Graduate Management Admission Council®

Creating Access to Graduate Business Education®

MBA ALUMNI PERSPECTIVE SURVEY SEPTEMBER 2006

COMPREHENSIVE DATA REPORT

Table of Contents

Background

The MBA Alumni Perspectives Surveys are biannual follow-up studies of past participants of one of the Graduate Management Admission Council® student surveys—the Global MBA® Graduate Survey. 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 2006 Wave Study included alumni from the classes of 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, and 2006. Refer to the *Methodology* section for response rates and sample characteristics. This report presents both the overall findings and significant findings from the study by graduation year, gender, citizenship, U.S. subgroup, and program type.

The results of this survey do not necessarily reflect a statistically representative sample of MBA alumni as a whole. Rather, these findings reflect responses from 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 about the MBA alumni population, but 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 $p \leq .05$, 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 that 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 cells in the contingency table are specifically significant in the X^2 test. Values in the contingency table appear in bold if the standardized residual is ±1.8.

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 $p \leq .05$, 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 appear in bold indicate that even with the Bonferroni correction the difference in means is still statistically significant.

First Job after Graduation

This section of the report examines the employment status of respondents at the time of their graduation from an MBA program. Included in the analysis are the timing of their first job after graduation, number of other job offers, respondent opinions on whether accepting the job was the right decision, and 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, 89% of respondents from the class of 2006 were working after graduation. Nearly two-fifths (37%) of the respondents started their first job after graduation either before or during graduate management school. Fifteen percent continued working for an employer with whom they'd had an internship or work project during graduate management school. One third (34%) of the respondents started their first job after leaving graduate management school, and 4% are self-employed or own small businesses. About one in ten (11%) have not had a job since leaving graduate management school.

Employment Status after Graduation (Class of 2006)	
Response	**(*n* = 1,110)**
I held this job while in graduate management school and continued working at this job after I left graduate management school.	37%
I had an internship/work project with the employer and continued working for this employer after I left graduate management school.	15%
It was the first job I held after leaving graduate management school.	34%
I was self-employed or a small business owner.	4%
I have not had a job since leaving graduate management school.	11%
Total	100%

The classes of 2005 and 2006 are significantly more likely than the classes of 2000, 2002, and 2003 to have held their first job after graduation while in school. The class of 2006 is slightly, yet significantly, more likely than other classes to have continued working for an internship or work project after graduation. The classes of 2000, 2001, and 2002 are significantly more likely than the classes of 2003 and 2006 to have obtained their first job after leaving school. The classes of 2003 and 2004 are more likely than all other classes to have graduated without a job. Data for respondents who graduated prior to 2006 were collected from their respective first MBA Alumni Perspectives survey.

Employment Status after Graduation, by Graduation Year*							
	Graduation Year**						
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Response	(*n* = 353)	(*n* = 619)	(*n* = 576)	(*n* = 1,074)	(*n* = 1,446)	(*n* = 1,095)	(*n* = 1,110)
I held this job while in graduate management school and continued working at this job.	**15%**	28%	**22%**	**18%**	28%	**30%**	**37%**
I had an internship/work project with the employer and continued working for this employer .	15%	10%	11%	12%	11%	11%	**14%**
It was the first job I held after leaving graduate management school.	**66%**	**54%**	**54%**	**36%**	41%	41%	**34%**
I was self-employed or a small business owner.	3%	5%	**7%**	4%	5%	5%	4%
I have not had a job since leaving graduate management school.	**1%**	**4%**	**6%**	**29%**	**16%**	13%	**11%**
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

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

** Data for the classes of 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, and 2005 are taken from past alumni surveys.

Part-time and executive MBA respondents are the most likely to have held their first post-MBA job while in graduate management school. Full-time respondents were the most likely to have had an internship and to have continued to work for the employer with whom they had the internship after graduation. Additionally, full-time respondents are the most likely to have obtained their first job after leaving graduate management school or to have not yet had a job since completing graduate management school.

Employment Status after Graduation, by Program Type (Class of 2006)*			
	Program Type		
	Full-time	Part-time	Executive
Response	(*n* = 661)	(*n* =343)	(*n* =98)
I held this job while in graduate management school and continued working at this job.	**10%**	**79%**	**70%**
I had an internship/work project with the employer and continued working for this employer.	**23%**	**1%**	**1%**
It was the first job I held after leaving graduate management school.	**45%**	**14%**	**12%**
I was self-employed or a small business owner.	4%	3%	**11%**
I have not had a job since leaving graduate management school.	**16%**	**3%**	5%
Total	100%	100%	100%

*p ≤ .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 and Asia are more likely than other respondents to have continued working for an employer with whom they had an internship/work project. Canadians are the most likely to have not had a job since leaving graduate management school.

Employment Status after Graduation, by Country of Citizenship (Class of 2006)*

	World Region				
Response	Asia (*n* =108)	United States (*n* = 761)	Canada (*n* = 53)	Latin America (*n* = 59)	Europe (*n* = 117)
I held this job while in graduate management school and continued working at this job.	**23%**	**41%**	25%	**17%**	34%
I had an internship/work project with the employer and continued working for this employer.	**22%**	13%	11%	**25%**	12%
It was the first job I held after leaving graduate management school.	42%	32%	32%	39%	39%
I was self-employed or a small business owner.	2%	5%	**11%**	7%	1%
I have not had a job since leaving graduate management school.	11%	9%	**21%**	12%	15%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

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

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

Respondents Not Working after Graduation

Respondents in the class of 2006 who have not had a job since graduation were asked the reasons why they are not currently working. The majority (64%) stated that they have been unable to find the job they want. About one in ten stated that they recently moved, are currently interviewing, or are continuing their education.

Reasons for Unemployment (Class of 2006)

Reason	(*n* = 143)
Unable to find a job you want	64%
Have recently moved	13%
Currently interviewing	11%
Continuing your education	10%
Family reasons	6%
Taking time off	5%
Currently involved in an internship or work project	3%
In process of starting own business	3%
Found job, but start later in the year	3%
Health reasons	1%
Military obligations	1%
Recently laid off	1%
Other	4%

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

Timing of First Job after Graduation

Respondents from the class of 2006 who started their first job after leaving graduate management school were asked when they began working. Twenty-six percent of the respondents started their first job between January and May, 43% in June or July, and 31% between August and December.

Start Date of First Job after Graduation (Class of 2006)	
Month	**(*n* = 369)**
January–May	26%
June–July	43%
August–December	31%
Total	100%

Method of Finding First Job

Respondents who found their first job after leaving graduate management school were asked to indicate how they found their job. A third of respondents (33%) in the class of 2006 found their first job through the use of their network of contacts, and just less than another third (31%) found their job through an on-campus interview. Additionally, 16% found their job through advertisements, and one in twenty (5%) used job fairs or a job agency.

"How did you find your first job after leaving graduate management school?" (First Job after Graduation – Class of 2006)	
Response	**(*n* = 369)**
Your network of contacts	33%
On-campus interview	31%
Job advertisement	16%
Job fair/forum/conference	5%
Job agency/recruiter/headhunter	5%
Cold call to company	4%
Internet search	4%
Other	2%
Total	100%

Women are significantly less likely than men to have found their first job through an on-campus interview but are more likely than men to have found their job at a job fair.

"How did you find your first job after leaving graduate management school?" by Gender (First Job after Graduation – Class of 2006)		
	Male	**Female**
Response	**(*n* = 238)**	**(*n* = 131)**
On-campus interview	36%	**22%**
Job advertisement	15%	18%
Your network of contacts	32%	36%
Job fair/forum/conference	3%	**9%**
Job agency/recruiter/headhunter	5%	5%
Cold call to company	4%	3%
Internet search	3%	7%
Other	3%	0%
Total	100%	100%
*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.		

Statistical testing of the difference in methods for finding the first job by program type, world region, and U.S. subgroup cannot be performed due to small cell sizes.

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, the time of year, the type of job the respondent was seeking, and the industry in which they were seeking employment.

Overall, employed respondents in the class of 2006 had an average of 2.7 job offers per respondent after graduation, and about one-quarter indicated they had four or more offers from which to choose.

Number of Job Offers (First Job after Graduation – Class of 2006)	
Response	**(*n* = 525)**
One job offer	23%
Two job offers	28%
Three job offers	23%
Four or more job offers	26%
Total	100%
Mean number of job offers	2.7
Median number of job offers	2.0

The class of 2006 and the class of 2000 are significantly more likely to have had four or more job offers than are the classes of 2002 and 2003. Data for respondents who graduated prior to 2006 were collected from their first MBA Alumni Perspectives survey.

**Number of Job Offers, by Graduation Year*
(First Job after Graduation)**

	Graduation Year**						
	2000	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**
Response	**(*n* = 348)**	**(*n* = 597)**	**(*n* = 541)**	**(*n* = 767)**	**(*n* = 740)**	**(*n* = 570)**	**(*n* = 525)**
One job offer	**27%**	41%	**48%**	**41%**	37%	34%	**23%**
Two job offers	27%	24%	26%	27%	28%	28%	28%
Three job offers	18%	17%	18%	20%	21%	23%	23%
Four or more job offers	**28%**	18%	**7%**	**13%**	14%	16%	**26%**
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.
** Data for the classes of 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, and 2004 are taken from past alumni surveys.

Women are significantly less likely than men to have had four or more job offers and are more likely than men to have had only one job offer.

**Number of Job Offers, by Gender
(First Job after Graduation – Class of 2006)**

	Male	**Female**
Response	**(*n* = 353)**	**(*n* = 172)**
One job offer	19%	**33%**
Two job offers	30%	26%
Three job offers	23%	22%
Four or more job offers	29%	**19%**
Total	100%	100%

There are no statistically significant differences in the number of job offers among the class of 2006 by program type, world region, or 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 accepted was the type for which they were looking.

Only one in fifty (2%) of the respondents stated that the job they took was not the kind they were looking for after graduation. Sixty-five percent stated that their job was definitely the type they were looking for, and one-third (33%) stated that it was somewhat like the job they were seeking after graduation.

"When you took this job, was it the kind of job you were looking for?" (First Job after Graduation – Class of 2006)	
Response	**(*n* = 525)**
Yes, definitely	65%
Yes, somewhat	33%
No	2%
Total	100%

The class of 2006 is significantly more likely than the classes of 2001 and 2002 to have stated that the job they accepted was definitely the type they were looking for after graduation. Data for respondents who graduated prior to 2006 were collected from their first MBA Alumni Perspectives survey.

"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**	**2006**
Response	**(*n* = 348)**	**(*n* = 597)**	**(*n* = 541)**	**(*n* = 767)**	**(*n* = 740)**	**(*n* = 570)**	**(*n* = 525)**
Yes, definitely	62%	**51%**	**45%**	56%	61%	62%	**65%**
Yes, somewhat	31%	40%	**44%**	37%	34%	33%	33%
No	7%	**9%**	**11%**	7%	5%	5%	**2%**
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.
** Data for the classes of 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, and 2004 are taken from past alumni surveys.

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, world region, or 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 the position without an MBA degree.

More than one-half (55%) of respondents in the class of 2006 strongly agreed that they could not have obtained their job without graduate management school training. An additional one-quarter (26%) somewhat agreed with the statement. Only 14% stated that they somewhat or strongly disagreed with the statement.

"I could not have obtained this job without my graduate management school training." (First Job after Graduation – Class of 2006)	
Response	**(*n* = 525)**
Strongly agree	55%
Somewhat agree	26%
Neither agree nor disagree	5%
Somewhat disagree	7%
Strongly disagree	7%
Total	100%

The classes of 2004, 2005, and 2006 are significantly more likely than the classes of 2001, 2002, and 2003 to strongly agree that they could not have obtained their job without graduate management education. Conversely, the classes of 2001, 2002, and 2003 are significantly more likely than the classes of 2004, 2005, and 2006 to strongly disagree with the statement. Data for respondents who graduated prior to 2006 were collected from their first MBA Alumni Perspectives 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**	**2006**
Response	**(*n* = 348)**	**(*n* = 597)**	**(*n* = 541)**	**(*n* = 764)**	**(*n* = 740)**	**(*n* = 570)**	**(*n* = 525)**
Strongly agree	49%	**41%**	**38%**	**42%**	**55%**	**57%**	**55%**
Somewhat agree	23%	22%	21%	20%	24%	25%	26%
Neither agree nor disagree	7%	11%	11%	**12%**	7%	**6%**	**5%**
Somewhat disagree	10%	8%	**12%**	10%	8%	**6%**	7%
Strongly disagree	12%	**18%**	**19%**	**17%**	**7%**	**5%**	**7%**
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.
** Data for the classes of 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, and 2004 are taken from past alumni surveys.

There are no statistically significant differences by program type, gender, world region, or U.S. subgroup in 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 was provided in the survey instrument.

On average, the class of 2006 had a starting annual salary of $71,593 with $13,106 in additional first-year compensation.

Starting Annual Salary and Other Compensation in U.S. Dollars (First Job after Graduation – Class of 2006)		
	Starting Annual Salary	**Other First-Year Compensation**
Statistic	**(*n* = 891)**	**(*n* = 891)**
Lower 95% confidence interval	$69,629	$11,703
Mean	$71,593	$13,106
Upper 95% confidence interval	$73,556	$14,508

The class of 2004 reported a significantly lower starting annual salary than did the classes of 2000, 2005, and 2006. Data for respondents who graduated prior to 2006 were collected from their first MBA Alumni Perspectives survey.

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**	**2006**
Starting Annual Salary	**(*n* = 251)**	**(*n* = 365)**	**(*n* = 349)**	**(*n* = 433)**	**(*n* = 1,103)**	**(*n* = 878)**	**(*n* = 891)**
Lower 95% confidence interval	$71,062	$68,033	$64,625	$67,232	$63,755	$70,253	$69,629
Mean*	**$73,874**	$70,679	$70,588	$69,713	**$65,334**	**$72,730**	**$71,593**
Upper 95% confidence interval	$76,687	$73,326	$76,551	$72,194	$66,913	$75,206	$73,556
*p ≤ .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.							

Respondents from executive MBA programs had the highest starting annual salary, followed by respondents from full-time programs and then part-time programs—a statistically significant difference. Full-time and executive MBA respondents reported more than twice the amount of other first-year compensation than that of part-time MBA respondents—a statistically significant difference.

Starting Annual Salary and Other Compensation in U.S. Dollars, by Program Type (First Job after Graduation – Class of 2006)			
	Program Type		
	Full-Time	**Part-Time**	**Executive**
Starting Annual Salary	**(*n* = 502)**	**(*n* = 308)**	**(*n* = 75)**
Lower 95% confidence interval	$72,892	$58,216	$79,443
Mean*	**$75,307**	**$61,334**	**$88,261**
Upper 95% confidence interval	$77,722	$64,453	$97,078
Other First-Year Compensation			
Lower 95% confidence interval	$14,571	$5,290	$8,709
Mean*	$16,388	**$7,476**	$15,100
Upper 95% confidence interval	$18,204	$9,663	$21,490
*p ≤ .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 than women. These findings are consistent with the differences in salary between program types—respondents from full-time and executive programs are more likely to be men.

Starting Annual Salary and Other Compensation in U.S. Dollars, by Gender (First Job after Graduation – Class of 2006)		
	Gender	
	Male	**Female**
Starting Annual Salary	**(*n* = 618)**	**(*n* = 273)**
Lower 95% confidence interval	$71,483	$63,057
Mean*	**$73,876**	**$66,423**
Upper 95% confidence interval	$76,270	$69,788
Other First-Year Compensation		
Lower 95% confidence interval	$13,019	$7,329
Mean*	**$14,866**	**$9,121**
Upper 95% confidence interval	$16,713	$10,912
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.		

