



Alumni Perspectives Survey

September 2009

Comprehensive Data Report

The Alumni Perspectives Survey is a product of the Graduate Management Admission Council® (GMAC®), a global nonprofit education organization of leading graduate business schools and the owner of the Graduate Management Admission Test® (GMAT®). The GMAT exam is an important part of the admissions process for more than 4,700 graduate management programs around the world. GMAC is dedicated to creating access to and disseminating information about graduate management education; these schools and others rely on the Council as the premier provider of reliable data about the graduate management education industry.

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	1
I. EMPLOYMENT PERSPECTIVES FROM 2009 GRADUATES.....	2
Key Findings	2
Employment Status at Graduation.....	2
First Job (Class of 2009)	6
Job Offers	7
Satisfaction With First Job.....	9
Right Decision in Choice of First Job	9
Similarity Between Job Acquired and Job Desired (Class of 2009).....	10
Business School and the First Job (Class of 2009).....	11
Career Services	11
Essential Education (Class of 2009).....	13
Compensation From First Job After Graduation.....	14
Annual Base Salary.....	14
Additional Compensation.....	16
Salary Expectations.....	17
II. EMPLOYMENT DATA.....	18
Key Findings	18
Current Employment Status	19
Work Hours.....	32
Employment Attributes.....	34
Job Industry	34
Job Function.....	38
Organization Size.....	42
Employment Location Data.....	48
Location of Employment	50
Career Progression Data	53
Promotions	55
Job Level	64
Supervisory Responsibilities	67
Skills for Current Job.....	70
Compensation Data	81
Self-Employed Respondent Data	85
Organization Size.....	85
Organization Focus	88

Business Location	89
Business Industry	89
Unemployment Data	91
Reasons for Unemployment.....	92
Industry of Job Search	94
Searched Job Function	95
III. PERSPECTIVES ON ETHICS EDUCATION.....	96
Key Findings	96
Perceptions of the Economy.....	96
Concern for Values Learned	102
Ethics Education.....	104
Impact of Ethics Education	108
Ethical Business Practices.....	110
IV. PERSPECTIVES ON GRADUATE BUSINESS INSTITUTIONS.....	113
Key Findings	113
Retrospective Decisions.....	116
School Recommendations	120
Communication Efforts.....	125
Frequency of Contact.....	128
Communication Preferences	131
Information Preferences	135
Campus Activity Participation	139
METHODOLOGY	150
Survey Sample.....	150
Characteristics of Respondents	151
Online Questionnaire Administration.....	153
Data Analysis	153
Category Definition	153
CONTACT INFORMATION.....	156
Authorship	156
Acknowledgements	156

Introduction

The Alumni Perspectives Surveys are biannual follow-up studies of past participants in the Global MBA® Graduate Survey. Each year, about three-quarters of the graduate management students who respond to the Global Management Education 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
- Monitor the educational needs of alumni

The September 2009 study included alumni from the classes of 2000 to 2009. Refer to the *Methodology* section for response rates and sample characteristics. The demographic characteristics of respondents to this survey reflect the sample of Global Management Education Graduate Survey respondents in terms of program type, gender, age, country of citizenship, and race (for US respondents). This report presents overall findings as well as significant findings from the study by graduation year, program type, gender, citizenship, school location, and US subgroup. Some comparisons involving alumni from different graduating classes are based on earlier studies.

The results of this survey do not necessarily reflect a statistically representative sample of graduate business alumni as a whole. Rather, these findings reflect responses from a broad cross section of alumni who participated in a previous Global Management Education 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 generalize about the graduate business alumni population, but can be used instead as a reflection of the sample frame under consideration.

I. Employment Perspectives From 2009 Graduates

Key Findings

- Overall, 84 percent of the Class of 2009 was employed at the time of graduation, which is about four percentage points lower than in each of the previous four years. There also is a notable increase in the percentage of career enhancers and a notable decrease in the percentage of career switchers compared to prior years.
- The top three methods by which employed graduates in 2009 found their first job were their network of contacts (35%), campus interviews (31%), and school alumni networks (21%).
- The majority of alumni indicated they made the right choice in their first job, their first job was very much like the one they wanted, and they strongly agreed their graduate business degree was essential for their first job after graduation.
- Three out of four (78%) of the employed alumni among the class of 2009 indicated their school career services office was somewhat to extremely helpful with their job search process.
- Employed alumni from the class of 2009 reported a median salary of US\$66,694 and a mean salary of US\$70,938 on their first job after graduation. While these values are slightly less than last year, two-thirds of these respondents indicated their salary met or exceeded their expectations.

Employment Status at Graduation

Respondents were asked to indicate the best description of their first job after graduate management school from a list of five options.

Job Status at Graduation (Class of 2009)

Response	Percentage
I held this job while in graduate management school and continued.	40%
I had an internship/work project with this employer and continued.	13%
It was the first job I found after leaving graduate management school.	25%
I was self-employed or a small-business owner.	5%
I have not had a job since leaving graduate management school.	16%
	100%
Total	N=1,205

Job Status at Graduation (Class of 2009) by Graduation Year*

Response	Graduation Year									
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
I held this job while in graduate management school and continued.	14%	27%	22%	19%	27%	30%	37%	31%	37%	40%
I had an internship/work project with this employer and continued.	17%	9%	12%	12%	11%	11%	14%	11%	13%	13%
It was the first job I found after leaving graduate management school.	66%	55%	54%	36%	41%	41%	34%	42%	35%	25%
I was self-employed or a small-business owner.	3%	5%	7%	4%	5%	5%	4%	5%	3%	5%
I have not had a job since leaving graduate management school.	1%	4%	6%	28%	16%	13%	11%	11%	12%	16%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=332	N=607	N=564	N=1,085	N=1,432	N=1,095	N=1,093	N=772	N=1,128	N=1,205

Data for the classes of 2000-2008 are taken from past Alumni surveys.

*Chi-square; p < .05.

Job Status at Graduation (Class of 2009) , by Program Type*

Response	Program Type			
	Full-Time MBA	Part-Time MBA	EMBA	Other Degree
I held this job while in graduate management school and continued.	10%	84%	79%	54%
I had an internship/work project with this employer and continued.	20%	3%	2%	12%
It was the first job I found after leaving graduate management school.	40%	7%	7%	14%
I was self-employed or a small-business owner.	6%	3%	8%	5%
I have not had a job since leaving graduate management school.	25%	4%	4%	15%
	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=635	N=256	N=132	N=182

*Chi-squared; p < .05.

Job Status at Graduation (Class of 2009) , by Gender

Response	Gender	
	Male	Female
I held this job while in graduate management school and continued.	41%	38%
I had an internship/work project with this employer and continued.	13%	13%
It was the first job I found after leaving graduate management school.	25%	25%
I was self-employed or a small-business owner.	5%	5%
I have not had a job since leaving graduate management school.	16%	18%
	100%	100%
Total	N=819	N=386

No statistical differences found.

Job Status at Graduation (Class of 2009), by Age*

Response	Age at time of survey		
	27 and younger	28 to 34	35 and older
I held this job while in graduate management school and continued.	17%	38%	66%
I had an internship/work project with this employer and continued.	20%	15%	3%
It was the first job I found after leaving graduate management school.	37%	27%	11%
I was self-employed or a small-business owner.	6%	4%	6%
I have not had a job since leaving graduate management school.	20%	16%	14%
	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=271	N=635	N=299

*Chi-squared; p < .05.

Job Status at Graduation (Class of 2009), by Citizenship*

Response	Citizenship (World Regions)					
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America	Africa/Middle East
I held this job while in graduate management school and continued.	47%	22%	36%	31%	27%	—
I had an internship/work project with this employer and continued.	14%	13%	9%	12%	12%	—
It was the first job I found after leaving graduate management school.	22%	37%	22%	31%	37%	—
I was self-employed or a small-business owner.	4%	5%	9%	4%	8%	—
I have not had a job since leaving graduate management school.	13%	24%	24%	23%	17%	—
Total	100% N=773	100% N=144	100% N=128	100% N=52	100% N=78	— N=30

—Data not shown because N < 50. *Chi-squared; p < .05.

Job Status at Graduation (Class of 2009), by School Location*

Response	School Location (World Region)				
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America
I held this job while in graduate management school and continued.	45%	37%	20%	22%	—
I had an internship/work project with this employer and continued.	14%	5%	14%	9%	—
It was the first job I found after leaving graduate management school.	23%	44%	26%	31%	—
I was self-employed or a small-business owner.	5%	5%	9%	5%	—
I have not had a job since leaving graduate management school.	14%	10%	31%	33%	—
Total	100% N=923	100% N=63	100% N=125	100% N=55	— N=32

—Data not shown because N < 50. *Chi-squared; p < .05.

Job Status at Graduation (Class of 2009), by US Subgroups

Response	US Subgroups		
	Non-Hispanic White	Asian American	Underrepresented Minorities
I held this job while in graduate management school and continued.	48%	50%	39%
I had an internship/work project with this employer and continued.	14%	4%	15%
It was the first job I found after leaving graduate management school.	21%	25%	23%
I was self-employed or a small-business owner.	4%	0%	5%
I have not had a job since leaving graduate management school.	12%	21%	18%
	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=626	N=52	N=61

No statistical differences found.

First Job (Class of 2009)

Respondents who reported they were working at the time of graduation were asked to indicate when they began working with their employer.

Timing of First Job (Class of 2009)*

Response	I held this job while in graduate management school and continued.	I had an internship/work project with this employer and continued.	It was the first job I found after leaving graduate management school.	Overall
1st Quarter of 2009	2%	8%	8%	5%
2nd Quarter of 2009	2%	26%	26%	14%
3rd Quarter of 2009	1%	38%	59%	26%
4th Quarter of 2009	0%	1%	0%	0%
2008 or earlier	95%	26%	7%	55%
	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=480	N=155	N=297	N=932

*Chi-squared; $p < .05$.

Respondents who reported they were working at the time of graduation were asked to indicate the method they used to find their first job.

**Method of Finding First Job After Graduation
(Class of 2009)**

Response	Percentage
My network of contacts	35%
On-campus interview	31%
School alumni network	21%
Company website (job openings/listings)	15%
Online job board	13%
Job fair/forum/conference	13%
Internet search	11%
Job agency/recruiter/head hunter	8%
Cold call to company	4%
Job ad in print media	2%
Online social networking	2%
List serve participation	1%
Other	7%

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

Job Offers

Respondents who either continued working for an employer with whom they had an internship or began a new job after graduation were asked to report the number of job offers they received.

Number of Job Offers (Including Current Employer) for the Class of 2009, by Graduation Year*

Response	Graduation Year									
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
One	27%	38%	51%	40%	37%	34%	23%	27%	21%	56%
Two	27%	26%	25%	27%	27%	28%	28%	27%	29%	29%
Three	16%	18%	18%	20%	21%	22%	23%	25%	24%	11%
Four or more	29%	18%	7%	13%	14%	16%	26%	21%	26%	4%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=329	N=584	N=530	N=774	N=737	N=570	N=525	N=412	N=543	N=231

Data for the classes of 2000-2008 are taken from past Alumni surveys.

*Chi-square; $p < .05$.

Number of Job Offers (Including Current Employer) for the Class of 2009, by Graduation Year (Mean Scores)

Statistic	Graduation Year									
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Mean*	2.8	2.3	1.9	2.1	2.3	2.3	2.7	2.5	2.7	1.7
Standard Error	.10	.06	.05	.05	.06	.05	.07	.06	.06	.06
Total	N=329	N=584	N=530	N=774	N=737	N=570	N=525	N=412	N=543	N=231

Data for the classes of 2000-2008 are taken from past Alumni surveys. *ANOVA; p < .05.

Number of Job Offers (Class of 2009) by Gender

Response	Gender	
	Male	Female
One	54%	63%
Two	29%	27%
Three	11%	10%
Four or more	6%	0%
	100%	100%
Total	N=169	N=62

No statistical differences found.

Number of Job Offers for Class of 2009 (Mean Scores), by Gender*

Statistic	Gender	
	Male	Female
Mean	1.7	1.5
Standard Error	.08	.09
Valid N	N=169	N=62

*t-test, p < .05

Number of Job Offers (Class of 2009), by Age

Response	Age at time of survey		
	27 and younger	28 to 34	35 and older
One	54%	56%	—
Two	30%	29%	—
Three	13%	11%	—
Four or more	4%	4%	—
	100%	100%	—
Total	N=71	N=138	N=22

—Data not shown because N < 50. No statistical differences found.

Number of Job Offers for Class of 2009 (Mean Scores), by Age

Statistic	Age at time of survey		
	27 and younger	28 to 34	35 and older
Mean	1.7	1.7	—
Standard Error	.14	.08	—
Valid N	N=71	N=138	N=22

—Data not shown because N < 50.
No statistical differences found.

Satisfaction With First Job**Right Decision in Choice of First Job**

Respondents who either continued working for an employer with whom they had an internship or started a new job were asked to indicate whether their first job was the kind of job they were looking for.

Right Decision in Choice of First Job (Class of 2009)

Response	Percentage
Yes, definitely	58%
Yes, somewhat	34%
No	8%
	100%
Total	N=448

Right Decision in Choice of First Job (Class of 2009), by Graduation Year

Response	Graduation Year									
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Yes, definitely	64%	52%	45%	55%	61%	62%	65%	65%	66%	58%
Yes, somewhat	29%	39%	45%	38%	34%	33%	33%	31%	31%	34%
No	6%	9%	10%	7%	5%	5%	2%	1%	4%	8%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=329	N=584	N=530	N=774	N=737	N=570	N=525	N=412	N=543	N=448

Data for the classes of 2000-2008 are taken from past Alumni surveys.*Chi-squared; p < .05.

