Graduate
Management
Admission
Council®

Creating Access to Graduate Business Education®

MBA ALUMNI PERSPECTIVE SURVEY SEPTEMBER 2005

COMPREHENSIVE DATA REPORT

Table of Contents

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

Background

The MBA Alumni Perspectives Surveys are biannual follow-up studies of past participants of the Global MBA® Graduate Surveys. Each year, about three-quarters of the respondents to the Global MBA® Graduate Survey express interest in participating in longitudinal studies tracking their career decisions and job satisfaction.

The research objectives of this study are to—

- understand first and/or current job characteristics;
- track changes in responsibility, promotions, and salary;
- assess the performance of graduate management education; and
- monitor the educational needs of alumni.

The September 2005 Wave Study included alumni from the classes of 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, and 2005. This report presents the overall findings and significant findings by graduation year, gender, citizenship, race/ethnicity, and type of program.

The results of this survey do not necessarily reflect a statistically representative sample of MBA alumni as a whole. Rather, it is a broad cross-section of alumni who participated in a previous Global MBA® Graduate Survey and expressed a willingness to participate in future follow-up studies. Due to this limitation, the results of this research study should not be used to make generalizations to the MBA alumni population, but rather can be used as a reflection of the sample frame under consideration.

Statistical tests are performed on the sample of respondents to determine differences between various characteristics. A chi-squared test (X^2) is used to evaluate whether two variables in a contingency table are independent. For the purpose of this report, if the X^2 value has a $p \leq 0.05$, the null hypothesis, which states the two variables are independent, is rejected. Rejecting the null hypothesis indicates that there is a relationship between the variables and one variable contributes to the differences in proportions of another variable—one variable is dependent upon the other. To further understand the relationship when rejecting the null hypothesis, standardized residuals are used to determine which cell in the contingency table are specifically significant in the X^2 test. Values in the contingency table are in bold if the standardized residual is ±1.9.

An analysis of variance (ANOVA) test is used to evaluate the difference between two or more means. If the F-statistic in the ANOVA has a $p \leq 0.05$, the null hypothesis, which states the means are equal, is rejected. Rejecting the null hypothesis indicates that there are differences in the mean value between groups. A Bonferroni correction is used to raise the threshold to reject the null hypothesis when making multiple comparisons. Items in the ANOVA tables that are in bold indicate that even with the Bonferroni correction the difference in means is still statistically significant.

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

First Job after Graduation

This section of the report examines the employment status of respondents at the time of their graduation from the MBA program. Included in the analysis are the timing of their first job after graduation, number of other job offers, whether accepting the job was the right decision, how the job ties into the MBA degree, plus starting salary and other compensation received from their first job after graduation.

Employment Status after Graduation

Overall, 87% of respondents among the class of 2005 were working after graduation. Nearly a third (30%) of respondents was working in their first job after graduation while in graduate management school. About one in ten (11%) continued working for an employer with whom they had an internship or work project during graduate management school. Forty-one percent of respondents started their first job after leaving graduate management school, and 5% are self-employed or own a small business. Additionally, 13% have not had a job since leaving graduate management school.

Employment Status After Graduation (Class of 2005)	
Response	**(*n* = 1,095)**
I held this job while in graduate management school and continued working at this job after I left graduate management school	30%
I had an internship/work project with the employer and continued working for this employer after I left graduate management school	11%
It was the first job I held after leaving graduate management school	41%
I was self-employed or a small business owner	5%
I have not had a job since leaving graduate management school	13%
Total	100%

The classes of 2004 and 2005 are significantly more likely to have held their first job while in graduate management school compared with the classes of 2000 and 2003. This finding may be linked to the higher proportion of respondents in the class of 2005 who graduated from part-time and EMBA programs, which generally are pursued by individuals who wish to continue to work during their education. The class of 2000 is most likely to have transitioned from an internship or work project into their first job after graduation. The classes of 2000, 2001, and 2002 are significantly more likely compared with the classes of 2003 and 2004 to have obtained their first job after graduation. The class of 2002 is slightly, although significantly, more likely to be self-employed or small business owners compared with other graduating classes. The class of 2003 is the least likely to have had a job right after graduation compared with the classes of 2000, 2001, and 2002. Data for respondents who graduated prior to 2005 were collected from their respective first MBA Alumni Perspective survey.

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

Employment Status After Graduation, by Graduation Year*						
	Graduation Year**					
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Response	(*n* = 353)	(*n* = 619)	(*n* = 576)	(*n* = 1,074)	(*n* = 1,446)	(*n* = 1,095)
I held this job while in graduate management school and continued working at this job	**15%**	28%	22%	**18%**	**28%**	**30%**
I had an internship/work project with the employer and continued working for this employer	**15%**	10%	11%	12%	11%	11%
It was the first job I held after leaving graduate management school	**66%**	**54%**	**54%**	**36%**	**41%**	41%
I was self-employed or a small business owner	3%	5%	**7%**	4%	5%	5%
I have not had a job since leaving graduate management school	**1%**	**4%**	**6%**	**29%**	16%	13%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

*$p \leq 0.05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.
** Data for the classes of 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, and 2004 are taken from past alumni surveys.

Part-time and EMBA graduates are the most likely to have held their first post-MBA job while in graduate management school. Full-time graduates were the most likely to have had an internship and to have continued to work for the employer after graduation. Additionally, full-time graduates are most likely to have obtained their first job after graduation and the most likely to have not had a job after graduation.

Employment Status After Graduation, by Program Type (Class of 2005)*			
	Program Type		
	Full-time	Part-time	Executive
Response	(*n* = 710)	(*n* = 241)	(*n* = 133)
I held this job while in graduate management school and continued working at this job	**6%**	**76%**	**74%**
I had an internship/work project with the employer and continued working for this employer	**16%**	**2%**	**1%**
It was the first job I held after leaving graduate management school	**56%**	**17%**	**8%**
I was self-employed or a small business owner	5%	**1%**	**10%**
I have not had a job since leaving graduate management school	**17%**	**3%**	**7%**
Total	100%	100%	100%

*$p \leq 0.05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.

U.S. citizens are significantly more likely to have held their first job while in school, which is consistent with the greater proportion of U.S. citizens graduating from part-time programs. Respondents from Latin America are the most likely to have obtained their first job after graduation. Canadians are the most likely to have not had a job since leaving graduate management school.

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

Employment Status After Graduation, by Country of Citizenship (Class of 2005)*					
	World Region				
Response	Asia (*n* = 116)	United States (*n* = 657)	Canada (*n* = 97)	Latin America (*n* = 60)	Europe (*n* = 132)
I held this job while in graduate management school and continued working at this job	22%	**36%**	**10%**	**15%**	31%
I had an internship/work project with the employer and continued working for this employer	15%	10%	12%	8%	10%
It was the first job I held after leaving graduate management school	48%	39%	51%	**58%**	35%
I was self-employed or a small business owner	4%	5%	1%	8%	7%
I have not had a job since leaving graduate management school	11%	10%	**26%**	10%	17%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
*$p \leq 0.05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.					

There are no statistically significant differences by U.S. subgroup in employment status after graduation.

Respondents Not Working After Graduation

Respondents in the class of 2005 who have not had a job since graduation were asked the reasons for their current unemployment status. The majority (65%) state that they are unable to find the job they want. One in five stated that they recently moved, and nearly one in ten are continuing their education.

Reasons for Unemployment (Class of 2005)	
Reason	**(*n* = 162)**
Unable to find the job I want	65%
Recently moved	20%
Continuing my education	9%
Family reasons	7%
Currently involved in internship/work project	7%
Military obligations	1%
Other	19%

Timing of First Job after Graduation

Respondents from the class of 2005 working for an employer were asked when they began their first job after graduation. Twenty-eight percent of respondents started their job between January and May, 40% in June or July, and 32% between August and December. The majority of the class of 2005 began their first post-MBA job in 2005 (64%)—the year they graduated. However, 36% began their job before they graduated, indicating that they were employed during their MBA program.

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

When First Job After Graduation Started (Class of 2005)	
Month	**(*n* = 900)**
January–May	28%
June–July	40%
August–December	32%
Total	100%
Year	
2000 and earlier	19%
2001	4%
2002	3%
2003	3%
2004	7%
2005	64%
Total	100%

Number of Job Offers

This section of the report presents the number of job offers employed respondents received after graduation. The number of job offers received is influenced by a variety of factors, such as the number of jobs to which a respondent applied, time of year, the type of job the respondent was seeking, and their choice of industry.

Overall, employed respondents in the class of 2005 had an average of 2.3 job offers after graduation. A third (34%) of the class of 2005 had one job offer, 28% had two job offers, 23% had three job offers, and 16% had four or more job offers.

Number of Job Offers (First Job After Graduation – Class of 2005)	
Response	**(*n* = 570)**
One job offer	34%
Two job offers	28%
Three job offers	23%
Four or more job offers	16%
Total	100%
Mean number of job offers	2.3
Median number of job offers	2.0

The employed respondents in the class of 2002 were significantly more likely than those in the class of 2000 to have had only one job offer at the time of graduation. On the other hand, the classes of 2000 and 2001 were significantly more likely than the class of 2002 to have had four or more job offers. Data for respondents who graduated prior to 2005 were collected from their respective first MBA Alumni Perspective survey.

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

Number of Job Offers, by Graduation Year* (First Job After Graduation)						
	Graduation Year**					
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Response	(*n* = 348)	(*n* = 597)	(*n* = 541)	(*n* = 767)	(*n* = 740)	(*n* = 570)
One job offer	**27%**	41%	**48%**	41%	37%	34%
Two job offers	27%	24%	26%	27%	28%	28%
Three job offers	18%	17%	18%	20%	21%	23%
Four or more other job offers	**28%**	**18%**	**7%**	13%	14%	16%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

*$p \leq 0.05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.
** Data for the classes of 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, and 2004 are taken from past alumni surveys.

There were no statistically significant differences in the number of job offers among the class of 2005 by program type, gender, world region, and U.S. subgroup.

Right Decision in Choice of First Job

Respondents whose first job commenced after graduation or whose first job resulted from an internship/work project were asked whether the job they took is the kind of job they were looking for.

Only one in twenty (5%) of the respondents state that the job they took was not the kind of job they were looking for after graduation. Sixty-two percent state that the job they took was definitely the kind of job they were looking for, and a third (33%) state that it is somewhat like the job they were looking for after graduation.

When You Took this Job, Was it the Kind of Job You Were Looking For? (First Job After Graduation – Class of 2005)	
Response	**(*n* = 570)**
Yes, definitely	62%
Yes, somewhat	33%
No	5%
Total	100%

The class of 2002 responded to the question, "When you took this job, was it the kind of job you were looking for?" differently compared with all other graduating classes. The class of 2002 was the least likely to state that it definitely was the type of job they were looking for, and the most likely to state that the job was not the type of job they were looking for after graduation. Data for respondents who graduated prior to 2005 were collected from their respective first MBA Alumni Perspective survey.

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

When You Took This Job, Was It the Kind of Job You Were Looking For?, by Graduation Year* (First Job After Graduation)						
	Graduation Year**					
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Response	(*n* = 348)	(*n* = 597)	(*n* = 541)	(*n* = 764)	(*n* = 740)	(*n* = 570)
Yes, definitely	62%	51%	**45%**	56%	61%	62%
Yes, somewhat	31%	40%	**44%**	37%	34%	33%
No	7%	9%	**11%**	7%	5%	5%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

*$p \leq 0.05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.
** Data for the classes of 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, and 2004 are taken from past alumni surveys.

Respondents from Asia are the least likely to state that the job they took was the type they were looking for after graduation. One in eight (12%) Europeans compared to one in fifty (2%) U.S. citizens state that the job they took was not the type they were looking for after graduation—a statistically significant difference.

When You Took this Job, Was it the Kind of Job You Were Looking For?, by Country of Citizenship* (First Job After Graduation)					
	World Region				
	Asia	United States	Canada	Latin America	Europe
Response	(*n* = 73)	(*n* = 321)	(*n* = 61)	(*n* = 40)	(*n* = 59)
Yes, definitely	**41%**	66%	69%	55%	59%
Yes, somewhat	51%	32%	23%	38%	29%
No	8%	**2%**	8%	8%	**12%**
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

*$p \leq 0.05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.

There are no statistically significant differences in the response to the question, "When you took this job, was it the kind of job you were looking for?" by program type, gender, and U.S. subgroup.

MBA Degree Essential for First Job

Respondents whose first job commenced after graduation or whose first job resulted from an internship/work project were asked whether they could have obtained this first job without an MBA degree.

Over half (57%) of graduates in the class of 2005 strongly agree that they could not have obtained their job without their graduate management school training. An additional quarter (25%) somewhat agree with the statement. Only 11% state that they somewhat or strongly disagree with the statement.

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

I Could Not Have Obtained this Job Without My Graduate Management School Training (First Job After Graduation – Class of 2005)	
Response	**(*n* = 570)**
Strongly agree	57%
Somewhat agree	25%
Neither agree nor disagree	6%
Somewhat disagree	6%
Strongly disagree	5%
Total	100%

The classes of 2004 and 2005 are significantly more likely compared with the classes of 2001, 2002, and 2003 to strongly agree that they could not have obtained their job without their graduate management education. On the contrary, the classes of 2001, 2002, and 2003 are significantly more likely compared with the classes of 2004 and 2005 to strongly disagree with the statement. Data for respondents who graduated prior to 2005 were collected from their respective first MBA Alumni Perspective survey.

I Could Not Have Obtained this Job Without My Graduate Management School Training, by Graduation Year* (First Job After Graduation)						
	Graduation Year**					
	2000	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**
Response	**(*n* = 348)**	**(*n* = 597)**	**(*n* = 541)**	**(*n* = 764)**	**(*n* = 740)**	**(*n* = 570)**
Strongly agree	49%	**41%**	**38%**	**42%**	**55%**	**57%**
Somewhat agree	23%	22%	21%	20%	24%	25%
Neither agree nor disagree	7%	11%	11%	**12%**	7%	**6%**
Somewhat disagree	10%	8%	**12%**	10%	8%	**6%**
Strongly disagree	12%	**18%**	**19%**	**17%**	**7%**	**5%**
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

*$p \leq 0.05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.

** Data for the classes of 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, and 2004 are taken from past alumni surveys.

Graduates of part-time programs are the least likely to strongly agree that they could not have obtained their job without an education, but are the most likely to somewhat agree with the statement.

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

I Could Not Have Obtained this Job Without My Graduate Management School Training, by Program Type* (First Job After Graduation – Class of 2005)			
	Program Type		
	Full-time	Part-time	Executive
Response	(*n* = 508)	(*n* = 47)	(*n* = 12)
Strongly agree	60%	**36%**	58%
Somewhat agree	23%	**43%**	33%
Neither agree nor disagree	6%	2%	8%
Somewhat disagree	6%	9%	0%
Strongly disagree	5%	11%	0%
Total	100%	100%	100%
*$p \leq 0.05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.			

There are no statistically significant difference by gender, world region, and U.S. subgroup in their agreement or disagreement with the statement, "I could not have obtained this job without my graduate management school training."

Salary and Other Compensation

Respondents were asked to provide their starting annual salary and other first-year compensation for the job they held after graduating from their MBA program. Respondents were asked to provide this information in U.S. dollars—a currency conversion calculator is provided in the survey instrument.

On average, the class of 2005 had a starting annual salary of $72,730 and had $16,114 in additional first year compensation.

Starting Annual Salary and Other Compensation in U.S. Dollars (First Job After Graduation – Class of 2005)		
	Starting Annual Salary	Other First-Year Compensation
Statistic	(*n* = 878)	(*n* = 878)
Lower 95% confidence interval	$70,253	$13,813
Mean	$72,730	$16,114
Upper 95% confidence interval	$75,206	$18,416

The class of 2004 had significantly lower starting annual salary compared with the classes of 2000 and 2005. Data for respondents who graduated prior to 2005 were collected from their respective first MBA Alumni Perspective survey.

