asked to rate the value of the degree, estimate their return on investment, and whether they would decide to pursue an MBA degree knowing what they know now. Additionally, respondents are asked to rate their career services office if they used them after graduation.

Value of the MBA Degree

Respondents are asked to rate the overall value of the MBA degree by comparing the total monetary cost of the degree to the career opportunities received as a result of obtaining the degree. Overall, about a quarter (24%) of respondents rates the value as outstanding, about a third (34%) rates the value as excellent, and 27% rate the value as good. Additionally, 10% rate the value as fair, and 5% rate the value as poor.

Overall Value of the MBA Degree	
Response	**Percentage (*n* = 2,828)**
Outstanding	24%
Excellent	34%
Good	27%
Fair	10%
Poor	5%
Total	100%

Respondents who graduated from full-time programs are more than twice as likely as respondents who graduated from part-time programs to rate the value of their degree as outstanding. Respondents of part-time programs are more likely than respondents of full-time programs to rate the degree as good. Respondents of part-time programs are additionally the most likely of all respondents to rate the value of the degree as fair or poor.

Overall Value of the MBA Degree, by Program Type*			
Response	**Full-time (*n* = 2,048)**	**Part-time (*n* = 533)**	**Executive (*n* = 215)**
Outstanding	**27%**	**13%**	23%
Excellent	34%	30%	35%
Good	**25%**	**36%**	29%
Fair	9%	**14%**	8%
Poor	5%	**7%**	5%
Total	100%	100%	100%
*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.			

Men are more likely than women to rate the value of the degree as outstanding, and women are more likely than men to rate the degree as good.

Overall Value of the MBA Degree, by Gender*		
Response	**Male (*n* = 2,018)**	**Female (*n* = 802)**
Outstanding	**26%**	**17%**
Excellent	33%	35%
Good	25%	**32%**
Fair	10%	10%
Poor	5%	6%
Total	100%	100%
*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.		

There are no statistically significant differences in the respondent ratings for the overall value of the MBA degree by graduation year, citizenship, and U.S. subgroup. However, there may be a selection bias in the respondent base, where disgruntled individuals may be less likely to participate in the survey compared with satisfied graduates.

Return on Investment

Respondents are asked to indicate the extent they have recouped their investment in the MBA degree. Among all respondents, the average rate of return on their investment at the time of the survey is 56%. Nearly a quarter (23%) recouped their total investment, and 45% have recouped more than 50% of their investment.

Return on Investment (ROI)	
To what extant have you recouped your investment in the MBA degree?	**Percentage (*n* = 2,828)**
Fully (100%)	23%
90%	4%
80%	9%
70%	6%
60%	3%
Partially (50%)	19%
40%	5%
30%	9%
20%	9%
10%	5%
Not at all (0%)	8%
Total	100%
Mean	56%

Not surprisingly, respondents who have been out of school for a longer period of time have recouped a greater percentage of their investment. Half (50%) of the respondents from the class of 2000, 43% of the class of 2001, and a third (33%) of the class of 2002 have recouped their investment fully.

Return on Investment (ROI), by Graduation Year*						
To what extant have you recouped your investment in the MBA degree?	**2000 (*n* = 187)**	**2001 (*n* = 267)**	**2002 (*n* = 249)**	**2003 (*n* = 366)**	**2004 (*n* = 721)**	**2005 (*n* = 1,038)**
Fully (100%)	**50%**	**43%**	**33%**	25%	**18%**	**12%**
90%	4%	4%	4%	5%	4%	3%
80%	11%	7%	12%	10%	10%	8%
70%	5%	5%	8%	5%	7%	5%
60%	3%	3%	4%	3%	3%	3%
Partially (50%)	**12%**	17%	14%	**23%**	20%	20%
40%	3%	4%	6%	4%	7%	6%
30%	**5%**	**4%**	**4%**	8%	10%	**12%**
20%	**3%**	**5%**	7%	7%	9%	**13%**
10%	1%	3%	2%	4%	5%	8%
Not at all (0%)	**3%**	**3%**	5%	6%	7%	**11%**
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Mean**	**77%**	**71%**	**67%**	**60%**	**54%**	**45%**

*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.

** p ≤ .05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.

Statistically, there is no difference in the average ROI by program type. However, respondents from part-time programs are the most likely to report not recouping any of their investment.