Statistically, there is no difference in starting annual salary by world region. However, respondents from Latin America received significantly more in other first-year compensation compared with respondents from the U.S.

Starting Annual Salary and Other Compensation in U.S. Dollars, by Country of Citizenship (First Job after Graduation – Class of 2006)					
	World Region				
	Asia	**United States**	**Canada**	**Latin America**	**Europe**
Starting Annual Salary	**(*n* = 87)**	**(*n* = 625)**	**(*n* = 35)**	**(*n* = 42)**	**(*n* = 76)**
Lower 95% confidence interval	$64,057	$69,089	$62,577	$60,175	$67,707
Mean	$70,788	$71,381	$73,534	$68,619	$74,353
Upper 95% confidence interval	$77,519	$73,673	$84,492	$77,063	$80,998
Other First-Year Compensation					
Lower 95% confidence interval	$9,783	$10,695	$8,176	$13,394	$8,784
Mean*	$14,048	**$12,333**	$14,040	**$22,836**	$13,275
Upper 95% confidence interval	$18,313	$13,971	$19,904	$32,277	$17,766
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.					

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

Current Employment

This section of the report examines current employment status of all 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, 94% of respondents were currently employed, including 88% who worked for an employer and 6% who were self-employed or small business owners. Six percent of respondents were not working at the time of the survey.

Current Employment Status	
Response	**(*n* = 3,677)**
Currently employed	88%
I am currently self-employed or a small business owner.	6%
I am not currently working.	6%
Total	100%

Among the 6% of respondents not currently working, 57% were unable to find a job they want, 15% recently moved, 13% were not working for family reasons, and 12% were continuing their education.

Reasons for Unemployment	
Reason	**(*n* = 216)**
Unable to find a job you want	57%
Have recently moved	15%
Family reasons	13%
Continuing your education	12%
Currently interviewing	8%
Taking time off	5%
Currently involved in an internship or work project	3%
Recently laid off	3%
In process of starting own business	2%
Found job, but start later in the year	2%
Waiting on visa	2%
Health reasons	1%
Working as a temp—searching for job	1%
Military obligations	0%
Other	3%
Responses add to more than 100% due to multiple selections.	

Respondents from the class of 2006 are the least likely to be self-employed or small business owners. Additionally, the class of 2006 is more likely than the classes of 2002, 2003, 2004, and 2005 to not be currently working.

Current Employment Status, by Graduation Year*

	Graduation Year						
	2000	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**
Status	**(*n* = 175)**	**(*n* = 258)**	**(*n* = 223)**	**(*n* = 380)**	**(*n* = 591)**	**(*n* = 819)**	**(*n* = 1,231)**
Currently employed	85%	88%	91%	92%	92%	91%	85%
I am currently self-employed or a small business owner.	9%	9%	7%	6%	5%	7%	**4%**
I am not currently working.	6%	4%	**3%**	**2%**	**3%**	**3%**	**12%**
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

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

Respondents from an executive program are the most likely to be self-employed or small business owners. Respondents from full-time programs are significantly more likely than respondents from part-time programs to not be currently working.

Current Employment Status, by Program Type*

	Program Type		
	Full-time	**Part-time**	**Executive**
Response	**(*n* = 2,534)**	**(*n* = 844)**	**(*n* = 264)**
Currently employed	87%	93%	84%
I am currently self-employed or a small business owner.	6%	4%	**12%**
I am not currently working.	**7%**	**3%**	4%
Total	100%	100%	100%

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

Women are slightly, yet significantly, more likely to be unemployed at the time of the survey.

Current Employment Status, by Gender*

	Gender	
	Male	**Female**
Response	**(*n* = 2,558)**	**(*n* = 1,110)**
Currently employed	89%	88%
I am currently self-employed or a small business owner.	6%	4%
I am not currently working.	5%	**8%**
Total	100%	100%

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

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

Method of Finding Current Job

Respondents who were not employed with the same employer since leaving graduate management school were asked to indicate how they found their most recent job. About one-third (36%) of respondents found the job using their network of contacts. Additionally, 18% found their job through an advertisement, 15% worked at their current job during or prior to school, and 11% used a career services office/on-campus interview to obtain their current position.

"How did you find your most recent job?"	
Response	**(*n* = 3,256)**
My network of contacts	36%
Job advertisement	18%
Worked there during/prior to school	15%
On-campus interview/career services office	11%
Job agency/recruiter	7%
Internship	6%
Cold call to the company	3%
Job fair/forum/conference	2%
Internet	2%
Other	1%
Total	100%

The number-one method of finding a job among respondents who graduated prior to 2006 was through the use of their network of contacts. Among the class of 2006, about two-fifths continued working for a job they began prior to or during their schooling.

"How did you find your most recent job?" by Graduation Year*							
	2000	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**
Response	**(*n* = 149)**	**(*n* = 226)**	**(*n* = 201)**	**(*n* = 346)**	**(*n* = 540)**	**(*n* = 739)**	**(*n* = 1,045)**
On-campus interview/career services office	**19%**	8%	**6%**	**6%**	10%	12%	12%
Job advertisement	15%	19%	**26%**	22%	**26%**	**22%**	**9%**
My network of contacts	44%	**50%**	**44%**	**55%**	**43%**	**42%**	**16%**
Cold call to the company	3%	4%	3%	3%	4%	4%	**2%**
Internet	1%	4%	2%	1%	1%	2%	2%
Job fair/forum/conference	3%	1%	2%	**<1%**	3%	2%	2%
Job agency/recruiter	9%	**10%**	**11%**	8%	7%	8%	**3%**
Internship	1%	0%	<1%	1%	1%	1%	**15%**
Worked there during/prior to school	3%	2%	2%	2%	3%	4%	**39%**
Other	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

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

Respondents from part-time and executive programs are the most likely to have held their current job during or prior to their education. Respondents from full-time programs are more likely than others to have found their most recent job through an on-campus interview, their network of contacts, or an internship.

"How did you find your most recent job?" by Program Type*			
Response	**Full-time (*n* = 2,216)**	**Part-time (*n* = 787)**	**Executive (*n* = 221)**
On-campus interview/career services office	**15%**	**2%**	**2%**
Job advertisement	19%	16%	14%
My network of contacts	**39%**	**27%**	32%
Cold call to the company	3%	3%	3%
Internet	2%	2%	1%
Job fair/forum/conference	3%	**1%**	1%
Job agency/recruiter	6%	8%	8%
Internship	**8%**	**1%**	**1%**
Worked there during/prior to school	**4%**	**39%**	**38%**
Other	1%	1%	1%
Total	100%	100%	100%
*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.			

Respondents from Latin America are twice as likely as European respondents to have obtained their job through an on-campus interview or career services office. Additionally, respondents from Latin America are more likely than all other respondents to have used their network of contacts or internships to find their current job. Respondents from Asia are more likely than U.S. respondents to have found their job through advertisements, while U.S. respondents are more likely than those from Asia, Canada, and Latin America to have worked at their current job prior to or during school.

"How did you find your most recent job?" by World Region*					
Response	**Asia (*n* = 338)**	**United States (*n* = 2,082)**	**Canada (*n* = 196)**	**Latin America (*n* = 170)**	**Europe (*n* = 380)**
On-campus interview/career services office	9%	12%	8%	**16%**	**8%**
Job advertisement	**26%**	**16%**	23%	14%	21%
My network of contacts	32%	35%	41%	**44%**	38%
Cold call to the company	4%	**2%**	5%	3%	**6%**
Internet	2%	2%	1%	**0%**	2%
Job fair/forum/conference	3%	2%	1%	2%	1%
Job agency/recruiter	6%	7%	9%	5%	7%
Internship	7%	5%	4%	**9%**	5%
Worked there during/prior to school	**9%**	**17%**	**9%**	**7%**	12%
Other	1%	1%	1%	0%	1%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.					

There are no statistically significant differences in the method of finding one's most recent job by gender or U.S. subgroup.

Employer Characteristics

Location of Employment

Nearly one in five (18%) respondents was working outside their country of citizenship.

Employed in Country of Citizenship (Respondents Who Work for an Employer)	
Response	**(*n* = 3,226)**
Yes	82%
No	18%
Total	100%

Fifty-five countries are represented among respondents who work outside their country of citizenship. Countries with 10 or more alumni represented are listed below. Half (50%) of the respondents working outside their country of citizenship were employed in the United States. About one in eight (13%) were working in the United Kingdom, and 6% were working in Canada.

Country of Employment (Respondents Who Work Outside Their Country of Citizenship)	
Country	**Percentage**
United States	50%
United Kingdom	13%
Canada	6%
Switzerland	3%
France	3%
Germany	2%
Singapore	2%
China, People's Republic of	2%
Australia	2%
Other countries	18%
Total	100%

Respondents from part-time programs are the most likely to be working in their country of citizenship. About one-fifth (22%) of full-time respondents were working outside their country of citizenship; this is a significantly higher percentage than part-time and executive respondents.

Employed in Country of Citizenship, by Program Type* (Respondents Who Work for an Employer)			
	Program Type		
	Full-Time	**Part-Time**	**Executive**
Response	**(*n* = 2,193)**	**(*n* = 781)**	**(*n* = 220)**
Yes	**78%**	**92%**	87%
No	**22%**	**8%**	**13%**
Total	100%	100%	100%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.			

Women are slightly, yet significantly, less likely than men to be working outside their country of citizenship.

Employed in Country of Citizenship, by Gender* (Respondents Who Work for an Employer)		
	Gender	
	Male	**Female**
Response	**(*n* = 2,249)**	**(*n* = 969)**
Yes	81%	85%
No	19%	**15%**
Total	100%	100%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.		

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%) were working outside of the United States.

Employed in Country of Citizenship, by Country of Citizenship* (Respondents Who Work for an Employer)					
	World Region				
	Asia	**United States**	**Canada**	**Latin America**	**Europe**
Response	**(*n* = 330)**	**(*n* = 2,069)**	**(*n* = 194)**	**(*n* = 167)**	**(*n* = 376)**
Yes	**46%**	**96%**	80%	**46%**	**58%**
No	**54%**	**4%**	20%	**54%**	**42%**
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.					

There are no statistically significant differences in the location of a respondent's employment by graduation year or U.S. subgroup.

Scope of Organization

Two-thirds of the respondents worked for multinational organizations, 17% worked for national organizations, 9% worked for regional organizations, and 8% worked for local organizations.

Scope of Organization (Respondents Who Work for an Employer)	
Response	**(*n* = 3,224)**
Local	8%
Regional	9%
National	17%
Multinational	67%
Total	100%

Respondents who work outside their country of citizenship are significantly more likely to be working for a multinational organization than respondents working in their country of citizenship. Conversely, respondents working in their country of citizenship are more likely to be working in a national or local organization.

Scope of Organization, by Location of Employment* (Respondents Who Work for an Employer)		
	In Country of Citizenship	**Outside Country of Citizenship**
Response	**(*n* = 2,643)**	**(*n* = 581)**
Local	8%	**4%**
Regional	9%	7%
National	**19%**	**8%**
Multinational	**63%**	**82%**
Total	100%	100%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.		

Respondents from part-time programs are significantly more likely than respondents from other programs to be working for a local organization. Although more than half (61%) of respondents from part-time programs work for multinational organizations, they are the least likely to be working for such an organization.

Scope of Organization, by Program Type* (Respondents Who Work for an Employer)			
	Program Type		
	Full-Time	**Part-Time**	**Executive**
Response	**(*n* = 2,193)**	**(*n* = 780)**	**(*n* = 219)**
Local	6%	**12%**	5%
Regional	8%	10%	8%
National	17%	18%	18%
Multinational	69%	**61%**	69%
Total	100%	100%	100%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.			

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

Scope of Organization, by Gender* (Respondents Who Work for an Employer)		
	Gender	
	Male	**Female**
Response	**(*n* = 2,249)**	**(*n* = 967)**
Local	**6%**	**10%**
Regional	8%	9%
National	16%	18%
Multinational	69%	62%
Total	100%	100%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.		

Europeans and respondents from Latin America 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 local or regional organization.

Scope of Organization, by Country of Citizenship* (Respondents Who Work for an Employer)					
	World Region				
	Asia	**United States**	**Canada**	**Latin America**	**Europe**
Response	**(*n* = 329)**	**(*n* = 2,068)**	**(*n* = 194)**	**(*n* = 167)**	**(*n* = 376)**
Local	8%	**9%**	5%	4%	**3%**
Regional	9%	**9%**	10%	7%	**5%**
National	**12%**	18%	16%	11%	15%
Multinational	71%	**64%**	68%	**78%**	**77%**
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.					

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

Size of Organization

About one-third (35%) of employed respondents were working at organizations with more than 25,000 employees. One in five (20%) worked at organizations with 5,000 to 24,999 employees, 14% worked with 1,000 to 4,999 employees, 20% worked with 50 to 999 employees, and one in ten (10%) worked with fewer than 50 employees.

Only 3% worked in a location with more than 25,000 employees. One in ten (11%) worked at a location with 5,000 to 24,999 employees, 22% worked with 1,000 to 4,999 employees, 43% worked with 50 to 999 employees, and almost one-quarter (22%) worked with fewer than 50 employees.

Number of Employees in Organization (Respondents Who Work for an Employer)		
	All Locations	Location Where Respondent Works
Response	(*n* = 3,171)	(*n* = 3,175)
Fewer than 50	10%	22%
50–999	20%	43%
1,000–4,999	14%	22%
5,000–24,999	20%	11%
More than 25,000	35%	3%
Total	100%	100%

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

Industry

Twenty-one percent of respondents worked in the finance/accounting industry, while another 21% worked in the products/services industry. Fourteen percent worked in the technology industry, and 13% worked in the consulting industry. An additional 11% worked in healthcare/pharmaceuticals, 8% worked in manufacturing, and 6% worked in nonprofit/government industries. Three percent worked in the energy/utility industry.

Type of Industry (Respondents Who Work for an Employer)	
Industry	(*n* = 3,223)
Finance/Accounting	21%
Products/Services	21%
Technology	14%
Consulting	13%

Type of Industry (Respondents Who Work for an Employer)	
Industry	**(*n* = 3,223)**
Healthcare/Pharmaceuticals	11%
Manufacturing	8%
Nonprofit/Government	6%
Energy/Utilities	3%
Other	3%
Total	100%

There are only slight variations in the type of industry in which respondents from various graduating classes are working. The class of 2002 is the least likely to work in finance/accounting. The classes of 2001 and 2002 are more likely than the class of 2005 to work in the nonprofit/government sector.

Type of Industry, by Graduation Year* (Respondents Who Work for an Employer)							
	2000	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**
Industry	**(*n* = 149)**	**(*n* = 224)**	**(*n* = 200)**	**(*n* = 347)**	**(*n* = 538)**	**(*n* = 737)**	**(*n* = 1,028)**
Consulting	11%	12%	9%	13%	11%	15%	14%
Finance/Accounting	23%	18%	**14%**	21%	21%	22%	23%
Products/Services	19%	17%	26%	22%	22%	20%	20%
Manufacturing	11%	8%	10%	8%	7%	8%	7%
Technology	14%	17%	12%	12%	15%	15%	13%
Healthcare/Pharmaceuticals	8%	12%	14%	10%	9%	10%	12%
Energy/Utilities	3%	5%	4%	2%	4%	4%	3%
Nonprofit/Government	7%	**10%**	**10%**	8%	7%	**4%**	6%
Other	3%	0%	4%	4%	3%	2%	3%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

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

Respondents from full-time programs (15%) are significantly more likely than respondents from part-time programs (9%) to work in the consulting industry. Graduates of executive programs are the least likely to work in finance/accounting, but they are the most likely to work in manufacturing or the energy/utility industries. Respondents from part-time programs are more likely than respondents from full-time programs to work in technology. Additionally, respondents from part-time programs are more likely than respondents from executive programs to work in the nonprofit/government sector.