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

Starting Annual Salary and Other Compensation in U.S. Dollars, by Graduation Year (First Job After Graduation)						
	Graduation Year**					
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Starting Annual Salary	**(*n* = 251)**	**(*n* = 365)**	**(*n* = 349)**	**(*n* = 433)**	**(*n* = 1,103)**	**(*n* = 878)**
Lower 95% confidence interval	$71,062	$68,033	$64,625	$67,232	$63,755	$70,253
Mean*	**$73,874**	$70,679	$70,588	$69,713	**$65,334**	**$72,730**
Upper 95% confidence interval	$76,687	$73,326	$76,551	$72,194	$66,913	$75,206
*p ≤ 0.05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA. ** Data for the classes of 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, and 2004 are taken from past alumni surveys.						

Graduates of EMBA programs had the highest starting annual salary, followed by graduates of full-time programs and then part-time programs—a statistically significant difference. The same pattern holds true for other first year compensation, where EMBA graduates had higher compensation compared with full-time and then part-time graduates.

Starting Annual Salary and Other Compensation in U.S. Dollars, by Program Type (First Job After Graduation – Class of 2005)			
	Program Type		
	Full-Time	Part-Time	Executive
Starting Annual Salary	**(*n* = 546)**	**(*n* = 219)**	**(*n* = 105)**
Lower 95% confidence interval	$72,782	$54,715	$77,351
Mean*	**$75,515**	**$59,174**	**$87,860**
Upper 95% confidence interval	$78,249	$63,633	$98,368
Other First-Year Compensation			
Lower 95% confidence interval	$15,304	$4,229	$15,875
Mean*	**$17,453**	**$5,755**	**$30,749**
Upper 95% confidence interval	$19,603	$7,281	$45,623
*p ≤ 0.05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.			

Men had significantly higher first year starting annual salaries and other first-year compensation compared with women. These findings are consistent with the differences in salary between program types—men are more likely to be graduates of full-time and executive programs.

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

Starting Annual Salary and Other Compensation, by Gender in U.S. Dollars (First Job After Graduation – Class of 2005)		
	Gender	
	Male	**Female**
Starting Annual Salary	**(*n* = 622)**	**(*n* = 256)**
Lower 95% confidence interval	$74,006	$58,172
Mean*	**$76,981**	**$62,402**
Upper 95% confidence interval	$79,955	$66,631
Other First-Year Compensation		
Lower 95% confidence interval	$15,721	$7,210
Mean*	**$18,796**	**$9,599**
Upper 95% confidence interval	$21,871	$11,989
*p ≤ 0.05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.		

Europeans had the highest starting annual salary among all the world regions. There are no statistically significant differences in other first-year compensation by world region.

Starting Annual Salary and Other Compensation, by Country of Citizenship in U.S. Dollars (First Job After Graduation – Class of 2005)					
	World Region				
	Asia	**United States**	**Canada**	**Latin America**	**Europe**
Starting Annual Salary	**(*n* = 94)**	**(*n* = 546)**	**(*n* = 71)**	**(*n* = 49)**	**(*n* = 94)**
Lower 95% confidence interval	$68,303	$68,453	$61,727	$61,117	$75,792
Mean*	$77,184	$71,726	$66,893	$68,237	**$82,808**
Upper 95% confidence interval	$86,066	$75,000	$72,059	$75,356	$89,823
Other First-Year Compensation					
Lower 95% confidence interval	$8,131	$12,578	$6,145	$9,975	$17,056
Mean	$12,062	$15,797	$10,970	$17,316	$24,380
Upper 95% confidence interval	$15,993	$19,016	$15,795	$24,657	$31,703
*p ≤ 0.05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.					

There are no statistically differences in starting salary or other first-year compensation by U.S. subgroup.

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

Current Job

This section of the report examines the current employment status of all the respondents at the time of the survey. Included in the analysis are employer characteristics; satisfaction with employer; job function; satisfaction with job, skills, and abilities used in current job; and promotions, salary and other compensation.

Current Employment Status

Overall, 92% of respondents are currently employed, including 86% who work for an employer and 6% who are self-employed or small business owners. Eight percent of respondents were not working at the time of the survey.

Current Employment Status	
Response	**(*n* = 3,113)**
Currently employed	86%
I am currently self-employed or a small business owner	6%
I am not currently working	8%
Total	100%

Among all the respondents who are not currently working, 61% are unable to find a job they want, 19% had recently moved, 13% are continuing their education, and 11% state family reasons. Other reasons for not currently working include taking a break/vacation (4%), recently terminated/laid off from employment (3%), just graduated (3%), waiting for visa or work authorization (2%), and in the process of starting one's own business (1%).

Reasons Respondent Is Not Working	
Reason	**(*n* = 238)**
Unable to find a job I want	61%
Have recently moved	19%
Continuing my education	13%
Family reasons	11%
Currently involved in internship or work project	5%
Military obligations	<1%
Other	18%
Responses may add to more than 100% due to multiple selections.	

Respondents from the class of 2005 are least likely to be self-employed or small business owners. The class of 2005 is more likely compared to the classes of 2001, 2002, 2003, and 2004 to currently not be working.

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

Current Employment Status, by Graduation Year*						
	Graduation Year					
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Status	(*n* = 179)	(*n* = 292)	(*n* = 334)	(*n* = 357)	(*n* = 757)	(*n* = 1,194)
Currently employed	88%	89%	88%	88%	89%	82%
I am currently self-employed or a small business owner	6%	9%	8%	8%	7%	**5%**
I am not currently working	6%	**3%**	**4%**	**4%**	**4%**	**14%**
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
*p ≤ 0.05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.						

Graduates of an EMBA program are the most likely to be self-employed or small business owners. Graduates of full-time programs are significantly more likely compared to graduates of part-time programs to currently not be working.

Current Employment Status, by Program Type*			
	Program Type		
	Full-time	Part-time	Executive
Response	(*n* = 2,251)	(*n* = 597)	(*n* = 228)
Currently employed	85%	92%	84%
I am currently self-employed or a small business owner	7%	5%	**11%**
I am not currently working	**9%**	**4%**	6%
Total	100%	100%	100%
*p ≤ 0.05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.			

Europeans are significantly most likely to be self-employed or small business owners. Canadians are the most likely not to be working.

Current Employment Status, by Country of Citizenship*					
	World Region				
	Asia	United States	Canada	Latin America	Europe
Response	(*n* = 351)	(*n* = 1,864)	(*n* = 225)	(*n* = 166)	(*n* = 369)
Currently employed	88%	87%	82%	87%	82%
I am currently self-employed or a small business owner	5%	6%	6%	6%	**10%**
I am not currently working	7%	7%	**12%**	7%	8%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
*p ≤ 0.05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.					

There are no statistically significant differences in current employment status by gender or U.S. subgroup.

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

Employer Characteristics

One in five (20%) respondents is working outside their country of citizenship and 80% are working in their country of citizenship.

Employed in County of Citizenship (Graduates Who Work for an Employer)	
Response	**(*n* = 2,675)**
Yes	80%
No	20%
Total	100%

Graduates of part-time programs are the most likely to be working in their country of citizenship. About a quarter (24%) of full-time graduates work outside their country of citizenship; this is a significantly higher percentage than part-time graduates who work outside their country of citizenship.

Employed in County of Citizenship, by Program Type* (Graduates Who Work for an Employer)			
	Program Type		
	Full-Time	**Part-Time**	**Executive**
Response	**(*n* = 1,905)**	**(*n* = 546)**	**(*n* = 191)**
Yes	76%	**91%**	85%
No	**24%**	**9%**	15%
Total	100%	100%	100%
*$p \leq 0.05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.			

Men are significantly more likely compared with women to be working outside their country of citizenship.

Employed in County of Citizenship, by Gender* (Graduates Who Work for an Employer)		
	Gender	
	Male	**Female**
Response	**(*n* = 1,856)**	**(*n* = 805)**
Yes	78%	86%
No	**22%**	**14%**
Total	100%	100%
*$p \leq 0.05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.		

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

Respondents from Asia, Latin America, and Europe are significantly more likely than U.S. respondents to be working outside their country of citizenship. Very few U.S. respondents (4%) work outside of the United States.

Employed in County of Citizenship, by Country of Citizenship* (Graduates Who Work for an Employer)					
	World Region				
Response	**Asia (*n* = 309)**	**United States (*n* = 1,619)**	**Canada (*n* = 184)**	**Latin America (*n* = 145)**	**Europe (*n* = 302)**
Yes	**47%**	**96%**	84%	**39%**	**56%**
No	**53%**	**4%**	16%	**61%**	**44%**
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
*p ≤ 0.05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.					

Asian Americans are significantly more likely than other U.S. subgroups to be working outside their country of citizenship.

Employed in County of Citizenship, by U.S. Subgroup* (Graduates Who Work for an Employer)				
	U.S. Subgroup			
Response	**Asian American (*n* = 127)**	**African American (*n* = 55)**	**White (*n* = 1,289)**	**Hispanic (*n* = 55)**
Yes	89%	98%	97%	93%
No	**11%**	2%	3%	7%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
*p ≤ 0.05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.				

There is no statistically significant difference in the location of a respondent's employment by graduation year.

Two-thirds of respondents work for multinational organizations, 18% work for national organizations, 9% work for regional organizations, and 8% work for local organizations.

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

Scope of Organization (Graduates Who Work for an Employer)	
Response	**(*n* = 2,675)**
Local	8%
Regional	9%
National	18%
Multinational	66%
Total	100%

Graduates of part-time programs are significantly more likely than graduates of full-time programs to be working for a local organization. Although more than half (60%) of graduates of part-time programs work for multinational organizations, they are the least likely to be working for a multinational organization.

Scope of Organization, by Program Type* (Graduates Who Work for an Employer)			
	Program Type		
	Full-Time	**Part-Time**	**Executive**
Response	**(*n* = 1,905)**	**(*n* = 546)**	**(*n* = 191)**
Local	**6%**	**13%**	6%
Regional	8%	10%	9%
National	19%	17%	14%
Multinational	67%	**60%**	71%
Total	100%	100%	100%
*$p \leq 0.05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.			

One in ten (10%) women are working for a local organization—a significantly higher percent than men (6%) who work for a local organization.

Scope of Organization, by Gender (Graduates Who Work for an Employer)		
	Gender	
	Male	**Female**
Response	**(*n* = 1,856)**	**(*n* = 805)**
Local	6%	**10%**
Regional	8%	10%
National	18%	19%
Multinational	68%	61%
Total	100%	100%
*$p \leq 0.05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.		

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

Europeans are significantly more likely than U.S. citizens to be working for a multinational organization. Conversely, U.S. citizens are significantly more likely than Europeans to be working for a regional organization.

Scope of Organization, by Country of Citizenship*
(Graduates Who Work for an Employer)

	World Region				
Response	**Asia (*n* = 309)**	**United States (*n* = 1,619)**	**Canada (*n* = 184)**	**Latin America (*n* = 145)**	**Europe (*n* = 302)**
Local	1%	9%	8%	3%	**1%**
Regional	7%	**10%**	10%	6%	**4%**
National	14%	19%	17%	19%	13%
Multinational	70%	**62%**	66%	72%	**81%**
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

*$p \leq 0.05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.

There are no statistically significant differences in the scope of the organizations respondents work for by graduation year or U.S. subgroup.

One-third (34%) of employed respondents are working at organizations with over 25,000 employees. About one in five (19%) work at organizations with 5,000 to 24,999 employees, 15% work for organizations with 1,000 to 4,999 employees, 21% with 50 to 999 employees, and one in ten (10%) with less than 50 employees.

Only 2% work in a location with over 25,000 employees. One in ten (11%) work at a location with 5,000 to 24,999 employees, 23% with 1,000 to 4,999 employees, 42% with 50 to 999 employees, and almost a quarter (23%) with less than 50 employees.

Number of Employees in Organization
(Graduates Who Work for an Employer)

Response	**All Locations (*n* = 2,631)**	**Location Where Respondent Works (*n* = 2,626)**
Less than 50	10%	23%
50–999	21%	42%
1,000–4,999	15%	23%
5,000–24,999	19%	11%
Over 25,000	34%	2%
Total	100%	100%

Graduates of EMBA programs (4%) are more likely to work at a location with over 25,000 employees compared with graduates of full-time programs (2%).

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

There are no other statistically significant differences in the size of organizations by the various respondent characteristics.

One percent of the respondents who are working for an employer are the CEO or head of the organization. One in eight (12%) respondents report to the CEO or head of the organization directly. Over a third (35%) of respondents has two to three levels and 36% have four to six levels between them and the head of the organization. Ten percent have seven or more reporting levels between them and the head of the organization. Additionally, 6% of respondents work for a professional firm with managing partners.

How Many Reporting Levels Are There Between You and the CEO/Head of the Organization? (Graduates Who Work for an Employer)	
Number of Levels	**(*n* = 2,675)**
None, I am the CEO/head of the organization	1%
One, I report to the CEO/head of the organization	12%
Two to three	35%
Four to six	36%
Seven to nine	7%
Ten or more	3%
Not applicable, I work for a professional firm with managing partners	6%
Total	100%

Interestingly, there are no statistically significant differences in the reporting levels by the year a respondent graduated.

Graduates of EMBA programs (20%) are the most likely to report to the head of the organization directly compared with graduates of full-time (12%) and part-time (11%) programs.

Among respondents who work for professional firms with managing partners, 3% are managing partners. One in ten (10%) is a senior partner, 15% are junior partners, and 45% are managers or senior managers within the professional firm. Additionally, 28% have four or more levels between them and the managing partner.

How Many Reporting Levels Are There Between You and the Managing Partners (Graduates Who Work for a Professional)	
Number of Levels	**(*n* = 165)**
None, I am a managing partner	3%
One, I am a senior partner	10%
Two, I am a junior partner	15%
Three, I am a manager/senior manager	45%
Four or more	28%
Total	100%

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

Comparisons by various respondent characteristics are not computed due to the small sample of respondents who work for professional firms.

Twenty-two percent of respondents work in the products/services industry, and 20% work in the finance/accounting industry. Fifteen percent work in the technology industry, and 14% work in the consulting industry. An additional 8% work in each of the manufacturing, healthcare/pharmaceutical, and nonprofit/government industries. Three percent work in the energy/utility industry.

Type of Industry (Graduates Who Work for an Employer)	
Industry	**(*n* = 2,674)**
Product/Services	22%
Finance/Accounting	20%
Technology	15%
Consulting	14%
Manufacturing	8%
Health Care/Pharmaceuticals	8%
Non-profit/Government	8%
Energy/Utilities	3%
Other	3%
Total	100%

Graduates of full-time programs (16%) are significantly more likely than graduates of part-time programs (8%) to work in the consulting industry. Nearly a quarter (23%) of EMBA graduates and 18% of part-time graduates work in the technology industry, which is significantly higher than the percentage working in technology among full-time graduates (13%).

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

Type of Industry, by Program Type* (Graduates Who Work for an Employer)			
	Program Type		
	Full-Time	**Part-Time**	**Executive**
Industry	**(*n* = 1,905)**	**(*n* = 545)**	**(*n* = 191)**
Product/Services	23%	19%	20%
Finance/Accounting	21%	18%	16%
Consulting	**16%**	**8%**	9%
Technology	**13%**	**18%**	**23%**
Manufacturing	7%	8%	11%
Health Care/Pharmaceuticals	8%	11%	8%
Energy/Utilities	3%	3%	3%
Non-profit/Government	6%	11%	5%
Other	3%	4%	4%
Total	100%	100%	100%
*$p \leq 0.05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.			

Women are significantly more likely than men to work in the healthcare/pharmaceutical and nonprofit/government industries. Women are significantly less likely to work in finance/accounting and energy/utility industries.

Type of Industry, by Gender* (Graduates Who Work for an Employer)		
	Gender	
	Male	**Female**
Industry	**(*n* = 1,855)**	**(*n* = 805)**
Product/Services	21%	24%
Finance/Accounting	22%	**17%**
Consulting	14%	12%
Technology	15%	12%
Manufacturing	8%	7%
Health Care/Pharmaceuticals	**7%**	**12%**
Energy/Utilities	4%	**2%**
Non-profit/Government	**6%**	**10%**
Other	3%	4%
Total	100%	100%
*$p \leq 0.05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.		

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

Asians and Europeans are the least likely to work in the products/services industry. Citizens of the United States are less likely than Asians and Canadians to work in the finance/accounting industry. Canadians are the least likely to work in manufacturing, and respondents from Latin America are the least likely to work in the healthcare/pharmaceutical industry. Citizens of the United States are significantly more likely than Europeans to work in the nonprofit/government industry.