Return on Investment (ROI), by Program Type*			
To what extant have you recouped your investment in the MBA degree?	**Full-time (*n* = 2,048)**	**Part-time (*n* = 533)**	**Executive (*n* = 215)**
Fully (100%)	23%	21%	23%
90%	4%	4%	4%
80%	8%	11%	10%
70%	5%	6%	**10%**
60%	3%	2%	3%
Partially (50%)	20%	19%	16%
40%	5%	6%	7%
30%	10%	7%	6%
20%	10%	8%	8%
10%	5%	6%	4%
Not at all (0%)	7%	**10%**	9%
Total	100%	100%	100%
Mean	56%	55%	58%

*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.

There is no difference in the average percentage recouped by gender. However, women are slightly, yet significantly, less likely than men to report that they have recouped 100% of their investment.

Return on Investment (ROI), by Gender*		
To what extant have you recouped your investment in the MBA degree?	**Male (*n* = 2,018)**	**Female (*n* = 802)**
Fully (100%)	24%	**19%**
90%	4%	3%
80%	9%	8%
70%	6%	5%
60%	3%	3%
Partially (50%)	19%	20%
40%	5%	6%
30%	9%	9%
20%	9%	11%
10%	5%	6%
Not at all (0%)	7%	9%
Total	100%	100%
Mean**	57%	52%

*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.
** $p \leq .05$; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.

Respondents from Asia and Europe have recouped more of their investment, on average, compared with respondents from the U.S.

Return on Investment (ROI), by Citizenship*					
To what extant have you recouped your investment in the MBA degree?	**Asia (*n* = 286)**	**United States (*n* = 1,715)**	**Canada (*n* = 201)**	**Latin America (*n* = 143)**	**Europe (*n* = 366)**
Fully (100%)	28%	22%	20%	17%	26%
90%	5%	3%	3%	3%	5%
80%	8%	9%	7%	7%	10%
70%	6%	6%	8%	5%	5%
60%	4%	3%	3%	4%	3%
Partially (50%)	22%	19%	20%	25%	17%
40%	3%	6%	4%	9%	6%
30%	7%	9%	12%	**17%**	8%
20%	7%	10%	9%	5%	10%
10%	5%	6%	4%	2%	**2%**
Not at all (0%)	5%	8%	7%	6%	7%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Mean**	**61%**	**54%**	55%	54%	**60%**

*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.
** $p \leq .05$; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.

There are no statistically significant differences in the percentage of the investment recouped by U.S. subgroup.

Right Decision to Pursue the MBA Degree

Respondents are asked to indicate whether they made the right decision to pursue the MBA degree knowing what they know now. Overall, 72% of respondents indicate that they definitely made the right decision and 22% indicate that they probably made the right decision. Only 5% of respondents indicate that they probably did not or definitely did not make the right decision in pursuing the MBA degree.

Right Decision to Pursue the MBA Degree	
Knowing what you know now, would you still have pursued an MBA Degree?	**Percentage (*n* = 2,828)**
Definitely yes	72%
Probably yes	22%
Probably no	4%
Definitely no	1%
Total	100%

Overall, 82% of respondents from executive programs, 72% from full-time programs, and 68% from part-time programs report that they definitely made the right decision in pursuing the MBA degree. However, respondents from part-time programs are more likely than respondents from executive programs to indicate that they probably made the right decision in pursing the MBA degree.

Right Decision to Pursue the MBA Degree, by Program Type*			
Knowing what you know now, would you still have pursued an MBA Degree?	**Full-time (*n* = 2,048)**	**Part-time (*n* = 533)**	**Executive (*n* = 215)**
Definitely yes	72%	68%	82%
Probably yes	22%	**27%**	**15%**
Probably no	5%	3%	2%
Definitely no	1%	1%	<1%
Total	100%	100%	100%
*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.			

There are no statistically significant differences in the percentage of respondents indicating whether they made the right decision by graduation year, gender, citizenship, and U.S. subgroup.

The MBA Degree and the Entrepreneur

Respondents who are self-employed are asked to indicate the helpfulness of the MBA degree to their becoming self-employed. One in 20 (5%) of the self-employed respondents report they were self-employed prior to entering the MBA degree program. Overall, 38% indicate that the MBA degree was extremely helpful, 35% state it was very helpful, and 15% report that the degree was somewhat helpful in becoming self-employed.