Type of Industry, by Program Type* (Respondents Who Work for an Employer)			
	Program Type		
	Full-Time	Part-Time	Executive
Industry	(*n* = 2,192)	(*n* = 780)	(*n* = 219)
Consulting	**15%**	**9%**	10%
Finance/Accounting	22%	22%	**16%**
Products/Services	21%	20%	18%
Manufacturing	7%	8%	**12%**
Technology	**13%**	**17%**	18%
Healthcare/Pharmaceuticals	10%	12%	14%
Energy/Utilities	3%	3%	**6%**
Nonprofit/Government	6%	**8%**	**3%**
Other	3%	2%	2%
Total	100%	100%	100%
*p ≤ .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 products/services, healthcare/pharmaceuticals, and nonprofit/government industries. Men are significantly more likely than women to work in the consulting and energy/utility industries.

Type of Industry, by Gender* (Respondents Who Work for an Employer)		
	Gender	
	Male	Female
Industry	(*n* = 2,249)	(*n* = 966)
Consulting	14%	**10%**
Finance/Accounting	22%	20%
Products/Services	**19%**	**25%**
Manufacturing	9%	6%
Technology	15%	12%
Healthcare/Pharmaceuticals	10%	**13%**
Energy/Utilities	4%	**2%**
Nonprofit/Government	**5%**	**9%**
Other	3%	2%
Total	100%	100%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.		

Canadian and European respondents are more likely than all other respondents to work in the consulting industry. Asian respondents are more likely than all other respondents to work in finance/accounting and technology. Respondents from Latin America are more likely than European respondents to work in the products/services industry. U.S. respondents are more likely than Asian respondents to work in the healthcare/pharmaceuticals industry. Additionally,

U.S. respondents are more likely than Asian and European respondents to work in the nonprofit/government sector.

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

	World Region				
Response	**Asia (*n* = 329)**	**United States (*n* = 2,067)**	**Canada (*n* = 194)**	**Latin America (*n* = 167)**	**Europe (*n* = 376)**
Consulting	11%	12%	**18%**	11%	**18%**
Finance/Accounting	**28%**	20%	19%	20%	24%
Products/Services	18%	22%	21%	**28%**	**15%**
Manufacturing	8%	8%	**4%**	10%	9%
Technology	**18%**	13%	17%	12%	14%
Healthcare/Pharmaceuticals	**7%**	**12%**	7%	7%	9%
Energy/Utilities	3%	3%	4%	3%	3%
Nonprofit/Government	**4%**	**8%**	6%	5%	**3%**
Other	4%	2%	5%	5%	2%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

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

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

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 employer aspect was the ethical standards of the company, followed by company image and reputation, company stability, and organizational climate. The lowest-rated aspect of employers was the value placed on MBA skills.

Satisfaction with Aspects of Your Employer (Respondents Who Work for an Employer)

		(*n* = 3,231)					
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 the company	4.1	41%	38%	15%	4%	2%	100%
Company image and reputation	4.0	36%	37%	20%	6%	2%	100%
Company stability	3.9	34%	38%	20%	6%	3%	100%
Organizational climate	3.5	20%	31%	30%	13%	6%	100%
Value employer places on MBA skills	3.3	18%	29%	28%	16%	9%	100%

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

The class of 2006 rated satisfaction with various aspects of their employer higher than did all other graduating classes.

Mean Satisfaction with Aspects of Your Employer, by Graduation Year*
(Respondents Who Work for an Employer)

	Graduation Year						
	2000	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**
Employer Aspects	**(*n* = 149)**	**(*n* = 225)**	**(*n* = 200)**	**(*n* = 347)**	**(*n* = 541)**	**(*n* = 740)**	**(*n* = 1,029)**
Ethical standards of the company	4.2	4.1	4.0	4.1	4.0	**4.1**	**4.2**
Company image and reputation	4.0	4.0	**3.8**	4.0	3.9	4.0	**4.1**
Company stability	3.9	3.9	3.8	3.9	3.9	**3.9**	**4.0**
Organizational climate	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.5	**3.4**	**3.4**	**3.6**
Value employer places on MBA skills	3.3	3.2	3.1	3.4	**3.2**	3.3	**3.4**

Scale: 5–1, where 5 = Extremely satisfied; 1 = Not at all satisfied
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.

Respondents from full-time programs rated all aspects of their employer significantly higher than did part-time and executive MBA respondents.

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

	Program Type		
	Full-Time	**Part-Time**	**Executive**
Employer Aspects	**(*n* = 2,197)**	**(*n* = 782)**	**(*n* = 220)**
Company stability	**4.0**	3.8	3.8
Value employer places on MBA skills	**3.4**	2.9	3.1
Company image and reputation	**4.1**	3.9	3.9
Ethical standards of the company	**4.2**	4.0	4.0
Organizational climate	**3.6**	3.2	3.3

Scale: 5–1, where 5 = Extremely satisfied; 1 = Not at all satisfied
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.

Respondents from all the world regions rated their company stability statistically similarly. Latin American respondents are more likely than Asian and European respondents to feel that their employer values MBA skills. Latin American respondents rated their company image and reputation more highly than did Asian, U.S., and European respondents. Latin American respondents also rated the ethical standards of their company significantly more highly than did U.S. and European respondents. Additionally, Latin American respondents rated the organizational climate more highly than did U.S. respondents.

Mean Satisfaction with Aspects of Your Employer, by Country of Citizenship* (Respondents Who Work for an Employer)					
	World Region				
Employer Aspects	Asia (*n* = 332)	United States (*n* = 2,072)	Canada (*n* = 194)	Latin America (*n* = 167)	Europe (*n* = 376)
Company stability	3.9	4.0	3.8	4.1	3.9
Value employer places on MBA skills	**3.2**	3.3	3.3	**3.6**	**3.2**
Company image and reputation	**3.9**	**4.0**	4.0	**4.2**	**3.9**
Ethical standards of the company	4.0	**4.1**	4.0	**4.3**	**4.0**
Organizational climate	3.5	**3.4**	3.5	**3.7**	3.6

Scale: 5–1, where 5 = Extremely satisfied; 1 = Not at all satisfied
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.

Hispanic and white U.S. respondents rated the ethical standards of their company significantly higher than did African American respondents. Additionally, there are significant differences in the satisfaction with the value one's employer places on MBA skills by U.S. subgroup.

Mean Satisfaction with Aspects of Your Employer, by U.S. Subgroup (Respondents Who Work for an Employer)				
	U.S. Subgroup			
Employer Aspects	Asian American (*n* = 136)	African American (*n* = 68)	White (*n* = 1,663)	Hispanic (*n* = 69)
Company stability	4.0	3.8	4.0	4.2
Value employer places on MBA skills*	3.5	3.2	3.3	3.7
Company image and reputation	4.0	3.9	4.0	4.3
Ethical standards of the company*	4.0	**3.8**	**4.2**	**4.3**
Organizational climate	3.6	3.2	3.4	3.7

Scale: 5–1, where 5 = Extremely satisfied; 1 = Not at all satisfied
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.

Respondents in the consulting, finance/accounting, and nonprofit/government industries rated their company stability significantly higher than did respondents in the manufacturing and technology industries. Additionally, respondents in the finance/accounting and nonprofit/government industries rated their company stability higher than did respondents in the products/services industry. Furthermore, respondents in the products/services industry rated their company stability higher than did respondents in the technology industry.

Respondents in the consulting industry are more likely to feel that their employer values MBA skills than are respondents in the products/services, manufacturing, and technology industries. Additionally, respondents in the finance/accounting and healthcare/pharmaceuticals industries rate this aspect higher than did respondents in the nonprofit/government sector.

The respondents in the finance/accounting industry rated their company image and reputation higher than did respondents in manufacturing and technology.

The organizational climate was rated higher among respondents in the consulting industry than it was among respondents in the products/services, manufacturing, technology, healthcare/pharmaceuticals, and nonprofit/government industries. Additionally, respondents in the finance/accounting industry rated this aspect higher than did respondents in manufacturing, technology, and nonprofit/government industries.

**Mean Satisfaction with Aspects of Your Employer, by Industry Type*
(Respondents 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**	4.0	4.2	**3.7**
Finance/Accounting	**4.1**	3.4	**4.1**	4.2	**3.6**
Product/Services	**3.9**	**3.2**	4.0	4.1	**3.5**
Manufacturing	**3.7**	**3.2**	**3.8**	4.0	**3.2**
Technology	**3.7**	**3.2**	**3.9**	4.0	**3.4**
Healthcare/ Pharmaceuticals	4.0	**3.4**	4.0	4.2	**3.4**
Energy/Utilities	3.9	3.2	3.9	4.1	3.4
Nonprofit/Government	4.2	**3.0**	3.9	4.0	**3.3**

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

*$p \leq .05$; 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 respondent gender.

Current Job

Job Function

More than one-quarter (27%) of respondents were working in a finance/accounting function, 25% in a marketing/sales function, and 17% in a consulting function. Additionally, 11% were working in operations/logistics, 10% in general management, 6% in information technology, and 3% in human resources.

Job Function (Respondents Who Work for an Employer)	
Job Function	**(*n* = 3,214)**
Finance/Accounting	27%
Marketing/Sales	25%
Consulting	17%
Operations/Logistics	11%
General management	10%
Information technology/MIS	6%
Human resources	3%
Other	2%
Total	100%

The class of 2006 is more likely than the class of 2003 to work in an operations/logistics position, as well as more likely than all other respondents to work in an information technology position. The class of 2005 is the most likely of the respondents to work in a consulting position, and the class of 2001 is the most likely to work in general management.

Job Function, by Graduation Year* (Respondents Who Work for an Employer)							
	Graduation Year						
	2000	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**
Job Function	**(*n* = 148)**	**(*n* = 223)**	**(*n* = 199)**	**(*n* = 346)**	**(*n* = 536)**	**(*n* = 736)**	**(*n* = 1,026)**
Marketing/Sales	23%	23%	27%	27%	28%	23%	24%
Operations/Logistics	10%	9%	12%	**7%**	10%	11%	**13%**
Consulting	15%	13%	16%	18%	16%	**21%**	16%
General management	10%	**19%**	13%	11%	8%	9%	9%
Finance/Accounting	29%	26%	25%	31%	28%	28%	26%
Human resources	3%	4%	**0%**	2%	3%	2%	3%
Information technology/MIS	7%	5%	4%	4%	6%	6%	**8%**
Other	**3%**	2%	**4%**	1%	2%	1%	1%
*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.							

Respondents from part-time and executive programs are twice as likely as those from full-time programs to work in operations/logistics. Full-time respondents are more likely than part-time respondents to work in consulting, and part-time respondents are more likely than full-time respondents to work in information technology. Respondents from executive programs are the most likely to work in general management positions and less likely than full-time respondents to work in finance/accounting positions.

Job Function, by Program Type*
(Respondents Who Work for an Employer)

	Program Type		
	Full-Time	**Part-Time**	**Executive**
Job Function	**(*n* = 2,186)**	**(*n* = 777)**	**(*n* = 219)**
Marketing/Sales	26%	23%	21%
Operations/Logistics	**8%**	**17%**	**18%**
Consulting	**20%**	**9%**	16%
General management	10%	8%	**18%**
Finance/Accounting	**30%**	25%	**14%**
Human resources	2%	**4%**	2%
Information technology/MIS	**4%**	**13%**	9%
Other	1%	1%	**3%**
Total	100%	100%	100%

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

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

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

	Gender	
	Male	**Female**
Job Function	**(*n* = 2,244)**	**(*n* =962)**
Marketing/Sales	**22%**	**31%**
Operations/Logistics	12%	**9%**
Consulting	18%	15%
General management	11%	**8%**
Finance/Accounting	28%	27%
Human resources	**2%**	**5%**
Information technology/MIS	7%	**5%**
Other	1%	2%
Total	100%	100%

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

European and Canadian respondents are more likely than U.S. respondents to work in a consulting position. European respondents are more likely than all others to work in general management. Asians are more likely than Europeans to work in finance/accounting, while U.S. citizens are more likely than Asians to work in human resources.

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

	World Region				
Job Function	**Asia (*n* = 328)**	**United States (*n* = 2,061)**	**Canada (*n* = 193)**	**Latin America (*n* = 167)**	**Europe (*n* = 375)**
Marketing/Sales	22%	25%	27%	25%	25%
Operations/Logistics	9%	12%	9%	11%	8%
Consulting	16%	**15%**	**26%**	16%	**23%**
General management	8%	10%	8%	8%	**14%**
Finance/Accounting	**36%**	27%	22%	33%	**22%**
Human resources	**1%**	**3%**	3%	1%	1%
Information technology/MIS	8%	7%	4%	5%	5%
Other	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

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

There are no statistically significant differences in job function by U.S. subgroups.

Job Level

Less than 1% of the respondents who were working for an employer were the CEO or head of their organization. One in eight (12%) respondents reported to the CEO or head of the organization directly. More than one-third (37%) of respondents had two to three levels between themselves and the head of the organization, and 35% had four to six levels between themselves and the organization head. Ten percent had seven or more reporting levels between themselves and the head of the organization. Additionally, 6% of respondents worked for a professional firm with managing partners.

"How many reporting levels are there between you and the CEO/head of the organization?"
(Respondents Who Work for an Employer)

Number of Levels	**(*n* = 3,229)**
None, I am the CEO/head of the organization	<1%
One, I report to the CEO/head of the organization	12%
Two to three	37%
Four to six	35%
Seven to nine	7%
10 or more	3%
Not applicable, I work for a professional firm with managing partners	6%
Total	100%

The classes of 2005 and 2006 are more likely than the classes of 2001 and 2004 to work in a professional firm. Respondents from full-time programs are more likely than respondents from part-time programs to work in a professional firm. Additionally, executive MBA respondents are more likely than all other respondents to report directly to the CEO. Respondents from Europe are more likely than all other respondents to report directly to the CEO. There are no statistically significant differences by U.S. subgroups.

Among respondents who worked for professional firms with managing partners, 2% were managing partners. Nearly one in 10 (9%) was a senior partner, 16% were junior partners, and 35% were managers or senior managers within the professional firm. Additionally, 39% had four or more levels between themselves and the managing partner.

"How many reporting levels are there between you and the managing partners?" (Respondents Who Work for a Professional Firm)	
Number of Levels	**(*n* = 208)**
None, I am a managing partner	2%
One, I am a senior partner	9%
Two, I am a junior partner	16%
Three, I am a manager/senior manager	35%
Four or more	39%
Total	100%

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

Number of Direct Reports

More than one-half (57%) of the employed respondents did not manage other people in their position. About one-third (35%) managed between one and 10 employees, 6% managed 11 to 49, and 2% managed more than 50 employees.

"How many people do you manage?" (Respondents Who Work for an Employer)	
Response	**(*n* = 3,229)**
None	57%
1–10	35%
11–49	6%
50 or more	2%
Total	100%

The class of 2006 is less likely than the classes of 2001 and 2002 to manage other people. The classes of 2001and 2002 are more likely than the class of 2006 to manage between 1 and 10 people. Additionally, the class of 2002 is the most likely to manage 11 to 49 employees.

"How many people do you manage?" by Graduation Year* (Respondents Who Work for an Employer)							
	Graduation Year						
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Number of People Managed	(*n* = 149)	(*n* = 225)	(*n* = 200)	(*n* = 347)	(*n* = 539)	(*n* = 740)	(*n* = 1,029)
None	47%	**44%**	**45%**	51%	55%	60%	**63%**
1–10	43%	**45%**	**44%**	40%	37%	32%	**29%**
11–49	7%	8%	**9%**	7%	5%	5%	5%
50 or more	3%	3%	2%	1%	2%	2%	2%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.							