Type of Industry, by Country of Citizenship*
(Graduates Who Work for an Employer)

	World Region				
Response	**Asia (*n* = 308)**	**United States (*n* = 1,619)**	**Canada (*n* = 184)**	**Latin America (*n* = 145)**	**Europe (*n* = 302)**
Product/Services	**17%**	24%	19%	27%	**16%**
Finance/Accounting	**27%**	**17%**	**28%**	21%	25%
Consulting	14%	13%	14%	10%	**18%**
Technology	16%	14%	14%	17%	14%
Manufacturing	8%	8%	**2%**	11%	8%
Health Care/Pharmaceuticals	8%	9%	8%	**1%**	9%
Energy/Utilities	4%	3%	4%	4%	4%
Non-profit/Government	3%	**9%**	7%	5%	**4%**
Other	3%	3%	5%	4%	3%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

*$p \leq 0.05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.

There are no statistically significant differences in the type of industry in which the respondent is employed by graduation year or U.S. subgroup.

Satisfaction with Employer

Respondents were asked to rate their satisfaction with various aspects of their employer. There are statistically significant differences between the mean ratings for each of the employer aspects at the 95% confidence level. The highest-rated aspect of employers is the ethical standards of the company followed by the company image and reputation, company stability, and organizational climate. The lowest-rated aspect of employers is the value the employer places on MBA skills.

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

Satisfaction with Aspects of Your Employer (Graduates Who Work for an Employer)							
		(*n* = 2,675)					
Employer Aspects	**Mean***	**Extremely Satisfied (5)**	**Very Satisfied (4)**	**Somewhat Satisfied (3)**	**Not Very Satisfied (2)**	**Not at all Satisfied (1)**	**Total**
Ethical standards of company	4.1	39%	37%	17%	5%	2%	100%
Company image and reputation	4.0	36%	36%	20%	6%	1%	100%
Company stability	3.9	32%	37%	22%	7%	3%	100%
Organizational climate	3.5	20%	31%	30%	13%	6%	100%
Value employer places on MBA skills	3.3	18%	28%	28%	17%	9%	100%
*Scale: 5–1, where 5 = Extremely satisfied; 1 = Not at all satisfied							

The class of 2005 rate their employer's image and reputation significantly higher than the classes of 2002 and 2004. Additionally, the class of 2005 rates the organizational climate and the value the employer places on MBA skills significantly higher than all other graduating classes except for the class of 2000.

Mean Satisfaction with Aspects of Your Employer, by Graduation Year* (Graduates Who Work for an Employer)						
	Graduation Year					
	2000	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**
Employer Aspects	**(*n* = 158)**	**(*n* = 259)**	**(*n* = 295)**	**(*n* = 315)**	**(*n* = 672)**	**(*n* = 976)**
Ethical standards of company	4.2	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.1	4.1
Company image and reputation*	4.0	4.0	**3.8**	4.0	**3.9**	**4.1**
Company stability	3.8	3.9	3.8	3.8	3.9	4.0
Organizational climate*	3.4	**3.4**	**3.3**	**3.4**	**3.4**	**3.6**
Value employer places on MBA skills*	3.4	**3.2**	**3.0**	**3.2**	**3.2**	**3.5**
Scale: 5–1, where 5 = Extremely satisfied; 1 = Not at all satisfied *$p \leq 0.05$; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.						

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

Graduates of full-time programs rate all aspects of their employer significantly higher compared with part-time and EMBA graduates.

Mean Satisfaction with Aspects of Your Employer, by Program Type (Graduates Who Work for an Employer)

	Program Type		
	Full-Time	Part-Time	Executive
Employer Aspects	(*n* = 1,905)	(*n* = 546)	(*n* = 191)
Ethical standards of company*	**4.2**	3.9	3.9
Company image and reputation*	**4.1**	3.8	3.8
Company stability*	**4.0**	3.8	3.7
Organizational climate*	**3.6**	3.2	3.2
Value employer places on MBA skills*	**3.5**	2.9	3.1

Scale: 5–1, where 5 = Extremely satisfied; 1 = Not at all satisfied
*p ≤ 0.05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.

Respondents from Latin America and U.S. citizens rate the ethical standards of their company higher than Asians and Europeans. Respondents from Latin America rate the image and reputation of the company significantly higher than Asians, Canadians, and Europeans. Additionally, U.S. citizens rate company image and reputation higher than Asians. Respondents from Latin America rate organizational climate higher than Asians, and respondents from Latin American and Canadians rate the value the employer places on MBA skills significantly higher than all other world regions.

Mean Satisfaction with Aspects of Your Employer, by Country of Citizenship (Graduates Who Work for an Employer)

	World Region				
	Asia	United States	Canada	Latin America	Europe
Employer Aspects	(*n* = 309)	(*n* = 1,619)	(*n* = 184)	(*n* = 145)	(*n* = 302)
Ethical standards of company*	**3.9**	**4.2**	4.0	**4.2**	**4.0**
Company image and reputation*	**3.8**	**4.0**	**3.9**	**4.2**	**3.9**
Company stability	3.8	3.9	3.9	4.0	3.9
Organizational climate*	**3.3**	3.4	3.6	**3.7**	3.5
Value employer places on MBA skills*	3.2	3.3	**3.4**	**3.4**	3.1

Scale: 5–1, where 5 = Extremely satisfied; 1 = Not at all satisfied
*p ≤ 0.05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.

Company stability is rated higher among respondents employed in the nonprofit/government, consulting, and finance/accounting industries compared with the technology industry.

The consulting and finance/accounting industries receive higher ratings than products/services, manufacturing, energy/utility, technology, and nonprofit/government industries for the value the

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

employer places on MBA skills. Respondents in the consulting industry rate company image and reputation higher than technology and nonprofit/government industries.

The finance/accounting industry rates company image and reputation higher than manufacturing, technology and nonprofit/government. Respondents from the products/services industry rate company image and reputation higher than those from the technology industry.

Respondents employed in the energy/utility industry rate the ethical standard of the company the highest among the industries.

The consulting industry rates organizational climate higher compared with products/services, manufacturing, technology, and nonprofit/government. Finance/accounting rates organizational climate higher compared with products/services, manufacturing, and technology. Products/ services and healthcare/pharmaceuticals rate organizational climate higher compared with technology.

Mean Satisfaction with Aspects of Your Employer, by Industry Type*
(Graduates Who Work for an Employer)

	Employer Aspects				
Industry Type	**Company Stability**	**Value Employer Places on MBA Skills**	**Company Image and Reputation**	**Ethical Standards of Company**	**Organizational Climate**
Consulting	**4.0**	**3.6**	**4.1**	4.2	**3.8**
Finance/Accounting	**4.0**	**3.5**	**4.1**	4.1	**3.6**
Product/Services	3.9	**3.2**	**3.8**	4.0	**3.3**
Manufacturing	3.8	**3.2**	**3.8**	4.0	**3.3**
Technology	**3.7**	**3.1**	**3.8**	4.0	**3.2**
Health Care/ Pharmaceuticals	3.9	3.4	4.0	4.2	**3.5**
Energy/Utilities	4.0	**3.2**	4.1	**4.3**	3.4
Non-profit/Government	**4.1**	**3.1**	**3.8**	4.0	**3.4**

Scale: 5–1, where 5 = Extremely satisfied; 1 = Not at all satisfied
*$p \leq 0.05$; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.

There are no statistically significant differences in the rating of employers by gender or U.S. subgroups.

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

Job Function

Over a quarter (28%) of respondents work in a finance/accounting function, 24% in a marketing/sales function, and 15% in a consulting function. Additionally, 10% work in operations/logistics, 9% in general management, 7% in information technology, and 3% in human resources.

Job Function (Graduates Who Work for an Employer)	
Job Function	**(*n* = 2,675)**
Finance/Accounting	28%
Marketing/Sales	24%
Consulting	15%
Operations/Logistics	10%
General Management	9%
Information Technology/MIS	7%
Human Resources	3%
Other	4%
Total	100%

EMBA graduates are the least likely to work in a finance/accounting function and part-time graduates are the least likely to work in a marketing/sales function. Full-time graduates are significantly more likely compared with part-time graduates to work in a consulting function. EMBA and part-time graduates are more likely than full-time graduates to work in operations/logistics. Part-time graduates are more likely to work in information technology compared with full-time graduates.

Job Function, by Program Type* (Graduates Who Work for an Employer)			
	Program Type		
	Full-Time	**Part-Time**	**Executive**
Job Function	**(*n* = 1,905)**	**(*n* = 546)**	**(*n* = 191)**
Finance/Accounting	30%	25%	**18%**
Marketing/Sales	25%	**20%**	25%
Consulting	**18%**	**8%**	13%
Operations/Logistics	**7%**	**15%**	**16%**
General Management	8%	9%	**14%**
Information Technology/MIS	**5%**	**13%**	8%
Human Resources	2%	3%	3%
Other	4%	**7%**	4%
Total	100%	100%	100%
*$p \leq 0.05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.			

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

Women are more likely than men to work in marketing/sales and human resources. Men are more likely than women to work in operations/logistics and information technology.

Job Function, by Gender*
(Graduates Who Work for an Employer)

	Gender	
	Male	**Female**
Job Function	**(*n* = 1,856)**	**(*n* = 805)**
Finance/Accounting	29%	27%
Marketing/Sales	**21%**	**31%**
Consulting	16%	13%
Operations/Logistics	**11%**	**6%**
General Management	10%	7%
Information Technology/MIS	**8%**	**4%**
Human Resources	**2%**	**5%**
Other	**3%**	**7%**
Total	100%	100%

*$p \leq 0.05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.

Europeans are the most likely to work in a consulting position. Asians are the most likely to work in an information technology position. U.S. citizens are more likely than Asians and Europeans to work in human resources.

Job Function, by Country of Citizenship*
(Graduates Who Work for an Employer)

	World Region				
	Asia	**United States**	**Canada**	**Latin America**	**Europe**
Job Function	**(*n* = 309)**	**(*n* = 1,619)**	**(*n* = 184)**	**(*n* = 145)**	**(*n* = 302)**
Finance/Accounting	34%	28%	28%	28%	28%
Marketing/Sales	20%	26%	22%	26%	22%
Consulting	13%	14%	18%	17%	**22%**
Operations/Logistics	10%	10%	10%	9%	8%
General Management	7%	8%	10%	10%	11%
Information Technology/MIS	**12%**	6%	5%	7%	4%
Human Resources	**1%**	**4%**	2%	1%	**1%**
Other	3%	5%	4%	3%	4%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

*$p \leq 0.05$; 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. subgroups.

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

On average, respondents manage nine people. However, more than half (57%) do not manage other people at all. A third (34%) manage between one and ten, 7% manage 11 to 50, and 2% manage more than 50 employees.

How Many People Do You Manage? (Graduates Who Work for an Employer)	
Response	**(*n* = 2,674)**
None	57%
1–10	34%
11–50	7%
50 or more	2%
Total	100%

The class of 2005 is more likely than the classes of 2000 and 2001 not to manage other people. The classes of 2000 and 2001 are more likely than the class of 2005 to manage between 1 and 10 people. Additionally, the class of 2001 is the most likely to manage 11 or more people.

How Many People Do You Manage? (Graduates Who Work for an Employer)						
	Graduation Year					
	2000	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**
Number of People Managed	**(*n* = 158)**	**(*n* = 259)**	**(*n* = 295)**	**(*n* = 315)**	**(*n* = 672)**	**(*n* = 976)**
None	**45%**	**44%**	51%	56%	60%	**64%**
1–10	**44%**	**41%**	40%	36%	32%	**29%**
11–50	10%	**12%**	7%	7%	5%	6%
50 or more	1%	**4%**	2%	2%	2%	2%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
*p ≤ 0.05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.						

There are no statistically significant differences in the number of people managed by gender, world region, or U.S. subgroup.

Satisfaction with Job

Respondents were asked to rate their satisfaction with various aspects of their job. The following tables present the frequency distribution for each aspect, as well as the mean score for each aspect on a scale of five (extremely satisfied) to one (not at all satisfied).

There are significant differences at the 95% confidence level between the mean satisfaction with each aspect of the job, except for the opportunity to learn new things and job autonomy, where statistically they are both rated as the highest areas of satisfaction with the job. The next highest areas respondents were satisfied with at their jobs, by order of preference, are challenging and interesting work, job security, and benefits. The lowest rated aspect of the job is pay.

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

Satisfaction with Aspects of Your Job (Graduates Who Work for an Employer)							
		(*n* = 2,675)					
Job Aspects	**Mean***	**Extremely Satisfied (5)**	**Very Satisfied (4)**	**Somewhat Satisfied (3)**	**Not Very Satisfied (2)**	**Not at all Satisfied (1)**	**Total**
Opportunity to learn new things	3.9	33%	35%	22%	8%	2%	100%
Job autonomy	3.9	27%	42%	23%	6%	2%	100%
Challenging/interesting work	3.8	30%	34%	23%	9%	3%	100%
Job security	3.7	22%	41%	27%	7%	4%	100%
Benefits	3.6	22%	37%	28%	9%	4%	100%
Achieving something you personally value	3.6	22%	34%	29%	11%	4%	100%
Opportunity for advancement	3.5	21%	30%	28%	14%	7%	100%
Opportunity to use your skills to the maximum	3.4	18%	32%	30%	14%	6%	100%
Pay	3.3	13%	32%	36%	14%	5%	100%
*Scale: 5–1, where 5 = Extremely satisfied; 1 = Not at all satisfied							

The class of 2005 rates the opportunity to learn new things significantly higher than the class of 2003. Additionally, the class of 2005 rates their benefits significantly higher compared with the class of 2002. Furthermore, the class of 2005 rates their pay significantly higher than the classes of 2002 and 2003.

Mean Satisfaction with Aspects of Your Job, by Graduation Year (Graduates Who Work for an Employer)						
	Graduation Year					
	2000	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**
Job Aspects	**(*n* = 158)**	**(*n* = 259)**	**(*n* = 295)**	**(*n* = 315)**	**(*n* = 672)**	**(*n* =976)**
Opportunity to learn new things*	4.0	3.8	3.8	**3.7**	3.9	**4.0**
Job autonomy	4.0	3.9	3.9	3.8	3.8	3.9
Challenging and interesting work	4.0	3.7	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.9
Job security	3.7	3.6	3.7	3.6	3.7	3.7
Benefits*	3.7	3.6	**3.5**	3.6	3.6	**3.7**
Achieving something you personally value	3.7	3.6	3.5	3.6	3.5	3.6
Opportunity for advancement	3.4	3.3	3.4	3.3	3.4	3.6
Opportunity to use your skills to the maximum	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.3	3.4	3.5
Pay*	3.4	3.4	**3.2**	**3.2**	3.3	**3.4**
Scale: 5–1, where 5 = Extremely satisfied; 1 = Not at all satisfied *$p \leq 0.05$; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.						

Graduates of full-time programs rate the opportunity to learn new things and the opportunity to use their skills to the maximum the highest. Full-time graduates rate job autonomy, achieving

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

something you personally value, and pay significantly higher than part-time graduates. Challenging and interesting work is rated the lowest among part-time graduates. The opportunity for advancement is rated the highest among full-time graduates followed by EMBA graduates and part-time graduates—statistically significant differences.

Mean Satisfaction with Aspects of Your Job, by Program Type (Graduates Who Work for an Employer)

	Program Type		
	Full-Time	Part-Time	Executive
Job Aspects	(*n* = 1,905)	(*n* = 546)	(*n* = 191)
Opportunity to learn new things*	**4.0**	3.6	3.7
Job autonomy*	**3.9**	**3.8**	3.7
Challenging and interesting work*	3.9	**3.5**	3.7
Job security	3.7	3.7	3.7
Benefits	3.7	3.6	3.6
Achieving something you personally value*	**3.7**	**3.3**	3.5
Opportunity for advancement*	**3.6**	**3.0**	**3.2**
Opportunity to use your skills to the maximum*	**3.5**	3.2	3.3
Pay*	**3.4**	**3.2**	3.4

Scale: 5–1, where 5 = Extremely satisfied; 1 = Not at all satisfied
*$p \leq 0.05$; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.