Right Decision in Choice of First Job (Class of 2009), by Gender

	Gender	
	Male	Female
Yes, definitely	58%	59%
Yes, somewhat	35%	32%
No	8%	9%
	100%	100%
Total	N=306	N=142

No statistical differences found.

Right Decision in Choice of First Job (Class of 2009), by Age

	Age at time of survey		
	27 and younger	28 to 34	35 and older
Yes, definitely	54%	63%	—
Yes, somewhat	35%	30%	—
No	10%	7%	—
	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=147	N=260	N=41

—Data not shown because N < 50.

No statistical differences found.

Similarity Between Job Acquired and Job Desired (Class of 2009)

Respondents who either continued working for an employer with whom they had an internship or started a new job were asked, “In general, how well would you say that your job measures up to the sort of job you wanted when you first took it?”

Similarity Between Job Acquired and Job Desired (Class of 2009)

Response	Percentage
Very much like	51%
Somewhat like	39%
Not very much like	10%
	100%
Total	N=449

Similarity Between Job Acquired and Job Desired (Class of 2009), by Graduation Year

Statistic	Graduation Year									
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Very much like	64%	52%	45%	55%	61%	62%	65%	65%	66%	51%
Somewhat like	29%	39%	45%	38%	34%	33%	33%	31%	31%	39%
Not very much like	6%	9%	10%	7%	5%	5%	2%	4%	4%	10%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=329	N=584	N=530	N=774	N=737	N=570	N=525	N=412	N=543	N=448

Data for the classes of 2000-2008 are taken from past Alumni surveys. *Chi-squared; p < .05.

Similarity Between Job Acquired and Job Desired (Class of 2009), by Gender

Response	Gender	
	Male	Female
Very much like	50%	52%
Somewhat like	39%	38%
Not very much like	10%	10%
	100%	100%
Total	N=307	N=142

No statistical differences found.

Similarity Between Job Acquired and Job Desired (Class of 2009), by Age

Response	Age at time of survey		
	27 and younger	28 to 34	35 and older
Very much like	46%	55%	—
Somewhat like	43%	36%	—
Not very much like	12%	9%	—
	100%	100%	—
Total	N=147	N=261	N=41

—Data not shown because N < 50.

No statistical differences found.

Business School and the First Job (Class of 2009)

Career Services

Respondents who either continued working for an employer with whom they had an internship or started a new job were asked, “How helpful was your school’s career services office in providing you services that prepared you for a successful job search?”

Helpfulness of Career Services in Job Search (Class of 2009)

Response	Percentage
Extremely helpful	20%
Very helpful	29%
Somewhat helpful	30%
Not very helpful	16%
Not at all helpful	7%
	100%
Total	N=457

Helpfulness of Career Services in Job Search (Class of 2009), by Gender

Response	Gender	
	Male	Female
Extremely helpful	22%	15%
Very helpful	28%	31%
Somewhat helpful	29%	30%
Not very helpful	15%	16%
Not at all helpful	6%	8%
	100%	100%
Total	N=311	N=146

No statistical differences found.

Helpfulness of Career Services in Job Search (Class of 2009), by Age

Response	Age at time of survey		
	27 and younger	28 to 34	35 and older
Extremely helpful	20%	22%	—
Very helpful	28%	29%	—
Somewhat helpful	28%	29%	—
Not very helpful	18%	13%	—
Not at all helpful	5%	7%	—
	100%	100%	—
Total	N=152	N=264	N=41

—Data not shown because N < 50. No statistical differences found.

Essential Education (Class of 2009)

Respondents who either continued working for an employer with whom they had an internship or started a new job after graduation were asked to indicate their agreement with the following statement, "I could not have obtained this job without my graduate management school training."

Graduate Business Degree Essential for First Job (Class of 2009)

Response	Percentage
Strongly agree	54%
Somewhat agree	24%
Neither agree nor disagree	8%
Somewhat disagree	8%
Strongly disagree	6%
	100%
Total	N=448

Graduate Business Degree Essential for First Job (Class of 2009), by Graduation Year

Response	Graduation Year									
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Strongly agree	51%	41%	37%	42%	55%	57%	55%	55%	60%	54%
Somewhat agree	23%	22%	22%	21%	23%	25%	26%	23%	20%	24%
Neither agree nor disagree	6%	10%	12%	12%	7%	6%	5%	8%	6%	8%
Somewhat disagree	10%	9%	11%	10%	8%	6%	6%	7%	7%	8%
Strongly disagree	9%	18%	19%	16%	7%	5%	7%	7%	6%	6%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=329	N=584	N=530	N=774	N=737	N=570	N=525	N=412	N=543	N=448

Data for the classes of 2000-2008 are taken from past Alumni surveys.

*Chi-square; $p < .05$.

Graduate Business Degree Essential for First Job (Class of 2009), by Gender

Response	Gender	
	Male	Female
Strongly agree	55%	50%
Somewhat agree	22%	28%
Neither agree nor disagree	8%	6%
Somewhat disagree	8%	9%
Strongly disagree	7%	6%
	100%	100%
Total	N=306	N=142

No statistical differences found.

Graduate Business Degree Essential for First Job (Class of 2009), by Age

Response	Age at time of survey		
	27 and younger	28 to 34	35 and older
Strongly agree	47%	59%	—
Somewhat agree	26%	21%	—
Neither agree nor disagree	8%	7%	—
Somewhat disagree	10%	8%	—
Strongly disagree	10%	5%	—
	100%	100%	—
Total	N=147	N=260	N=41

—Data not shown because N < 50.

No statistical differences found.

Compensation From First Job After Graduation

Annual Base Salary

Respondents who continued with an internship/work project or employment or began a new job after graduation were asked to report their starting annual base salary.

Annual Average Base Salary on First Job (Class of 2009)

Statistic	Median	Mean	Standard Error	Valid N
US dollars	\$66,694	\$70,938	\$1,286	N=772

Annual Average Base Salary on First Job (Class of 2009), by Graduation Year

US Dollars	Graduation Year									
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Median	\$75,000	\$75,000	\$66,716	\$70,000	\$66,000	\$70,000	\$72,000	\$70,000	\$73,000	\$66,694
Mean*	\$74,532	\$71,621	\$66,868	\$69,965	\$65,321	\$72,730	\$71,580	\$73,089	\$74,370	\$70,938
Standard Error	\$1,458	\$1,357	\$1,453	\$1,236	\$807	\$1,262	\$1,011	\$1,358	\$1,160	\$1,286
Valid N	N=243	N=354	N=346	N=441	N=1,094	N=878	N=875	N=635	N=851	N=772

Data for 2000-2008 classes are taken from past Alumni surveys.

*ANOVA; $p < .05$.

Annual Average Base Salary on First Job (Class of 2009), by Program Type

Statistic	Program Type			
	Full-Time MBA	Part-Time MBA	EMBA	Other Degree
Median	\$74,313	\$60,000	\$80,000	\$56,602
Mean*	\$72,483	\$63,665	\$86,894	\$65,514
Standard Error	\$1,592	\$2,015	\$5,939	\$3,148
Valid N	N=358	N=206	N=97	N=111

*One-way ANOVA, $p < .05$

Annual Average Base Salary on First Job (Class of 2009), by Gender

Statistic	Gender	
	Male	Female
Median	\$72,000	\$58,000
Mean*	\$74,741	\$61,978
Standard Error	\$1,631	\$1,838
Valid N	N=542	N=230

*t-test, $p < .05$

Annual Average Base Salary on First Job (Class of 2009), by Age

Statistic	Age		
	27 and younger	28 to 34	35 and older
Median	\$57,000	\$70,000	\$78,000
Mean*	\$60,440	\$68,843	\$83,473
Standard Error	\$2,112	\$1,448	\$3,462
Valid N	N=147	N=430	N=195

*One-way ANOVA, $p < .05$

Annual Average Base Salary on First Job (Class of 2009), by Citizenship

Statistic	Citizenship (World Regions)					
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America	Africa/Middle East
Median	\$70,000	\$65,000	\$66,389	—	—	—
Mean*	\$73,018	\$61,748	\$73,922	—	—	—
Standard Error	\$1,500	\$3,972	\$6,023	—	—	—
Valid N	N=547	N=71	N=61	N=33	N=46	N=14

—Data not shown because N < 50.

*One-way ANOVA, $p < .05$ **Additional Compensation**

Respondents who continued with an internship/work project or began a new job after graduation were asked to report additional first-year compensation before taxes.

Additional Compensation (Class of 2009)

Statistic	Median	Mean	Standard Error	Valid N
US dollars	\$7,500	\$17,648	\$1,148	N=634

Additional Compensation (Class of 2009), by Program Type

Statistic	Program Type			
	Full-Time MBA	Part-Time MBA	EMBA	Other Degree
Median	\$10,000	\$5,060	\$8,000	\$4,776
Mean	\$18,553	\$17,567	\$17,243	\$15,031
Standard Error	\$1,327	\$3,255	\$3,061	\$3,002
Valid N	N=316	N=142	N=84	N=92

No statistical differences found.

Additional Compensation (Class of 2009), by Gender

Statistic	Gender	
	Male	Female
Median	\$9,850	\$5,000
Mean*	\$19,847	\$12,269
Standard Error	\$1,506	\$1,371
Valid N	N=450	N=184

*t-test, $p < .05$

Additional Compensation (Class of 2009), by Age

Statistic	Age		
	27 and younger	28 to 34	35 and older
Median	\$5,008	\$9,326	\$8,228
Mean*	\$11,767	\$19,331	\$18,889
Standard Error	\$1,446	\$1,648	\$2,596
Valid N	N=132	N=347	N=155

*One-way ANOVA, $p < .05$ **Average Additional Compensation (Class of 2009), by Citizenship**

Statistic	Citizenship (World Regions)					
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America	Africa/Middle East
Median	\$5,000	\$0	\$0	—	\$700	—
Mean*	\$15,399	\$7,319	\$8,520	—	\$6,498	—
Standard Error	\$1,214	\$1,297	\$2,469	—	\$1,546	—
Valid N	N=568	N=104	N=103	N=42	N=59	N=22

—Data not shown because $N < 50$.*One-way ANOVA, $p < .05$ **Additional Compensation (Class of 2009), by School Location**

Statistic	School World Location				
	US	Canada	Europe	Asia	Other
Median	\$10,000	—	\$3,138	—	—
Mean*	\$19,731	—	\$9,213	—	—
Standard Error	\$1,384	—	\$1,862	—	—
Valid N	N=511	N=22	N=55	N=26	N=17

—Data not shown because $N < 50$.*One-way ANOVA, $p < .05$ **Salary Expectations**

Respondents were asked, “Did your annual base salary meet the expectations you had prior to starting your job search?”

Expectations for Starting Salary

Response	Percentage
Exceeded expectations	14%
Met expectations	52%
Did not meet expectations	34%
	100%
Total	N=442

Expectations for Starting Salary, by Gender*

Response	Gender	
	Male	Female
Exceeded expectations	14%	14%
Met expectations	56%	44%
Did not meet expectations	30%	42%
	100%	100%
Total	N=303	N=139

*Chi-squared; $p < .05$.**Expectations for Starting Salary, by Age**

Response	Age at time of survey		
	27 and younger	28 to 34	35 and older
Exceeded expectations	16%	14%	—
Met expectations	47%	55%	—
Did not meet expectations	38%	32%	—
	100%	100%	—
Total	N=144	N=257	N=41

—Data not shown because $N < 50$.
No statistical differences found.

II. Employment Data

Key Findings

- The vast majority (83%) of alumni indicated they were employed at the time of the survey and 7 percent indicated they were business owners. Of the 10 percent that indicated they were not employed, 84 percent were actively searching for employment.
- The top industry of employment among all alumni was finance and accounting, closely followed by products and services.
- Alumni that graduated from executive MBA programs were more likely to indicate their current job function was in general management compared to graduates of full-time and

part-time MBA programs, who were more likely to indicate their current job function was in finance and accounting.

- According to employed alumni, the two most important interpersonal skills needed for their current job were the ability to work with others and the ability to influence others.
- Nearly half (48%) of alumni were extremely or very satisfied with their career progression after graduation.
- About half of all alumni had received a promotion with their current employer. On average, 90 percent of their promotions involved an increase in pay and more responsibilities. Alumni that graduated from schools in Latin America, Canada, and the United States were more likely to indicate they worked within their country of citizenship than alumni that graduated from schools in Europe and Asia.
- Asian Americans and underrepresented US minorities were more likely to consider cross-cultural sensitivity to be important than non-Hispanic white respondents.

Current Employment Status

Respondents, not limited to the class of 2009, were asked, “Are you currently working?”

Current Employment Status

Response	Percentage
Yes, I am currently working for an employer.	83%
Yes, I am self-employed or a small-business owner.	7%
No, I am not currently working.	10%
	100%
Total	N=3,732

Current Employment Status, by Graduation Year*

Response	Graduation Year									
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Yes, I am currently working for an employer.	83%	86%	82%	84%	86%	88%	87%	87%	88%	74%
Yes, I am self-employed or a small-business owner.	11%	9%	13%	7%	9%	8%	8%	5%	4%	6%
No, I am not currently working.	6%	5%	5%	10%	6%	4%	6%	8%	8%	20%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=83	N=132	N=119	N=166	N=293	N=365	N=519	N=410	N=657	N=1,177

*Chi-squared; p < .05.