Respondents from full-time programs are the least likely to manage other employees in their current position. Respondents from part-time programs are more likely than respondents from full-time programs to manage between one and 10 employees, while respondents from executive programs are more likely than respondents from full-time programs to manage 11 or more employees.

"How many people do you manage?" by Program Type* (Respondents Who Work for an Employer)			
	Program Type		
	Full-Time	Part-Time	Executive
Number of People Managed	(*n* = 2,196)	(*n* = 781)	(*n* = 220)
None	**61%**	**50%**	**40%**
1–10	**33%**	**40%**	41%
11–49	**5%**	7%	**14%**
50 or more	**2%**	3%	**6%**
Total	100%	100%	100%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.			

Women are less likely to have management responsibilities than men.

"How many people do you manage?" by Gender* (Respondents Who Work for an Employer)		
	Gender	
	Male	Female
Number of People Managed	(*n* = 2,250)	(*n* = 971)
None	55%	**62%**
1–10	36%	33%
11–49	7%	**4%**
50 or more	3%	2%
Total	100%	100%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.		

Respondents from Latin America are the most likely to have management responsibilities. Respondents from Europe are more likely than respondents from Canada to manage 11 to 50 employees.

"How many people do you manage?" by World Region*
(Respondents Who Work for an Employer)

	World Region				
Number of People Managed	**Asia (*n* = 331)**	**United States (*n* = 2,071)**	**Canada (*n* = 194)**	**Latin America (*n* = 167)**	**Europe (*n* = 376)**
None	55%	59%	61%	**44%**	52%
1–10	38%	34%	36%	**44%**	35%
11–49	5%	5%	**3%**	9%	**10%**
50 or more	2%	2%	1%	3%	3%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

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

There are no statistically significant differences in the number of people managed by 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 were significant differences at the 95% confidence level between the respondent mean satisfaction rating with each aspect of the job, with two exceptions: between the opportunity to learn new things and job autonomy, which were both statistically rated the highest areas of satisfaction, and between the opportunity to use skills and the opportunity for advancement. The next highest areas of respondent satisfaction, by order of preference, were challenging and interesting work, job security, and benefits. The lowest-rated aspect of the job was pay.

Mean Satisfaction with Aspects of Your Job
(Respondents Who Work for an Employer)

		(*n* = 3,232)					
Job Aspects	**Mean***	**Extremely Satisfied (5)**	**Very Satisfied (4)**	**Somewhat Satisfied (3)**	**Not Very Satisfied (2)**	**Not at all Satisfied (1)**	**Total**
Job autonomy	3.9	30%	41%	21%	5%	2%	100%
Opportunity to learn new things	3.9	33%	35%	21%	8%	2%	100%
Challenging and interesting work	3.8	31%	35%	23%	8%	3%	100%
Job security	3.7	22%	42%	27%	6%	3%	100%

Mean Satisfaction with Aspects of Your Job (Respondents Who Work for an Employer)							
		(*n* = 3,232)					
Job Aspects	Mean*	Extremely Satisfied (5)	Very Satisfied (4)	Somewhat Satisfied (3)	Not Very Satisfied (2)	Not at all Satisfied (1)	Total
Benefits	3.7	22%	38%	29%	9%	3%	100%
Achieving something that you personally value	3.6	22%	35%	27%	10%	5%	100%
Opportunity to use your skills to the maximum	3.5	19%	33%	29%	14%	6%	100%
Opportunity for advancement	3.4	20%	32%	28%	13%	7%	100%
Pay	3.4	12%	34%	36%	13%	5%	100%
*Scale: 5–1, where 5 = Extremely satisfied; 1 = Not at all satisfied							

The class of 2006 rated benefits significantly higher than did the classes of 2004 and 2005. Additionally, the classes of 2006 and 2001 rated their pay significantly higher than did the class of 2004.

Mean Satisfaction with Aspects of Your Job, by Graduation Year (Respondents Who Work for an Employer)							
	Graduation Year						
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Job Aspects	(*n* = 149)	(*n* = 225)	(*n* = 201)	(*n* = 347)	(*n* = 541)	(*n* = 740)	(*n* = 1,029)
Opportunity to use your skills to the maximum	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.5	3.4	3.5
Achieving something that you personally value	3.6	3.6	3.5	3.7	3.6	3.5	3.6
Job autonomy	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.9	4.0	3.9	4.0
Challenging and interesting work	3.9	3.8	3.8	3.9	3.8	3.8	3.8
Opportunity for advancement	3.3	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.5
Job security	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.8	3.7	3.8
Opportunity to learn new things	3.8	3.8	3.7	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.9
Benefits*	3.6	3.7	3.6	3.6	**3.6**	**3.6**	**3.8**
Pay*	3.3	**3.5**	3.3	3.4	**3.2**	3.3	**3.4**
Scale: 5–1, where 5 = Extremely satisfied; 1 = Not at all satisfied *p ≤ .05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.							

Respondents from part-time programs rated the following aspects of their job lower than did respondents from full-time and executive programs: achieving something you personally value, challenging and interesting work, and the opportunity to learn new things. Respondents from full-time programs rated the opportunity to use their skills to the maximum higher than did respondents from part-time programs. Additionally, respondents from executive programs rated job autonomy and pay higher than did respondents from part-time programs.

Mean Satisfaction with Aspects of Your Job, by Program Type (Respondents Who Work for an Employer)			
	Program Type		
	Full-Time	Part-Time	Executive
Job Aspects	(*n* = 2,198)	(*n* = 782)	(*n* = 220)
Opportunity to use your skills to the maximum*	**3.5**	**3.2**	3.4
Achieving something that you personally value*	3.7	**3.4**	3.7
Job autonomy*	3.9	**3.8**	**4.0**
Challenging and interesting work*	3.9	**3.6**	3.8
Opportunity for advancement*	**3.6**	3.1	3.2
Job security	3.8	3.7	3.7
Opportunity to learn new things*	4.0	**3.6**	3.9
Benefits	3.7	3.7	3.7
Pay*	3.4	**3.3**	**3.5**
Scale: 5–1, where 5 = Extremely satisfied; 1 = Not at all satisfied *p ≤ .05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.			

Men rated the opportunity for advancement and pay slightly, yet significantly, higher than did women.

Mean Satisfaction with Aspects of Your Job, by Gender (Respondents Who Work for an Employer)		
	Gender	
	Male	Female
Job Aspects	(*n* = 2,251)	(*n* = 973)
Opportunity to use your skills to the maximum	3.5	3.4
Achieving something that you personally value	3.6	3.6
Job autonomy	3.9	3.9
Challenging and interesting work	3.8	3.8
Opportunity for advancement*	**3.5**	**3.4**
Job security	3.7	3.8
Opportunity to learn new things	3.9	3.9
Benefits	3.7	3.7
Pay*	**3.4**	**3.3**
Scale: 5–1, where 5 = Extremely satisfied; 1 = Not at all satisfied *p ≤ .05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.		

Respondents from Latin America are more likely than respondents from Canada to feel that they are achieving something they personally value. Respondents from the U.S. are more likely than respondents from Asia and Europe to rate their benefits higher. U.S. respondents also rated their pay higher than did respondents from Asia.

Mean Satisfaction with Aspects of Your Job, by Country of Citizenship (Respondents Who Work for an Employer)					
	World Region				
Job Aspects	Asia (*n* = 333)	United States (*n* = 2,072)	Canada (*n* = 194)	Latin America (*n* = 167)	Europe (*n* = 376)
Opportunity to use your skills to the maximum	3.4	3.5	3.3	3.6	3.5
Achieving something that you personally value*	3.6	3.6	**3.4**	**3.8**	3.6
Job autonomy	3.8	3.9	3.9	4.1	3.9
Challenging and interesting work*	3.7	3.8	3.7	4.0	3.9
Opportunity for advancement	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.7	3.5
Job security	3.7	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.7
Opportunity to learn new things	3.8	3.9	3.9	4.0	4.0
Benefits*	**3.4**	**3.8**	3.6	3.6	**3.4**
Pay*	**3.2**	**3.4**	3.3	3.4	3.3

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

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

Asian Americans and Hispanics rated the opportunity to use their skills higher than did African Americans. Additionally, Hispanics are more likely to feel that they have an opportunity to learn new things than are African Americans. Whites and Hispanics are more likely to feel their work is challenging and interesting than are African Americans. African Americans are less likely than other U.S. respondents to be satisfied that they are achieving something they personally value and with the opportunity for advancement. Additionally, whites are more likely to be satisfied with their pay than are African Americans.

Mean Satisfaction with Aspects of Your Job, by U.S. Subgroup (Respondents Who Work for an Employer)				
	U.S. Subgroup			
Job Aspects	Asian American (*n* = 136)	African American (*n* = 68)	White (*n* = 1,663)	Hispanic (*n* = 69)
Opportunity to use your skills to the maximum*	**3.6**	**3.1**	3.5	**3.6**
Achieving something that you personally value*	3.7	**3.2**	3.6	3.8
Job autonomy	3.9	3.7	3.9	4.2
Challenging and interesting work*	3.9	**3.5**	**3.8**	**4.0**
Opportunity for advancement*	3.5	**3.0**	3.4	3.6
Job security	3.8	3.6	3.8	4.0
Opportunity to learn new things*	4.0	**3.6**	3.9	**4.0**
Benefits	3.7	3.6	3.8	4.0
Pay*	3.3	**3.1**	**3.4**	3.4

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

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

Respondents in the consulting industry are more likely to report they are satisfied with the opportunity to use their skills to the maximum and to learn new things than are respondents in the finance/accounting, products/services, and nonprofit/government industries. Additionally, respondents in consulting report higher satisfaction with learning new things than do respondents in manufacturing.

Respondents in the nonprofit/government and healthcare/pharmaceuticals industries report greater satisfaction with achieving something they personally value than do respondents in the products/services and manufacturing industries. Additionally, respondents in the nonprofit/government industry report higher satisfaction with this aspect than do respondents in the finance/accounting industry.

Respondents in the consulting industry are more satisfied that their job is challenging and interesting than are respondents in the products/services and manufacturing industries.

Respondents in the consulting industry are also more satisfied with their advancement opportunities than are those in the products/services, manufacturing, technology, healthcare/pharmaceuticals, and nonprofit/government industries. Additionally, respondents in the finance/accounting industry are more satisfied with this aspect than are those in technology, healthcare/pharmaceuticals, and nonprofit/government industries.

Respondents in the nonprofit/government industry report higher levels of satisfaction with job security than do respondents in all other industries, except the energy/utility industry.

Respondents in finance/accounting, energy/utilities, and nonprofit/government industries are more satisfied with their benefits than are respondents in the products/services industry. Additionally, respondents in the nonprofit/government industry are more satisfied with their benefits than are those in consulting.

Respondents in consulting, finance/accounting, and technology are more satisfied with their pay than are respondents in products/services and nonprofit/government. Additionally, respondents in manufacturing, healthcare/pharmaceuticals, and energy/utilities are more satisfied with their pay than are respondents in the nonprofit/government industry.

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

	Industry							
Job Aspects	**Consulting (*n* = 415)**	**Finance/ Accounting (*n* = 691)**	**Products/ Services (*n* = 667)**	**Manufacturing (*n* = 256)**	**Technology (*n* = 448)**	**Healthcare/ Pharm. (*n* = 341)**	**Energy/ Utilities (*n* = 111)**	**Nonprofit/ government (*n* = 207)**
Opportunity to use your skills to the maximum*	**3.7**	**3.5**	**3.4**	3.3	3.5	3.4	3.6	**3.3**
Achieving something that you personally value*	3.6	**3.6**	**3.5**	**3.5**	3.6	**3.8**	3.6	**3.8**

Mean Satisfaction with Aspects of Your Job, by Industry (Respondents Who Work for an Employer)								
	Industry							
Job Aspects	Consulting (*n* = 415)	Finance/ Accounting (*n* = 691)	Products/ Services (*n* = 667)	Manufacturing (*n* = 256)	Technology (*n* = 448)	Healthcare/ Pharm. (*n* = 341)	Energy/ Utilities (*n* = 111)	Nonprofit/ government (*n* = 207)
Job autonomy	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.9	4.0	3.9	3.9	4.0
Challenging and interesting work*	**4.0**	3.8	**3.7**	**3.7**	3.9	3.8	3.8	3.9
Opportunity for advancement*	**3.7**	**3.6**	**3.4**	3.4	**3.3**	**3.3**	3.5	**3.2**
Job security*	**3.7**	**3.8**	**3.8**	**3.7**	**3.6**	**3.7**	3.8	**4.1**
Opportunity to learn new things*	**4.1**	**3.9**	**3.8**	**3.8**	3.9	3.9	3.9	**3.9**
Benefits*	**3.6**	**3.8**	**3.5**	3.7	3.7	3.7	**3.9**	**3.8**
Pay*	**3.6**	**3.4**	**3.2**	**3.4**	**3.4**	**3.4**	**3.5**	**3.1**

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

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

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 8% 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?" (Respondents Who Work for an Employer)	
Response	**(*n* = 3,249)**
Very much like	50%
Somewhat like	41%
Not very much like	8%
Total	100%

The class of 2003 is significantly the least likely to state that the job they accepted 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?", by Graduation Year* (Respondents Who Work for an Employer)							
	Graduation Year						
	2000	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**
Response	**(*n* = 149)**	**(*n* = 225)**	**(*n* = 202)**	**(*n* = 348)**	**(*n* = 542)**	**(*n* = 744)**	**(*n* = 1,039)**
Very much like	55%	55%	50%	50%	52%	47%	51%
Somewhat like	38%	35%	39%	45%	40%	43%	42%
Not very much like	7%	10%	12%	**5%**	9%	10%	7%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.							

Respondents from 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 respondents 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* (Respondents Who Work for an Employer)			
	Program Type		
	Full-Time	**Part-Time**	**Executive**
Response	**(*n* = 2,212)**	**(*n* = 784)**	**(*n* = 221)**
Very much like	53%	**43%**	51%
Somewhat like	40%	45%	40%
Not very much like	7%	**11%**	9%
Total	100%	100%	100%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X2 statistic of the contingency table.			

African American respondents are the least likely U.S. subgroup to report that their job is very much like the one they wanted and the most likely to report that the job is not very much like the one they wanted when they took it.

"In general, does your job measure up to the sort of job you wanted when you took it?" by U.S. Subgroup* (Respondents Who Work for an Employer)				
	U.S. Subgroup			
	Asian American	**African American**	**White**	**Hispanic**
Response	**(*n* = 136)**	**(*n* = 69)**	**(*n* = 1,667)**	**(*n* = 69)**
Very much like	55%	**33%**	52%	61%
Somewhat like	35%	51%	40%	29%
Not very much like	10%	**16%**	8%	10%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.				

There are no statistically significant differences by gender or world region 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 (Respondents Who Work for an Employer)	
Response	**(*n* = 3,250)**
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%

Although the majority of each class report that they would take the same job without hesitation, the class of 2005 is the least likely to report that they would decide without hesitation to take the same job again.

Reflection on Job Choice, by Graduation Year* (Respondents Who Work for an Employer)							
	Graduation Year						
	2000	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**
Response	**(*n* = 149)**	**(*n* = 225)**	**(*n* = 202)**	**(*n* = 348)**	**(*n* = 542)**	**(*n* = 744)**	**(*n* = 1,039)**
I would decide without hesitation to take the same job.	67%	71%	64%	68%	68%	**60%**	68%
I would have second thoughts.	30%	28%	32%	29%	27%	**34%**	28%
I would decide definitely not to take the same job.	3%	**2%**	4%	3%	5%	**6%**	4%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.							

Asian respondents are the most likely to have second thoughts about taking the same job again.