Women rate job security significantly higher than men, but men rate pay significantly higher than women.

Mean Satisfaction with Aspects of Your Job, by Gender (Graduates Who Work for an Employer)

	Gender	
	Male	Female
Job Aspects	(*n* = 1,856)	(*n* = 805)
Opportunity to learn new things	3.9	3.9
Job autonomy	3.9	3.8
Challenging and interesting work	3.8	3.8
Job security*	**3.7**	**3.8**
Benefits	3.6	3.7
Achieving something you personally value	3.6	3.6
Opportunity for advancement*	3.5	3.4
Opportunity to use your skills to the maximum	3.4	3.4
Pay*	**3.4**	**3.2**

Scale: 5–1, where 5 = Extremely satisfied; 1 = Not at all satisfied
*$p \leq 0.05$; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.

Respondents from Latin America rate the opportunity to learn new things significantly higher than Asians. U.S. citizens rate job autonomy significantly higher than Asians. Asians rate

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

challenging and interesting work significantly lower than the rest of the world regions. U.S. citizens rate their job security significantly higher compared with Asians, Canadians, and Europeans. Additionally, U.S. citizens rate their benefits significantly higher than the rest of the world regions. Respondents from Latin America rate achieving something you personally value significantly higher than Asians and U.S. citizens.

Mean Satisfaction with Aspects of Your Job, by Country of Citizenship (Graduates Who Work for an Employer)

	World Region				
Job Aspects	**Asia (*n* = 309)**	**United States (*n* = 1,619)**	**Canada (*n* = 184)**	**Latin America (*n* = 145)**	**Europe (*n* = 302)**
Opportunity to learn new things*	**3.7**	3.9	4.0	**4.0**	3.9
Job autonomy*	**3.7**	**3.9**	3.9	3.9	3.8
Challenging and interesting work*	**3.6**	3.8	3.9	3.8	3.8
Job security*	**3.6**	**3.8**	**3.5**	3.7	**3.5**
Benefits*	3.3	**3.8**	3.5	3.4	3.5
Achieving something you personally value*	**3.4**	**3.6**	3.6	**3.9**	3.6
Opportunity for advancement	3.4	3.5	3.6	3.7	3.4
Opportunity to use your skills to the maximum	3.4	3.4	3.6	3.7	3.5
Pay	3.2	3.4	3.3	3.2	3.4

Scale: 5–1, where 5 = Extremely satisfied; 1 = Not at all satisfied

*$p \leq 0.05$; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.

Respondents employed in the consulting industry rate the opportunity to learn new things significantly higher compared with manufacturing, technology, and nonprofit/government. Finance/accounting rates the opportunity to learn new things significantly higher than technology and nonprofit/government.

Technology rates challenging and interesting work significantly lower than consulting and finance/accounting.

Nonprofit/government rates job security significantly higher compare with consulting, finance/accounting, products/services, and technology. Additionally, finance/accounting and healthcare/pharmaceuticals rate job security significantly higher than technology.

Finance/accounting and healthcare/pharmaceuticals rate their benefits significantly higher than products/services and technology.

Achieving something you personally value is rated higher by finance/accounting, products/services, healthcare/pharmaceuticals, and nonprofit/government compared with technology. Additionally, healthcare/pharmaceuticals and nonprofit/government rate the ability to achieve something you personally value significantly higher than manufacturing.

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

Technology rates advancement opportunity significantly lower than all other industries except energy/utilities and nonprofit/government.

Consulting and finance/accounting rate the opportunity to use their skills significantly higher than manufacturing, technology and nonprofit/government.

Respondents in the consulting industry rate their pay significantly higher compared with products/services, manufacturing, technology, and nonprofit/government. Finance/accounting rate pay higher compared with products/services, technology, and nonprofit/government. Additionally, products/services, manufacturing, and healthcare/pharmaceuticals rate their pay significantly higher than nonprofit/government.

Mean Satisfaction with Aspects of Your Job, by Industry (Graduates Who Work for an Employer)

	Industry							
Job Aspects	**Consulting (*n* = 365)**	**Finance/ Accounting (*n* = 538)**	**Products/ Services (*n* = 579)**	**Manufacturing (*n* = 209)**	**Technology (*n* = 387)**	**Health Care/ Pharm. (*n* = 225)**	**Energy/ Utilities (*n* = 83)**	**Non-profit/ government (*n* = 200)**
Opportunity to learn new things*	**4.1**	**4.0**	3.9	**3.7**	**3.8**	3.9	3.7	**3.7**
Job autonomy	3.9	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	4.0	3.9	3.8
Challenging and interesting work*	**3.9**	**3.9**	3.8	3.6	**3.7**	3.8	3.7	3.6
Job security*	**3.7**	**3.7**	**3.7**	3.7	**3.5**	**3.8**	3.6	**4.0**
Benefits*	3.6	**3.8**	**3.5**	3.6	**3.5**	**3.8**	3.6	3.8
Achieving something you personally value*	3.6	**3.7**	**3.6**	**3.4**	**3.4**	**3.8**	3.4	**3.8**
Opportunity for advancement*	**3.7**	**3.6**	**3.5**	**3.5**	**3.1**	**3.5**	3.4	3.1
Opportunity to use your skills to the maximum*	**3.6**	**3.6**	3.4	**3.3**	**3.3**	3.5	3.2	**3.3**
Pay*	**3.6**	**3.5**	**3.2**	**3.3**	**3.2**	3.4	3.2	**3.0**

Scale: 5–1, where 5 = Extremely satisfied; 1 = Not at all satisfied

*$p \leq 0.05$; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

There are no statistically significant differences in satisfaction with various aspects of the job by U.S. subgroup.

Half (50%) of the respondents who are working for an employer state that the job they hold is very much like the job they wanted, 41% state it is somewhat like the job they wanted, and 9% state that it is not very much like the job they wanted.

In General, Does Your Job Measure Up To the Sort of Job You Wanted When You Took It? (Graduates Who Work for an Employer)	
Response	**(*n* = 2,676)**
Very much like	50%
Somewhat like	41%
Not very much like	9%
Total	100%

The class of 2003 is significantly the most likely to state that the job they took is somewhat like the job they wanted.

In General, Does Your Job Measure Up To the Sort of Job You Wanted When You Took It?, by Graduation Year* (Graduates Who Work for an Employer)						
	Graduation Year					
	2000	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**
Response	**(*n* = 158)**	**(*n* = 259)**	**(*n* = 295)**	**(*n* = 315)**	**(*n* = 673)**	**(*n* = 976)**
Very much like	57%	49%	49%	44%	50%	52%
Somewhat like	35%	39%	41%	**48%**	40%	40%
Not very much like	8%	12%	11%	9%	10%	8%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
*$p \leq 0.05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.						

Graduates of part-time programs are the least likely to state that the job is very much like the one they wanted and the most likely to state that the job is not very much like the one they wanted. Additionally, part-time graduates are the most likely to state that the job is somewhat like the one they wanted.

In General, Does Your Job Measure Up To the Sort of Job You Wanted When You Took It?, by Program Type* (Graduates Who Work for an Employer)			
	Program Type		
	Full-Time	**Part-Time**	**Executive**
Response	**(*n* = 1,906)**	**(*n* = 546)**	**(*n* = 191)**
Very much like	53%	**41%**	52%
Somewhat like	39%	**47%**	37%
Not very much like	8%	**12%**	11%

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

Total	100%	100%	100%
*p ≤ 0.05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X2 statistic of the contingency table.			

Asians, compared to all other world regions, are the most likely to state that the job they took is not very much like the one they wanted.

In General, Does Your Job Measure Up To the Sort of Job You Wanted When You Took It?, by Country of Citizenship* (Graduates Who Work for an Employer)					
	World Region				
Response	**Asia (*n* = 309)**	**United States (*n* = 1,619)**	**Canada (*n* = 184)**	**Latin America (*n* = 145)**	**Europe (*n* = 302)**
Very much like	43%	50%	57%	47%	57%
Somewhat like	44%	41%	38%	43%	36%
Not very much like	**13%**	9%	5%	10%	7%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
*p ≤ 0.05; 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 response to the question, "Does your job measure up to the sort of job you wanted when you took it?"

Employed respondents were asked to reflect on their decision to accept their current job. Two-thirds (66%) of employed respondents would not hesitate to take the same job again. Thirty percent would have second thoughts about taking the same job again, and only 4% would definitely not take the same job again.

Reflection on Job Choice (Graduates Who Work for an Employer)	
Response	**(*n* = 2,676)**
I would decide without hesitation to take the same job	66%
I would have second thoughts	30%
I would decide definitely not to take the same job	4%
Total	100%

Graduates of part-time programs are the most likely to have second thoughts about taking the same job again.

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

Reflection on Job Choice, by Program Type* (Graduates Who Work for an Employer)			
	Program Type		
	Full-Time	Part-Time	Executive
Response	(*n* = 1,906)	(*n* = 546)	(*n* = 191)
I would decide without hesitation to take the same job	68%	61%	62%
I would have second thoughts	29%	**35%**	31%
I would decide definitely not to take the same job	4%	4%	6%
Total	100%	100%	100%
*p ≤ 0.05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.			

Asians are the least likely to state that they would decide without hesitation to take the same job, but are the most likely to have second thoughts or decide definitely not to take the same job again.

Reflection on Job Choice, by Country of Citizenship* (Graduates Who Work for an Employer)					
	World Region				
	Asia	United States	Canada	Latin America	Europe
Response	(*n* = 309)	(*n* = 1,619)	(*n* = 184)	(*n* = 145)	(*n* = 302)
I would decide without hesitation to take the same job	**54%**	67%	69%	74%	69%
I would have second thoughts	**40%**	30%	29%	22%	26%
I would decide definitely not to take the same job	**6%**	3%	2%	4%	6%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
*p ≤ 0.05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.					

There are no statistically significant differences in the reflection on job choice by graduation year, gender, or U.S. subgroup.

About two-thirds (68%) of employed respondents would strongly recommend their job to a friend, 28% have doubts about recommending the job, and 4% would strongly advise against taking this sort of job.

Recommend Job and Employer to a Friend (Graduates Who Work for an Employer)	
Response	(*n* = 2,676)
Strongly recommend this job	68%
Have doubts about recommending it	28%
Strongly advise them against this sort of job	4%
Total	100%

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

Graduates of part-time programs are the least likely to strongly recommend their job. Part-time graduates are more likely than full-time graduates to have doubts about recommending the job. Additionally, part-time graduates are the most likely to strongly advise against this sort of job.

Recommend Job and Employer to a Friend, by Program Type*
(Graduates Who Work for an Employer)

	Program Type		
	Full-Time	**Part-Time**	**Executive**
Response	**(*n* = 1,906)**	**(*n* = 546)**	**(*n* = 191)**
Strongly recommend this job	71%	**59%**	64%
Have doubts about recommending it	**26%**	**35%**	31%
Strongly advise them against this sort of job	4%	**6%**	4%
Total	100%	100%	100%

*$p \leq 0.05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.

Asians are the least likely to strongly recommend their job, and Asians are the most likely to have doubts about recommending the job.

Recommend Job and Employer to a Friend, by Country of Citizenship*
(Graduates Who Work for an Employer)

	World Region				
	Asia	**United States**	**Canada**	**Latin America**	**Europe**
Response	**(*n* = 309)**	**(*n* = 1,619)**	**(*n* = 184)**	**(*n* = 145)**	**(*n* = 302)**
Strongly recommend this job	**58%**	69%	69%	77%	69%
Have doubts about recommending it	**39%**	26%	29%	20%	27%
Strongly advise them against this sort of job	3%	5%	3%	3%	4%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

*$p \leq 0.05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.

There are no statistically significant differences in job recommendations by graduation year, gender, and U.S. subgroup.

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

Skills and Abilities Used in Current Job

Employed respondents were asked to what extent they used the following skills and abilities in their current job. There are significant differences between almost all the skills/abilities at the 95% confidence level. However, the differences between the ability to integrate information, analytical thinking, and oral communication are not significantly different. Additionally, the differences in use between technical skills and leadership skills and between cost/benefit and financial analyses are not significantly different. On average, respondents use interpersonal skills significantly more than all other skills or abilities on their current job.

Skills and Abilities Used in Current Job (Graduates Who Work for an Employer)							
	(*n* = 2,674)						
Skills/Abilities	Mean	A Great Deal (5)	A Good Amount (4)	Some (3)	A Little (2)	Not at All (1)	Total
Interpersonal skills	4.5	59%	30%	8%	2%	1%	100%
Ability to integrate information	4.3	53%	31%	11%	4%	1%	100%
Oral communication skills	4.3	52%	31%	13%	3%	<1%	100%
Analytical thinking abilities	4.3	50%	33%	13%	3%	1%	100%
Written communication skills	4.2	46%	34%	15%	5%	1%	100%
Creative problem solving skills	4.1	40%	37%	16%	6%	1%	100%
Strategic thinking abilities	4.0	39%	33%	18%	7%	3%	100%
Technical skills for your specialty	3.8	32%	33%	23%	10%	3%	100%
Leadership skills	3.8	31%	32%	23%	10%	4%	100%
Managing change	3.7	32%	30%	21%	11%	7%	100%
Networking skills	3.6	26%	30%	27%	13%	4%	100%
Analyzing, organizing, and interpreting statistical data	3.5	28%	27%	25%	14%	7%	100%
Conducting financial analyses/preparing a budget	3.2	22%	21%	22%	18%	16%	100%
Conducting cost/benefit analyses or proposed changes	3.2	19%	25%	25%	17%	14%	100%
Recruiting, managing, maintaining staff	2.6	12%	16%	21%	21%	29%	100%
Scale: 5–1, where 5 = A Great Deal; 1 = Not at all							

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

The top skills are used often by each of the graduating classes. The class of 2000 uses leadership skills significantly more on their current job than the classes of 2004 and 2005. Additionally, the class of 2001 use leadership skills significantly more than the class of 2004. Furthermore, the classes of 2000 and 2001 use the skills to recruit, manage, and maintain staff significantly more than the classes of 2004 and 2005.

Skills and Abilities Used in Current Job, by Graduation Year – Mean Score (Graduates Who Work for an Employer)

	Graduation Year					
	2000	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**
Skill/Ability	**(*n* = 158)**	**(*n* = 259)**	**(*n* = 295)**	**(*n* = 315)**	**(*n* = 672)**	**(*n* = 975)**
Interpersonal skills	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.5
Ability to integrate information	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.4
Oral communication skills	4.4	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.3
Analytical thinking abilities	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.3
Written communication skills	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.1	4.2
Creative problem solving skills	4.2	4.2	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1
Strategic thinking abilities	4.1	4.1	4.0	3.9	3.9	4.0
Technical skills for your specialty	3.9	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.8	3.9
Leadership skills*	**4.1**	**3.9**	3.8	3.8	**3.6**	**3.7**
Managing change	3.9	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.6	3.7
Networking skills	3.6	3.7	3.6	3.5	3.6	3.7
Analyzing, organizing, and interpreting statistical data	3.6	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.6
Conducting financial analyses/preparing a budget	3.2	3.4	3.2	3.1	3.1	3.1
Conducting cost/benefit analyses or proposed changes	3.3	3.3	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.2
Recruiting, managing, maintaining staff*	**3.0**	**3.0**	2.7	2.6	**2.5**	**2.5**

Scale: 5–1, where 5 = A Great Deal; 1 = Not at all

*$p \leq 0.05$; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

Graduates of full-time programs use the ability to integrate information and analytical thinking significantly more than part-time graduates. Graduates of part-time programs use interpersonal skills, strategic thinking abilities, networking skills, and conducting financial analysis/preparing a budget the least among alumni. EMBA graduates use oral communication skills significantly more than graduates of part-time programs. Additionally, EMBA graduates conduct cost/benefit analysis significantly more than full-time graduates, and full-time graduate conduct cost/benefit analysis more than part-time graduates. Furthermore, EMBA graduates use leadership skills, managing change, and recruiting, managing, and maintaining staff the most among alumni.