Current Employment Status, by Program Type*

Response	Program Type			
	Full-Time MBA	Part-Time MBA	EMBA	Other Degree
Yes, I am currently working for an employer.	81%	90%	85%	75%
Yes, I am self-employed or a small-business owner.	7%	4%	10%	7%
No, I am not currently working.	12%	6%	5%	17%
	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=2,448	N=902	N=337	N=223

*Chi-squared; $p < .05$.**Current Employment Status, by Gender***

Response	Gender	
	Male	Female
Yes, I am currently working for an employer.	84%	80%
Yes, I am self-employed or a small-business owner.	7%	6%
No, I am not currently working.	9%	14%
	100%	100%
Total	N=2,756	N=1,165

*Chi-squared; $p < .05$.**Current Employment Status, by Age***

Response	Age at time of survey		
	27 and younger	28 to 34	35 and older
Yes, I am currently working for an employer.	85%	84%	78%
Yes, I am self-employed or a small-business owner.	5%	6%	9%
No, I am not currently working.	11%	10%	12%
	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=956	N=2,149	N=816

*Chi-squared; $p < .05$.

Current Employment Status, by Citizenship *

Response	Citizenship (World Regions)					
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America	Africa/Middle East
Yes, I am currently working for an employer.	85%	82%	76%	77%	82%	73%
Yes, I am self-employed or a small-business owner.	5%	5%	11%	11%	7%	11%
No, I am not currently working.	9%	13%	13%	12%	11%	16%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=2,632	N=380	N=427	N=209	N=187	N=75

*Chi-squared; p < .05.

Current Employment Status, by School Location *

Response	School Location (World Region)				
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America
Yes, I am currently working for an employer.	85%	84%	72%	78%	81%
Yes, I am self-employed or a small-business owner.	6%	8%	11%	8%	3%
No, I am not currently working.	10%	8%	16%	14%	16%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=3,062	N=127	N=410	N=228	N=32

*Chi-squared; p < .05.

Current Employment Status, by US Subgroup

Response	US Subgroups		
	Non-Hispanic White	Asian American	Underrepresented Minorities
Yes, I am currently working for an employer.	86%	83%	83%
Yes, I am self-employed or a small-business owner.	6%	4%	6%
No, I am not currently working.	9%	13%	12%
	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=2,092	N=195	N=197

No statistical differences found.

Respondents who indicated they were currently employer were asked, “Are you still employed by the employer you worked for in your first job after graduate management school?”

Still Employed With First Employer After Graduation

Response	Percentage
Yes	72%
No	28%
	100%
Total	N=3,257

Still Employed With First Employer After Graduation, by Graduation Year*

Response	Graduation Year									
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Yes	30%	37%	35%	40%	46%	54%	63%	76%	86%	96%
No	70%	63%	65%	60%	54%	46%	37%	24%	14%	4%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=69	N=114	N=98	N=139	N=251	N=322	N=450	N=355	N=577	N=876

*Chi-squared; p < .05.

Still Employed With First Employer After Graduation, by Program Type*

Response	Program Type			
	Full-Time MBA	Part-Time MBA	EMBA	Other Degree
Yes	67%	78%	83%	89%
No	33%	22%	17%	11%
	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=1,976	N=809	N=288	N=168

*Chi-squared; p < .05.

Still Employed With First Employer After Graduation, by Gender

Response	Gender	
	Male	Female
Yes	71%	73%
No	29%	27%
	100%	100%
Total	N=2,315	N=936

No statistical differences found.

Still Employed With First Employer After Graduation, by Age*

Response	Age at time of survey		
	27 and younger	28 to 34	35 and older
Yes	69%	70%	80%
No	31%	30%	20%
	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=807	N=1,805	N=639

*Chi-squared; p < .05.

Still Employed With First Employer After Graduation, by Citizenship*

Response	Citizenship (World Regions)					
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America	Africa/Middle East
Yes	73%	73%	64%	68%	71%	67%
No	27%	27%	36%	32%	29%	33%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=2,240	N=310	N=324	N=161	N=153	N=55

*Chi-squared; p < .05.

Still Employed With First Employer After Graduation, by School Location*

Response	School Location (World Region)				
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America
Yes	72%	85%	66%	68%	—
No	28%	15%	34%	32%	—
	100%	100%	100%	100%	—
Total	N=2,592	N=107	N=296	N=178	N=26

—Data not shown because N < 50.

*Chi-squared; p < .05.

Still Employed With First Employer After Graduation, by US Subgroup

Response	US Subgroups		
	Non-Hispanic White	Asian American	Underrepresented Minorities
Yes	74%	70%	69%
No	26%	30%	31%
	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=1,788	N=161	N=163

No statistical differences found.

Respondents who indicated they were currently employed were asked, “How many employers have you worked for since graduation from graduate management school?”

Number of Employers Since Graduation

Response	Percentage
One	72%
Two	19%
Three	7%
Four or more	2%
	100%
Total	N=3,257

**Number of Employers Worked for Since Graduation
(Mean Scores)**

Statistic	Mean	Standard Error	Valid N
Number of Employers	1.4	.01	N=3,527

Number of Employers Since Graduation, by Graduation Year*

Response	Graduation Year									
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
One	30%	37%	37%	40%	47%	55%	64%	77%	87%	97%
Two	25%	33%	33%	35%	29%	33%	30%	20%	11%	3%
Three	19%	19%	22%	19%	21%	10%	5%	4%	1%	0%
Four or more	26%	11%	8%	6%	3%	2%	1%	0%	1%	0%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=69	N=114	N=98	N=139	N=251	N=322	N=450	N=355	N=577	N=876

*Chi-squared; p < .05.

Number of Employers (Mean Scores), by Graduation Year*

Statistic	Graduation Year									
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Mean	2.5	2.1	2.0	1.9	1.8	1.6	1.4	1.3	1.2	1.0
Standard Error	.16	.10	.10	.08	.06	.04	.03	.03	.02	.01
Valid N	N=69	N=114	N=98	N=139	N=251	N=322	N=450	N=355	N=577	N=876

*ANOVA; p < .05.

Number of Employers (Mean Scores), by Program Type *

Statistic	Program Type			
	Full-Time MBA	Part-Time MBA	EMBA	Other Degree
Mean	1.5	1.3	1.2	1.1
Standard Error	.02	.02	.03	.03
Valid N	N=1,976	N=809	N=288	N=168

*ANOVA; p < .05.

Number of Employers Since Graduation, by Program Type *

Response	Program Type			
	Full-Time MBA	Part-Time MBA	EMBA	Other Degree
One	67%	78%	84%	89%
Two	22%	16%	13%	10%
Three	9%	4%	2%	1%
Four or more	3%	1%	1%	0%
	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=1,976	N=809	N=288	N=168

*Chi-squared; p < .05.

Number of Employers Since Graduation, by Gender

Response	Gender	
	Male	Female
One	72%	74%
Two	19%	18%
Three	7%	6%
Four or more	2%	2%
	100%	100%
Total	N=2,315	N=936

No statistical differences found.

Number of Employers (Mean Scores), by Gender

Statistic	Gender	
	Male	Female
Mean	1.4	1.4
Standard Error	.02	.02
Valid N	N=2,315	N=936

No statistical differences found.

Number of Employers Since Graduation, by Age *

Response	Age at time of survey		
	27 and younger	28 to 34	35 and older
One	70%	71%	80%
Two	22%	19%	15%
Three	6%	8%	4%
Four or more	2%	2%	1%
	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=807	N=1,805	N=639

*Chi-squared; p < .05.

Number of Employers (Mean Scores), by Age *

Statistic	Age at time of survey		
	27 and younger	28 to 34	35 and older
Mean	1.4	1.4	1.3
Standard Error	.03	.02	.02
Valid N	N=807	N=1,805	N=639

*ANOVA; p < .05.

Number of Employers Since Graduation, by Citizenship *

Response	Citizenship (World Regions)					
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America	Africa/Middle East
One	74%	74%	65%	70%	72%	67%
Two	18%	17%	21%	21%	20%	22%
Three	6%	8%	11%	7%	7%	9%
Four or more	2%	1%	3%	1%	1%	2%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=2,240	N=310	N=324	N=161	N=153	N=55

*Chi-squared; p < .05.

Number of Employers (Mean Scores), by Citizenship

Statistic	Citizenship (World Regions)					
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America	Africa/Middle East
Mean	1.4	1.4	1.5	1.4	1.4	1.5
Standard Error	.02	.04	.05	.05	.06	.10

Number of Employers (Mean Scores), by Citizenship

Valid N	N=2,240	N=310	N=324	N=161	N=153	N=55
---------	---------	-------	-------	-------	-------	------

No statistical differences found.

Number of Employers Since Graduation, by School Location *

Response	School Location (World Region)				
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America
One	73%	86%	67%	69%	—
Two	19%	7%	22%	20%	—
Three	6%	6%	10%	10%	—
Four or more	2%	1%	2%	2%	—
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=2,592	N=107	N=296	N=178	N=26

—Data not shown because N < 50.

*Chi-squared; p < .05.

Number of Employers (Mean Scores), by School Location

Statistic	School Location (World Region)				
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America
Mean	1.4	1.2	1.5	1.4	—
Standard Error	.01	.06	.04	.06	—
Valid N	N=2,592	N=107	N=296	N=178	N=26

—Data not shown because N < 50.

No statistical differences found.

Number of Employers Since Graduation, by US Subgroups

Response	US Subgroups		
	Non-Hispanic White	Asian American	Underrepresented Minorities
One	75%	70%	70%
Two	18%	21%	20%
Three	5%	6%	7%
Four or more	2%	3%	3%
	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=1,788	N=161	N=163

No statistical differences found.

Number of Employers (Mean Scores), by US Subgroups

Statistic	US Subgroups		
	Non-Hispanic White	Asian American	Underrepresented Minorities
Mean	1.4	1.4	1.4
Standard Error	.02	.06	.06
Valid N	N=1,788	N=161	N=163

No statistical differences found.

Respondents who indicated they were currently employed were asked, “How many years have you worked for your current employer?”

Length of Time With Current Employer

Response	Percentage
3 years or less	61%
4 to 6 years	21%
7 years or more	18%
	100%
Total	N=3,231

Length of Time With Current Employer (Mean Number of Years)

Statistic	Mean	Median	Standard Error	Valid N
Number of years with employer	3.9	2.5	.08	N=3,231

Length of Time With Current Employer, by Graduation Year*

Response	Graduation Year									
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
3 years or less	46%	31%	33%	45%	45%	45%	69%	76%	72%	63%
4 to 6 years	20%	24%	38%	40%	44%	40%	13%	8%	13%	18%
7 years or more	33%	45%	30%	15%	10%	15%	18%	16%	16%	18%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=69	N=113	N=98	N=136	N=251	N=321	N=449	N=353	N=574	N=861

*Chi-squared; p < .05

Length of Time With Current Employer (Mean Number of Years), by Graduation Year

Response	Graduation Year									
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Mean*	5.0	6.4	5.2	4.6	4.3	4.2	4.2	3.6	3.2	3.4

Length of Time With Current Employer (Mean Number of Years), by Graduation Year

Standard Error	.55	.55	.40	.37	.24	.22	.20	.22	.17	.15
Valid N	N=69	N=113	N=98	N=136	N=251	N=321	N=449	N=353	N=574	N=861

*ANOVA; p < .05.

Length of Time With Current Employer, by Program Type*

Response	Program Type			
	Full-Time MBA	Part-Time MBA	EMBA	Other Degree
3 years or less	73%	41%	31%	61%
4 to 6 years	20%	26%	22%	19%
7 years or more	7%	32%	47%	21%
	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=1,961	N=801	N=288	N=165

*Chi-squared; p < .05.

Length of Time With Current Employer (Mean Number of Years), by Program Type

Response	Program Type			
	Full-Time MBA	Part-Time MBA	EMBA	Other Degree
Mean*	2.6	5.5	7.6	4.2
Standard Error	.06	.17	.41	.41
Valid N	N=1,961	N=801	N=288	N=165

*ANOVA; p < .05.

Length of Time With Current Employer, by Gender

Response	Gender	
	Male	Female
3 years or less	60%	62%
4 to 6 years	21%	22%
7 years or more	18%	17%
	100%	100%
Total	N=2,299	N=926

No statistical differences found.

Length of Time With Current Employer (Mean Scores), by Gender

Response	Gender	
	Male	Female
Mean	4.0	3.6
Standard Error	.09	.13
Valid N	N=2,299	N=926

Length of Time With Current Employer (Mean Scores), by Gender

Response	Gender	
	Male	Female
Mean	4.0	3.6
Standard Error	.09	.13
Valid N	N=2,299	N=926

No statistical differences found.

Length of Time With Current Employer, by Age*

Response	Age at time of survey		
	27 and younger	28 to 34	35 and older
3 years or less	74%	62%	42%
4 to 6 years	20%	23%	19%
7 years or more	7%	15%	39%
	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=795	N=1,794	N=636

*Chi-squared; p < .05

Length of Time With Current Employer (Mean Number of Years), by Age

Response	Age at time of survey		
	27 and younger	28 to 34	35 and older
Mean*	2.5	3.4	6.9
Standard Error	.08	.07	.28
Valid N	N=795	N=1,794	N=636

*ANOVA; p < .05.

Length of Time With Current Employer, by Citizenship*

Response	Citizenship (World Regions)					
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America	Africa/Middle East
3 years or less	58%	70%	61%	68%	63%	80%
4 to 6 years	23%	16%	18%	18%	24%	18%
7 years or more	19%	14%	21%	15%	13%	2%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=2,221	N=309	N=322	N=158	N=152	N=55

*Chi-squared; p < .05

Length of Time With Current Employer (Mean Number of Years), by Citizenship

Response	Citizenship (World Regions)					
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America	Africa/Middle East
Mean*	4.1	3.0	4.0	3.3	3.5	2.3
Standard Error	.10	.20	.24	.32	.30	.25
Valid N	N=2,221	N=309	N=322	N=158	N=152	N=55

*ANOVA; p < .05.