Reflection on Job Choice, by Country of Citizenship* (Respondents Who Work for an Employer)					
	World Region				
Response	Asia (*n* = 337)	United States (*n* = 2,078)	Canada (*n* = 196)	Latin America (*n* = 170)	Europe (*n* = 379)
I would decide without hesitation to take the same job.	59%	67%	61%	69%	67%
I would have second thoughts.	**37%**	28%	35%	27%	30%
I would decide definitely not to take the same job.	4%	5%	4%	4%	3%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.					

African American respondents are the least likely U.S. subgroup to report that they would take their job again without hesitation and the most likely to report that they would definitely not take the same job again.

Reflection on Job Choice, by U.S. Subgroup* (Respondents Who Work for an Employer)				
	U.S. Subgroup			
Response	Asian American (*n* = 137)	African American (*n* = 69)	White (*n* = 1,667)	Hispanic (*n* = 69)
I would decide without hesitation to take the same job.	66%	**45%**	69%	75%
I would have second thoughts.	32%	**45%**	27%	22%
I would decide definitely not to take the same job.	2%	**10%**	5%	3%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.				

There are no statistically significant differences in the reflection on job choice by program type or gender.

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 leadership skills and technical skills, managing change and technical skills, integrating information and oral communication, and cost/benefit analysis and financial analysis are not statistically different. On average, respondents use interpersonal skills significantly more than all other skills or abilities in their current job, followed by analytical thinking abilities, the ability to integrate information from a wide variety of sources, and oral communication skills.

Skills and Abilities Used in Current Job (Respondents Who Work for an Employer)							
	(*n* = 3,234)						
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	60%	30%	8%	2%	0%	100%
Analytical thinking abilities	4.3	50%	33%	12%	4%	1%	100%
Ability to integrate information from a wide variety of sources	4.3	54%	32%	10%	3%	1%	100%
Oral communication skills	4.3	53%	33%	10%	3%	1%	100%
Written communication skills	4.2	46%	34%	15%	4%	1%	100%
Creative problem-solving skills	4.1	41%	36%	16%	5%	1%	100%
Strategic thinking abilities	4.0	39%	33%	18%	7%	3%	100%
Leadership skills	3.8	33%	32%	23%	9%	4%	100%
Technical skills for your specialty	3.8	32%	32%	24%	9%	3%	100%
Managing change	3.8	33%	31%	21%	10%	5%	100%
Networking skills	3.6	25%	32%	27%	12%	4%	100%
Analyzing, organizing, and interpreting statistical data	3.5	27%	25%	25%	16%	7%	100%
Conducting cost/benefit analyses of proposed changes	3.2	18%	24%	25%	18%	14%	100%
Conducting financial analyses and preparing a budget	3.2	22%	21%	23%	18%	16%	100%
Recruiting, managing, and maintaining staff	2.7	13%	16%	21%	22%	28%	100%
Scale: 5–1, where 5 = A Great Deal; 1 = Not at all							

The classes of 2000 and 2001 use leadership skills significantly more in their current job than do the classes of 2003, 2004, 2005, and 2006. The class of 2006 reports using networking skills significantly more often than do respondents from the class of 2004.

Skills and Abilities Used in Current Job, by Graduation Year – Mean Score (Respondents Who Work for an Employer)							
	Graduation Year						
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Skill/Ability	(*n* = 149)	(*n* = 225)	(*n* = 201)	(*n* = 347)	(*n* = 542)	(*n* = 741)	(*n* = 1,029)
Leadership skills*	**4.1**	**4.1**	3.9	**3.8**	**3.8**	**3.8**	**3.8**
Technical skills for your specialty	3.7	3.8	3.6	3.8	3.8	3.9	3.8
Analytical thinking abilities	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3
Strategic thinking abilities	4.1	4.1	3.9	4.0	3.9	4.0	4.0
Creative problem-solving skills	4.2	4.2	4.0	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1
Ability to integrate information from a wide variety of sources	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.4	4.4
Oral communication skills	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.4	4.3
Written communication skills	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.2
Networking skills*	3.6	3.7	3.5	3.6	**3.5**	3.6	**3.7**

Skills and Abilities Used in Current Job, by Graduation Year – Mean Score (Respondents Who Work for an Employer)							
	Graduation Year						
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Skill/Ability	(*n* = 149)	(*n* = 225)	(*n* = 201)	(*n* = 347)	(*n* = 542)	(*n* = 741)	(*n* = 1,029)
Interpersonal skills	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.4
Analyzing, organizing, and interpreting statistical data	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5
Recruiting, managing, and maintaining staff*	3.0	3.0	2.8	2.7	2.6	2.6	2.5
Conducting cost/benefit analyses of proposed changes	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.1	3.2	3.1
Conducting financial analyses and preparing a budget	3.3	3.3	3.2	3.2	3.1	3.2	3.1
Managing change*	4.0	3.9	3.8	3.7	3.8	3.7	3.7
Scale: 5–1, where 5 = A Great Deal; 1 = Not at all *p ≤ .05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.							

Respondents from executive programs are the most likely to report the use of leadership skills; creative problem-solving skills; and staff recruitment, management, and maintenance skills. The following skills are used most by executive program respondents, followed by full-time program respondents and part-time program respondents: strategic thinking abilities, oral communication skills, and conducting cost/benefit analyses of proposed changes. Respondents from part-time programs are the least likely to report using analytical thinking abilities, the ability to integrate information, networking skills, and conducting financial analyses and preparing a budget. Managing changes is a skill used most often by respondents from executive programs, followed by respondents from part-time and full-time programs, respectively.

Skills and Abilities Used in Current Job, by Program Type – Mean Score (Respondents Who Work for an Employer)			
	Program Type		
	Full-Time	Part-Time	Executive
Skill/Ability	(*n* = 2,199)	(*n* = 782)	(*n* = 221)
Leadership skills*	3.8	3.8	**4.2**
Technical skills for your specialty	3.8	3.9	3.9
Analytical thinking abilities*	4.3	**4.2**	4.4
Strategic thinking abilities*	**4.0**	**3.9**	**4.2**
Creative problem-solving skills*	4.1	4.1	**4.3**
Ability to integrate information from a wide variety of sources*	4.4	**4.2**	4.4
Oral communication skills*	**4.4**	**4.3**	**4.5**
Written communication skills	4.2	4.2	4.2
Networking skills*	3.7	**3.5**	3.8
Interpersonal skills*	4.5	**4.4**	**4.6**
Analyzing, organizing, and interpreting statistical data	3.5	3.5	3.4
Recruiting, managing, and maintaining staff*	2.6	2.7	**3.1**

Skills and Abilities Used in Current Job, by Program Type – Mean Score (Respondents Who Work for an Employer)			
	Program Type		
Skill/Ability	Full-Time (*n* = 2,199)	Part-Time (*n* = 782)	Executive (*n* = 221)
Conducting cost/benefit analyses of proposed changes*	**3.2**	**3.0**	**3.5**
Conducting financial analyses and preparing a budget*	3.2	**2.9**	3.2
Managing change*	**3.7**	**3.8**	**4.1**
Scale: 5–1, where 5 = A Great Deal; 1 = Not at all *p ≤ .05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.			

Men use the following skills and abilities on the job more often than do women:

- Analyzing, organizing, and interpreting statistical data
- Recruiting, managing, and maintaining staff
- Conducting financial analyses and preparing a budget
- Conducting cost/benefit analyses of proposed changes

Women use the following skills and abilities on the job more often than do men:

- Oral communication skills
- Written communication skills
- Interpersonal skills

Skills and Abilities Used in Current Job, by Gender – Mean Score (Respondents Who Work for an Employer)		
	Gender	
Skill/Ability	Male (*n* = 2,253)	Female (*n* = 973)
Leadership skills	3.8	3.8
Technical skills for your specialty*	3.8	3.8
Analytical thinking abilities	4.3	4.3
Strategic thinking abilities	4.0	4.0
Creative problem-solving skills	4.1	4.1
Ability to integrate information from a wide variety of sources	4.3	4.4
Oral communication skills*	**4.3**	**4.4**
Written communication skills*	**4.2**	**4.3**
Networking skills	3.6	3.7
Interpersonal skills*	**4.4**	**4.6**
Analyzing, organizing, and interpreting statistical data*	**3.5**	**3.4**
Recruiting, managing, and maintaining staff*	**2.7**	**2.6**
Conducting cost/benefit analyses of proposed changes*	**3.3**	**2.9**
Conducting financial analyses and preparing a budget*	**3.2**	**3.0**
Managing change	3.7	3.8
Scale: 5–1, where 5 = A Great Deal; 1 = Not at all *p ≤ .05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.		

Respondents from the United States and Latin America use leadership skills more often than do respondents from Asia and Canada. Respondents from the United States are also more likely to use written communication skills than are respondents from Europe. European and U.S. respondents are more likely to use interpersonal skills on the job than are Asian respondents. Latin American and Asian respondents report conducting cost/benefit analyses more often than do U.S. and Canadian respondents, while Latin American respondents conduct financial analyses more often than do respondents from the United States and Canada. Statistically, respondents from the United States manage change more often than do respondents from Asia and Europe.

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

	World Region				
Skill/Ability	**Asia (*n* = 333)**	**United States (*n* = 2,072)**	**Canada (*n* = 195)**	**Latin America (*n* = 167)**	**Europe (*n* = 377)**
Leadership skills*	**3.7**	**3.9**	**3.7**	**4.0**	3.8
Technical skills for your specialty	3.8	3.8	3.7	3.9	3.7
Analytical thinking abilities	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.4	4.2
Strategic thinking abilities	3.9	4.0	4.0	4.1	3.9
Creative problem-solving skills*	4.0	4.1	4.1	4.2	4.0
Ability to integrate information from a wide variety of sources	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.3
Oral communication skills*	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.4	4.3
Written communication skills*	4.1	**4.3**	4.2	4.2	**4.1**
Networking skills	3.6	3.6	3.7	3.7	3.7
Interpersonal skills*	**4.3**	**4.5**	4.5	4.5	**4.4**
Analyzing, organizing, and interpreting statistical data	3.6	3.5	3.4	3.6	3.4
Recruiting, managing, and maintaining staff	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.8	2.8
Conducting cost/benefit analyses of proposed changes*	**3.4**	**3.1**	**3.1**	**3.5**	3.2
Conducting financial analyses and preparing a budget*	3.3	**3.1**	**3.0**	**3.5**	3.2
Managing change*	**3.6**	**3.8**	3.6	3.6	**3.7**

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

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

Asian Americans are more likely to report using technical skills than are African Americans. Additionally, Asian Americans report using networking skills more often do whites.

Skills and Abilities Used in Current Job, by U.S. Subgroup – Mean Score (Respondents Who Work for an Employer)				
	U.S. Subgroup			
Skill/Ability	Asian American (*n* = 136)	African American (*n* = 68)	White (*n* = 1,663)	Hispanic (*n* = 69)
Leadership skills	4.0	3.9	3.8	3.9
Technical skills for your specialty*	**4.0**	**3.5**	3.8	3.9
Analytical thinking abilities	4.4	4.1	4.3	4.4
Strategic thinking abilities	4.1	3.9	4.0	4.0
Creative problem-solving skills	4.3	4.0	4.1	4.2
Ability to integrate information from a wide variety of sources	4.5	4.3	4.4	4.5
Oral communication skills	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.5
Written communication skills	4.3	4.2	4.3	4.4
Networking skills*	**4.0**	3.6	**3.6**	3.7
Interpersonal skills	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.6
Analyzing, organizing, and interpreting statistical data	3.8	3.4	3.5	3.5
Recruiting, managing, and maintaining staff	2.9	2.5	2.7	2.4
Conducting cost/benefit analyses of proposed changes	3.3	3.1	3.1	3.0
Conducting financial analyses and preparing a budget	3.1	2.9	3.1	3.1
Managing change*	4.1	4.0	3.8	3.7

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

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

Promotions

Overall, 43% of respondents have received a promotion in their current job. Among respondents who received a promotion, nearly half (48%) received one promotion, 24% received two promotions, and 27% received three or more promotions. Additionally, half (50%) received one promotion that involved a title change, 20% received two title changes, 22% received three or more title changes, and 8% received a promotion without a title change. Finally, among respondents who received a promotion, 48% received one pay raise, 22% received two, 24% received three or more pay raises, and 6% received a promotion without a pay raise.

Promotions (Respondents Who Work for an Employer)	
"Since you began working on this job, have you received any promotions?"	**(*n* = 3,252)**
Yes	43%

Promotions (Respondents Who Work for an Employer)		
Number of promotions		**(*n* = 1,395)**
Total number of promotions	1	48%
	2	24%
	3 or more	27%
	Total	100%
Number of promotions that involved a change in job title (collapsed)	0	8%
	1	50%
	2	20%
	3 or more	22%
	Total	100%
Number of promotions that involved a pay raise (collapsed)	0	6%
	1	48%
	2	22%
	3 or more	24%
	Total	100%

The classes of 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, and 2004 are significantly more likely than the classes of 2005 and 2006 to have received a promotion. The class of 2006 is significantly more likely than the classes of 2003 and 2004 to have received three or more promotions in their current job. Considering that 37% of the class of 2006 started their current job prior to entering a graduate management program, it may be that the class has had more promotions due to enrollment and graduation from an MBA program.

Promotions, by Graduation Year (Respondents Who Work for an Employer)								
		Graduation Year						
Since you began working on this job, have you received any promotions?		**2000 (*n* = 149)**	**2001 (*n* = 226)**	**2002 (*n* = 202)**	**2003 (*n* = 348)**	**2004 (*n* = 542)**	**2005 (*n* = 744)**	**2006 (*n* = 1,041)**
Yes*		**65%**	**57%**	**61%**	**54%**	**50%**	**38%**	**29%**
Number of promotions		**(*n* = 97)**	**(*n* = 128)**	**(*n* = 124)**	**(*n* = 189)**	**(*n* = 269)**	**(*n* = 284)**	**(*n* = 305)**
Number of promotions*	1	37%	43%	**37%**	**58%**	**56%**	55%	**40%**
	2	33%	**34%**	30%	27%	25%	**16%**	21%
	3 or more	30%	23%	33%	**15%**	**18%**	29%	**39%**
	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of promotions that involved a change in job title (collapsed)*	0	6%	10%	8%	6%	9%	8%	7%
	1	42%	45%	41%	**64%**	**59%**	54%	**40%**
	2	28%	**29%**	**27%**	20%	17%	**13%**	19%
	3 or more	24%	16%	23%	**10%**	**15%**	25%	**33%**
	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Promotions, by Graduation Year (Respondents Who Work for an Employer)								
Number of promotions that involved a pay raise (collapsed)*	0	7%	5%	**2%**	6%	6%	**9%**	7%
	1	38%	45%	40%	56%	**57%**	52%	**38%**
	2	28%	29%	**31%**	24%	22%	**13%**	20%
	3 or more	27%	21%	27%	**14%**	**16%**	26%	**35%**
	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

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

Respondents from executive and part-time programs are significantly more likely than full-time respondents to have received a promotion. Additionally, executive and part-time respondents are more likely to have received a greater number of promotions, title changes, and pay raises than are respondents from full-time programs.

Promotions, by Program Type (Respondents Who Work for an Employer)				
		Program Type		
Since you began working on this job, have you received any promotions?		**Full-Time (*n* = 2,214)**	**Part-Time (*n* = 785)**	**Executive (*n* = 221)**
	Yes*	**37%**	**56%**	**56%**
Number of promotions		**(*n* = 821)**	**(*n* = 436)**	**(*n* = 124)**
Number of promotions*	1	**61%**	**32%**	**27%**
	2	24%	26%	21%
	3 or more	**16%**	**42%**	**52%**
	Total	100%	100%	100%
Number of promotions that involved a change in job title (collapsed)*	0	**10%**	6%	**2%**
	1	**61%**	**36%**	**31%**
	2	19%	22%	18%
	3 or more	**10%**	**36%**	**49%**
	Total	100%	100%	100%
Number of promotions that involved a pay raise (collapsed)*	0	7%	5%	4%
	1	**58%**	**34%**	**30%**
	2	22%	23%	16%
	3 or more	**13%**	**38%**	**50%**
	Total	100%	100%	100%

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

Statistically, there is no difference in the percent of respondents who have received a job promotion by world region. However, among respondents who received a promotion, Asians are more likely to have received a promotion that did not involve a change in job title than are Latin American respondents.