Skills and Abilities Used in Current Job, by Program Type – Mean Score (Graduates Who Work for an Employer)

	Program Type		
	Full-Time	**Part-Time**	**Executive**
Skill/Ability	**(*n* = 1,905)**	**(*n* = 545)**	**(*n* = 191)**
Interpersonal skills*	4.5	**4.4**	4.5
Ability to integrate information *	**4.3**	**4.2**	4.3
Oral communication skills*	4.3	**4.2**	**4.5**
Analytical thinking abilities*	**4.3**	**4.2**	4.3
Written communication skills	4.2	4.2	4.2
Creative problem solving skills	4.1	4.1	4.2
Strategic thinking abilities*	4.0	**3.8**	4.1
Technical skills for your specialty	3.8	3.9	3.9
Leadership skills*	3.7	3.8	**4.1**
Managing change*	3.6	3.7	**4.0**
Networking skills*	3.7	**3.4**	3.7
Analyzing, organizing, and interpreting statistical data	3.6	3.4	3.5
Conducting financial analyses/preparing a budget*	3.2	**2.9**	3.4
Conducting cost/benefit analyses of proposed changes*	**3.2**	**3.0**	**3.6**
Recruiting, managing, maintaining staff*	2.6	2.6	**3.3**

Scale: 5–1, where 5 = A Great Deal; 1 = Not at all

*$p \leq 0.05$; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

Men use the following skills and abilities more than women:

- Technical skills for your specialty;
- Analyzing, organizing, and interpreting statistical data;
- Conducting financial analyses/preparing a budget;
- Conducting cost/benefit analyses or proposed changes; and
- Recruiting, managing, maintaining staff.

Women use the following skills and abilities more than men:

- Interpersonal skills;
- Oral communication skills; and
- Written communication skills.

Skills and Abilities Used in Current Job, by Gender – Mean Score (Graduates Who Work for an Employer)

	Gender	
	Male	Female
Skill/Ability	**(*n* = 1,855)**	**(*n* = 805)**
Interpersonal skills*	**4.4**	**4.5**
Ability to integrate information	4.3	4.3
Oral communication skills*	**4.3**	**4.4**
Analytical thinking abilities	4.3	4.2
Written communication skills*	**4.1**	**4.3**
Creative problem solving skills	4.1	4.1
Strategic thinking abilities	4.0	4.0
Technical skills for your specialty*	**3.9**	**3.7**
Leadership skills	3.8	3.8
Managing change	3.7	3.7
Networking skills	3.6	3.7
Analyzing, organizing, and interpreting statistical data*	**3.6**	**3.4**
Conducting financial analyses/preparing a budget*	**3.2**	**3.0**
Conducting cost/benefit analyses or proposed changes*	**3.3**	**2.9**
Recruiting, managing, maintaining staff*	**2.6**	**2.5**

Scale: 5–1, where 5 = A Great Deal; 1 = Not at all

*$p \leq 0.05$; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

Asians are the least likely to use interpersonal skills in their current job. U.S. citizens, respondents from Latin America, and Europeans are significantly more likely to use the ability to integrate information compared with Asians. U.S. citizens are significantly more likely compared with Asians to use written communication skills. U.S. citizens and respondents from Latin America are significantly more likely to use leadership skills compared with Asians. Managing change is used more often by U.S. citizens and respondents from Latin America compared with Asians and Europeans. Respondents from Latin America conduct financial analyses more often than U.S. citizens. Additionally, respondents from Latin America conduct cost/benefit analyses more often than U.S. citizens and Europeans.

Skills and Abilities Used in Current Job, by Country of Citizenship – Mean Score (Graduates Who Work for an Employer)

	World Region				
Skill/Ability	**Asia (*n* = 308)**	**United States (*n* = 1,619)**	**Canada (*n* = 184)**	**Latin America (*n* = 145)**	**Europe (*n* = 302)**
Interpersonal skills*	**4.2**	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.4
Ability to integrate information*	**4.1**	**4.3**	4.2	**4.4**	**4.4**
Oral communication skills	4.2	4.3	4.3	4.4	4.3
Analytical thinking abilities	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.4	4.3
Written communication skills*	**4.0**	**4.2**	4.2	4.1	4.1
Creative problem solving skills	4.0	4.1	4.2	4.1	4.1
Strategic thinking abilities	3.9	4.0	4.0	4.2	4.0
Technical skills for your specialty	3.8	3.8	3.7	3.9	3.8
Leadership skills*	**3.5**	**3.8**	3.7	**4.0**	3.7
Managing change*	**3.5**	**3.8**	3.6	**3.9**	**3.5**
Networking skills	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.7	3.6
Analyzing, organizing, and interpreting statistical data	3.6	3.5	3.6	3.7	3.5
Conducting financial analyses/preparing a budget*	3.2	**3.1**	3.2	**3.5**	3.2
Conducting cost/benefit analyses or proposed changes*	3.3	**3.1**	3.2	**3.5**	**3.3**
Recruiting, managing, maintaining staff	2.6	2.6	2.5	2.7	2.6

Scale: 5–1, where 5 = A Great Deal; 1 = Not at all

*$p \leq 0.05$; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.

Among U.S. citizens, Asian Americans use the ability to analyze, organize, and interpret statistical data more often than African Americans. Additionally, Asian Americans conduct cost/benefit analyses more often than whites.

The consulting, products/services, and healthcare/pharmaceuticals industries use leadership skills more often than the finance/accounting and energy/utility industries.

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

The finance/accounting industry uses technical skills for their specialty more often than products/services, technology and nonprofit/government.

Consulting and finance/accounting industries use analytical thinking abilities more often than nonprofit/government.

Consulting uses creative problem solving skills more often than finance/accounting, manufacturing, and nonprofit/government.

Consulting uses the ability to integrate information more often than products/services, energy, and nonprofit/government.

Consulting uses oral communication skills more often than energy/utilities.

Consulting uses written communication skills more often than all other industries. Additionally, nonprofit/government uses written communication skills more often than products/services.

The energy/utility industry uses interpersonal skills significantly less than all other industries.

The nonprofit/government industry uses cost/benefit analyses less often than the consulting, products/services, manufacturing and technology industries. Additionally, finance/accounting uses cost/benefit analyses less often than products/services and technology.

The products/services and manufacturing industries manage change more often than the finance industry. Additionally, the healthcare/pharmaceutical industry manages change more often than finance/accounting and nonprofit/government industries.

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

Skills and Abilities Used in Current Job, by Industry (Graduates Who Work for an Employer)								
	Industry							
Skill/Ability	Consulting (*n* = 365)	Finance/ Accounting (*n* = 538)	Products/ Services (*n* = 579)	Manufacturing (*n* = 209)	Technology (*n* = 387)	Health Care/ Pharm. (*n* = 225)	Energy/ Utilities (*n* = 83)	Non-profit/ government (*n* = 200)
Interpersonal skills*	**4.5**	**4.4**	**4.5**	**4.5**	**4.5**	**4.6**	**4.1**	**4.4**
Ability to integrate information *	**4.5**	**4.4**	4.3	**4.3**	4.3	4.3	4.1	**4.2**
Oral communication skills*	**4.4**	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.4	**4.1**	4.3
Analytical thinking abilities	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.1
Written communication skills*	**4.5**	**4.2**	**4.1**	**4.2**	**4.1**	**4.2**	**3.9**	**4.4**
Creative problem solving skills*	**4.3**	**4.0**	4.1	**4.0**	4.1	4.2	4.1	**4.0**
Strategic thinking abilities	4.1	3.9	4.0	3.9	4.0	4.0	3.9	3.9
Technical skills for your specialty*	3.8	**4.0**	**3.8**	3.8	**3.8**	3.8	3.7	**3.6**
Leadership skills*	**3.9**	**3.5**	**3.9**	3.8	3.8	**4.0**	**3.4**	3.8
Managing change*	3.6	**3.4**	**3.8**	**3.9**	3.8	**4.0**	3.7	**3.5**
Networking skills	3.8	3.6	3.6	3.5	3.6	3.7	3.5	3.6
Analyzing, organizing, and interpreting statistical data	3.6	3.7	3.6	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.3
Conducting financial analyses/preparing a budget	3.0	3.2	3.3	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.2	3.0
Conducting cost/benefit analyses*	**3.2**	**3.0**	**3.3**	**3.3**	**3.3**	3.2	3.2	**2.7**
Recruiting, managing, maintaining staff	2.7	2.5	2.7	2.7	2.5	2.7	2.3	2.7

Scale: 5–1, where 5 = A Great Deal; 1 = Not at all;

*$p \leq 0.05$; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

Promotions

Overall, 38% of respondents have received a promotion in their current job. Among respondents who received a promotion, over half (54%) received one promotion, 22% received two promotions, and 24% received three or more promotion in their current job. Additionally, more than half (52%) received one promotion that involved a title change, 20% received two title changes, 19% received three or more title changes, and 9% received a promotion without a title change. Finally, among respondents who received a promotion, 50% received one pay raise, 20% received two, 22% received three or more pay raises, and 9% received a promotion without a pay raise.

Promotions (Graduates Who Work for an Employer)		
Since you began working on this job, have you received any promotions		**(*n* = 2,675)**
	Yes	38%
Number of promotions		**(*n* = 1,021)**
Total number of promotions	1	54%
	2	22%
	3 or more	24%
	Total	100%
Number of promotions that involved a change in job title (collapsed)	0	9%
	1	52%
	2	20%
	3 or more	19%
	Total	100%
Number of promotions that involved a pay raise (collapsed)	0	9%
	1	50%
	2	20%
	3 or more	22%
	Total	100%

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

The classes of 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003 are significantly more likely than the class of 2005 to have received a promotion. The class of 2005 is significantly more likely than the class of 2003 to have received three or more promotions in their current job, which at first glance does not make logical sense. However, considering that 22% of the class of 2005 started their current job before 2002 and only 13% of the class of 2002 started their current job before 2002, it is conceivable that the class of 2005 have had more promotions—possibly due to the enrollment and graduation from an MBA program.

Promotions, by Graduation Year
(Graduates Who Work for an Employer)

Since you began working on this job, have you received any promotions?		**Graduation Year**					
		2000	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**
		(*n* = 158)	**(*n* = 259)**	**(*n* = 295)**	**(*n* = 315)**	**(*n* = 672)**	**(*n* = 976)**
Yes*		**63%**	**54%**	**53%**	**46%**	37%	**24%**
Number of promotions		**(*n* = 100)**	**(*n* = 140)**	**(*n* = 155)**	**(*n* = 145)**	**(*n* = 246)**	**(*n* = 235)**
Number of promotions*	1	41%	46%	54%	**74%**	64%	**41%**
	2	30%	30%	25%	16%	**16%**	22%
	3 or more	29%	24%	21%	**10%**	20%	**37%**
	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of promotions that involved a change in job title (collapsed)*	0	4%	8%	7%	12%	11%	9%
	1	45%	46%	54%	**69%**	59%	41%
	2	**29%**	**29%**	22%	**10%**	**13%**	21%
	3 or more	22%	17%	17%	**9%**	18%	**29%**
	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of promotions that involved a pay raise (collapsed)*	0	4%	6%	6%	10%	**13%**	11%
	1	42%	44%	54%	**68%**	55%	**37%**
	2	**30%**	26%	22%	13%	15%	20%
	3 or more	24%	24%	19%	**10%**	18%	**33%**
	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

*$p \leq 0.05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

Graduates of EMBA and part-time programs are significantly more likely compared with full-time graduates to have received a promotion. Additionally, EMBA and part-time graduates are more likely to have received more promotions, title changes, and pay raises compared to graduates of full-time programs.

Promotions, by Program Type (Graduates Who Work for an Employer)				
Since you began working on this job, have you received any promotions?		**Program Type**		
		Full-Time	**Part-Time**	**Executive**
		(*n* = 1,905)	**(*n* = 546)**	**(*n* = 191)**
	Yes*	**33%**	**52%**	**53%**
Number of promotions		**(*n* = 620)**	**(*n* = 285)**	**(*n* = 101)**
Number of promotions*	1	**67%**	**34%**	**26%**
	2	20%	25%	23%
	3 or more	**13%**	**40%**	**52%**
	Total	100%	100%	100%
Number of promotions that involved a change in job title (collapsed)*	0	11%	6%	**3%**
	1	**62%**	**37%**	**34%**
	2	18%	24%	19%
	3 or more	**9%**	**34%**	**45%**
	Total	100%	100%	100%
Number of promotions that involved a pay raise (collapsed)*	0	11%	7%	4%
	1	**60%**	**35%**	**27%**
	2	19%	22%	21%
	3 or more	**11%**	**36%**	**49%**
	Total	100%	100%	100%
*$p \leq 0.05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.				

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

Respondents from Asia are the least likely among the world regions to have received a promotion in their current job. However, among respondents who received a promotion, there are no significant differences in the number of promotions, title changes, or pay raises by world region.

Promotions, by Country of Citizenship
(Graduates Who Work for an Employer)

Since you began working on this job, have you received any promotions?		World Region				
		Asia	**United States**	**Canada**	**Latin America**	**Europe**
		(*n* = 309)	**(*n* = 1,619)**	**(*n* = 184)**	**(*n* = 145)**	**(*n* = 302)**
Yes*		**29%**	41%	34%	35%	38%
Number of promotions		**(*n* = 90)**	**(*n* = 661)**	**(*n* = 63)**	**(*n* = 51)**	**(*n* = 115)**
Number of promotions	1	50%	53%	60%	61%	53%
	2	24%	22%	14%	22%	23%
	3 or more	26%	25%	25%	18%	24%
	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of promotions that involved a change in job title (collapsed)	0	8%	10%	11%	4%	4%
	1	53%	50%	54%	59%	57%
	2	23%	20%	14%	22%	18%
	3 or more	16%	20%	21%	16%	20%
	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of promotions that involved a pay raise (collapsed)	0	8%	9%	3%	10%	13%
	1	44%	50%	60%	53%	48%
	2	22%	20%	13%	22%	18%
	3 or more	26%	22%	24%	16%	21%
	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

*$p \leq 0.05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table

There are no statistically significant differences in the percent of respondents receiving promotions by gender or U.S. subgroup.

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

Salary and Other Compensation for Current Job

Respondents were asked to provide their starting annual salary, other first-year compensation, current salary, and current amount of other compensation for their job. The average starting annual salary among respondents who are currently employed was $69,271, and the average other first year compensation was $12,990. Currently, these respondents earn $80,695 on average plus an additional $17,836 in other compensation. This is a 16% increase in salary between starting and current annual salary.

Annual Salary		
	(*n* = 2,600)	
Statistics	**Starting Salary**	**Current Salary**
Lower 95% confidence interval	$68,048	$79,317
Mean	$69,271	$80,695
Upper 95% confidence interval	$70,493	$82,074
Other Compensation		
Statistics	**First Year**	**Current Year**
Lower 95% confidence interval	$11,977	$16,201
Mean	$12,990	$17,836
Upper 95% confidence interval	$14,003	$19,471

The next series of tables present a comparison between starting annual salary and current annual salary from the respondents' current jobs by various characteristics.

The class of 2000 had significantly higher starting annual salaries compared with the classes of 2002, 2003, and 2004. The class of 2000 also has significantly higher current annual salaries compared to the classes of 2002, 2003, 2004, and 2005. Additionally, the class of 2001 has significantly higher current salaries compared with the classes of 2003, 2004, and 2005.

Starting annual salary is highest among EMBA graduates, followed by full-time graduates and then part-time graduates—the differences between each program type are statistically significant. EMBA graduates have significantly higher current salaries compared with full-time and part-time graduates.

Men have significantly higher starting and current salaries compared with women.

U.S. citizens have significantly higher starting annual salaries compared with Asians and respondents from Latin America. Additionally, Europeans have significantly higher starting salaries compared with Asians, Canadians, and respondents from Latin America.

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

Europeans have significantly higher current salaries compared with U.S. citizens. U.S. citizens have significantly higher current salaries compared with Asians, Canadians, and respondents from Latin America.

There is no statistically significant difference in starting or current salary between U.S. subgroups.