Length of Time With Current Employer, by School Location*

Response	School Location (World Region)				
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America
3 years or less	59%	64%	69%	70%	72%
4 to 6 years	23%	14%	15%	17%	12%
7 years or more	18%	21%	17%	13%	16%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=2,572	N=107	N=294	N=176	N=25

*Chi-squared; p < .05

Length of Time With Current Employer (Mean Number of Years), by School Location

Response	School Location (World Region)				
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America
Mean	4.0	3.8	3.5	3.3	3.1
Standard Error	.09	.42	.23	.33	1.09
Valid N	N=2,572	N=107	N=294	N=176	N=25

No statistical differences found.

Length of Time With Current Employer, by US Subgroups*

Response	US Subgroups		
	Non-Hispanic White	Asian American	Underrepresented Minorities
3 years or less	57%	63%	68%
4 to 6 years	24%	21%	18%
7 years or more	20%	16%	13%
	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=1,770	N=160	N=163

*Chi-squared; p < .05

Length of Time With Current Employer (Mean Number of Years), by US Subgroups

Response	US Subgroups		
	Non-Hispanic White	Asian American	Underrepresented Minorities
Mean	4.2	3.7	3.5
Standard Error	.11	.29	.37
Valid N	N=1,770	N=160	N=163

No statistical differences found.

Work Hours

Respondents who indicated they were currently employed were asked, “Approximately how many hours do you work in a typical week?”

Typical Number of Hours Worked

Statistic	Median	Mean	Standard Error	Valid N
Hours worked in a typical week	50.0	48.2	.17	N=3,512

Typical Number of Hours Worked, by Graduation Year

Statistic	Graduation Year									
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Median	50.0	46.5	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0	48.0	45.5	45.0
Mean*	48.8	46.4	48.4	48.9	50.0	49.5	49.6	48.3	47.8	46.8
Standard Error	1.25	.99	1.27	.84	.62	.51	.44	.48	.41	.33
Valid N	N=78	N=126	N=113	N=150	N=276	N=353	N=490	N=374	N=600	N=944

*ANOVA; $p < .05$.

Typical Number of Hours Worked, by Program Type

Statistic	Program Type			
	Full-Time MBA	Part-Time MBA	EMBA	Other Degree
Median	50.0	45.0	50.0	45.0
Mean*	49.0	46.2	49.4	45.6
Standard Error	.23	.29	.50	.74
Valid N	N=2,144	N=847	N=320	N=183

*ANOVA; $p < .05$.

Typical Number of Hours Worked, by Gender

Statistic	Gender	
	Male	Female
Median	50.0	45.0
Mean*	49.3	45.6
Standard Error	.20	.30
Valid N	N=2,500	N=1,004

*t-test; p < .05.

Typical Number of Hours Worked, by Age

Statistic	Age at time of survey		
	27 and younger	28 to 34	35 and older
Median	45.0	50.0	45.0
Mean	46.8	49.1	47.5
Standard Error	.35	.23	.39
Valid N	N=851	N=1,938	N=715

No statistical differences found.

Typical Number of Hours Worked, by Citizenship

Statistic	Citizenship (World Regions)					
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America	Africa/Middle East
Median	50.0	48.0	50.0	45.0	50.0	47.0
Mean*	48.0	48.4	49.5	47.6	49.3	45.8
Standard Error	.20	.66	.50	.85	.78	1.59
Valid N	N=2,381	N=329	N=370	N=184	N=167	N=63

*ANOVA; p < .05.

Typical Number of Hours Worked, by School Location

Statistic	School Location (World Region)				
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America
Median	50.0	45.0	50.0	45.0	50.0
Mean*	48.2	48.7	49.2	46.7	47.3
Standard Error	.19	1.26	.57	.76	1.97
Valid N	N=2,760	N=117	N=342	N=197	N=27

*ANOVA; p < .05.

Typical Number of Hours Worked, by US Subgroup

Statistic	US Subgroups		
	Non-Hispanic White	Asian American	Underrepresented Minorities
Median	50.0	45.0	45.0
Mean	48.1	47.5	46.6
Standard Error	.22	.80	.79
Valid N	N=1,903	N=169	N=174

No statistical differences found.

Employment Attributes

Job Industry

Respondents who indicated they were currently employed were asked, “In what business or industry do you currently work?”

Detailed Industry List

Industry	Percentage (n = 3,076)	Industry	Percentage (n = 3,076)
Banking	5.9%	Real estate and rental and/or leasing	1.3%
Investment banking or management	4.9%	Engineering	1.2%
Other manufacturing	4.8%	Aviation and airlines	1.0%
Consulting services	4.4%	Marketing services	1.0%
Information technology or services	4.4%	Other energy and utilities	0.8%
Consumer goods	4.1%	Health insurance	0.8%
Education or educational services	3.9%	Advertising	0.8%
Management consulting	3.8%	Other consulting	0.7%
Other finance	3.4%	Military	0.7%
Government (non-military)	3.3%	Construction and installation	0.7%
Energy and utilities	3.2%	Engineering	0.7%
Telecommunications	2.9%	Health care consulting	0.6%
Retail/wholesale	2.9%	Arts and entertainment	0.6%
Health care	2.7%	Hotel, gaming, leisure, and travel	0.6%
Pharmaceutical	2.3%	Venture capital	0.5%
Aerospace and defense	2.2%	Professional, scientific, and technical services	0.5%
Finance and insurance	2.1%	Human resource services	0.4%
Nonprofit/not-for-profit	2.0%	Health managed care (provider)	0.4%
Information technology consulting	1.9%	Mining	0.3%
Food, beverage, and tobacco	1.9%	Utilities	0.3%
Internet and/or e-commerce	1.8%	Customer services	0.3%
Insurance	1.7%	Science and research	0.2%
Other health care or pharmaceutical	1.6%	Restaurant and food services	0.2%
Accounting	1.5%	Sports and recreation	0.2%

Detailed Industry List

Industry	Percentage (n = 3,076)	Industry	Percentage (n = 3,076)
Biotechnology	1.5%	Science and research	0.1%
Other technology	1.4%	Architecture	0.1%
Other products and services	1.4%	Other industry not listed	4.6%
Automotive	1.3%	Total	100%

Current Industry of Employment

Industry	Percentage
Finance/accounting	21%
Products/services	19%
Consulting	13%
Technology	13%
Nonprofit/government	11%
Health care/pharmaceuticals	10%
Manufacturing	9%
Energy/utilities	5%
	100%
Total	N=3,076

Current Employment Industry, by Graduation Year

Industry	Graduation Year									
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Consulting	12%	10%	9%	14%	15%	13%	16%	13%	12%	11%
Energy/utilities	4%	5%	4%	1%	5%	7%	4%	5%	5%	5%
Finance/accounting	20%	25%	16%	22%	19%	26%	23%	19%	23%	20%
Health care/pharmaceuticals	12%	6%	17%	11%	10%	8%	9%	11%	9%	10%
Technology	14%	15%	17%	10%	16%	12%	14%	12%	13%	12%
Manufacturing	9%	9%	14%	9%	11%	5%	6%	9%	10%	10%
Nonprofit/government	12%	17%	9%	13%	8%	8%	9%	9%	10%	13%
Products/services	17%	13%	14%	19%	16%	20%	18%	22%	17%	21%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=69	N=110	N=95	N=134	N=242	N=309	N=422	N=333	N=537	N=820

No statistical differences found.

Current Employment Industry, by Program Type*

Industry	Program Type			
	Full-Time MBA	Part-Time MBA	EMBA	Other Degree
Consulting	15%	8%	8%	6%
Energy/utilities	5%	5%	7%	3%
Finance/accounting	22%	20%	16%	26%
Health care/pharmaceuticals	9%	11%	13%	12%
Technology	13%	14%	15%	13%
Manufacturing	7%	12%	16%	5%
Nonprofit/government	10%	12%	9%	18%
Products/services	20%	18%	16%	17%
	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=1,888	N=760	N=262	N=151

*Chi-squared; $p < .05$.**Current Employment Industry, by Gender***

Industry	Gender	
	Male	Female
Consulting	14%	9%
Energy/utilities	5%	4%
Finance/accounting	22%	19%
Health care/pharmaceuticals	10%	11%
Technology	14%	11%
Manufacturing	9%	7%
Nonprofit/government	8%	16%
Products/services	17%	23%
	100%	100%
Total	N=2,196	N=875

*Chi-squared; $p < .05$.**Current Employment Industry, by Age***

Industry	Age at time of survey		
	27 and younger	28 to 34	35 and older
Consulting	12%	14%	9%
Energy/utilities	4%	5%	6%
Finance/accounting	25%	22%	14%
Health care/pharmaceuticals	9%	9%	12%

Current Employment Industry, by Age*

Industry	Age at time of survey		
	27 and younger	28 to 34	35 and older
Technology	10%	14%	14%
Manufacturing	7%	8%	15%
Nonprofit/government	11%	10%	13%
Products/services	22%	18%	17%
	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=766	N=1,699	N=606

*Chi-squared; p < .05.

Current Employment Industry, by Citizenship*

Industry	Citizenship (World Regions)					
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America	Africa/Middle East
Consulting	11%	17%	19%	19%	13%	9%
Energy/utilities	5%	5%	7%	5%	3%	6%
Finance/accounting	20%	25%	21%	21%	26%	36%
Health care/pharmaceuticals	11%	6%	9%	7%	8%	4%
Technology	12%	22%	11%	11%	14%	8%
Manufacturing	9%	8%	9%	8%	8%	4%
Nonprofit/government	12%	7%	5%	18%	4%	17%
Products/services	20%	11%	19%	12%	25%	17%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=2,118	N=294	N=301	N=153	N=145	N=53

*Chi-squared; p < .05.

Current Employment Industry, by School Location

Industry	School Location (World Region)				
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America
Consulting	11%	16%	20%	16%	—
Energy/utilities	5%	7%	5%	5%	—
Finance/accounting	21%	21%	22%	27%	—
Health care/pharmaceuticals	11%	2%	9%	6%	—
Technology	13%	20%	14%	11%	—
Manufacturing	9%	11%	6%	6%	—
Nonprofit/government	11%	9%	6%	15%	—
Products/services	20%	14%	17%	15%	—

Current Employment Industry, by School Location

Industry	School Location (World Region)				
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	—
	N=2,450	N=100	N=277	N=171	N=25

—Data not shown because N < 50. No statistical differences found.

Current Employment Industry, by US Subgroups

Industry	US Subgroups		
	Non-Hispanic White	Asian American	Underrepresented Minorities
Consulting	10%	13%	10%
Energy/utilities	4%	3%	7%
Finance/accounting	20%	22%	13%
Health care/pharmaceuticals	11%	12%	12%
Technology	12%	17%	14%
Manufacturing	10%	5%	7%
Nonprofit/government	11%	10%	17%
Products/services	20%	18%	20%
Total	100%	100%	100%
	N=1,696	N=155	N=150

No statistical differences found.

Job Function

Respondents who indicated they were currently employed were asked, “What job function do you currently perform?”

Detailed Job Function List

Job Function	Percentage (n = 2,973)	Job Function	Percentage (n = 2,973)
General management	8.8%	Systems analysis	1.4%
Corporate finance	7.0%	Communications	1.1%
Product management	6.9%	Logistics	1.1%
Strategy	6.9%	Change management	1.1%
Other marketing/sales	5.6%	Other human resources	1.1%
Operations	4.4%	Advertising	1.0%
Accounting/auditing	4.1%	Systems consulting	1.0%
Other finance/accounting	3.9%	Product development	0.9%
Investments	3.8%	Production/manufacturing	0.6%
Other consulting	3.1%	Other general management	0.5%
Other information technology/MIS	3.1%	Staffing and training	0.5%

Detailed Job Function List

Job Function	Percentage (n = 2,973)	Job Function	Percentage (n = 2,973)
Sales	3.0%	Public relations	0.4%
Sales management	2.7%	Compensation and benefits	0.4%
Business development	2.1%	Product management	0.3%
Engineering	2.0%	Entrepreneurial	0.3%
Market research	1.9%	Public finance	0.3%
Purchasing	1.8%	Change management	0.3%
Banking	1.8%	Electronic commerce	0.3%
Treasury and financial analysis	1.8%	Telecommunications	0.2%
M&A (mergers & acquisitions)	1.5%	Industrial/labor relations	0.1%
Other operations/logistics	1.4%	Other job function not listed	7.7%
Real estate	1.4%	Total	100%

Current Job Function

Function	Percentage
Marketing/sales	25%
Operations/logistics	13%
Consulting	15%
General management	11%
Finance/accounting	28%
Human resources	3%
IT/MIS	7%
	100%
Total	N=2,973

Current Job Function, by Graduation Year

Function	Graduation Year									
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Marketing/sales	25%	21%	21%	28%	29%	23%	23%	25%	26%	24%
Operations/logistics	13%	9%	12%	13%	7%	9%	12%	14%	15%	17%
Consulting	16%	13%	19%	13%	16%	18%	17%	16%	12%	13%
General management	10%	19%	13%	6%	10%	14%	9%	8%	10%	10%
Finance/accounting	21%	29%	26%	31%	30%	30%	31%	29%	28%	24%
Human resources	6%	3%	2%	1%	3%	3%	1%	3%	2%	3%
IT/MIS	10%	7%	7%	9%	4%	3%	6%	6%	7%	9%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=63	N=105	N=91	N=127	N=234	N=306	N=411	N=325	N=520	N=786

Current Job Function, by Graduation Year

Function	Graduation Year									
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Marketing/sales	25%	21%	21%	28%	29%	23%	23%	25%	26%	24%
Operations/logistics	13%	9%	12%	13%	7%	9%	12%	14%	15%	17%
Consulting	16%	13%	19%	13%	16%	18%	17%	16%	12%	13%
General management	10%	19%	13%	6%	10%	14%	9%	8%	10%	10%
Finance/accounting	21%	29%	26%	31%	30%	30%	31%	29%	28%	24%
Human resources	6%	3%	2%	1%	3%	3%	1%	3%	2%	3%
IT/MIS	10%	7%	7%	9%	4%	3%	6%	6%	7%	9%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=63	N=105	N=91	N=127	N=234	N=306	N=411	N=325	N=520	N=786

No statistical differences found.