Promotions, by Country of Citizenship
(Respondents 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* = 337)	**(*n* = 2,079)**	**(*n* = 196)**	**(*n* = 170)**	**(*n* = 380)**
Yes		40%	45%	40%	38%	40%
Number of promotions		**(*n* = 134)**	**(*n* = 930)**	**(*n* = 78)**	**(*n* = 64)**	**(*n* = 150)**
Number of promotions	1	54%	47%	49%	56%	49%
	2	23%	25%	27%	25%	26%
	3 or more	23%	29%	24%	19%	25%
	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of promotions that involved a change in job title (collapsed)*	0	**14%**	7%	6%	**2%**	7%
	1	51%	48%	54%	64%	58%
	2	20%	21%	21%	20%	15%
	3 or more	15%	24%	19%	14%	20%
	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of promotions that involved a pay raise (collapsed)	0	5%	6%	6%	6%	5%
	1	51%	45%	51%	58%	49%
	2	22%	22%	19%	23%	26%
	3 or more	22%	26%	23%	13%	19%
	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

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

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

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 $72,052, and the average other first-year compensation was $12,824. Currently, these respondents earn $85,523 on average plus an additional $19,191 in other compensation. This is a 19% increase in salary between starting and current annual salary.

Annual Salary		
	(*n* = 3,122)	
Statistics	**Starting Salary**	**Current Salary**
Lower 95% confidence interval	$70,788	$84,217
Mean	$72,052	$85,523
Upper 95% confidence interval	$73,316	$86,828
Other Compensation		
Statistics	**First Year**	**Current Year**
Lower 95% confidence interval	$11,948	$17,730
Mean	$12,824	$19,191
Upper 95% confidence interval	$13,699	$20,651

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

The class of 2000 had a significantly higher starting annual salary than did the classes of 2002 and 2004. Currently, the class of 2000 has higher salaries than do the classes of 2004, 2005, and 2006. Additionally, the class of 2001 has higher salaries than do the classes of 2003 through 2006, and the classes of 2002 and 2003 have higher salaries than do the classes of 2004 and 2006.

Respondents from executive programs had higher starting salaries than did respondents from full-time programs, who in turn had higher starting salaries than did part-time program respondents. Currently, respondents from executive programs have significantly higher salaries than do all other respondents.

Men had significantly higher starting salaries than did women, and men also have higher current salaries than do women.

European respondents had higher starting salaries than did all other respondents. Additionally, U.S. respondents had higher starting salaries than did Asian respondents. U.S. respondents also currently have higher salaries than do Asian respondents, while European respondents currently have higher salaries than do Asian, Canadian, and Latin American respondents.

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	**$79,168**	**$99,562**	26%
2001	$76,972	**$99,656**	29%
2002	**$66,529**	**$90,338**	36%
2003	$74,031	**$89,714**	21%
2004	**$68,331**	**$80,740**	18%
2005	$73,743	**$85,521**	16%
2006	$71,066	**$80,343**	13%
Program Type*			
Full-time	**$74,078**	$83,513	13%
Part-time	**$62,014**	$81,401	31%
Executive	**$88,020**	**$118,847**	35%
Gender*			
Male	**$74,368**	**$89,151**	20%
Female	**$66,732**	**$76,983**	15%
World Region*			
Asia	**$64,673**	$77,552	20%
United States	**$72,117**	$86,614	20%
Canada	**$67,710**	$78,715	16%
Latin America	**$68,539**	$80,224	17%
Europe	**$82,640**	$91,923	11%
*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.			

Respondents in the consulting industry had higher starting salaries than did those in all other industries, except for the energy/utility industry. Additionally, respondents in the finance/accounting and technology industries had higher starting salaries than did those in products/services. Currently, respondents in the consulting industry have higher salaries than do respondents in the finance/accounting, products/services, manufacturing, and healthcare/pharmaceuticals industries. Additionally, respondents in the energy/utility industry have higher salaries than do respondents in the products/services industry. Respondents in the nonprofit/government industry had the lowest starting and current salaries of all respondents.

Respondents working in consulting positions had significantly higher starting salaries than did respondents in all other job positions. Additionally, respondents in general management had higher starting salaries than did respondents in information technology. Respondents in consulting and general management positions currently have higher salaries than do respondents in marketing/sales, operations/logistics, finance/accounting, human resources, 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	**$84,452**	**$96,500**	14%
Finance/Accounting	**$74,312**	**$86,783**	17%
Products/Services	**$66,336**	**$78,666**	19%
Manufacturing	**$70,755**	**$87,017**	23%
Technology	**$74,532**	**$88,759**	19%
Health/Pharmaceuticals	**$72,634**	**$87,046**	20%
Energy/Utilities	**$76,143**	**$94,987**	25%
Nonprofit/Government	**$53,797**	**$67,606**	26%
Job Function			
Marketing/sales	**$69,969**	**$80,300**	15%
Operations/logistics	**$67,230**	**$83,620**	24%
Consulting	**$84,773**	**$97,233**	15%
General Management	**$75,495**	**$95,885**	27%
Finance/Accounting	**$70,012**	**$82,590**	18%
Human Resources	**$63,830**	**$72,917**	14%
Information Technology/MIS	**$65,485**	**$82,611**	26%
*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.			

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, 27% work in consulting, 12% work in finance/accounting, and 12% work in technology.

There are significant differences in the industry type by whether a 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 and significantly less likely to work in the finance/accounting, manufacturing, and nonprofit/government industries.

Type of Industry (Respondents Who Are Self-Employed/Small Business Owners)	
Response	**(*n* = 202)**
Products/Services	33%
Consulting	27%
Finance/Accounting	12%
Technology	12%
Healthcare/Pharmaceuticals	7%
Manufacturing	4%
Energy/Utilities	2%
Nonprofit/Government	2%
Other	3%
Total	100%

Self-employed respondents most often use technical skills, analytical thinking abilities, strategic thinking abilities, the ability to integrate information, and written communication skills. The ability to conduct financial analyses/prepare a budget is used least often by self-employed respondents.

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

- Leadership skills
- Strategic thinking abilities
- Creative problem solving skills
- Networking skills
- Recruiting, managing, and maintaining staff
- Conducting cost/benefit analyses or proposed changes
- Conducting financial analyses/preparing a budget

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

Skills and Abilities Used in Current Job (Respondents Who Are Self-Employed/Small Business Owners)							
		(*n* = 209)					
Skills/Abilities	**Mean**	**A Great Deal**	**A Good Amount**	**Some**	**A Little**	**Not at All**	**Total**
Technical skills for your specialty	4.5	62%	31%	6%	0%	1%	100%
Creative problem-solving skills	4.4	55%	33%	9%	2%	0%	100%
Analytical thinking abilities	4.4	58%	29%	8%	4%	1%	100%
Strategic thinking abilities	4.4	54%	33%	10%	3%	0%	100%
Ability to integrate information	4.4	53%	36%	9%	2%	0%	100%
Written communication skills	4.4	56%	33%	7%	1%	2%	100%
Interpersonal skills	4.1	49%	30%	12%	5%	4%	100%
Networking skills	4.1	44%	32%	19%	2%	3%	100%
Leadership skills	3.9	33%	38%	21%	6%	2%	100%
Recruiting, managing, maintaining staff	3.9	40%	27%	21%	6%	6%	100%
Oral communication skills	3.7	33%	23%	29%	9%	5%	100%
Analyzing, organizing, and interpreting statistical data	3.6	28%	30%	22%	13%	7%	100%
Conducting cost/benefit analyses or proposed changes	3.5	26%	29%	26%	11%	8%	100%
Managing change	3.3	22%	25%	22%	20%	11%	100%
Conducting financial analyses/preparing a budget	3.1	23%	18%	24%	13%	21%	100%

The MBA Program

This section of the report examines survey 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. More than three-quarters (78%) of respondents stated that they definitely made the right decision in pursuing an MBA degree and 78% also said they definitely made the right decision about the type of program in which they enrolled. Over one-half of respondents stated that they definitely made the right decision in the school they chose to attend (55%) and the area in which they concentrated their studies (55%).

"Did you make the right decision?"						
	(*n* = 3,677)					
Item	**Mean**	**Definitely Yes**	**Probably Yes**	**Probably No**	**Definitely No**	**Total**
Pursuing your MBA degree	3.7	78%	18%	3%	1%	100%
The school you chose to attend	3.4	55%	36%	8%	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%	38%	6%	1%	100%
Scale: 4–1, where 4 = Definitely Yes; 1 = Definitely No						

The class of 2006 was significantly more likely to have stated they made the right decision in the area in which they concentrated their studies than were the classes of 2000, 2001, and 2002.

"Did you make the right decision?" (Percent Yes), by Graduation Year							
	Graduation Year						
	2000	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**
Item	**(*n* = 175)**	**(*n* = 258)**	**(*n* = 223)**	**(*n* = 380)**	**(*n* = 591)**	**(*n* = 819)**	**(*n* = 1,231)**
Pursuing your MBA degree	96%	94%	96%	97%	96%	97%	97%
The school you chose to attend	91%	88%	90%	92%	91%	91%	90%
The type of program in which you enrolled	97%	94%	95%	96%	95%	95%	95%
The area in which you concentrated your studies*	**86%**	**89%**	**88%**	91%	93%	93%	**95%**
*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.							

Respondents from executive programs were the most likely to have stated they made the right decision in pursuing an MBA degree, the school they chose to attend, and the area in which they concentrated their studies. Respondents from part-time programs are less likely to have stated that they made the right decision in the program in which they enrolled than are respondents from full-time programs.

"Did you make the right decision?" (Percent Yes), by Program Type			
	Program Type		
Item	**Full-Time (*n* = 2,534)**	**Part-Time (*n* = 844)**	**Executive (*n* = 64)**
Pursuing your MBA degree*	96%	95%	**99%**
The school you chose to attend*	89%	91%	**97%**
The type of program in which you enrolled*	**96%**	**91%**	97%
The area in which you concentrated your studies*	92%	93%	**97%**
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.			

Respondents from Latin America are the most likely to report making the right decision in pursuing an MBA degree.

"Did you make the right decision?" (Percent Yes), by Country of Citizenship					
	World Region				
Item	**Asia (*n* = 372)**	**United States (*n* = 2,325)**	**Canada (*n* = 233)**	**Latin America (*n* = 192)**	**Europe (*n* = 439)**
Pursuing your MBA degree*	97%	96%	98%	**99%**	97%
The school you chose to attend	88%	90%	91%	94%	88%
The type of program in which you enrolled	96%	95%	94%	98%	96%
The area in which you concentrated your studies	91%	93%	91%	94%	91%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.					

There are no statistically significant differences by gender or U.S. subgroup.

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 provides job security.

Satisfaction with Potential Benefits of Graduate Management Education

	(*n* = 3,677)						
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 personally	4.3	42%	44%	12%	2%	0%	100%
Credentials you desired	4.2	36%	49%	13%	2%	1%	100%
Increased career options	4.1	36%	41%	17%	4%	1%	100%
Development of management knowledge/technical skill	4.1	28%	51%	18%	2%	1%	100%
Preparation to get a good job in the business world	3.9	26%	47%	22%	4%	1%	100%
Opportunity for quicker advancement	3.8	25%	42%	25%	6%	2%	100%
Increased earning power	3.8	28%	38%	25%	7%	2%	100%
Opportunity to network and form relationships with long-term value	3.8	28%	35%	27%	8%	1%	100%
Job security	3.6	16%	40%	35%	7%	2%	100%

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

The class of 2003 reported greater satisfaction than did the class of 2002 with the preparation to get a good job and increased career options. Respondents from the class of 2006 reported being more satisfied with the opportunity to improve personally than did the class of 2000. The class of 2006 also reported greater satisfaction with the opportunity for quicker advancement than did the classes of 2002 and 2004. The class of 2003 is more satisfied with their development of management knowledge and technical skill than are the classes of 2000 and 2001. Additionally, the class of 2006 is more satisfied with their development of management knowledge and technical skill than is the class of 2000. The class of 2003 reported greater satisfaction with their increase in earning power than did the class of 2004. Respondents further from graduation are less satisfied with their opportunity to network than are respondents who graduated more recently.

Mean Satisfaction with Your Graduate Management Education, by Graduation Year							
	Graduation Year						
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Potential Benefits	(*n* = 175)	(*n* = 258)	(*n* = 223)	(*n* = 380)	(*n* = 591)	(*n* = 819)	(*n* = 1,231)
Preparation to get a good job in the business world*	3.9	3.8	**3.8**	**4.0**	3.9	3.9	3.9
Increased career options*	4.1	4.0	**3.9**	**4.2**	4.0	4.1	4.1
Credentials you desired	4.2	4.2	4.1	4.2	4.1	4.2	4.2
Opportunity to improve personally*	**4.1**	4.2	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.2	**4.3**
Opportunity for quicker advancement*	3.7	3.8	**3.7**	3.9	**3.7**	3.8	**3.9**
Development of management knowledge/technical skill*	**3.9**	**4.0**	4.0	**4.2**	4.1	4.0	**4.1**
Increased earning power*	3.9	3.8	3.7	**3.9**	**3.7**	3.8	3.8
Opportunity to network and form relationships with long-term value*	**3.6**	**3.6**	**3.5**	**3.8**	**3.7**	**3.9**	**3.9**
Job security	3.4	3.5	3.5	3.7	3.6	3.6	3.6
Scale: 5–1, where 5 = Extremely satisfied; 1 = Not at all satisfied *p ≤ .05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.							

Respondents from part-time programs are the least satisfied of all respondents with the following potential benefits of their degree: preparation to get a good job, increased career options, opportunity for quicker advancement, increased earning power, and job security. Respondents from executive programs are the most satisfied of all respondents with earning the credentials they desired. Additionally, executive respondents are more satisfied than full-time respondents, who are in turn more satisfied than part-time respondents, with the following: opportunity to improve personally, development of management knowledge and technical skill, and the opportunity to network.

Mean Satisfaction with Your Graduate Management Education, by Program Type			
	Program Type		
	Full-Time	Part-Time	Executive
Potential Benefits	(*n* = 2,534)	(*n* = 844)	(*n* = 264)
Preparation to get a good job in the business world*	4.0	**3.7**	4.1
Increased career options*	4.1	**3.8**	4.1
Credentials you desired*	4.2	4.1	**4.4**
Opportunity to improve personally*	**4.3**	**4.2**	**4.5**
Opportunity for quicker advancement*	3.9	**3.6**	3.9
Development of management knowledge/technical skill*	**4.1**	**3.9**	**4.3**
Increased earning power*	3.9	**3.6**	3.8
Opportunity to network and form relationships with long-term value*	**3.9**	**3.5**	**4.0**
Job security*	3.6	**3.5**	3.7
Scale: 5–1, where 5 = Extremely satisfied; 1 = Not at all satisfied *p ≤ .05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.			