Salary Change in Current Job, by Various Characteristics			
Characteristics	**Starting Annual Salary**	**Current Annual Salary**	**Percent Change**
Graduation Year*			
2000	**$76,238**	**$90,010**	18%
2001	$71,201	**$90,335**	27%
2002	**$65,868**	$81,604	24%
2003	**$66,641**	**$78,730**	18%
2004	**$64,494**	**$74,516**	16%
2005	$72,776	**$80,208**	10%
Program Type*			
Full-time	**$70,936**	**$78,277**	10%
Part-time	**$57,918**	**$75,778**	31%
Executive	**$86,226**	**$119,805**	39%
Gender*			
Male	**$72,213**	**$84,773**	17%
Female	**$62,594**	**$71,432**	14%
World Region*			
Asia	**$64,533**	**$72,862**	13%
United States	**$70,592**	**$82,469**	17%
Canada	**$64,032**	**$73,062**	14%
Latin America	**$61,005**	**$70,314**	15%
Europe	**$75,189**	**$89,575**	19%
*$p \leq 0.05$; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.			

Respondents in the nonprofit/government industry have the lowest starting annual salary among all industries. The technology and finance/accounting industries have significantly higher starting annual salaries compared with the product/services industry. Additionally, the consulting industry has significantly higher starting annual salaries compared with products/services and manufacturing.

For current annual salary, the nonprofit/government industry continues to have the lowest salary among the industries. Additionally, the products/services industry has significantly lower annual salaries compared with consulting, finance/accounting, technology, healthcare/pharmaceuticals, and the energy/utility industries.

Respondents in consulting positions have significantly higher starting annual salaries compared to respondents in operations/logistics, finance/accounting, healthcare, information technology,

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

and marketing/sales positions. General management and finance/accounting positions have higher starting salaries than operations/logistics and healthcare positions.

Consulting and general management positions have significantly higher current salaries compared with marketing/sales, operations/logistics, finance/accounting, healthcare, and information technology positions.

Salary Change in Current Job By Job Characteristics			
	Statistics		
Characteristic	Starting Annual Salary*	Current Annual Salary*	Percent Change
Type of Industry			
Consulting	**$77,804**	**$88,401**	14%
Finance/Accounting	**$72,343**	**$83,340**	15%
Products/Services	**$65,233**	**$74,737**	15%
Manufacturing	**$67,085**	$80,182	20%
Technology	**$72,195**	**$84,065**	16%
Health/Pharmaceuticals	$72,520	**$86,861**	20%
Energy/Utilities	$75,101	**$90,490**	20%
Non-profit/Government	**$52,081**	**$62,873**	21%
Job Function			
Marketing/sales	**$66,199**	**$75,981**	15%
Operations/logistics	**$62,062**	**$79,085**	27%
Consulting	**$79,884**	**$90,611**	13%
General Management	**$72,749**	**$89,869**	24%
Finance/Accounting	**$70,463**	**$79,594**	13%
Human Resources	**$57,676**	**$68,401**	19%
Information Technology/ MIS	**$65,604**	**$79,159**	21%
*$p \leq 0.05$; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.			

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

Self-Employed Respondents

Six percent of respondents are self-employed or small business owners. One-third (33%) of self-employed respondents work in products/services, 29% in consulting, 12% in finance/accounting, and 12% in technology.

There are significant differences in the types of industries by whether the respondent is self-employed or working for an employer. Self-employed respondents are significantly more likely to work in the consulting and products/services industries. Self-employed respondents are significantly less likely to work in the finance/accounting, manufacturing, healthcare/ pharmaceuticals, and nonprofit/government industries.

Type of Industry (Graduates Who Are Self-Employed/Small Business Owners)	
Response	**(*n* = 200)**
Product/Services	33%
Consulting	29%
Finance/Accounting	12%
Technology	12%
Energy/Utilities	3%
Health Care/Pharmaceuticals	2%
Manufacturing	2%
Non-profit/Government	2%
Other	7%
Total	100%

Self-employed respondents use interpersonal skills, oral communication skills, and creative problem solving skills the most. Recruiting, managing, and maintaining staff is the least used skill among self-employed respondents.

Self-employed respondents use the following skills significantly more than respondents working for an employer:

- Leadership skills;
- Strategic thinking abilities;
- Creative problem solving;
- Oral communication skills;
- Networking skills;
- Recruiting, managing, and maintaining staff;
- Conducting cost/benefit analyses; and
- Conducting financial analyses and preparing a budget.

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

Respondents working for an employer use the abilities to analyze, organize, and interpret statistical data significantly more often than self-employed respondents.

Skills and Abilities Used in Current Job (Graduates Who Are Self-Employed/Small Business Owners)							
		(*n* = 200)					
Skills/Abilities	**Mean**	**A Great Deal**	**A Good Amount**	**Some**	**A Little**	**Not at All**	**Total**
Interpersonal skills	4.5	66%	24%	10%	1%	0%	100%
Oral communication skills	4.5	61%	28%	8%	4%	0%	100%
Creative problem solving skills	4.4	59%	24%	12%	5%	1%	100%
Analytical thinking abilities	4.4	54%	33%	11%	2%	1%	100%
Strategic thinking abilities	4.3	58%	24%	11%	6%	2%	100%
Ability to integrate information	4.3	55%	30%	11%	4%	2%	100%
Written communication skills	4.3	54%	27%	14%	4%	1%	100%
Networking skills	4.1	51%	23%	17%	7%	3%	100%
Leadership skills	4.1	49%	23%	18%	6%	5%	100%
Technical skills for your specialty	3.9	37%	27%	25%	8%	4%	100%
Managing change	3.7	36%	24%	24%	12%	6%	100%
Conducting financial analyses/preparing a budget	3.6	31%	25%	23%	13%	9%	100%
Conducting cost/benefit analyses or proposed changes	3.5	30%	27%	19%	14%	12%	100%
Analyzing, organizing, and interpreting statistical data	3.4	27%	22%	23%	18%	11%	100%
Recruiting, managing, maintaining staff	2.8	18%	18%	19%	21%	25%	100%

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

The MBA Program

This section of the report examines the respondents' retrospective perceptions of their decisions to pursue an MBA degree, their satisfaction with the MBA program from which they graduated, the skills and abilities in which they wish they had received more education or training, and their participation in alumni activities.

Right Decisions in Educational Choices

Respondents were asked to reflect on their decision to pursue an MBA degree, the school and program they chose, and the area in which they concentrated their studies. Three-quarters (75%) of respondents state that they definitely made the right decision in pursuing the MBA degree and 78% definitely made the right decision in the type of program in which they enrolled. Over half of respondents state that they definitely made the right decision in the school they choose to attend (53%) and the area in which they concentrated their studies (55%).

Did You Make the Right Decision						
	(*n* = 3,112)					
Item	**Mean**	**Definitely Yes**	**Probably Yes**	**Probably No**	**Definitely No**	**Total**
Pursuing your MBA degree	3.7	75%	21%	3%	1%	100%
The school you chose to attend	3.4	53%	36%	9%	2%	100%
The type of program in which you enrolled	3.7	78%	17%	4%	1%	100%
The area in which you concentrated your studies	3.5	55%	37%	7%	1%	100%
Scale: 4–1, where 4 = Definitely Yes; 1 = Definitely No						

The classes of 2004 and 2005 are significantly more likely to have stated they made the right decision in the area in which they concentrated their studies compared to the classes of 2000 and 2001.

Did You Make the Right Decision, by Graduation Year – Percent Yes						
	Graduation Year					
	2000	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**
Item	**(*n* = 179)**	**(*n* = 292)**	**(*n* = 333)**	**(*n* = 357)**	**(*n* = 757)**	**(*n* = 1,194)**
Pursuing your MBA degree	96%	95%	96%	94%	95%	97%
The school you chose to attend	91%	86%	89%	89%	88%	89%
The type of program in which you enrolled	97%	94%	94%	96%	95%	95%
The area in which you concentrated your studies*	**87%**	**85%**	90%	90%	**94%**	**94%**
*$p \leq 0.05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.						

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

Graduates of EMBA programs are the most likely to have stated they made the right decision in pursuing the MBA degree and in the school they chose to attend. Graduates of part-time programs are the least likely to have stated that they made the right decisions in the program in which they enrolled and the area in which they concentrated their studies.

Did You Make the Right Decision (Percent Yes), by Program Type			
	Program Type		
	Full-Time	Part-Time	Executive
Item	(*n* = 2,250)	(*n* = 597)	(*n* = 228)
Pursuing your MBA degree*	96%	95%	**99%**
The school you chose to attend*	88%	89%	**96%**
The type of program in which you enrolled*	96%	**92%**	96%
The area in which you concentrated your studies*	92%	**87%**	96%
*$p \leq 0.05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.			

Respondents from the United States are the least likely to respond that they made the right decision in the area in which they concentrated their studies.

Did You Make the Right Decision (percent Yes, by Country of Citizenship					
	World Region				
	Asia	United States	Canada	Latin America	Europe
Item	(*n* = 309)	(*n* = 1,619)	(*n* = 184)	(*n* = 145)	(*n* = 302)
Pursuing your MBA degree	98%	96%	98%	96%	95%
The school you chose to attend	88%	88%	92%	93%	89%
The type of program in which you enrolled	96%	95%	96%	97%	95%
The area in which you concentrated your studies*	93%	**90%**	95%	95%	93%
*$p \leq 0.05$; 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.

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

Satisfaction with Graduate Management Education

Respondents were asked how satisfied they were with various potential benefits of their graduate management education. Respondents are the most satisfied that their education provided them with an opportunity to improve personally followed by receiving the credentials they desired. Respondents are the least satisfied that their education provided job security.

Satisfaction with Your Graduate Management Education							
	(*n* = 3,112)						
Potential Benefits	Mean	Extremely Satisfied (5)	Very Satisfied (4)	Somewhat Satisfied (3)	Not Very Satisfied (2)	Not at all Satisfied (1)	Total
Opportunity to improve yourself personally	4.3	43%	44%	11%	2%	1%	100%
Credentials you desired	4.1	34%	49%	14%	2%	1%	100%
An increase in your career options	4.0	34%	43%	17%	4%	2%	100%
Development of your management knowledge/ technical skills	4.0	27%	53%	17%	2%	1%	100%
Preparation to get a good job in the business world	3.9	24%	47%	22%	5%	2%	100%
Opportunity to network and to form relationships with long-term value	3.8	27%	38%	26%	8%	2%	100%
An increase in earning power	3.8	26%	38%	25%	8%	3%	100%
Opportunity for quicker advancement	3.8	22%	43%	26%	7%	2%	100%
Job security	3.5	14%	39%	34%	10%	3%	100%
Scale: 5–1, where 5 = Extremely satisfied; 1 = Not at all satisfied							

The class of 2005 is slightly, but significantly, more satisfied that their education provided them the opportunity to improve personally compared with the class of 2001. The classes of 2000 and 2005 are significantly more satisfied that their education provided the credentials they desired compared to the class of 2002. The class of 2000 is significantly more satisfied than the classes of 2001, 2002, 2003, and 2004 that the education increased their career options. Additionally, the class of 2000 is more satisfied than the classes of 2002 and 2004 in their preparation to get a good job. The class of 2005 is the most satisfied with their opportunity to network and to form relationships with long-term value. The class of 2000 is more satisfied than the classes 2002, 2003, 2004, and 2005 that the MBA increased their earning power. The class of 2005 is more satisfied than the class of 2002 that the MBA increased their opportunity for advancement.

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

Mean Satisfaction with Your Graduate Management Education, by Graduation Year						
	Graduation Year					
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Potential Benefits	(*n* = 179)	(*n* = 292)	(*n* = 333)	(*n* = 357)	(*n* = 757)	(*n* = 1,194)
Opportunity to improve yourself personally*	4.3	**4.2**	4.2	4.2	4.3	**4.3**
Credentials you desired*	**4.2**	4.1	**4.0**	4.1	4.1	**4.2**
An increase in your career options*	**4.3**	**4.0**	**3.9**	**4.0**	**4.0**	4.1
Development of your management knowledge/technical skills	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.1
Preparation to get a good job in the business world*	**4.1**	3.9	**3.8**	3.9	**3.8**	3.9
Opportunity to network and to form relationships with long-term value*	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.8	3.7	**4.0**
An increase in earning power*	**4.0**	3.9	**3.7**	**3.7**	**3.7**	**3.8**
Opportunity for quicker advancement*	3.8	3.8	**3.6**	3.7	3.7	**3.8**
Job security	4.1	3.9	3.8	3.9	3.8	3.9

Scale: 5–1, where 5 = Extremely satisfied; 1 = Not at all satisfied

*p ≤ 0.05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.

EMBA graduates are significantly more satisfied than full-time and part-time graduates that their education provided them the opportunity to improve personally and with the credentials they desired. Part-time graduates are the least satisfied that their education increased their career options, increased their earning power, prepared them to get a good job, provided the opportunity for quicker advancement, and provided job security. EMBA graduates are more satisfied than full-time graduates in their development of knowledge and skills and the opportunity to network, and full-time graduates are more satisfied than part-time graduates.

Mean Satisfaction with Your Graduate Management Education, by Program Type			
	Program Type		
	Full-Time	Part-Time	Executive
Potential Benefits	(*n* = 2,250)	(*n* = 597)	(*n* = 228)
Opportunity to improve yourself personally*	4.3	4.2	**4.5**
Credentials you desired*	4.1	4.1	**4.3**
An increase in your career options*	4.1	**3.8**	4.1
Development of your management knowledge/technical skills*	**4.1**	**3.9**	**4.2**
Preparation to get a good job in the business world*	3.9	**3.6**	4.0
Opportunity to network and to form relationships with long-term value*	**3.9**	**3.5**	**4.0**
An increase in earning power*	3.8	**3.5**	3.7
Opportunity for quicker advancement*	3.8	**3.5**	3.8
Job security*	3.5	**3.4**	3.7

Scale: 5–1, where 5 = Extremely satisfied; 1 = Not at all satisfied

*p ≤ 0.05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

Men are slightly, but significantly, more satisfied than women in the following aspects of their education.

- Opportunity to improve yourself personally
- An increase in your career options
- Development of your management knowledge/technical skills
- Preparation to get a good job in the business world
- An increase in earning power
- Opportunity for quicker advancement
- Job security

There are no aspects of their education that women are more satisfied with compared to men.

Mean Satisfaction with Your Graduate Management Education, by Gender

	Gender	
	Male	**Female**
Potential Benefits	**(*n* = 2,160)**	**(*n* = 938)**
Opportunity to improve yourself personally*	**4.3**	**4.2**
Credentials you desired	4.1	4.1
An increase in your career options*	**4.1**	**3.9**
Development of your management knowledge/technical skills*	**4.1**	**3.9**
Preparation to get a good job in the business world*	**3.9**	**3.8**
Opportunity to network and to form relationships with long-term value	3.8	3.8
An increase in earning power*	**3.8**	**3.6**
Opportunity for quicker advancement*	**3.8**	**3.7**
Job security*	**3.5**	**3.4**

Scale: 5–1, where 5 = Extremely satisfied; 1 = Not at all satisfied

*$p \leq 0.05$; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.

Respondents from Latin America and U.S. citizens are more satisfied with the opportunity to improve personally compared to Asians. U.S. citizens and Canadians are more satisfied with the credentials than Asians and Europeans. Respondents from Latin America are more satisfied than Asians that the MBA prepared them to get a good job. Additionally, respondents from Latin America are the most satisfied with their opportunity to network. Canadians and U.S. citizens are more satisfied than Asians with the opportunity for quicker advancement. U.S. citizens are more satisfied than Europeans with the job security their education afforded.

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

Mean Satisfaction with Your Graduate Management Education, by Country of Citizenship					
	World Region				
Potential Benefits	**Asia (*n* = 351)**	**United States (*n* = 1,864)**	**Canada (*n* = 224)**	**Latin America (*n* = 166)**	**Europe (*n* = 369)**
Opportunity to improve yourself personally*	**4.1**	**4.3**	4.3	**4.4**	4.3
Credentials you desired*	**4.0**	**4.2**	**4.2**	4.1	**4.0**
An increase in your career options	3.9	4.0	4.1	4.1	4.0
Development of your management knowledge/technical skills	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.1	4.1
Preparation to get a good job in the business world*	**3.8**	3.9	3.8	**4.0**	3.8
Opportunity to network and to form relationships with long-term value*	3.8	3.8	3.8	**4.1**	3.8
An increase in earning power	3.6	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.7
Opportunity for quicker advancement*	**3.6**	**3.8**	**3.9**	3.8	3.7
Job security*	3.5	**3.6**	3.4	3.6	**3.4**

Scale: 5–1, where 5 = Extremely satisfied; 1 = Not at all satisfied

*$p \leq 0.05$; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.