Helpfulness of the MBA Degree to Becoming Self-Employed	
Response	**Percentage (*n* = 162)**
Extremely helpful	38%
Very helpful	35%
Somewhat helpful	15%
Not very helpful	5%
Not at all helpful	2%
I was self-employed prior to entering the MBA program.	5%
Total	100%

The respondents who were self-employed prior to entering the MBA degree program are asked to indicate the helpfulness of the MBA degree in managing and/or improving their business. Of the eight respondents who were self-employed prior to entering the MBA program, the majority (76%) are either extremely or very satisfied that the MBA degree helped them manage and/or improve their business.

Helpfulness of the MBA Degree to Manage/Improve Business	
Response	**Percentage (*n* = 8)**
Extremely helpful	13%
Very helpful	63%
Somewhat helpful	13%
Not very helpful	0%
Not at all helpful	13%
Total	100%

Career Services Office

Respondents who are not working at the time of the survey are asked to indicate whether they are using their alma mater's career services office in their job search. About a quarter (26%) of these respondents indicate that they are not currently searching for a job. Among the respondents who are currently searching for a job, 49% are using their alma mater's career services office and 51% are not using the career services office in their job search.

Are You Using Your Alma Mater's Career Service Office in Your Current Job Search? (Respondents Currently Not Working)		
Response	**Currently Not Working (*n* = 90)**	**Currently Working, But Was Out of Work in the Past (*n* = 67)**
Yes	37%	49%
No	38%	51%
Currently not searching for a job	26%	Excluded
Total	100%	100%

Respondents who are currently employed but who had been unemployed at some point since completing their MBA degree are asked to indicate whether they used their career services office in their job search. Overall, 55% used the career services office in their job search.

Did You Use Your Alma Mater's Career Service Office in Your Job Search? (Respondents Previously Unemployed)	
Response	**Percentage (*n* = 462)**
Yes	55%
No	45%
Total	100%

Respondents who used their alma mater's career services office in their job search are asked to indicate the helpfulness of the career services office. Twice as many respondents who used the office in the past compared to respondents who are current using the career services office feel that the career services office is extremely helpful. But twice as many respondents who were previously unemployed compared to those who are currently using the office feel that the career services office is very helpful.

Helpfulness of Alma Mater's Career Service Office		
Response	**Currently Unemployed (*n* = 33)**	**Previously Unemployed (*n* = 255)**
Extremely helpful	6%	13%
Very helpful	30%	17%
Somewhat helpful	30%	31%
Not very helpful	27%	26%
Not at all helpful	6%	13%
Total	100%	100%

VI. 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 in this section of the report.

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® research on graduates from MBA programs; (2) prior GMAC® 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® Graduate Surveys administered among the MBA classes of 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, and 2005.

On April 19, 2006, an e-mail invitation was sent to the 14,139 members of the sample. A reminder e-mail was sent on May 3 to the sample members who had not yet completed the survey or who had only partially completed it. The questionnaire was available at the online survey site from April 19 to May 10, 2006. As an incentive for people to participate in the survey, we offered to place them in a drawing for one US$500 and four US$100 gifts.

Of the 14,139 contacts that were initiated for the April 2006 MBA Alumni Perspectives Survey, 778 contacts were undeliverable (6%). Of the remaining contacts, 2,828 people responded—a 21% response rate.

Response Rates				
Graduation Year	**Sample**	**Adjusted Sample**	**Respondents**	**Adjusted Response Rate**
Overall	**14,139**	**13,361**	**2,828**	**21.2%**
2000	936	892	187	21.0%
2001	2,055	1,944	267	13.7%
2002	1,692	1,611	249	15.5%
2003	2,165	2,053	366	17.8%
2004	3,398	3,201	721	22.5%
2005	3,893	3,660	1,038	28.4%

Who Are the Alumni?

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 2006 MBA Alumni Perspectives Survey.

The respondents to the April 2006 MBA Alumni Perspectives Survey represent about 10% of all the respondents to the Global MBA® Graduate Surveys. However, among the available sample from the Global MBA® Graduate Survey who indicated a willingness to participate (N = 13,161), the April 2006 MBA Alumni Perspectives represents a 21% response rate.

The graduating class of 2005 represents 37% of the respondents to the current survey. The class of 2004 represents 25%, the class of 2003 represents 13%, the classes of 2002 and 2001 each represents 9%, and the class of 2000 represents 7% of the respondents. When comparing the respondents to the current survey, there is a statistically significant difference in the distribution by graduation year compared with all the respondents to the Global MBA® Graduate Surveys.