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

- Preparation to get a good job
- Increased career options
- Opportunity to improve personally
- Opportunity for quicker advancement
- Development of management knowledge and technical skill
- Opportunity to network
- Job security

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

Mean Satisfaction with Your Graduate Management Education, by Gender

	Gender	
	Male	**Female**
Potential Benefits	**(*n* = 2,558)**	**(*n* = 1,110)**
Preparation to get a good job in the business world*	**4.0**	**3.8**
Increased career options*	**4.1**	**4.0**
Credentials you desired	4.2	4.2
Opportunity to improve personally*	**4.3**	**4.2**
Opportunity for quicker advancement*	**3.9**	**3.7**
Development of management knowledge/technical skill*	**4.1**	**4.0**
Increased earning power*	**3.9**	**3.8**
Opportunity to network and form relationships with long-term value*	**3.8**	**3.7**
Job security*	**3.6**	**3.5**

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

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

Respondents from Latin America are more satisfied that the MBA prepared them to get a good job than are respondents from Asia and Canada. Additionally, respondents from Latin America are more satisfied with the opportunity to improve personally and the opportunity for quicker advancement than are Asian respondents. Respondents from Asia and Europe are less satisfied with earning the credentials they desired than are all other respondents. Respondents from the United States are more satisfied with their increase in earning power and job security than are respondents from Europe.

Mean Satisfaction with Your Graduate Management Education, by Country of Citizenship					
	World Region				
Potential Benefits	Asia (*n* = 372)	United States (*n* = 2,325)	Canada (*n* = 233)	Latin America (*n* = 192)	Europe (*n* = 439)
Preparation to get a good job in the business world*	**3.9**	3.9	**3.8**	**4.1**	3.9
Increased career options	4.0	4.1	4.1	4.2	4.1
Credentials you desired*	**4.0**	**4.2**	**4.2**	**4.3**	**4.0**
Opportunity to improve personally*	**4.2**	4.2	4.3	**4.4**	4.3
Opportunity for quicker advancement*	**3.7**	3.9	3.8	**4.0**	3.8
Development of management knowledge/technical skill	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.2	4.1
Increased earning power*	3.8	**3.9**	3.8	3.9	**3.7**
Opportunity to network and form relationships with long-term value	3.7	3.8	3.9	3.9	3.8
Job security*	3.6	**3.6**	3.5	3.7	**3.5**
Scale: 5–1, where 5 = Extremely satisfied; 1 = Not at all satisfied *p ≤ .05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.					

Hispanics are more satisfied than other U.S. respondents with the job security their MBA provided.

Mean Satisfaction with Your Graduate Management Education, by U.S. Subgroup				
	U.S. Subgroup			
Potential Benefits	Asian American (*n* = 163)	African American (*n* = 74)	White (*n* = 1,850)	Hispanic (*n* = 79)
Preparation to get a good job in the business world	3.9	4.1	3.9	4.2
Increased career options	4.0	4.1	4.1	4.3
Credentials you desired	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.4
Opportunity to improve personally	4.1	4.2	4.2	4.4
Opportunity for quicker advancement	3.8	3.9	3.9	4.1
Development of management knowledge/technical skill	4.0	4.1	4.0	4.1
Increased earning power*	3.8	4.0	3.9	4.1
Opportunity to network and form relationships with long-term value	3.9	3.9	3.8	4.0
Job security	3.6	3.6	3.6	**3.9**
Scale: 5–1, where 5 = Extremely satisfied; 1 = Not at all satisfied *p ≤ .05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.				

Retrospective Educational Needs of MBA Alumni

The next series of tables presents the areas in which MBA alumni wish they had received more education or training during their programs of study. More than one-third (35%) of respondents wish they had received additional training in managing their career. Over one-quarter of respondents wish they had received additional training in developing a strategic plan (28%); recruiting, managing, and maintaining staff (28%); networking skills (28%); conducting financial analyses and preparing a budget (26%); and strategic thinking (25%).

"In which areas do you wish you had more education/training during your MBA program?"	
Area	**(*n* = 3,677)**
Managing your career	35%
Developing a strategic plan	28%
Recruiting, managing, and maintaining staff	28%
Networking skills	27%
Conducting financial analyses and preparing a budget	26%
Strategic thinking	25%
Leadership skills	24%
Conducting cost/benefit analyses of proposed changes	22%
Managing change	21%
Analyzing, organizing, and interpreting statistical data	20%
Stress management	19%
Developing creative problem-solving skills	17%
Oral communication skills	17%
Designing and conducting market research	16%
Analytical thinking	15%
Interpersonal skills	15%
Computer and related technological skills	13%
Technical skills for your specialty	13%
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.	

The class of 2006 is nearly twice as likely as the class of 2000 to wish they had received more training in analyzing, organizing, and interpreting statistical data. Respondents in the class of 2000 are the least likely to wish they had received more training in developing creative problem-solving skills. The class of 2004 is the most likely to wish they had received additional leadership training, while the class of 2006 is the least likely to wish they had received more training in managing change.

"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**	**2006**
Area	**(*n* = 175)**	**(*n* = 258)**	**(*n* = 223)**	**(*n* = 380)**	**(*n* = 591)**	**(*n* = 819)**	**(*n* = 1,231)**
Analytical thinking	13%	16%	13%	14%	17%	13%	15%
Analyzing, organizing, and interpreting statistical data*	**12%**	16%	17%	19%	20%	21%	**23%**
Computer and related technological skills	12%	10%	11%	12%	12%	12%	14%
Conducting cost/benefit analyses of proposed changes	26%	18%	18%	19%	20%	24%	24%
Conducting financial analyses and preparing a budget	25%	26%	24%	22%	26%	26%	29%
Designing and conducting market research	13%	20%	16%	16%	13%	16%	16%
Developing a strategic plan	33%	29%	25%	25%	29%	30%	26%
Developing creative problem-solving skills*	**10%**	18%	16%	15%	19%	16%	19%
Integrating information from a wide variety of sources	11%	11%	8%	13%	11%	11%	13%
Interpersonal skills	17%	16%	15%	15%	16%	15%	13%
Leadership skills*	20%	24%	30%	25%	**29%**	22%	22%
Managing change*	25%	20%	26%	25%	23%	21%	**18%**
Managing your career	35%	34%	39%	34%	35%	35%	35%
Networking skills	27%	32%	28%	22%	27%	28%	27%
Oral communication skills	17%	16%	17%	17%	18%	18%	16%
Recruiting, managing, and maintaining staff	29%	33%	32%	27%	30%	29%	25%
Strategic thinking	25%	27%	26%	21%	26%	24%	24%
Stress management	20%	19%	18%	19%	19%	18%	19%
Technical skills for your specialty	14%	12%	13%	12%	10%	14%	15%
Written communication skills	9%	8%	12%	10%	10%	11%	11%
None of the above	7%	5%	6%	6%	5%	4%	6%

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

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

Respondents from executive programs are the least likely of all respondents to wish they had received additional training in computer/technological skills, conducting financial analyses, oral communication skills, and technical skills for their specialty. Respondents from part-time programs are more likely to wish they had received additional training in leadership skills, managing their career, networking skills, and strategic thinking than are respondents from full-time programs.

"In which areas do you wish you had more education/training during your MBA program?" by Program Type

	Program Type		
Area	**Full-Time (*n* = 2,534)**	**Part-Time (*n* = 844)**	**Executive (*n* = 264)**
Analytical thinking	14%	16%	14%
Analyzing, organizing, and interpreting statistical data	20%	20%	20%
Computer and related technological skills*	13%	12%	**8%**
Conducting cost/benefit analyses of proposed changes	21%	24%	20%
Conducting financial analyses and preparing a budget*	26%	29%	**21%**
Designing and conducting market research	15%	16%	17%
Developing a strategic plan*	26%	**32%**	28%
Developing creative problem-solving skills	17%	17%	17%
Integrating information from a wide variety of sources	11%	14%	10%
Interpersonal skills	16%	13%	11%
Leadership skills*	**22%**	**31%**	20%
Managing change	21%	20%	17%
Managing your career*	**33%**	**40%**	39%
Networking skills*	**25%**	**33%**	28%
Oral communication skills*	18%	15%	**12%**
Recruiting, managing, and maintaining staff	28%	29%	25%
Strategic thinking*	**22%**	**29%**	28%
Stress management	19%	19%	19%
Technical skills for your specialty*	14%	12%	**6%**
Written communication skills*	11%	**8%**	11%
None of the above*	6%	**2%**	**9%**

Responses may add to more than 100% due to multiple selections.
*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.

Women wish they had received more training than do men in the following areas:

- Analyzing, organizing, and interpreting statistical data
- Conducting cost/benefit analyses of proposed changes
- Designing and conducting market research
- Developing a strategic plan

Men are more likely than women to wish they had received more training in interpersonal skills.

"In which areas do you wish you had more education/ training during your MBA program?" by Gender		
	Gender	
	Male	**Female**
Area	**(*n* = 2,558)**	**(*n* = 1,110)**
Analytical thinking	15%	14%
Analyzing, organizing, and interpreting statistical data*	19%	**24%**
Computer and related technological skills*	12%	14%
Conducting cost/benefit analyses of proposed changes*	**20%**	**28%**
Conducting financial analyses and preparing a budget*	**25%**	**31%**
Designing and conducting market research*	15%	**18%**
Developing a strategic plan*	26%	**31%**
Developing creative problem-solving skills	16%	19%
Integrating information from a wide variety of sources	12%	11%
Interpersonal skills*	16%	**12%**
Leadership skills	25%	22%
Managing change*	22%	19%
Managing your career	35%	34%
Networking skills	27%	27%
Oral communication skills	17%	16%
Recruiting, managing, and maintaining staff	28%	28%
Strategic thinking	24%	25%
Stress management	19%	19%
Technical skills for your specialty	13%	15%
Written communication skills	11%	10%
None of the above	6%	5%
Responses may add up to more than 100% due to multiple selections. *$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.		

Respondents from Asia are more likely than respondents from the United States, Latin America, and Europe to report they wish they had received more education in a variety of areas.

"In which areas do you wish you had more education/training during your MBA program?" by Country of Citizenship					
	World Region				
	Asia	**United States**	**Canada**	**Latin America**	**Europe**
Area	**(*n* = 372)**	**(*n* = 2,325)**	**(*n* = 233)**	**(*n* = 192)**	**(*n* = 439)**
Analytical thinking*	**28%**	**13%**	12%	**21%**	**11%**
Analyzing, organizing, and interpreting statistical data*	**26%**	21%	18%	18%	**13%**
Computer and related technological skills	14%	14%	10%	11%	9%
Conducting cost/benefit analyses of proposed changes	22%	23%	21%	19%	20%
Conducting financial analyses and preparing a budget*	29%	28%	21%	23%	**22%**
Designing and conducting market research*	**19%**	17%	12%	15%	**10%**
Developing a strategic plan	32%	27%	27%	30%	26%

"In which areas do you wish you had more education/training during your MBA program?" by Country of Citizenship					
	World Region				
Area	Asia (*n* = 372)	United States (*n* = 2,325)	Canada (*n* = 233)	Latin America (*n* = 192)	Europe (*n* = 439)
Developing creative problem-solving skills*	**29%**	**14%**	17%	**23%**	18%
Integrating information from a wide variety of sources*	**24%**	**10%**	11%	11%	10%
Interpersonal skills*	**31%**	**11%**	11%	**28%**	**18%**
Leadership skills*	**35%**	**21%**	28%	28%	**28%**
Managing change*	**28%**	**19%**	19%	**27%**	24%
Managing your career	37%	34%	40%	38%	31%
Networking skills*	**39%**	**24%**	24%	33%	30%
Oral communication skills*	**30%**	**13%**	15%	**32%**	**21%**
Recruiting, managing, and maintaining staff*	**22%**	29%	**37%**	23%	26%
Strategic thinking*	**38%**	**22%**	23%	27%	26%
Stress management*	**28%**	**16%**	18%	**24%**	**23%**
Technical skills for your specialty*	**17%**	14%	12%	11%	**10%**
Written communication skills*	**27%**	**8%**	9%	**18%**	11%
None of the above	3%	6%	7%	5%	5%

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

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

Asian Americans are more likely than other U.S. subgroups to wish they had received additional training in developing a strategic plan, interpersonal skills, managing change, oral communication skills, and strategic thinking. African Americans are the least likely of the U.S. subgroups to report a desire for additional leadership training.

"In which areas do you wish you had more education/training during your MBA program?" by U.S. Subgroup				
	U.S. Subgroup			
Area	Asian American (*n* = 163)	African American (*n* = 74)	White (non-Hispanic) (*n* = 1,850)	Hispanic (*n* = 79)
Analytical thinking	16%	16%	13%	15%
Analyzing, organizing, and interpreting statistical data	25%	20%	21%	27%
Computer and related technological skills	12%	14%	14%	11%
Conducting cost/benefit analyses of proposed changes	23%	27%	22%	33%
Conducting financial analyses and preparing a budget	29%	32%	28%	29%
Designing and conducting market research	20%	19%	16%	15%
Developing a strategic plan*	**36%**	35%	27%	25%
Developing creative problem-solving skills	21%	15%	14%	18%
Integrating information from a wide variety of sources	15%	11%	10%	8%
Interpersonal skills*	**19%**	11%	10%	8%
Leadership skills*	26%	**11%**	21%	18%
Managing change*	**28%**	12%	19%	18%

"In which areas do you wish you had more education/training during your MBA program?" by U.S. Subgroup				
	U.S. Subgroup			
Area	Asian American (*n* = 163)	African American (*n* = 74)	White (non-Hispanic) (*n* = 1,850)	Hispanic (*n* = 79)
Managing your career	40%	27%	34%	37%
Networking skills	29%	20%	24%	14%
Oral communication skills*	**20%**	7%	13%	8%
Recruiting, managing, and maintaining staff	30%	27%	29%	29%
Strategic thinking*	**31%**	26%	21%	16%
Stress management	17%	11%	17%	10%
Technical skills for your specialty	13%	19%	14%	9%
Written communication skills	11%	11%	7%	8%
None of the above	3%	4%	6%	3%
Responses may add up to more than 100% due to multiple selections. *p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.				

Participation in Alumni Activities

Participation in alumni activities remains low among MBA alumni. About one in ten alumni attend alumni social events and give financial donations frequently. About one-quarter (24%) never attend alumni social events, and two-fifths (42%) 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* = 3,677)					
Activity	Mean	Frequently	Occasionally	Rarely	Never	Total
Give financial donations to your business school	2.0	11%	24%	23%	42%	100%
Interview applicants for your admissions office	1.4	3%	10%	14%	73%	100%
Attend alumni social/networking events	2.3	11%	33%	33%	24%	100%
Recruit for new hires from your business school	1.9	8%	20%	22%	49%	100%
Meet with prospective applicants as part of business school recruiting activities	1.8	6%	18%	22%	54%	100%
Scale: 4–1, where 4 = Frequently; 1 = Never						

The class of 2000 is more likely to give financial donations than are the classes of 2002, 2003, 2004, 2005, and 2006. The class of 2003 is more likely than the classes of 2005 and 2006 to interview applicants for their admission office. The class of 2006 is more likely than the classes of 2001, 2002, 2003, and 2005 to attend alumni events.

"Have you done the following activities since graduation?" by Graduation Year							
	Graduation Year						
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Activity	(*n* = 175)	(*n* = 258)	(*n* = 223)	(*n* = 380)	(*n* = 591)	(*n* = 819)	(*n* = 1,231)
Give financial donations to your business school*	**2.4**	2.1	**1.9**	**2.2**	**2.0**	**2.0**	**2.0**
Interview applicants for your admissions office*	1.5	1.5	1.4	**1.6**	1.4	**1.4**	**1.4**
Attend alumni social/networking events*	2.2	**2.2**	**2.1**	**2.3**	2.2	**2.3**	**2.4**
Recruit for new hires from your business school	1.9	1.8	1.7	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.9
Meet with prospective applicants as part of business school recruiting activities*	1.7	1.7	1.6	1.8	1.7	1.8	1.8
Scale: 4–1, where 4 = Frequently; 1 = Never *p ≤ .05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.							