There are no statistically significant differences in satisfaction with aspects of the education by U.S. subgroup.

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

Retrospective Educational Needs of MBA Alumni

The next series of tables present the areas in which MBA alumni wish they had received more education or training during their programs of study. More than a third (36%) of respondents wishes they had received additional training in managing their career. Over a quarter of respondents wish they had received additional training in conducting financial analyses (28%), developing a strategic plan (28%), networking skills (28%), recruiting, managing, and maintaining staff (28%), leadership skills (26%), and strategic thinking (26%).

In Which Areas Do You Wish You Had More Education/Training During Your MBA Program?	
Area	**(*n* = 3,113)**
Managing your career	36%
Conducting financial analyses and preparing a budget	28%
Developing a strategic plan	28%
Networking skills	28%
Recruiting, managing, and maintaining staff	28%
Leadership skills	26%
Strategic thinking	26%
Conducting cost/benefit analyses of proposed changes	23%
Managing change	23%
Analyzing, organizing, and interpreting statistical data	19%
Oral communication skills	19%
Stress management	19%
Designing and conducting market research	17%
Developing creative problem-solving skills	17%
Technical skills for your specialty	16%
Analytical thinking	15%
Interpersonal skills	15%
Computer and related technological skills	14%
Integrating information from a wide variety of sources	12%
Written communication skills	11%
Other	4%
None of the above	5%
Responses may add to more than 100% due to multiple selections.	

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

The class of 2001 (36%) is more likely than the class of 2005 (24%) to wish they had received more networking skills training. The class of 2004 (30%) is more likely than the class of 2005 to wish they had received more leadership training.

In Which Areas Do You Wish You Had More Education/Training During Your MBA Program?, by Graduation Year

	Graduation Year					
	2000	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**
Area	**(*n* = 179)**	**(*n* = 292)**	**(*n* = 334)**	**(*n* = 357)**	**(*n* = 757)**	**(*n* = 1,194)**
Managing your career	44%	39%	38%	38%	35%	35%
Conducting financial analyses and preparing a budget	30%	26%	25%	27%	29%	29%
Developing a strategic plan	27%	27%	26%	27%	29%	27%
Networking skills*	25%	**36%**	31%	29%	29%	**24%**
Recruiting, managing, and maintaining staff	35%	26%	28%	32%	27%	26%
Leadership skills*	29%	28%	26%	22%	**30%**	**23%**
Strategic thinking	26%	28%	23%	27%	28%	25%
Conducting cost/benefit analyses of proposed changes	25%	18%	19%	24%	24%	23%
Managing change	25%	22%	22%	23%	25%	22%
Analyzing, organizing, and interpreting statistical data	16%	21%	15%	19%	19%	21%
Oral communication skills	15%	17%	18%	17%	20%	21%
Stress management	15%	17%	20%	18%	19%	19%
Designing and conducting market research	16%	16%	15%	18%	17%	19%
Developing creative problem-solving skills	16%	15%	15%	17%	17%	17%
Technical skills for your specialty	17%	16%	13%	17%	15%	17%
Analytical thinking	17%	14%	12%	15%	17%	14%
Interpersonal skills	13%	16%	14%	17%	17%	14%
Computer and related technological skills	12%	14%	10%	15%	14%	16%
Integrating information from a wide variety of sources	11%	10%	10%	11%	13%	12%
Written communication skills	8%	11%	9%	11%	12%	12%
Other	5%	4%	5%	4%	4%	4%
None of the above	6%	2%	5%	6%	4%	5%

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

*$p \leq 0.05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

Graduates of part-time programs are significantly more likely than full-time graduates to wish they had received addition training in managing their careers. Additionally, part-time graduates are the most likely to wish they had received additional education in developing strategic plans, networking skills, leadership skills, strategic thinking, and conducting cost/benefit analyses. EMBA graduates are the least likely to wish they had received additional training in the technical skills for their specialty and analytical thinking skills.

In Which Areas Do You Wish You Had More Education/Training During Your MBA Program?, by Program Type			
	Program Type		
Area	**Full-Time (*n* = 2,251)**	**Part-Time (*n* = 597)**	**Executive (*n* = 228)**
Managing your career*	**34%**	**44%**	44%
Conducting financial analyses and preparing a budget	27%	30%	25%
Developing a strategic plan*	26%	**33%**	31%
Networking skills*	25%	**36%**	24%
Recruiting, managing, and maintaining staff	28%	28%	30%
Leadership skills*	24%	**32%**	25%
Strategic thinking*	24%	**33%**	27%
Conducting cost/benefit analyses of proposed changes*	21%	**30%**	18%
Managing change	23%	24%	22%
Analyzing, organizing, and interpreting statistical data	20%	18%	17%
Oral communication skills	19%	19%	16%
Stress management	19%	20%	14%
Designing and conducting market research	17%	17%	23%
Developing creative problem-solving skills	16%	18%	18%
Technical skills for your specialty*	17%	15%	**9%**
Analytical thinking*	15%	17%	**10%**
Interpersonal skills	15%	14%	16%
Computer and related technological skills	15%	14%	11%
Integrating information from a wide variety of sources	11%	13%	15%
Written communication skills	12%	10%	11%
Other	4%	3%	5%
None of the above	5%	3%	5%

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

*$p \leq 0.05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

Men wish they had received more training compared with women in the following areas:

- Leadership skills; and
- Interpersonal skills.

Women wish they had received more training compared with men in the following areas:

- Managing your career;
- Conducting financial analyses;
- Developing a strategic plan;
- Conducting cost/benefit analyses;
- Analyzing, organizing, and interpreting statistical data; and
- Oral communication skills.

Additionally, 5% of men and 3% of women did not wish to have received additional education in any of the listed skills or abilities—a statistically significant difference.

In Which Areas Do You Wish You Had More Education/Training During Your MBA Program, by Gender

	Gender	
	Male	Female
Area	**(*n* = 2,161)**	**(*n* = 938)**
Managing your career*	**35%**	**40%**
Conducting financial analyses and preparing a budget*	**25%**	**34%**
Developing a strategic plan*	**27%**	**30%**
Networking skills	27%	29%
Recruiting, managing, and maintaining staff	27%	29%
Leadership skills*	**27%**	**22%**
Strategic thinking	26%	25%
Conducting cost/benefit analyses of proposed changes*	**20%**	**29%**
Managing change	23%	24%
Analyzing, organizing, and interpreting statistical data*	**18%**	**23%**
Oral communication skills	20%	18%
Stress management*	**17%**	**22%**
Designing and conducting market research	17%	18%
Developing creative problem-solving skills	16%	17%
Technical skills for your specialty	16%	17%
Analytical thinking	15%	16%
Interpersonal skills*	**17%**	**11%**
Computer and related technological skills	14%	15%
Integrating information from a wide variety of sources	11%	13%
Written communication skills	12%	10%
Other	5%	4%
None of the above*	**5%**	**3%**

Responses may add to more than 100% due to multiple selections.
*$p \leq 0.05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

Asians are more likely than respondents from Latin America (19%) to wish they had received additional training in conducting financial analyses. Asians are the most likely to wish they had received additional training in developing a strategic plan, networking skills, strategic thinking, and integrating information. Asians and Europeans are more likely than U.S. citizens to wish they had received additional training in leadership skills and interpersonal skills. Canadians are the least likely to wish they had received additional training in conducting cost/benefit analyses. Asians are more likely than Europeans to wish they had received additional training in analyzing, organizing, and interpreting statistical data and technical skills for their specialty. Asians and respondents from Latin America are more likely than U.S. citizens to wish they had received additional training in oral communication skills. Asians are more likely than U.S. citizens to wish they had received more education in stress management, developing creative problem solving skills and written communication skills. Europeans are the least likely to wish to have received additional training in designing and conducting market research. Asians are more likely than respondents from Latin America to wish they had received additional training in computer and related technology skills.

In Which Areas Do You Wish You Had More Education/Training During Your MBA Program, by Country of Citizenship

	World Region				
Area	**Asia (*n* = 351)**	**United States (*n* = 1,864)**	**Canada (*n* = 225)**	**Latin America (*n* = 166)**	**Europe (*n* = 369)**
Managing your career	37%	37%	40%	30%	35%
Conducting financial analyses and preparing a budget*	**34%**	29%	22%	**19%**	23%
Developing a strategic plan*	**34%**	28%	22%	27%	24%
Networking skills*	**43%**	26%	21%	25%	24%
Recruiting, managing, and maintaining staff	23%	29%	29%	27%	26%
Leadership skills*	**35%**	**23%**	24%	25%	**31%**
Strategic thinking*	**42%**	24%	20%	25%	26%
Conducting cost/benefit analyses of proposed changes*	25%	24%	**16%**	17%	20%
Managing change	29%	23%	20%	21%	23%
Analyzing, organizing, and interpreting statistical data*	**25%**	20%	19%	16%	**14%**
Oral communication skills*	**36%**	**15%**	20%	**25%**	21%
Stress management*	**27%**	**16%**	17%	23%	22%
Designing and conducting market research*	21%	18%	17%	14%	**13%**
Developing creative problem-solving skills*	**29%**	**14%**	13%	19%	18%
Technical skills for your specialty*	**21%**	17%	16%	16%	**10%**
Analytical thinking*	**29%**	14%	**8%**	15%	13%
Interpersonal skills*	**29%**	**11%**	11%	19%	**21%**
Computer and related technological skills*	**19%**	15%	13%	**8%**	11%
Integrating information from a wide variety of sources*	**21%**	10%	10%	11%	10%
Written communication skills*	**26%**	**8%**	10%	15%	13%
Other*	**1%**	5%	5%	2%	5%
None of the above	2%	5%	5%	7%	4%

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

*$p \leq 0.05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

Asian Americans are more likely than other U.S. subgroups to wish they had received additional training in oral communication skills and developing creative problem solving skills. Additionally, Asian Americans are more likely than whites to wish they had received additional interpersonal skills training. Asians and African Americans are more likely than whites and Hispanics to wish they had received additional written communication skills training.

In Which Areas Do You Wish You Had More Education/Training During Your MBA Program?, by U.S. Subgroup

	Race/Ethnicity			
Area	**Asian American (*n* = 145)**	**African American (*n* = 71)**	**White (non-Hispanic) (*n* = 1,473)**	**Hispanic (*n* = 66)**
Managing your career	35%	34%	37%	39%
Conducting financial analyses and preparing a budget	27%	35%	30%	24%
Developing a strategic plan	32%	31%	27%	18%
Networking skills	30%	24%	25%	24%
Recruiting, managing, and maintaining staff	22%	28%	30%	29%
Leadership skills	30%	24%	22%	26%
Strategic thinking	31%	32%	23%	27%
Conducting cost/benefit analyses of proposed changes	17%	24%	25%	26%
Managing change	25%	24%	22%	26%
Analyzing, organizing, and interpreting statistical data	23%	24%	19%	17%
Oral communication skills*	**23%**	17%	14%	12%
Stress management	22%	18%	15%	17%
Designing and conducting market research	21%	27%	17%	23%
Developing creative problem-solving skills*	**21%**	13%	13%	18%
Technical skills for your specialty	20%	11%	16%	17%
Analytical thinking	17%	15%	13%	18%
Interpersonal skills*	**22%**	17%	**9%**	18%
Computer and related technological skills	10%	20%	15%	12%
Integrating information from a wide variety of sources	10%	13%	10%	11%
Written communication skills*	**12%**	**15%**	7%	14%
Other	4%	8%	5%	5%
None of the above	6%	1%	5%	5%

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

*$p \leq 0.05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

How Alumni Stay Current in Field and Business Practices

The next series of tables show the methods MBA alumni use to stay current on development in their field and in business practices. The majority of respondents uses the Internet (82%) and reads industry magazines (71%) and national newspapers (67%). Additionally, 40% of respondents read industry newsletters, 38% participate in in-house training, 32% belong to a professional association, and 31% attend professional development seminars. Furthermore, 23% read academic journals and 10% attend executive education programs. Only 2%, or one-in-fifty, do nothing to stay current in their field or business practice.

Methods of Staying Current in Field/Business Practices	
Method	**(*n* = 3,113)**
Internet	82%
Read industry magazines	71%
Read national newspapers	67%
Industry newsletters	40%
In-house training	38%
Belong to professional associations	32%
Attend professional development seminars	31%
Read academic journals	23%
Attend executive education programs	10%
Other	3%
Do nothing	2%
Responses may add to more than 100% due to multiple selections.	

More than three-quarters (77%) of respondents do not read academic journals as a method of staying current in their field or business practice. These individuals were asked the reasons they do not read academic journals. More than a quarter (28%) state that they have no time to read academic journals, 24% do not have access to journals, and 20% feel the information in academic journals is not relevant. Additionally, 8% state that journals cost too much and 8% state that the information in journals is not practical.

Reasons Why Respondent Does Not Read Academic Journals	
Reason	**(*n* = 2,061)**
No time to read academic journals	28%
Do not have access to academic journals	24%
Information in academic journals is not relevant	20%
Academic journals cost too much	8%
Information in academic journals is not practical	8%
Academic journals are boring	4%
Academic journals are too theoretical	4%
I am not aware of academic journals	4%
No specified reason	5%
Responses may add to more than 100% due to multiple selections.	

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

The class of 2001 is the most likely to attend professional development seminars. The class of 2000 is the least likely to read academic journals.

Methods of Staying Current in Field/Business Practices, by Graduation Year						
	Graduation Year					
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Method	(*n* = 179)	(*n* = 292)	(*n* = 334)	(*n* = 357)	(*n* = 757)	(*n* = 1,194)
Internet	82%	78%	82%	80%	83%	84%
Read industry magazines	75%	70%	71%	69%	71%	72%
Read national newspapers	64%	65%	68%	68%	64%	69%
Industry newsletters	38%	42%	43%	38%	42%	39%
In-house training	42%	40%	39%	36%	38%	37%
Belong to professional associations	28%	35%	37%	30%	31%	31%
Attend professional development seminars*	35%	**38%**	30%	28%	30%	30%
Read academic journals*	**15%**	19%	27%	24%	23%	24%
Attend executive education programs	8%	13%	10%	8%	8%	11%
Other	5%	3%	3%	2%	3%	3%
Do nothing	3%	1%	2%	2%	2%	1%

Responses may add to more than 100% due to multiple selections.
*$p \leq 0.05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.

Graduates of part-time programs are the least likely to consult the Internet or read national newspapers as way to stay current in their field. EMBA graduates are the most likely to read industry magazines and academic journals. EMBA graduates and part-time graduates are more likely than full-time graduates to belong to professional associations and attend professional development seminars. EMBA graduates are more likely than full-time graduates to attend executive education programs.

Methods of Staying Current in Field/Business Practices, by Program Type			
	Program Type		
	Full-Time	Part-Time	Executive
Method	(*n* = 2,251)	(*n* = 597)	(*n* = 228)
Internet*	84%	**78%**	79%
Read industry magazines*	71%	71%	**80%**
Read national newspapers*	69%	**59%**	72%
Industry newsletters	40%	39%	44%
In-house training	38%	36%	38%
Belong to professional associations*	**29%**	**39%**	**41%**
Attend professional development seminars*	**28%**	**37%**	**43%**
Read academic journals*	22%	22%	**32%**
Attend executive education programs*	**8%**	11%	**24%**
Other	3%	2%	4%
Do nothing	1%	3%	0%

Responses may add to more than 100% due to multiple selections.
*$p \leq 0.05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

Men are more likely than women to consult the Internet and read industry magazines, national newspapers, industry newsletters, and academic journals. Women are more likely than men to attend professional development seminars.

Methods of Staying Current in Field/Business Practices, by Gender		
	Gender	
	Male	Female
Method	(*n* = 2,161)	(*n* = 938)
Internet*	**84%**	**78%**
Read industry magazines*	**74%**	**66%**
Read national newspapers*	**70%**	**61%**
Industry newsletters*	**41%**	**38%**
In-house training	38%	37%
Belong to professional associations	32%	32%
Attend professional development seminars*	**29%**	**34%**
Read academic journals*	**25%**	**17%**
Attend executive education programs	11%	8%
Other	3%	3%
Do nothing*	**1%**	**3%**
Responses may add to more than 100% due to multiple selections. *p ≤ 0.05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.		