Graduation Year*		
Graduation Year	**Respondents (*n* = 2,828)**	**Global MBA® Graduate Survey (*n* = 28,820)**
2000	7%	10%
2001	9%	18%
2002	9%	18%
2003	13%	16%
2004	25%	15%
2005	37%	23%
Total	100%	100%
*p ≤ .05; based on a difference of two proportions.		

Graduates of full-time MBA programs are equally represented in the respondent base for the current survey and the full population of respondents to the Global MBA® Graduate Surveys. However, graduates of part-time programs are slightly underrepresented and graduates of executive programs are slight overrepresented in the current survey.

Program Type		
Program Type	**Respondents (*n* = 2,796)**	**Global MBA® Graduate Survey (*n* = 25,559)**
Full-time	73%	73%
Part-time *	19%	21%
Executive*	8%	6%
Total	100%	100%
*p ≤ .05; based on a difference of two proportions.		

Male respondents are slightly overrepresented among the respondents to the current survey and females are slightly underrepresented.

Gender*		
Gender	**Respondents (*n* = 2,820)**	**Global MBA® Graduate Survey (*n* = 28,820)**
Male	72%	68%
Female	28%	32%
Total	100%	100%
*p ≤ .05; based on a difference of two proportions.		

Slightly overrepresented in the current survey are respondents from the United States, Canada, and Europe. Respondents from Asia are slightly underrepresented, and there is an equal distribution of individuals from Latin America.

Citizenship*		
World Region	**Respondents (*n* = 2,711)**	**Global MBA® Graduate Survey (*n* = 24,738)**
Asia	**11%**	**18%**
United States	**63%**	**60%**
Canada	**7%**	**6%**
Latin America	5%	5%
Europe	**14%**	**10%**
Total	100%	100%
*p ≤ .05; based on a difference of two proportions.		

African Americans are slightly underrepresented among the respondents compared with their distribution in the Global MBA® Graduate Survey.

U.S. Subgroup*		
U.S. Subgroup	**Respondents (*n* = 1,593)**	**Global MBA® Graduate Survey (*n* = 13,676)**
Asian American	8%	8%
African American	**3%**	**4%**
White	85%	83%
Hispanic	4%	4%
Total	100%	100%
*p ≤ .05; based on a difference of two proportions.		

Online Questionnaire Administration

Administration of the questionnaire online offered several advantages over a paper-and-pencil administration. First, responses automatically went into a database that was available for analysis at all times. This allowed for monitoring survey progress and eliminating the time and cost associated with data entry. Second, the site was programmed to check for the accurate completion of each question before the respondent was allowed to 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. They never saw questions that did not pertain to them, such as race/ethnicity for non-U.S. citizens.

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, version 11). Two weeks before the completion of data collection, a preliminary analysis was conducted of the data. Frequency distributions were examined for both topical questions and 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. In the final analysis, most topical questions were cross tabulated with the following classification items: gender, race/ethnicity (for U.S. citizens), and citizenship. A Chi-square analysis was used to evaluate the statistical significance in cross-classification tables ($p < .05$). (A relationship between a topical item and a classification item was considered statistically significant only when it could have been produced by chance less than 5% of the time.) T-tests, analysis of variance, and nonparametric tests were used whenever appropriate. Percentages in charts and tables might not always add exactly to 100% due to rounding.

Category Definition

Survey respondents identified their pre- and post-MBA employing industry from the list shown in the following table.

Industry and Industry Groups			
Consulting		**High technology (continued)**	
	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	**Manufacturing**	
Energy/utilities			Aerospace and defense
	Energy and utilities		Automotive
	Mining		Other manufacturing
	Utilities	**Nonprofit or government**	
	Other energy and utilities		Education or educational services
Finance			Government, nonmilitary
	Accounting	**Products and services**	
	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
Healthcare			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
High technology			Retail, wholesale
	Engineering		Other products and services
	Information technology or services	**Other industry**	

Contact Information

For questions or comments regarding study findings, methodology or data, please contact the GMAC® Research and Development department at 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®.

Acknowledgements

Rachel Edgington, Director, Market Research and Analysis, Graduate Management Admission Council®; Veronica Garcia, Research Writer/Editor, Graduate Management Admission Council®, writing and editorial services.