Respondents from 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* = 2,534)	(*n* = 844)	(*n* = 264)
Give financial donations to your business school*	**2.1**	**1.7**	**2.3**
Interview applicants for your admissions office*	1.5	**1.3**	1.5
Attend alumni social/networking events*	**2.4**	**2.0**	**2.6**
Recruit for new hires from your business school*	2.0	**1.6**	2.0
Meet with prospective applicants as part of business school recruiting activities*	1.9	**1.4**	2.0
Scale: 4–1, where 4 = Frequently; 1 = Never *p ≤ .05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.			

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 = 2,558)	(n = 1,110)
Give financial donations to your business school*	**2.1**	**2.0**
Interview applicants for your admissions office*	**1.5**	**1.4**
Attend alumni social/networking events*	**2.3**	**2.2**

"Have You Done the Following Activities Since Graduation?" by Gender		
	Gender	
	Male	**Female**
Activity	**(n = 2,558)**	**(n = 1,110)**
Recruit for new hires from your business school*	**1.9**	**1.8**
Meet with prospective applicants as part of business school recruiting activities*	**1.8**	**1.7**
Scale: 4–1, where 4 = Frequently; 1 = Never *p ≤ .05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.		

Europeans are the least likely of all respondents to give financial donations to their business school. Respondents from the United States and Canada are the least likely to interview applicants for their admissions office. Asian, Canadian, and European respondents are more likely than respondents from the United States to attend alumni events. Asian, Latin American, and European respondents are more likely than U.S. and Canadian respondents to meet with prospective applicants.

"Have you done the following activities since graduation?" by Country of Citizenship					
	World Region				
	Asia	**United States**	**Canada**	**Latin America**	**Europe**
Activity	**(*n* = 372)**	**(*n* = 2,325)**	**(*n* = 233)**	**(*n* = 192)**	**(*n* = 439)**
Give financial donations to your business school*	**2.0**	**2.1**	**2.0**	**1.9**	**1.8**
Interview applicants for your admissions office*	**1.6**	**1.4**	**1.4**	**1.7**	**1.6**
Attend alumni social/networking events*	**2.5**	**2.2**	**2.4**	2.4	**2.4**
Recruit for new hires from your business school	1.8	1.9	1.9	2.0	1.8
Meet with prospective applicants as part of business school recruiting activities*	**2.0**	**1.7**	**1.7**	**2.1**	**1.9**
Scale: 4–1, where 4 = Frequently; 1 = Never *p ≤ .05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.					

Among U.S. subgroups, Asian Americans are more likely than whites to give financially, interview applicants, and attend alumni events. Hispanics and Asian Americans are more likely than whites to meet with prospective students.

"Have you done the following activities since graduation?" by U.S. Subgroup				
	U.S. Subgroup			
Activity	Asian American (*n* = 163)	African American (*n* = 74)	White (*n* = 1,850)	Hispanic (*n* = 79)
Give financial donations to your business school*	**2.4**	2.3	**2.1**	2.4
Interview applicants for your admissions office*	**1.6**	1.5	**1.3**	1.5
Attend alumni social/networking events*	**2.4**	2.2	**2.2**	2.4
Recruit for new hires from your business school	2.0	2.1	1.9	1.9
Meet with prospective applicants as part of business school recruiting activities*	**1.9**	1.9	**1.6**	**1.9**
Scale: 4–1, where 4 = Frequently; 1 = Never *p ≤ .05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.				

Networking Activities

Respondents were asked to indicate whether they actively maintain a network of contacts. Four-fifths (80%) report that they do. Among those who do not maintain a network of contacts, the primary reason is that they are too busy and lack the time.

"Do you actively maintain a network of contacts?"	
Response	(*n* = 3,677)
Yes	80%
No	20%
Total	100%

The class of 2006 is more likely than the class of 2002 to actively maintain a network of contacts. Respondents from full-time and executive programs are more likely than respondents from part-time programs to actively maintain a network, and men are slightly, yet significantly, more likely than women to maintain a network. Respondents from Asia are the least likely of all respondents to maintain a network of contacts.

"Do you actively maintain a network of contacts?"	
Characteristic	Percent Maintaining Network
Graduation Year*	
2000	68%
2001	74%
2002	**69%**
2003	82%
2004	76%
2005	81%
2006	**86%**

"Do you actively maintain a network of contacts?"	
Characteristic	**Percent Maintaining Network**
Program Type*	
Full-time	82%
Part-time	**72%**
Executive	88%
Gender*	
Male	81%
Female	**77%**
World Region*	
Asia	**71%**
United States	82%
Canada	80%
Latin America	83%
Europe	80%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.	

Respondents who maintain an active network were asked to indicate who is included in their network. The vast majority said individuals from their MBA class, previous jobs, and current job. Additionally, respondents named those met at associations they belong to and at conferences they attended.

"Who is included in your network?"	
Individuals from…	**(*n* = 2,945)**
Your MBA class	95%
Previous jobs	86%
Current job	89%
Conferences attended	27%
Associations	39%
Other schools	6%
Family/friends	3%
School staff/professors	1%
Other	4%

Overall, 76% of respondents use their network to access jobs or the hidden job market, and 72% use their network to stay current in their field.

Respondents from the class of 2003 (70%) are the least likely of all respondents to use their network to access jobs or the hidden job market. Women (73%) are statistically less likely than men (77%) to use their network to access jobs. Asian respondents (64%) are also less likely than other respondents to use their network to access jobs.

There are no statistically significant differences in the reasons respondents maintain their network by program type or U.S. subgroup.

Respondents who actively maintain a network of contacts were asked to indicate the activities they participate in to maintain their network. Nearly all respondents use e-mail to maintain their network. Additionally, four-fifths use phone calls and in-person meetings to maintain their network.

"In what activities do you participate to maintain your network?"	
Activities	**(*n* = 2,945)**
E-mail	97%
Phone calls	81%
In-person meetings	80%
Conferences	31%
Other	1%

Respondents from executive programs (41%) are significantly more likely than respondents from full-time (29%) and part-time (34%) programs to use conferences to maintain their network. Additionally, executive program respondents (89%) are more likely than full-time (81%) and part-time (79%) respondents to maintain their network with phone calls. Furthermore, executive program respondents (88%) are more likely than full-time (79%) and part-time (81%) respondents to maintain their network with in-person meetings.

Men (83%) are more likely than women (77%) to maintain their network with phone calls.

Asian respondents are the least likely of all respondents to use conferences to maintain their network. Respondents from Latin America (73%) are less likely than respondents from the United States (83%) to use phone calls. Additionally, respondents from Latin America (74%) are less likely than European respondents (86%) to use in-person meetings to maintain their network.

Hispanics (91%) are the least likely of the U.S. subgroups (97%-99%) to use e-mail to maintain their network.

There are no statistically significant differences in the activities used to maintain networks by graduation year.

Methodology

Background

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

Survey Sample

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

On August 23, 2006, an e-mail was sent to the 17,367 members of the sample as a heads-up on the research project, and on August 30, 2006, an invitation e-mail was sent to the sample. A reminder e-mail was sent on September 13 to 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 August 30 to September 27. As an incentive for people to participate in the survey, GMAC® offered to place them in a drawing for one U.S. $500 and four U.S. $100 AMEX® gift checks.

Of the 17,367 contacts that were initiated for the September 2006 MBA Alumni Perspective Survey, 561 contacts were undeliverable (3.2%). Of the remaining contacts, 3,677 people responded—a 22% response rate.

Response Rates				
	Sample	**Adjusted Sample**	**Respondents**	**Adjusted Response Rate**
Overall	17,367	16,806	3,677	22%
Graduation Year				
2000	892	855	175	20%
2001	1,944	1,872	258	14%
2002	1,611	1,561	223	14%
2003	2,052	1,987	380	19%
2004	3,200	3,073	591	19%
2005	3,660	3,566	819	23%
2006	4,008	3,892	1,231	32%

Characteristics of the Respondents

Respondents represent a broad cross-section of MBA alumni. Overall, 34% of respondents graduated in 2006, 22% graduated in 2005, 16% graduated in 2004, 10% graduated in 2003, 6% graduated in 2002, 7% graduated in 2001, and 5% graduated in 2000.

Year of Graduation	
Graduation Year	**(*n* = 3,677)**
2000	5%
2001	7%
2002	6%
2003	10%
2004	16%
2005	22%
2006	34%
Total	100%

Slightly more than two-thirds (69%) of the respondents graduated from full-time programs. Nearly one-quarter (23%) graduated from part-time programs, and 7% graduated from executive programs. This distribution is different from the true distribution in the population according to the 1999–2000 National Postsecondary Student Aid Study[1], which shows that 34% of MBA students attend a program full-time and 66% attend a part-time or executive program. The Global MBA® Graduate Survey sample from which the MBA 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* = 3,668)**
Full-time	69%
Part-time	23%
Executive	7%
Other	1%
Total	100%

Among the respondents, males outnumber females by a margin of two-and-one-third to one. The distribution by gender is slightly different to the proportion of individuals who graduated from a graduate business program, where males represent 59% and females represent 41%[2].

[1] U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 1999–2000 National Postsecondary Student Aid Study (NPSAS:2000).
[2] National Center for Education Statistics (2002). Digest of Education Statistics Tables and Figures. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d02/lt3.asp.

Gender of Respondent	
Gender	**(*n* = 3,668)**
Male	70%
Female	30%
Total	100%

Three-fifths (63%) of respondents are U.S. citizens. One in eight (12%) are from Europe. Respondents from Asia represent 10% of all respondents, and Canadians represent 6% of the total. One in twenty (5%) are from Latin America and the Caribbean. Based on a comparison of GMAT® test-taker data, where 56% of test takers are U.S. citizens and 44% are non-U.S. citizens, the respondents resemble test takers.

Country of Citizenship	
World Region	**(*n* = 3,668)**
United States	63%
Europe	12%
Asia	10%
Canada	6%
Latin America and the Caribbean	5%
Other	3%
Total	100%

Whites comprise 85% of the U.S. respondents. Asian Americans represent 8%, African Americans represent 3%, and Hispanics represent 4%. There are slight differences between the respondents and the proportion of individuals graduating from a graduate business program, where 76% are white, 8% are Asian American, 10% are African American, and 5% are Hispanic[2].

U.S. Subgroup	
U.S. Subgroup	**(*n* = 2,166)**
White	85%
Asian American	8%
African American	3%
Hispanic	4%
Total	100%

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 respondents than does the class of 2006. On the other hand, the class of 2006 has a significantly greater proportion of part-time respondents compared with the classes of 2000, 2002, 2003, and 2004. Additionally, about one in 10 of the respondents in the classes of 2005 and 2006 are executive MBA respondents, which

represents a significantly higher proportion than executive respondents from the classes of 2000, 2002, and 2003.

Program Type, by Graduation Year*							
	Graduation Year						
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
Program Type	(*n* = 174)	(*n* = 258)	(*n* = 211)	(*n* = 375)	(*n* = 587)	(*n* = 814)	(*n* = 1,223)
Full-time	**91%**	76%	80%	**89%**	73%	66%	**58%**
Part-time	**7%**	18%	**17%**	**10%**	**19%**	23%	**33%**
Executive	**1%**	5%	**3%**	**2%**	7%	**11%**	**9%**
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.							

Respondents from the class of 2002 are more likely to be Asian and less likely to be U.S. citizens than are those from other graduating classes. Canadian respondents make up a greater proportion of the class of 2005 than they do the classes of 2000 and 2006. The class of 2003 has significantly more respondents from Latin America than do all other classes. Europeans make up a greater percentage of the class of 2003 than they do the class of 2006.

Country of Citizenship, by Graduation Year*							
	Graduation Year						
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
World Region	(*n* = 171)	(*n* = 248)	(*n* = 207)	(*n* = 364)	(*n* = 557)	(*n* = 799)	(*n* = 1,215)
Asia	9%	10%	**15%**	8%	12%	10%	10%
United States	75%	67%	**55%**	61%	63%	63%	69%
Canada	**2%**	7%	6%	5%	8%	**10%**	**5%**
Latin America and the Caribbean	3%	6%	8%	**9%**	4%	5%	5%
Europe	11%	9%	16%	**17%**	13%	13%	**10%**
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.							

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

Characteristics of the Respondents by Program Type

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

Gender, by Program Type*			
	Program Type		
Gender	Full-Time (*n* = 2,534)	Part-Time (*n* = 844)	Executive (*n* = 264)
Male	70%	67%	**80%**
Female	30%	33%	**20%**
Total	100%	100%	100%
*p ≤ .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 full-time respondents compared with their representation among part-time and executive respondents. Citizens of the United States represent a greater proportion of part-time and executive respondents compared with full-time respondents. There are significantly fewer Canadians from executive programs than from full-time and part-time programs. Europeans represent a significantly higher percentage of respondents from full-time programs than part-time programs.

Country of Citizenship, by Program Type*			
	Program Type		
World Region	Full-Time (*n* = 2,452)	Part-Time (*n* = 823)	Executive (*n* = 260)
Asia	**13%**	**6%**	**5%**
United States	**59%**	**80%**	**75%**
Canada	7%	6%	**3%**
Latin America	**7%**	**1%**	**2%**
Europe	**14%**	**7%**	16%
Total	100%	100%	100%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.			

Asian Americans represent a smaller proportion of respondents from executive programs than from full-time and part-time programs.

U.S. Subgroup, by Program Type*			
	Program Type		
U.S. Subgroup	Full-Time (*n* = 2,452)	Part-Time (*n* = 823)	Executive (*n* = 260)
White	84%	89%	89%
Asian American	9%	6%	**3%**
African American	4%	3%	4%
Hispanic	4%	2%	4%
Total	100%	100%	100%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.			

Characteristics of the Respondents by Gender

The following tables examine the respondents' characteristics by gender. There is a greater proportion of women from the U.S. than there is men among the respondents, and there is a greater proportion of men from Latin American and Europe than there is women from these areas.

Country of Citizenship, by Gender*		
	Gender	
	Male	Female
World Region	(*n* = 2,476)	(*n* = 1,085)
Asia	11%	10%
United States	**62%**	**74%**
Canada	7%	6%
Latin America	**7%**	**2%**
Europe	**14%**	**9%**
Total	100%	100%

*p ≤ .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
U.S. Subgroup	(*n* = 1,406)	(*n* = 760)
Asian American	8%	8%
African American	3%	**5%**
White	86%	84%
Hispanic	4%	3%
Total	100%	100%

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

Online Questionnaire Administration

Administration of the questionnaire online offered several advantages over a paper-and-pencil administration. First, responses automatically went into a database that was available for analysis at all times. This allowed for monitoring survey progress and eliminating the time and cost associated with data entry. Second, the site was programmed to check for the accurate completion of each question before the respondent was allowed to proceed to the next question, which eliminated the typical problems associated with item non-response. Third, skip patterns allowed respondents to move quickly and appropriately through the questionnaire. Respondents 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 12). Two weeks before the completion of data collection, a preliminary analysis of the data was conducted. Frequency distributions were examined for both topical questions and classification questions. Based on this examination, response categories for some questions were collapsed in order to make the final analysis more robust. In this preliminary analysis, variations to all topical questions were cross tabulated with each classification question. This made it possible to determine which classification questions offered the most promise in the interpretation of survey responses. In the final analysis, most topical questions were cross tabulated with the following classification items: gender, race/ethnicity (for U.S. citizens), and citizenship. A Chi-square analysis was used to evaluate the statistical significance in cross-classification tables ($p < .05$). (A relationship between a topical item and a classification item was considered statistically significant only when it could have been produced by chance less than 5% of the time.) T-tests, analysis of variance, and nonparametric tests were used whenever appropriate. Percentages in charts and tables might not always add exactly to 100% due to rounding.

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.