Asians are the least likely to read national newspapers, but are significantly more likely than U.S. citizens to read academic journals.

Methods of Staying Current in Field/Business Practices, by Country of Citizenship					
	World Region				
	Asia	United States	Canada	Latin America	Europe
Method	(*n* = 351)	(*n* = 1,864)	(*n* = 225)	(*n* = 166)	(*n* = 369)
Internet	84%	82%	78%	83%	82%
Read industry magazines	73%	72%	68%	69%	73%
Read national newspapers*	**59%**	66%	75%	70%	73%
Industry newsletters	38%	39%	42%	40%	47%
In-house training	36%	40%	36%	33%	37%
Belong to professional associations	30%	34%	31%	26%	30%
Attend professional development seminars	34%	32%	29%	23%	27%
Read academic journals*	**28%**	**20%**	24%	30%	26%
Attend executive education programs	9%	10%	10%	11%	9%
Other	3%	3%	3%	5%	2%
Do nothing	1%	2%	1%	2%	1%
Responses may add to more than 100% due to multiple selections. *p ≤ 0.05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.					

There are no statistically significant differences in the methods of staying current in their field or business practices by U.S. subgroup.

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

Participation in Alumni Activities

Participation in alumni activities remains relatively low among MBA alumni. About one in ten alumni attend alumni social events and give financial donations frequently. About a third (31%) never attend alumni social events and over half (53%) never give financial donations. Only 8% of respondents recruit from their business school frequently, 6% meet with prospective students frequently, and 3% interview applicants for their admissions office frequently.

Have You Done the Following Activities Since Graduation?						
	(*n* = 3,113)					
Activity	**Mean**	**Frequently**	**Occasionally**	**Rarely**	**Never**	**Total**
Attend alumni social/networking events	2.2	11%	32%	27%	31%	100%
Give financial donations to my business school	1.9	11%	21%	16%	53%	100%
Recruit from my business school for new hires	1.7	8%	17%	14%	60%	100%
Meet with prospective applicants as part of my business school recruiting activities	1.7	6%	19%	16%	59%	100%
Interview applicants for my admissions office	1.4	3%	8%	11%	78%	100%
Scale: 4–1, where 4 = Frequently; 1 = Never						

The class of 2000 is more likely to give financial donations compared with the classes of 2002, 2003, 2004, and 2005. The class of 2001 is more likely than the classes of 2004 and 2005 to give donations. Additionally, the class of 2002 is more likely than the class of 2005 to give donations to their business school.

The class of 2000 is more likely than the classes of 2004 and 2005 to recruit from their business school for new hires. The class of 2003 is more likely than the class of 2005 to recruit new hires from their business school.

The class of 2000 is more likely than the classes of 2004 and 2005 to meet with prospective students as a part of my business school recruiting activities.

The class of 2000 is more likely than the classes of 2001, 2004, and 2005 to interview applicants for their admission office. Additionally, the classes of 2002 and 2003 are more likely than the classes of 2004 and 2005 to interview applicants.

Have You Done the Following Activities Since Graduation?, by Graduation Year						
	Graduation Year					
	2000	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**
Activity	**(*n* = 179)**	**(*n* = 292)**	**(*n* = 334)**	**(*n* = 357)**	**(*n* = 757)**	**(*n* = 1,194)**
Attend alumni social/networking events*	2.3	2.2	2.3	2.3	2.2	2.2

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

Give financial donations to my business school*	**2.4**	**2.1**	**2.0**	**1.9**	**1.8**	**1.8**
Recruit from my business school for new hires*	**2.0**	1.8	1.8	**1.9**	**1.7**	**1.6**
Meet with prospective applicants as part of my business school recruiting activities	1.9	1.7	1.8	1.7	1.7	1.7
Interview applicants for my admissions office*	**1.6**	**1.4**	**1.5**	**1.5**	**1.3**	**1.3**

Scale: 4–1, where 4 = Frequently; 1 = Never
*p ≤ 0.05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.

Graduates of part-time programs are the least likely of all alumni to attend alumni social events, give financial donations, recruit new hires from their business school, meet with prospective applicants, and interview applicants.

Have You Done the Following Activities Since Graduation?, by Program Type			
	Program Type		
	Full-Time	**Part-Time**	**Executive**
Activity	**(*n* = 2,251)**	**(*n* = 597)**	**(*n* = 228)**
Attend alumni social/networking events*	2.3	**2.0**	2.4
Give financial donations to my business school*	2.0	**1.6**	2.0
Recruit from my business school for new hires*	1.8	**1.4**	1.7
Meet with prospective applicants as part of my business school recruiting activities*	1.8	**1.4**	1.9
Interview applicants for my admissions office*	1.4	**1.2**	1.4

Scale: 4–1, where 4 = Frequently; 1 = Never
*p ≤ 0.05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

Men are slightly, but significantly more likely than women to attend alumni social events, give financial donations, meet with prospective students, and interview applicants.

Have You Done the Following Activities Since Graduation?, by Gender		
	Gender	
	Male	Female
Activity	(*n* = 2,161)	(*n* = 938)
Attend alumni social/networking events*	**2.3**	**2.2**
Give financial donations to my business school*	**1.9**	**1.8**
Recruit from my business school for new hires	1.8	1.7
Meet with prospective applicants as part of my business school recruiting activities*	**1.8**	**1.6**
Interview applicants for my admissions office*	**1.4**	**1.3**
Scale: 4–1, where 4 = Frequently; 1 = Never *p ≤ 0.05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.		

Asians and Europeans are more likely than U.S. citizens to attend alumni social events. U.S. citizens are more likely than Asians, respondents from Latin America, and Europeans to give financial donations to their business school. U.S. citizens are more likely than Europeans to recruit new hires from their business school. Asians are more likely than U.S. citizens and Canadians to interview applicants.

Have You Done the Following Activities Since Graduation?, by Country of Citizenship					
	World Region				
	Asia	United States	Canada	Latin America	Europe
Activity	(*n* = 351)	(*n* = 1,864)	(*n* = 225)	(*n* = 166)	(*n* = 369)
Attend alumni social/networking events*	**2.4**	**2.2**	2.3	2.2	**2.4**
Give financial donations to my business school*	**1.8**	**2.0**	1.8	**1.7**	**1.6**
Recruit from my business school for new hires*	1.7	**1.8**	1.7	1.6	**1.6**
Meet with prospective applicants as part of my business school recruiting activities	1.8	1.7	1.6	1.8	1.8
Interview applicants for my admissions office*	**1.5**	**1.3**	**1.3**	1.4	1.4
Scale: 4–1, where 4 = Frequently; 1 = Never *p ≤ 0.05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.					

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

Hispanics are more likely than whites to attend alumni social events and interview applicants for their admission office. Asian Americans and Hispanics are more likely than whites to meet with prospective students.

Have You Done the Following Activities Since Graduation?, by U.S. Subgroup				
	Race/Ethnicity			
Activity	**Asian American (*n* = 145)**	**African American (*n* = 71)**	**White (non-Hispanic) (*n* = 1,473)**	**Hispanic (*n* = 66)**
Attend alumni social/networking events*	2.2	2.1	**2.1**	**2.5**
Give financial donations to my business school	2.2	1.8	2.0	2.2
Recruit from my business school for new hires	1.9	1.9	1.8	2.0
Meet with prospective applicants as part of my business school recruiting activities*	**2.0**	1.9	**1.6**	**2.0**
Interview applicants for my admissions office*	1.4	1.4	**1.3**	**1.6**

Scale: 4–1, where 4 = Frequently; 1 = Never

*$p \leq 0.05$; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

Who Are These 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 September 2005 MBA Alumni Perspectives Survey.

Characteristics of the Respondents

Respondents represent a broad cross-section of MBA graduates. The more time that has passed since graduation, the less likely an individual will respond to the survey, which is apparent in the distribution of respondents by graduation year. Overall, 38% of respondents graduated in 2005, 24% graduated in 2004, 12% graduated in 2003, 11% graduated in 2002, 9% graduated in 2001, and 6% graduated in 2000.

Year of Graduation	
Graduation Year	**(*n* = 3,113)**
2000	6%
2001	9%
2002	11%
2003	12%
2004	24%
2005	38%
Total	100%

Nearly three-quarters (73%) of the respondents graduated from full-time programs. About one in five (19%) graduated from part-time programs, and 7% graduated from executive (EMBA) programs. This distribution is different from the true distribution in the population according to the 1999–2000 National Postsecondary Student Aid Study[1]. That study shows that 34% of MBA students attend a program full-time and 66% attend a program part-time. The Global MBA® Graduate Survey sample from which the Alumni Perspective Survey sample is derived has a vast majority of respondents from full-time MBA programs, which explains the skewed distribution.

Program Type	
Program Type	**(*n* = 3,099)**
Full-time	73%
Part-time	19%
Executive	7%
Other	1%
Total	100%

[1] U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1999–2000 National Postsecondary Student Aid Study (NPSAS:2000).

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

Among the respondents, males outnumber females by a margin of two and a third to one. The distribution by gender is slightly different to the proportion of GMAT® test-takers, where males represent 60% and females represent 38% in the 2003-04 testing year (2% were unknown).

Gender of Respondent	
Gender	**(*n* = 3,099)**
Male	70%
Female	30%
Total	100%

Three-fifths (60%) of respondents are U.S. citizens. One in eight (12%) are from Europe. Respondents from Asia represent 11% of the respondents. Canadians represent 7% of the respondents. One in twenty (5%) are from Latin America and the Caribbean. Based on a comparison of GMAT® test-taker data, where 55% of test-takers are U.S. citizens and 43% are non-U.S. citizens (2% were unknown), the respondents resemble test-takers.

Country of Citizenship	
World Region	**(*n* = 3,099)**
United States	60%
Europe	12%
Asia	11%
Canada	7%
Latin America and the Caribbean	5%
Other	4%
Total	100%

Whites (non-Hispanic) comprise 84% of the U.S. respondents. Asian Americans represent 8%, African Americans represent 4%, and Hispanics represent 4% of the U.S. respondents. There are slight differences between the respondents and GMAT® test-takers, where 71% are white, 10% Asian American, 8% African American, and 6% Hispanic.

U.S. Subgroup	
Race/Ethnicity	**(*n* = 1,755)**
White (non-Hispanic)	84%
Asian American	8%
African American	4%
Hispanic (non-white)	4%
Total	100%

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

Characteristics of the Respondents by Graduation Year

The following tables examine respondent characteristics by graduation year. The classes of 2000 and 2003 have a significantly higher proportion of full-time graduates compared with the class of 2005. On the other hand, the class of 2005 has a significantly greater proportion of part-time graduates compared with the classes of 2000 and 2003. Additionally, one in eight graduates in the class of 2005 are EMBA graduates, which represent a significantly higher proportion than graduates represented by the classes of 2000, 2002, and 2003.

Program Type, by Graduation Year*

	Graduation Year					
	2000	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**
Program Type	**(*n* = 178)**	**(*n* = 292)**	**(*n* = 317)**	**(*n* = 354)**	**(*n* = 752)**	**(*n* = 1,183)**
Full-time	**90%**	77%	82%	**87%**	70%	**65%**
Part-time	**10%**	16%	16%	**11%**	23%	**23%**
Executive	**1%**	7%	**2%**	**2%**	7%	**12%**
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

*$p \leq 0.05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.

Among the respondents, graduates of the class of 2000 are significantly less likely to be Asian compared with the class of 2002. Canadians represent a greater proportion of the class of 2005 compared with the class of 2000. Europeans represent a greater proportion of the class of 2002 compared with the class of 2001.

Country of Citizenship, by Graduation Year*

	Graduation Year					
	2000	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**
World Region	**(*n* = 179)**	**(*n* = 292)**	**(*n* = 319)**	**(*n* = 357)**	**(*n* = 757)**	**(*n* = 1,194)**
Asia	**7%**	14%	**16%**	12%	12%	11%
United States	73%	67%	55%	61%	65%	61%
Canada	**3%**	7%	6%	5%	8%	**9%**
Latin America and the Caribbean	5%	4%	6%	8%	5%	6%
Europe	13%	**8%**	**16%**	14%	11%	13%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

*$p \leq 0.05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.

There are no statistically significant differences in the gender and U.S. subgroup distributions of respondents by graduation year.

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

Characteristics of the Respondents by Program Type

The following tables examine the respondents' characteristics by program type. Women represent one-fifth of EMBA graduates, which is significantly lower than the percent of women among full-time (30%) and part-time (33%) graduates.

Gender, by Program Type*			
	Program Type		
Gender	Full-Time (*n* = 2,251)	Part-Time (*n* = 597)	Executive (*n* = 228)
Male	70%	67%	80%
Female	30%	33%	**20%**
Total	100%	100%	100%

*p ≤ 0.05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.

Asians and respondents from Latin America represent a greater proportion of the full-time graduates compared with their representation among EMBA graduates. Citizens of the United States represent a greater proportion of part-time graduates compared with full-time graduates. There are significantly fewer Canadians from part-time programs compared with full-time and EMBA programs. Europeans represent a significantly higher percent of graduates from an EMBA program than a part-time program.

Country of Citizenship, by Program Type*			
	Program Type		
World Region	Full-Time (*n* = 2,153)	Part-Time (*n* = 577)	Executive (*n* = 223)
Asia	**13%**	10%	**4%**
United States	**58%**	**77%**	66%
Canada	8%	**5%**	8%
Latin America	**7%**	**2%**	**1%**
Europe	13%	**6%**	**21%**
Total	100%	100%	100%

*p ≤ 0.05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.

There are no statistically significant differences in the U.S. subgroup distributions of respondents by program type.

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

Characteristics of the Respondents by Gender

The following tables examine the respondents' characteristics by gender. There is a greater proportion of women from the United States compared to the proportion of men from the United States. On the other hand, respondents from Latin America and Europe have a greater proportion of men compared with women.

Country of Citizenship, by Gender*		
	Gender	
	Male	Female
World Region*	(*n* = 2,068)	(*n* = 907)
Asia	13%	10%
United States	**59%**	**71%**
Canada	8%	7%
Latin America	**7%**	**3%**
Europe	**14%**	**9%**
Total	100%	100%

*$p \leq 0.05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.

African American respondents are more likely to be women than men—the only significant difference by U.S. subgroup.

U.S. Subgroup, by Gender*		
	Gender	
	Male	Female
Race/Ethnicity	(*n* = 1,137)	(*n* = 618)
Asian American	8%	8%
African American	3%	**6%**
White (non-Hispanic)	85%	83%
Hispanic	4%	3%
Total	100%	100%

*$p \leq 0.05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

Methodology

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 include 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 August 25, 2005, an e-mail was sent to the 14,999 members of the sample as a heads-up about the research project. On September 1, 2005, the invitation e-mail was sent to the sample. A reminder e-mail was sent on September 15 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 September 1 to September 30. As an incentive for people to participate in the survey, we offered to place them in a drawing for one U.S. $500 and four U.S. $100 AMEX gift checks.

Of the 14,999 contacts that were initiated for the September 2005 MBA Alumni Perspectives Survey, 833 contacts were undeliverable (6%). Of the remaining contacts, 3,113 people responded—a 22% response rate.

Response Rates				
	Sample	**Adjusted Sample**	**Respondents**	**Adjusted Response Rate**
Overall	14,999	14,166	3,113	22%
Graduation Year				
2000	1,012	938	179	19%
2001	2,183	2,059	292	14%
2002	1,794	1,695	334	20%
2003	2,339	2,167	357	16%
2004	3,609	3,405	757	22%
2005	4,062	3,902	1,194	31%

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

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

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 ($p < 0.05$). (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.

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

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, GMAC®.

Acknowledgements

Larry Rudner, Vice President, Research and Development, GMAC®, review of manuscript; Rachel Edgington, Director, Market Research and Analysis, GMAC®, review of manuscript; Veronica Garcia, Research Writer/Editor, GMAC®, writing and editorial services.

© 2005, Graduate Management Admission Council®. All rights reserved.

© 2005 Graduate Management Admission Council® (GMAC®). All rights reserved.

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

Creating Access to Graduate Business Education®, Global MBA®, GMAT®, GMAC®, and Graduate Management Admission Council® are registered trademarks of the Graduate Management Admission Council® (GMAC®).