Current Job Function, by Program Type *

Function	Program Type			
	Full-Time MBA	Part-Time MBA	EMBA	Other Degree
Marketing/sales	26%	24%	23%	17%
Operations/logistics	9%	19%	22%	15%
Consulting	19%	8%	10%	7%
General management	9%	10%	17%	13%
Finance/accounting	29%	25%	20%	34%
Human resources	2%	3%	2%	5%
IT/MIS	5%	11%	6%	10%
	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=1,817	N=732	N=267	N=143

*Chi-squared; $p < .05$.**Current Job Function, by Gender***

Function	Gender	
	Male	Female
Marketing/sales	22%	32%
Operations/logistics	14%	12%
Consulting	16%	13%
General management	11%	9%
Finance/accounting	29%	25%
Human resources	2%	5%
IT/MIS	7%	5%

Current Job Function, by Gender*

Function	Gender	
	Male	Female
Total	100%	100%
	N=2,145	N=823

*Chi-squared; p < .05.

Current Job Function, by Age*

Function	Age at time of survey		
	27 and younger	28 to 34	35 and older
Marketing/sales	25%	25%	21%
Operations/logistics	11%	12%	21%
Consulting	12%	17%	11%
General management	8%	9%	17%
Finance/accounting	35%	28%	19%
Human resources	3%	2%	3%
IT/MIS	6%	7%	8%
	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=722	N=1,671	N=575

*Chi-squared; p < .05.

Current Job Function, by Citizenship*

Function	Citizenship (World Regions)					
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America	Africa/Middle East
Marketing/sales	26%	24%	22%	23%	19%	—
Operations/logistics	14%	10%	8%	13%	15%	—
Consulting	13%	15%	22%	24%	18%	—
General management	10%	11%	17%	13%	9%	—
Finance/accounting	28%	28%	24%	19%	36%	—
Human resources	3%	3%	1%	4%	0%	—
IT/MIS	7%	9%	6%	5%	3%	—
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	—
Total	N=2,035	N=287	N=306	N=142	N=142	N=49

—Data not shown because N < 50.

*Chi-squared; p < .05.

Current Job Function, by School Location*

Function	School Location (World Region)				
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America
Marketing/sales	24%	31%	26%	21%	—
Operations/logistics	14%	11%	8%	11%	—
Consulting	13%	11%	23%	25%	—
General management	10%	14%	14%	12%	—
Finance/accounting	29%	20%	22%	25%	—
Human resources	3%	5%	1%	2%	—
IT/MIS	7%	9%	5%	3%	—
	100%	100%	100%	100%	—
Total	N=2,358	N=102	N=277	N=162	N=22

—Data not shown because N < 50.

*Chi-squared; p < .05.

Current Job Function, by US Subgroups*

Function	US Subgroups		
	Non-Hispanic White	Asian American	Underrepresented Minorities
Marketing/sales	25%	20%	35%
Operations/logistics	14%	16%	10%
Consulting	12%	19%	12%
General management	9%	12%	10%
Finance/accounting	29%	21%	24%
Human resources	3%	3%	3%
IT/MIS	6%	11%	7%
	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=1,620	N=156	N=147

*Chi-squared; p < .05.

Organization Size

Respondents who indicated they were currently working for an employer were asked to indicate the size of all locations of their employer and the size of the location where they work, in terms of total number of employees.

Organization Size (All Locations)

Response	Percentage
Fewer than 5	1%
5 to 9	2%
10 to 24	3%
25 to 49	3%
50 to 99	4%
100 to 249	6%
250 to 499	5%
500 to 999	5%
1,000 to 2,499	8%
2,500 to 4,999	7%
5,000 to 9,999	8%
10,000 to 24,999	12%
25,000 or more	33%
Don't know	2%
	100%
Total	N=3,216

Organization Size (Location of Employment)

Response	Percentage
Fewer than 5	5%
5 to 9	4%
10 to 24	8%
25 to 49	7%
50 to 99	8%
100 to 249	13%
250 to 499	12%
500 to 999	11%
1,000 to 2,499	12%
2,500 to 4,999	9%
5,000 to 9,999	5%
10,000 to 24,999	3%
25,000 or more	1%
Don't know	1%
	100%
Total	N=3,216

Organization Size (All Locations), by Graduation Year

Response	Graduation Year									
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Fewer than 1,000	18%	33%	26%	29%	29%	34%	31%	27%	30%	33%
1,001 to 24,999	40%	37%	39%	38%	38%	32%	33%	39%	39%	34%
25,000 or more	42%	30%	35%	33%	33%	34%	36%	34%	31%	33%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=67	N=113	N=97	N=138	N=249	N=319	N=436	N=342	N=557	N=826

No statistical differences found.

Organization Size (Location of Employment), by Graduation Year

Response	Graduation Year									
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Fewer than 1,000	55%	74%	65%	70%	71%	68%	67%	68%	69%	68%
1,001 to 24,999	45%	25%	35%	28%	28%	29%	32%	31%	30%	30%
25,000 or more	0%	1%	0%	1%	1%	3%	1%	1%	1%	2%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=67	N=113	N=97	N=138	N=249	N=319	N=436	N=342	N=557	N=826

No statistical differences found.

Organization Size (All Locations), by Program Type *

Response	Program Type			
	Full-Time MBA	Part-Time MBA	EMBA	Other Degree
Fewer than 1,000	31%	29%	31%	33%
1,001 to 24,999	34%	40%	37%	34%
25,000 or more	35%	31%	32%	33%
	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=1,917	N=782	N=280	N=155

*Chi-squared; p < .05.

Organization Size (Location of Employment), by Program Type *

Response	Program Type			
	Full-Time MBA	Part-Time MBA	EMBA	Other Degree
Fewer than 1,000	68%	68%	68%	68%
1,001 to 24,999	30%	31%	32%	29%
25,000 or more	2%	1%	0%	3%
	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=1,917	N=782	N=280	N=155

Organization Size (Location of Employment), by Program Type*

Response	Program Type			
	Full-Time MBA	Part-Time MBA	EMBA	Other Degree
Fewer than 1,000	68%	68%	68%	68%
1,001 to 24,999	30%	31%	32%	29%
25,000 or more	2%	1%	0%	3%
	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=1,917	N=782	N=280	N=155

*Chi-squared; p < .05.

Organization Size (All Locations), by Gender*

Response	Gender	
	Male	Female
Fewer than 1,000	30%	31%
1,001 to 24,999	36%	36%
25,000 or more	34%	32%
	100%	100%
Total	N=2,257	N=887

*Chi-squared; p < .05.

Organization Size (Location of Employment), by Gender*

Response	Gender	
	Male	Female
Fewer than 1,000	69%	66%
1,001 to 24,999	29%	33%
25,000 or more	2%	1%
	100%	100%
Total	N=2,257	N=887

*Chi-squared; p < .05.

Organization Size (All Locations), by Age*

Response	Age at time of survey		
	27 and younger	28 to 34	35 and older
Fewer than 1,000	32%	30%	30%
1,001 to 24,999	35%	36%	38%
25,000 or more	33%	34%	31%
	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=771	N=1,749	N=624

Organization Size (All Locations), by Age *

Response	Age at time of survey		
	27 and younger	28 to 34	35 and older

*Chi-squared; p < .05.

Organization Size (Location of Employment), by Age

Response	Age at time of survey		
	27 and younger	28 to 34	35 and older
Fewer than 1,000	69%	68%	68%
1,001 to 24,999	30%	30%	31%
25,000 or more	1%	2%	1%
Total	100%	100%	100%
	N=771	N=1,749	N=624

No statistical differences found.

Organization Size (All Locations), by Citizenship

Response	Citizenship (World Regions)					
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America	Africa/Middle East
Fewer than 1,000	31%	28%	31%	32%	26%	48%
1,001 to 24,999	36%	32%	40%	34%	35%	23%
25,000 or more	33%	40%	29%	34%	39%	29%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	N=2,163	N=298	N=320	N=155	N=148	N=52

No statistical differences found.

Organization Size (Location of Employment), by Citizenship *

Response	Citizenship (World Regions)					
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America	Africa/Middle East
Fewer than 1,000	67%	63%	79%	75%	68%	79%
1,001 to 24,999	32%	35%	19%	25%	32%	21%
25,000 or more	2%	2%	2%	1%	0%	0%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	N=2,163	N=298	N=320	N=155	N=148	N=52

*Chi-squared; p < .05.

Organization Size (All Locations), by School Location

Response	School Location (World Region)				
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America
Fewer than 1,000	30%	28%	31%	33%	—
1,001 to 24,999	36%	42%	37%	30%	—
25,000 or more	34%	30%	32%	37%	—
	100%	100%	100%	100%	—
Total	N=2,502	N=104	N=290	N=172	N=26

—Data not shown because N < 50.

No statistical differences found.

Organization Size (Location of Employment), by School Location

Response	School Location (World Region)				
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America
Fewer than 1,000	67%	71%	77%	70%	—
1,001 to 24,999	32%	27%	22%	28%	—
25,000 or more	2%	2%	1%	1%	—
	100%	100%	100%	100%	—
Total	N=2,502	N=104	N=290	N=172	N=26

—Data not shown because N < 50.

No statistical differences found.

Organization Size (All Locations), by US Subgroups*

Response	US Subgroups		
	Non-Hispanic White	Asian American	Underrepresented Minorities
Fewer than 1,000	32%	22%	31%
1,001 to 24,999	36%	39%	36%
25,000 or more	32%	39%	33%
	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=1,730	N=157	N=155

*Chi-squared; p < .05.

Organization Size (Location of Employment), by US Subgroups*

Response	US Subgroups		
	Non-Hispanic White	Asian American	Underrepresented Minorities
Fewer than 1,000	67%	61%	70%

Organization Size (Location of Employment), by US Subgroups*

Response	US Subgroups		
	Non-Hispanic White	Asian American	Underrepresented Minorities
1,001 to 24,999	31%	38%	29%
25,000 or more	2%	1%	1%
	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=1,730	N=157	N=155

*Chi-squared; p < .05.

Employment Location Data

Respondents who indicated they were currently employed were asked, “Does your organization primarily have a local, regional, national, or multinational focus?”

Primary Focus of Current Employing Organization

Response	Percentage
Local	5%
Regional	12%
National	24%
Multinational	59%
	100%
Total	N=3,215

Primary Focus of Current Employing Organization, by Graduation Year

Response	Graduation Year									
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Local	10%	6%	5%	6%	5%	4%	6%	3%	5%	7%
Regional	7%	14%	6%	8%	11%	11%	9%	13%	13%	13%
National	19%	18%	30%	22%	25%	21%	24%	25%	28%	22%
Multinational	64%	61%	59%	64%	59%	64%	61%	59%	54%	58%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=69	N=114	N=98	N=139	N=251	N=322	N=446	N=351	N=567	N=852

No statistical differences found.

Primary Focus of Current Employing Organization, by Program Type*

Response	Program Type			
	Full-Time MBA	Part-Time MBA	EMBA	Other Degree
Local	4%	7%	6%	11%
Regional	11%	12%	12%	20%
National	23%	26%	21%	20%
Multinational	61%	55%	60%	49%
	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=1,956	N=800	N=283	N=160

*Chi-squared; p < .05.

Primary Focus of Current Employing Organization, by Gender*

Response	Gender	
	Male	Female
Local	5%	8%
Regional	10%	15%
National	24%	24%
Multinational	61%	53%
	100%	100%
Total	N=2,289	N=920

*Chi-squared; p < .05.

Primary Focus of Current Employing Organization, by Age*

Response	Age at time of survey		
	27 and younger	28 to 34	35 and older
Local	6%	5%	6%
Regional	12%	10%	15%
National	27%	23%	21%
Multinational	54%	62%	57%
	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=794	N=1,785	N=630

*Chi-squared; p < .05.

Primary Focus of Current Employing Organization, by Citizenship*

Response	Citizenship (World Regions)					
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America	Africa/Middle East
Local	6%	3%	2%	3%	6%	9%
Regional	13%	10%	6%	19%	7%	2%
National	25%	22%	23%	23%	18%	28%
Multinational	56%	64%	69%	55%	70%	61%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=2,210	N=303	N=322	N=160	N=152	N=54

*Chi-squared; p < .05.

Primary Focus of Current Employing Organization, by School Location*

Response	School Location (World Region)				
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America
Local	6%	5%	2%	3%	—
Regional	12%	8%	6%	18%	—
National	24%	23%	21%	24%	—
Multinational	58%	64%	71%	55%	—
	100%	100%	100%	100%	—
Total	N=2,555	N=106	N=294	N=177	N=26

—Data not shown because N < 50.

*Chi-squared; p < .05.

Primary Focus of Current Employing Organization, by US Subgroup

Response	US Subgroups		
	Non-Hispanic White	Asian American	Underrepresented Minorities
Local	6%	7%	10%
Regional	13%	11%	10%
National	25%	19%	22%
Multinational	56%	62%	57%
	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=1,764	N=159	N=162

No statistical difference found.

Location of Employment

Respondents who indicated they were currently employed were asked, “Are you currently working in your country of citizenship?”

Location of Employment

Response	Percentage
Within country of citizenship	84%
Outside country of citizenship	16%
	100%
Total	N=3,215

*Chi-squared; p < .05.

Location of Employment, by Graduation Year

Response	Graduation Year									
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Within country of citizenship	80%	80%	79%	75%	84%	82%	83%	84%	86%	86%
Outside country of citizenship	20%	20%	21%	25%	16%	18%	17%	16%	14%	14%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=69	N=114	N=98	N=139	N=251	N=322	N=446	N=351	N=567	N=852

No statistical differences found.

Location of Employment, by Program Type*

Response	Program Type			
	Full-Time MBA	Part-Time MBA	EMBA	Other Degree
Within country of citizenship	79%	93%	89%	91%
Outside country of citizenship	21%	8%	11%	9%
	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=1,956	N=800	N=283	N=160

*Chi-squared; p < .05.

Location of Employment, by Gender*

Response	Gender	
	Male	Female
Within country of citizenship	83%	86%
Outside country of citizenship	17%	14%
	100%	100%
Total	N=2,289	N=920

*Chi-squared; p < .05.

Location of Employment, by Age*

Response	Age at time of survey		
	27 and younger	28 to 34	35 and older
Within country of citizenship	84%	82%	88%
Outside country of citizenship	16%	18%	12%
	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=794	N=1,785	N=630

*Chi-squared; $p < .05$.**Location of Employment, by Citizenship***

Response	Citizenship (World Regions)					
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America	Africa/Middle East
Within country of citizenship	96%	47%	57%	81%	52%	59%
Outside country of citizenship	4%	53%	43%	19%	48%	41%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=2,210	N=303	N=322	N=160	N=152	N=54

*Chi-squared; $p < .05$.**Location of Employment, by School Location***

Response	School Location (World Region)				
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America
Within country of citizenship	87%	73%	59%	78%	88%
Outside country of citizenship	13%	27%	41%	22%	12%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=2,555	N=106	N=294	N=177	N=26

*Chi-squared; $p < .05$.**Location of Employment, by US Subgroups**

Response	US Subgroups		
	Non-Hispanic White	Asian American	Underrepresented Minorities
Within country of citizenship	96%	94%	97%
Outside country of citizenship	4%	6%	3%
	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=1,764	N=159	N=162

No statistical differences found.

Career Progression Data

Respondents who indicated they were currently employed were asked, “In general, how satisfied are you with your career progression since leaving graduate business school?”

Overall Satisfaction With Career Progression Since Graduation

Response	Percentage
Extremely satisfied	12%
Very satisfied	36%
Somewhat satisfied	35%
Not very satisfied	13%
Not at all satisfied	4%
	100%
Total	N=3,252

Satisfaction With Career Progression, by Graduation Year

Response	Graduation Year									
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Mean*	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.6	3.5	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.3	3.3
Standard Error	.10	.09	.09	.06	.05	.05	.04	.05	.05	.04
Valid N	N=69	N=114	N=98	N=139	N=251	N=322	N=450	N=354	N=575	N=874

Scale: 1 = Not at all satisfied; 5 = Extremely satisfied. *ANOVA; $p < .05$.

Satisfaction With Career Progression, by Program Type

Response	Program Type			
	Full-Time MBA	Part-Time MBA	EMBA	Other Degree
Mean*	3.5	3.2	3.4	3.2
Standard Error	.02	.04	.06	.08
Valid N	N=1,973	N=808	N=288	N=167

Scale: 1 = Not at all satisfied; 5 = Extremely satisfied. *ANOVA; $p < .05$.

Satisfaction With Career Progression, by Gender

Response	Gender	
	Male	Female
Mean*	3.4	3.3
Standard Error	.02	.03
Valid N	N=2,312	N=934

Scale: 1 = Not at all satisfied; 5 = Extremely satisfied.

*t-test; $p < .05$.**Satisfaction With Career Progression, by Age**

Response	Age at time of survey		
	27 and younger	28 to 34	35 and older
Mean*	3.5	3.4	3.2
Standard Error	.03	.02	.04
Valid N	N=803	N=1,804	N=639

Scale: 1 = Not at all satisfied; 5 = Extremely satisfied.

*ANOVA; $p < .05$.**Satisfaction With Career Progression, by Citizenship**

Response	Citizenship (World Regions)					
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America	Africa/Middle East
Mean*	3.4	3.2	3.4	3.3	3.7	3.3
Standard Error	.02	.05	.05	.08	.07	.12
Valid N	N=2,237	N=309	N=324	N=161	N=153	N=54

Scale: 1 = Not at all satisfied; 5 = Extremely satisfied.

*ANOVA; $p < .05$.**Satisfaction With Career Progression, by School Location**

Response	School Location (World Region)				
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America
Mean*	3.4	3.0	3.4	3.2	—
Standard Error	.02	.09	.05	.08	—
Valid N	N=2,588	N=107	N=296	N=178	N=26

—Data not shown because $N < 50$.

Scale: 1 = Not at all satisfied; 5 = Extremely satisfied.

*ANOVA; $p < .05$.

Satisfaction With Career Progression, by US Subgroups

Response	US Subgroups		
	Non-Hispanic White	Asian American	Underrepresented Minorities
Mean	3.4	3.3	3.4
Standard Error	.02	.08	.08
Valid N	N=1,785	N=161	N=163

Scale: 1 = Not at all satisfied; 5 = Extremely satisfied.
 No statistical differences found.

Promotions

Respondents who indicated they were currently employed were asked, “Have you received a promotion since you began working for your current employer?”

Job Promotions Received

Response	Percentage
Yes	49%
No	51%
	100%
Total	N=3,243

Job Promotions Received, by Graduation Year*

Response	Graduation Year									
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Yes	54%	60%	67%	65%	62%	65%	57%	47%	39%	38%
No	46%	40%	33%	35%	38%	35%	43%	53%	61%	62%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=69	N=114	N=98	N=139	N=251	N=322	N=449	N=354	N=571	N=870

*Chi-squared; p < .05.

Job Promotions Received, by Program Type*

Response	Program Type			
	Full-Time MBA	Part-Time MBA	EMBA	Other Degree
Yes	42%	60%	69%	47%
No	58%	40%	31%	53%
	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=1,970	N=804	N=288	N=165

*Chi-squared; p < .05.

Job Promotions Received, by Gender

Response	Gender	
	Male	Female
Yes	50%	48%
No	50%	52%
	100%	100%
Total	N=2,306	N=931

No statistical differences found.

Job Promotions Received, by Age*

Response	Age at time of survey		
	27 and younger	28 to 34	35 and older
Yes	44%	50%	54%
No	56%	50%	46%
	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=804	N=1,796	N=637

*Chi-squared; p < .05.

Job Promotions Received, by Citizenship*

Response	Citizenship (World Regions)					
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America	Africa/Middle East
Yes	51%	40%	50%	39%	57%	35%
No	49%	60%	50%	61%	43%	65%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=2,229	N=309	N=322	N=161	N=153	N=55

*Chi-squared; p < .05.

Job Promotions Received, by School Location*

Response	School Location (World Region)				
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America
Yes	51%	47%	47%	43%	—
No	49%	53%	53%	57%	—
	100%	100%	100%	100%	—
Total	N=2,580	N=106	N=295	N=178	N=26

—Data not shown because N < 50. *Chi-squared; p < .05.

Job Promotions Received, by US Subgroups*

Response	US Subgroups		
	Non-Hispanic White	Asian American	Underrepresented Minorities
Yes	53%	43%	42%
No	47%	57%	58%
	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=1,780	N=159	N=163

*Chi-squared; p < .05.

Respondents who indicated they received a promotion were asked, “How many promotions have you received since you began working for your current employer?”

Job Promotions Received (Mean Scores)

Response	Mean	Standard Error	Valid N
Number of promotions with current employer	2.1	.04	N=1,603

Number of Promotions Received, by Graduation Year (Mean Scores)

Response	Graduation Year									
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Mean*	—	2.5	2.2	2.1	2.0	2.1	1.9	2.1	2.0	2.4
Standard Error	—	.19	.18	.14	.11	.10	.09	.12	.11	.11
Valid N	N=37	N=68	N=66	N=90	N=156	N=210	N=254	N=165	N=224	N=329

—Data not shown because N < 50. *ANOVA; p < .05.

Number of Promotions Received, by Program Type (Mean Scores)

Response	Program Type			
	Full-Time MBA	Part-Time MBA	EMBA	Other Degree
Mean*	1.8	2.5	3.0	2.1
Standard Error	.04	.08	.16	.18
Valid N	N=836	N=484	N=198	N=77

*ANOVA; $p < .05$.**Number of Promotions Received, by Gender (Mean Scores)**

Response	Gender	
	Male	Female
Mean	2.2	2.0
Standard Error	.05	.07
Valid N	N=1,153	N=446

No statistical differences found.

Number of Promotions Received, by Age (Mean Scores)

Response	Age at time of survey		
	27 and younger	28 to 34	35 and older
Mean*	1.8	2.1	2.6
Standard Error	.06	.05	.11
Valid N	N=354	N=904	N=341

*ANOVA; $p < .05$.**Number of Promotions Received, by Citizenship (Mean Scores)**

Response	Citizenship (World Regions)					
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America	Africa/Middle East
Mean	2.2	2.0	2.2	1.7	1.9	—
Standard Error	.05	.13	.14	.16	.14	—
Valid N	N=1,142	N=123	N=162	N=62	N=87	N=19

—Data not shown because $N < 50$. No statistical differences found.

Number of Promotions Received, by School Location (Mean Scores)

Response	School Location (World Region)				
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America
Mean	2.1	2.2	2.1	1.9	—
Standard Error	.04	.24	.15	.19	—
Valid N	N=1,303	N=50	N=140	N=76	N=6

—Data not shown because N < 50. No statistical differences found.

Number of Promotions Received, by US Subgroups (Mean Scores)

Response	US Subgroups		
	Non-Hispanic White	Asian American	Underrepresented Minorities
Mean	2.2	2.0	2.0
Standard Error	.05	.17	.19
Valid N	N=942	N=69	N=68

No statistical differences found.

Respondents who indicated they were currently employed and had received a promotion since they began working with their current employer were asked, “How many of their promotions involved a change in job title, a pay increase, an increase in responsibilities, an increase in budgetary authority, or an increase in the number of direct reports supervised?”

Impact of Promotion Received
(Mean Percentage of Promotions That Involved the Following Job Changes)

Response	Mean Percentage	Standard Error	Valid N
Change in job title	86%	.77	N=1,596
Pay increase	90%	.68	N=1,596
Increase in responsibilities	90%	.65	N=1,596
Increase in budgetary authority	47%	1.13	N=1,596
Increase in number of direct reports supervised	45%	1.08	N=1,596

**Impact of Promotion Received, by Graduation Year
(Mean Percentage of Promotions That Involved the Following Job Changes)**

Response		Graduation Year									
		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Change in job title	Mean	84%	87%	92%	86%	84%	89%	88%	81%	83%	85%
	Standard Error	5.83	3.47	2.43	3.09	2.76	1.84	1.81	2.64	2.31	1.74
	Valid N	N=37	N=68	N=66	N=90	N=155	N=210	N=254	N=164	N=222	N=326
Pay increase	Mean	89%	91%	95%	88%	92%	90%	91%	92%	87%	88%
	Standard Error	4.80	2.83	2.44	2.87	1.90	1.77	1.72	1.78	2.06	1.66
	Valid N	N=37	N=68	N=66	N=90	N=155	N=210	N=254	N=164	N=222	N=326
Increase in responsibilities	Mean	90%	86%	92%	90%	90%	93%	92%	87%	85%	90%
	Standard Error	4.19	3.46	2.94	2.45	2.22	1.37	1.50	2.22	2.07	1.42
	Valid N	N=37	N=68	N=66	N=90	N=155	N=210	N=254	N=164	N=222	N=326
Increase in budgetary authority	Mean	51%	50%	46%	53%	51%	50%	45%	47%	43%	47%
	Standard Error	7.19	5.15	5.52	4.66	3.68	3.17	2.94	3.43	3.07	2.50
	Valid N	N=37	N=68	N=66	N=90	N=155	N=210	N=254	N=164	N=222	N=326
Increase in number of direct reports supervised*	Mean	48%	54%	50%	50%	51%	46%	47%	41%	34%	42%
	Standard Error	7.00	4.79	5.16	4.32	3.55	3.04	2.88	3.32	2.80	2.35
	Valid N	N=37	N=68	N=66	N=90	N=155	N=210	N=254	N=164	N=222	N=326

*ANOVA; p < .05.

**Impact of Promotion Received, by Program Type
(Mean Percentage of Promotions That Involved the Following Job Changes)**

Response		Program Type			
		Full-Time MBA	Part-Time MBA	EMBA	Other Degree
Change in job title	Mean	85%	87%	86%	87%
	Standard Error	1.13	1.31	2.04	3.37
	Valid N	N=833	N=482	N=197	N=76
Pay increase	Mean	90%	89%	90%	91%
	Standard Error	.97	1.21	1.82	3.02
	Valid N	N=833	N=482	N=197	N=76
Increase in responsibilities*	Mean	90%	88%	89%	97%
	Standard Error	.88	1.28	1.86	1.55
	Valid N	N=833	N=482	N=197	N=76

**Impact of Promotion Received, by Program Type
(Mean Percentage of Promotions That Involved the Following Job Changes)**

Response		Program Type			
		Full-Time MBA	Part-Time MBA	EMBA	Other Degree
Increase in budgetary authority*	Mean	46%	41%	67%	50%
	Standard Error	1.58	2.01	2.90	5.47
	Valid N	N=833	N=482	N=197	N=76
Increase in number of direct reports supervised*	Mean	46%	37%	57%	50%
	Standard Error	1.54	1.86	2.88	5.17
	Valid N	N=833	N=482	N=197	N=76

*ANOVA; p < .05.

**Impact of Promotion Received, by Gender
(Mean Percentage of Promotions That Involved the Following Job Changes)**

Response		Gender	
		Male	Female
Change in job title	Mean	85%	86%
	Standard Error	.92	1.44
	Valid N	N=1,147	N=445
Pay increase*	Mean	89%	92%
	Standard Error	.85	1.06
	Valid N	N=1,147	N=445
Increase in responsibilities	Mean	90%	89%
	Standard Error	.75	1.30
	Valid N	N=1,147	N=445
Increase in budgetary authority*	Mean	50%	41%
	Standard Error	1.33	2.16
	Valid N	N=1,147	N=445
Increase in number of direct reports supervised*	Mean	48%	35%
	Standard Error	1.28	1.97
	Valid N	N=1147	N=445

*ANOVA; p < .05.

Impact of Promotion Received, by Age
(Mean Percentage of Promotions That Involved the Following Job Changes)

Response		Age at time of survey		
		27 and younger	28 to 34	35 and older
Change in job title	Mean	84%	86%	86%
	Standard Error	1.77	1.01	1.65
	Valid N	N=354	N=899	N=339
Pay increase	Mean	90%	90%	89%
	Standard Error	1.51	.88	1.48
	Valid N	N=354	N=899	N=339
Increase in responsibilities*	Mean	90%	90%	89%
	Standard Error	1.43	.85	1.43
	Valid N	N=354	N=899	N=339
Increase in budgetary authority	Mean	43%	46%	55%
	Standard Error	2.44	1.50	2.41
	Valid N	N=354	N=899	N=339
Increase in number of direct reports supervised*	Mean	44%	42%	52%
	Standard Error	2.37	1.44	2.29
	Valid N	N=354	N=899	N=339

*ANOVA; p < .05.

Impact of Promotion Received, by Citizenship
(Mean Percentage of Promotions That Involved the Following Job Changes)

Response		Citizenship (World Regions)					
		United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America	Africa/Middle East
Change in job title*	Mean	87%	81%	79%	88%	83%	—
	Standard Error	.87	3.14	2.90	3.93	3.30	—
	Valid N	N=1,138	N=123	N=160	N=62	N=86	N=19
Pay increase*	Mean	90%	91%	85%	97%	87%	—
	Standard Error	.78	2.36	2.48	1.95	3.20	—
	Valid N	N=1,138	N=123	N=160	N=62	N=86	N=19
Increase in responsibilities	Mean	91%	87%	89%	85%	86%	—
	Standard Error	.74	2.54	2.02	4.21	3.33	—
	Valid N	N=1,138	N=123	N=160	N=62	N=86	N=19

**Impact of Promotion Received, by Citizenship
(Mean Percentage of Promotions That Involved the Following Job Changes)**

Response		Citizenship (World Regions)					
		United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America	Africa/Middle East
Increase in budgetary authority*	Mean	47%	41%	51%	47%	61%	—
	Standard Error	1.34	4.18	3.49	6.03	4.76	—
	Valid N	N=1,138	N=123	N=160	N=62	N=86	N=19
Increase in number of direct reports supervised*	Mean	43%	47%	52%	39%	56%	—
	Standard Error	1.27	4.12	3.33	5.76	4.55	—
	Valid N	N=1,138	N=123	N=160	N=62	N=86	N=19

—Data not shown because N < 50. *ANOVA; p < .05.

**Impact of Promotion Received, by School Location
(Mean Percentage of Promotions That Involved the Following Job Changes)**

Response		School Location (World Region)				
		United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America
Change in job title*	Mean	86%	—	77%	89%	—
	Standard Error	.84	—	3.16	3.29	—
	Valid N	N=1,298	N=49	N=139	N=76	N=6
Pay increase	Mean	90%	—	86%	93%	—
	Standard Error	.74	—	2.52	2.76	—
	Valid N	N=1,298	N=49	N=139	N=76	N=6
Increase in responsibilities*	Mean	90%	—	85%	88%	—
	Standard Error	.70	—	2.56	3.33	—
	Valid N	N=1,298	N=49	N=139	N=76	N=6
Increase in budgetary authority	Mean	47%	—	50%	44%	—
	Standard Error	1.26	—	3.77	5.25	—
	Valid N	N=1,298	N=49	N=139	N=76	N=6
Increase in number of direct reports supervised*	Mean	43%	—	53%	38%	—
	Standard Error	1.20	—	3.62	4.99	—
	Valid N	N=1,298	N=49	N=139	N=76	N=6

—Data not shown because N < 50. *ANOVA; p < .05.

**Impact of Promotion Received, by US Subgroups
(Mean Percentage of Promotions That Involved the Following Job Changes)**

Response		US Subgroups		
		Non-Hispanic White	Asian American	Underrepresented Minorities
Change in job title	Mean	87%	80%	88%
	Standard Error	.95	4.37	3.67
	Valid N	N=939	N=69	N=67
Pay increase	Mean	90%	95%	93%
	Standard Error	.88	2.29	2.36
	Valid N	N=939	N=69	N=67
Increase in responsibilities	Mean	91%	84%	93%
	Standard Error	.81	3.93	2.55
	Valid N	N=939	N=69	N=67
Increase in budgetary authority*	Mean	47%	30%	56%
	Standard Error	1.47	5.10	5.56
	Valid N	N=939	N=69	N=67
Increase in number of direct reports supervised	Mean	41%	43%	48%
	Standard Error	1.39	5.49	5.37
	Valid N	N=939	N=69	N=67

*ANOVA; $p < .05$.

Job Level

Respondents who indicated they were employed at the time of the survey were asked, “At what level of the organization are you currently employed?”

Job Level

Response	Percentage
Entry level	10%
Mid-level	58%
Senior level	25%
Executive level	7%
Total	100%
	N=3,202

Job Level, by Graduation Year*

Response	Graduation Year									
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Entry level	4%	5%	3%	1%	3%	2%	5%	9%	15%	17%
Mid-level	45%	42%	47%	47%	53%	59%	63%	68%	61%	59%
Senior level	37%	39%	44%	40%	37%	28%	24%	17%	19%	20%
Executive level	13%	13%	6%	11%	8%	12%	8%	6%	5%	5%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=67	N=112	N=98	N=137	N=251	N=317	N=444	N=345	N=566	N=860

*Chi-squared; p < .05.

Job Level, by Program Type*

Response	Program Type			
	Full-Time MBA	Part-Time MBA	EMBA	Other Degree
Entry level	11%	5%	2%	21%
Mid-level	60%	63%	34%	58%
Senior level	23%	26%	41%	17%
Executive level	5%	6%	23%	4%
	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=1,942	N=801	N=285	N=160

*Chi-squared; p < .05.

Job Level, by Gender*

Response	Gender	
	Male	Female
Entry level	8%	13%
Mid-level	56%	65%
Senior level	27%	19%
Executive level	8%	4%
	100%	100%
Total	N=2,278	N=919

*Chi-squared; p < .05.

Job Level, by Age*

Response	Age at time of survey		
	27 and younger	28 to 34	35 and older
Entry level	20%	7%	5%
Mid-level	63%	61%	46%

Job Level, by Age*

Response	Age at time of survey		
	27 and younger	28 to 34	35 and older
Senior level	14%	26%	35%
Executive level	3%	7%	14%
	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=795	N=1,781	N=621

*Chi-squared; p < .05.

Job Level, by Citizenship*

Response	Citizenship (World Regions)					
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America	Africa/Middle East
Entry level	9%	10%	8%	9%	7%	20%
Mid-level	62%	65%	39%	65%	44%	40%
Senior level	23%	20%	39%	22%	34%	35%
Executive level	6%	5%	13%	4%	15%	5%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=2,203	N=306	N=319	N=156	N=150	N=55

*Chi-squared; p < .05.

Job Level, by School Location*

Response	School Location (World Region)				
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America
Entry level	10%	7%	7%	9%	—
Mid-level	61%	54%	42%	64%	—
Senior level	23%	29%	38%	23%	—
Executive level	6%	9%	13%	5%	—
	100%	100%	100%	100%	—
Total	N=2,550	N=107	N=292	N=173	N=26

—Data not shown because N < 50.

*Chi-squared; p < .05.

Job Level, by US Subgroups

Response	US Subgroups		
	Non-Hispanic White	Asian American	Underrepresented Minorities
Entry level	9%	9%	16%
Mid-level	62%	62%	59%

Job Level, by US Subgroups

Response	US Subgroups		
	Non-Hispanic White	Asian American	Underrepresented Minorities
Senior level	23%	21%	19%
Executive level	6%	8%	6%
Total	100%	100%	100%
	N=1,761	N=159	N=159

No statistical differences found.

Supervisory Responsibilities

Respondents who indicated they were currently working were asked, “How many direct reports do you supervise?” and “For how many indirect reports do you have overall responsibility?”

Supervisory Responsibilities (Mean Scores)

Response	Mean	Standard Error	Valid N
Number of direct reports supervised	5.8	.25	N=1,364
Number of indirect reports for overall responsibility	32.2	3.74	N=1,429

Supervisory Responsibilities, by Graduation Year (Mean Scores)

Response		Graduation Year									
		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Number of direct reports supervised	Mean	–	5.1	4.0	6.0	5.5	5.5	5.9	6.4	6.3	5.7
	Standard Error	–	.58	.48	1.48	.67	.69	.67	.98	.86	.49
	Valid N	N=35	N=70	N=59	N=78	N=128	N=168	N=208	N=139	N=168	N=308
Number of indirect reports for overall responsibility*	Mean	–	92.3	30.9	22.1	18.1	30.9	31.0	34.0	41.7	25.1
	Standard Error	–	45.38	20.72	5.84	3.30	6.60	7.06	12.16	14.69	4.13
	Valid N	N=34	N=61	N=48	N=69	N=119	N=159	N=215	N=148	N=223	N=351

–Data not shown because N < 50.

*ANOVA; p < .05.

Supervisory Responsibilities, by Program Type (Mean Scores)

Response		Program Type			
		Full-Time MBA	Part-Time MBA	EMBA	Other Degree
Number of direct reports supervised*	Mean	5.0	6.1	7.3	7.5
	Standard Error	.31	.49	.71	1.82
	Valid N	N=752	N=327	N=212	N=65

Supervisory Responsibilities, by Program Type (Mean Scores)

Number of indirect reports for overall responsibility*	Mean	18.5	42.3	70.4	24.2
	Standard Error	2.34	9.70	17.73	5.46
	Valid N	N=788	N=372	N=191	N=69

*ANOVA; p < .05.

Supervisory Responsibilities, by Gender (Mean Scores)

Response		Gender	
		Male	Female
Number of direct reports supervised	Mean	6.0	5.0
	Standard Error	.30	.46
	Valid N	N=1,039	N=322
Number of indirect reports for overall responsibility	Mean	35.2	22.4
	Standard Error	4.72	4.24
	Valid N	N=1,089	N=338

*No statistical differences found.

Supervisory Responsibilities, by Age (Mean Scores)

Response		Age at time of survey		
		27 and younger	28 to 34	35 and older
Number of direct reports supervised*	Mean	5.8	4.8	7.6
	Standard Error	.70	.25	.61
	Valid N	N=281	N=735	N=345
Number of indirect reports for overall responsibility*	Mean	15.8	24.4	64.3
	Standard Error	3.85	4.39	11.25
	Valid N	N=299	N=785	N=343

*ANOVA; p < .05.

Supervisory Responsibilities, by Citizenship (Mean Scores)

Response		Citizenship (World Regions)					
		United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America	Africa/Middle East
Number of direct reports supervised	Mean	5.9	5.0	5.6	4.1	5.8	–
	Standard Error	.32	.54	.72	.53	.92	–
	Valid N	N=887	N=126	N=173	N=54	N=94	N=23
Number of indirect reports for overall responsibility	Mean	30.1	37.8	30.5	28.6	49.3	–
	Standard Error	4.34	18.73	5.57	13.07	17.21	–
	Valid N	N=942	N=148	N=176	N=61	N=74	N=23

–Data not shown because N < 50. *No statistical differences found.

Supervisory Responsibilities, by School Location (Mean Scores)

Response		School Location (World Region)				
		United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America
Number of direct reports supervised	Mean	5.9	4.6	5.8	3.9	–
	Standard Error	.29	.51	.85	.49	–
	Valid N	N=1,048	N=57	N=151	N=61	N=15
Number of indirect reports for overall responsibility	Mean	31.2	64.0	31.0	24.6	–
	Standard Error	3.96	47.26	6.30	12.32	–
	Valid N	N=1,121	N=57	N=149	N=63	N=10

–Data not shown because N < 50. *No statistical differences found.

Supervisory Responsibilities, by US Subgroups (Mean Scores)

Response		US Subgroups		
		Non-Hispanic White	Asian American	Underrepresented Minorities
Number of direct reports supervised	Mean	6.1	4.2	6.7
	Median	3.0	3.0	3.0
	Standard Error	.36	.50	1.82
	Valid N	N=722	N=52	N=56
Number of indirect reports for overall responsibility	Mean	32.6	18.4	18.7
	Median	5.0	5.0	6.0
	Standard Error	5.41	5.09	7.16
	Valid N	N=745	N=71	N=64

*No statistical differences found.

Skills for Current Job

Respondents who indicated they were currently employed were asked, “Please rate the importance of the following interpersonal and communication skills for your current job.”

Importance of Communication and Interpersonal Skills for Current Job

Skills	Extremely Important	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Not Very Important	Not at All Important	Total
Ability to work with others	61%	32%	6%	1%	0%	N=3,417
Ability to influence others	49%	37%	12%	2%	0%	N=3,417
Networking skills	33%	37%	23%	6%	1%	N=3,417
Mentoring skills	15%	30%	32%	18%	5%	N=3,417
Giving constructive feedback	23%	41%	26%	8%	1%	N=3,417
Cross-cultural sensitivity	23%	29%	29%	16%	4%	N=3,417
Managing organizational politics	31%	35%	24%	9%	2%	N=3,417
Negotiation skills	30%	34%	24%	10%	2%	N=3,417
Understanding business problems from diverse perspectives	39%	39%	17%	4%	1%	N=3,416
Meeting management	27%	41%	24%	6%	1%	N=3,417
Leadership skills	40%	39%	17%	4%	1%	N=3,417
Managing expectations/managing up	38%	42%	16%	3%	1%	N=3,417
Listening skills	47%	43%	9%	1%	0%	N=3,416
Communicating with diplomacy and tact	47%	40%	11%	1%	0%	N=3,417
Presentation skills	37%	36%	19%	6%	1%	N=3,417
Writing skills	31%	39%	24%	6%	1%	N=3,417

Importance of Interpersonal and Communication Skills for Current Job, by Graduation Year (Mean Scores)

Skills		Graduation Year									
		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Ability to influence others	Mean	4.4	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.3
	Standard Error	.10	.07	.06	.05	.04	.04	.04	.04	.04	.03
	Valid N	N=77	N=123	N=112	N=148	N=272	N=342	N=477	N=367	N=588	N=903
Networking skills*	Mean	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.9	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.9	3.9	4.0
	Standard Error	.10	.08	.09	.07	.06	.05	.04	.05	.04	.03
	Valid N	N=77	N=123	N=112	N=148	N=272	N=342	N=477	N=367	N=588	N=903
Mentoring skills	Mean	3.2	3.4	3.4	3.3	3.4	3.3	3.4	3.2	3.2	3.4
	Standard Error	.13	.09	.09	.09	.06	.06	.05	.06	.05	.04
	Valid N	N=77	N=123	N=112	N=148	N=272	N=342	N=477	N=367	N=588	N=903

Importance of Interpersonal and Communication Skills for Current Job, by Graduation Year (Mean Scores)

Skills		Graduation Year									
		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Giving constructive feedback	Mean	3.8	3.8	3.7	3.9	3.7	3.7	3.8	3.8	3.7	3.8
	Standard Error	.10	.07	.08	.07	.06	.05	.04	.05	.04	.03
	Valid N	N=77	N=123	N=112	N=148	N=272	N=342	N=477	N=367	N=588	N=903
Cross-cultural sensitivity	Mean	3.6	3.5	3.5	3.6	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.5	3.4	3.6
	Standard Error	.13	.10	.09	.09	.07	.06	.05	.06	.05	.04
	Valid N	N=77	N=123	N=112	N=148	N=272	N=342	N=477	N=367	N=588	N=903
Managing organizational politics	Mean	4.0	3.7	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.8	3.8
	Standard Error	.12	.09	.10	.08	.06	.05	.05	.05	.04	.03
	Valid N	N=77	N=123	N=112	N=148	N=272	N=342	N=477	N=367	N=588	N=903
Negotiation skills	Mean	3.7	3.8	3.8	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.9
	Standard Error	.13	.09	.09	.08	.06	.05	.05	.05	.04	.03
	Valid N	N=77	N=123	N=112	N=148	N=272	N=342	N=477	N=367	N=588	N=903
Understanding problems from diverse perspectives	Mean	4.0	3.9	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1
	Standard Error	.12	.08	.08	.07	.05	.05	.04	.05	.04	.03
	Valid N	N=77	N=123	N=112	N=148	N=272	N=342	N=476	N=367	N=588	N=903
Meeting management	Mean	3.9	3.8	3.7	3.8	3.8	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.9
	Standard Error	.11	.07	.08	.08	.05	.04	.04	.05	.04	.03
	Valid N	N=77	N=123	N=112	N=148	N=272	N=342	N=477	N=367	N=588	N=903
Leadership skills	Mean	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.1	4.1	4.0	4.1	4.1
	Standard Error	.10	.08	.08	.06	.05	.05	.04	.05	.04	.03
	Valid N	N=77	N=123	N=112	N=148	N=272	N=342	N=477	N=367	N=588	N=903
Managing expectations/managing up	Mean	4.3	4.0	4.2	4.1	4.2	4.2	4.1	4.1	4.2	4.1
	Standard Error	.11	.08	.07	.07	.05	.04	.04	.04	.03	.03
	Valid N	N=77	N=123	N=112	N=148	N=272	N=342	N=477	N=367	N=588	N=903
Listening skills	Mean	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.4	4.4
	Standard Error	.07	.06	.07	.05	.04	.04	.03	.04	.03	.02
	Valid N	N=77	N=123	N=112	N=148	N=272	N=342	N=477	N=367	N=587	N=903
Communicating with diplomacy and tact	Mean	4.4	4.3	4.2	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.3
	Standard Error	.09	.06	.07	.06	.04	.04	.03	.04	.03	.03
	Valid N	N=77	N=123	N=112	N=148	N=272	N=342	N=477	N=367	N=588	N=903
Presentation skills*	Mean	4.3	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.0	3.9	4.0
	Standard Error	.10	.07	.09	.07	.05	.05	.04	.05	.04	.03
	Valid N	N=77	N=123	N=112	N=148	N=272	N=342	N=477	N=367	N=588	N=903
Writing skills	Mean	4.1	4.0	3.8	3.9	4.0	3.9	4.0	3.9	3.9	3.9
	Standard Error	.10	.07	.08	.08	.05	.05	.04	.05	.04	.03
	Valid N	N=77	N=123	N=112	N=148	N=272	N=342	N=477	N=367	N=588	N=903

Importance of Interpersonal and Communication Skills for Current Job, by Graduation Year (Mean Scores)

Skills	Graduation Year									
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009

Scale: 1 = Not at all important to 5 = Extremely important. *ANOVA; $p < .05$.**Importance of Interpersonal and Communication Skills for Current Job, by Program Type (Mean Scores)**

Skills		Program Type			
		Full-Time MBA	Part-Time MBA	EMBA	Other Degree
Ability to influence others*	Mean	4.3	4.2	4.4	4.1
	Standard Error	.02	.03	.04	.07
	Valid N	N=2,088	N=828	N=311	N=172
Networking skills*	Mean	4.0	3.9	4.1	3.9
	Standard Error	.02	.03	.05	.08
	Valid N	N=2,088	N=828	N=311	N=172
Mentoring skills*	Mean	3.2	3.4	3.6	3.4
	Standard Error	.02	.04	.06	.08
	Valid N	N=2,088	N=828	N=311	N=172
Giving constructive feedback*	Mean	3.7	3.8	4.0	3.8
	Standard Error	.02	.03	.05	.07
	Valid N	N=2,088	N=828	N=311	N=172
Cross-cultural sensitivity	Mean	3.5	3.5	3.6	3.7
	Standard Error	.02	.04	.06	.08
	Valid N	N=2,088	N=828	N=311	N=172
Managing organizational politics	Mean	3.8	3.8	4.0	3.8
	Standard Error	.02	.04	.05	.08
	Valid N	N=2,088	N=828	N=311	N=172
Negotiation skills*	Mean	3.8	3.8	4.1	3.7
	Standard Error	.02	.04	.05	.09
	Valid N	N=2,088	N=828	N=311	N=172
Understanding business problems from diverse perspectives*	Mean	4.1	4.0	4.2	4.1
	Standard Error	.02	.03	.05	.07
	Valid N	N=2,087	N=828	N=311	N=172
Meeting management	Mean	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.8
	Standard Error	.02	.03	.05	.08
	Valid N	N=2,088	N=828	N=311	N=172
Leadership skills*	Mean	4.1	4.1	4.4	4.0
	Standard Error	.02	.03	.04	.07
	Valid N	N=2,088	N=828	N=311	N=172

**Importance of Interpersonal and Communication Skills for Current Job, by Program Type
(Mean Scores)**

Skills		Program Type			
		Full-Time MBA	Part-Time MBA	EMBA	Other Degree
Managing expectations/managing up	Mean	4.1	4.1	4.2	4.0
	Standard Error	.02	.03	.04	.07
	Valid N	N=2,088	N=828	N=311	N=172
Listening skills	Mean	4.3	4.3	4.4	4.5
	Standard Error	.02	.02	.04	.05
	Valid N	N=2,088	N=828	N=310	N=172
Communicating with diplomacy and tact	Mean	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3
	Standard Error	.02	.03	.04	.06
	Valid N	N=2,088	N=828	N=311	N=172
Presentation skills*	Mean	4.1	3.9	4.1	3.9
	Standard Error	.02	.03	.05	.08
	Valid N	N=2,088	N=828	N=311	N=172
Writing skills	Mean	3.9	4.0	3.9	4.0
	Standard Error	.02	.03	.05	.07
	Valid N	N=2,088	N=828	N=311	N=172

Scale: 1 = Not at all important to 5 = Extremely important.*ANOVA; p < .05.

Importance of Interpersonal and Communication Skills for Current Job, by Gender (Mean Scores)

Skills		Gender	
		Male	Female
Ability to influence others*	Mean	4.3	4.2
	Standard Error	.02	.03
	Valid N	N=2,432	N=977
Networking skills	Mean	4.0	4.0
	Standard Error	.02	.03
	Valid N	N=2,432	N=977
Mentoring skills	Mean	3.3	3.3
	Standard Error	.02	.04
	Valid N	N=2,432	N=977
Giving constructive feedback	Mean	3.8	3.8
	Standard Error	.02	.03
	Valid N	N=2,432	N=977
Cross-cultural sensitivity*	Mean	3.5	3.7
	Standard Error	.02	.03
	Valid N	N=2,432	N=977

Importance of Interpersonal and Communication Skills for Current Job, by Gender (Mean Scores)

Skills		Gender	
		Male	Female
Managing organizational politics*	Mean	3.8	3.9
	Standard Error	.02	.03
	Valid N	N=2,432	N=977
Negotiation skills*	Mean	3.8	3.7
	Standard Error	.02	.03
	Valid N	N=2,432	N=977
Understanding business problems from diverse perspectives	Mean	4.1	4.1
	Standard Error	.02	.03
	Valid N	N=2,431	N=977
Meeting management	Mean	3.8	3.9
	Standard Error	.02	.03
	Valid N	N=2,432	N=977
Leadership skills	Mean	4.1	4.1
	Standard Error	.02	.03
	Valid N	N=2,432	N=977
Managing expectations/managing up*	Mean	4.1	4.2
	Standard Error	.02	.03
	Valid N	N=2,432	N=977
Listening skills*	Mean	4.3	4.4
	Standard Error	.01	.02
	Valid N	N=2,431	N=977
Communicating with diplomacy and tact**	Mean	4.3	4.4
	Standard Error	.02	.02
	Valid N	N=2,432	N=977
Presentation skills	Mean	4.0	4.0
	Standard Error	.02	.03
	Valid N	N=2,432	N=977
Writing skills*	Mean	3.9	4.0
	Standard Error	.02	.03
	Valid N	N=2,432	N=977

Scale: 1 = Not At all important to 5 = Extremely important.

*ANOVA; p < .05.

Importance of Interpersonal and Communication Skills for Current Job, by Age (Mean Scores)

Skills		Age at time of survey		
		27 and younger	28 to 34	35 and older
Ability to influence others*	Mean	4.2	4.4	4.3
	Standard Error	.03	.02	.03
	Valid N	N=825	N=1,886	N=698
Networking skills	Mean	3.9	4.0	4.0
	Standard Error	.03	.02	.04
	Valid N	N=825	N=1,886	N=698
Mentoring skills*	Mean	3.2	3.3	3.4
	Standard Error	.04	.02	.04
	Valid N	N=825	N=1,886	N=698
Giving constructive feedback*	Mean	3.7	3.8	3.9
	Standard Error	.03	.02	.03
	Valid N	N=825	N=1,886	N=698
Cross-cultural sensitivity	Mean	3.5	3.5	3.6
	Standard Error	.04	.03	.04
	Valid N	N=825	N=1,886	N=698
Managing organizational politics	Mean	3.8	3.9	3.8
	Standard Error	.04	.02	.04
	Valid N	N=825	N=1,886	N=698
Negotiation skills*	Mean	3.7	3.8	3.9
	Standard Error	.04	.02	.04
	Valid N	N=825	N=1,886	N=698
Understanding business problems from diverse perspectives	Mean	4.1	4.1	4.1
	Standard Error	.03	.02	.03
	Valid N	N=825	N=1,886	N=697
Meeting management	Mean	3.9	3.9	3.8
	Standard Error	.03	.02	.04
	Valid N	N=825	N=1,886	N=698
Leadership skills*	Mean	4.1	4.1	4.2
	Standard Error	.03	.02	.03
	Valid N	N=825	N=1,886	N=698
Managing expectations/managing up	Mean	4.1	4.2	4.1
	Standard Error	.03	.02	.03
	Valid N	N=825	N=1,886	N=698
Listening skills	Mean	4.4	4.3	4.4
	Standard Error	.02	.02	.03
	Valid N	N=825	N=1,886	N=697

Importance of Interpersonal and Communication Skills for Current Job, by Age (Mean Scores)

Skills		Age at time of survey		
		27 and younger	28 to 34	35 and older
Communicating with diplomacy and tact	Mean	4.3	4.3	4.3
	Standard Error	.03	.02	.03
	Valid N	N=825	N=1,886	N=698
Presentation skills*	Mean	4.0	4.1	4.0
	Standard Error	.03	.02	.04
	Valid N	N=825	N=1,886	N=698
Writing skills	Mean	3.9	3.9	3.9
	Standard Error	.03	.02	.04
	Valid N	N=825	N=1,886	N=698

Scale: 1 = Not at all important to 5 = Extremely important. *ANOVA; $p < .05$.

Importance of Interpersonal and Communication Skills for Current Job, by Citizenship (Mean Scores)

Skills		Citizenship (World Regions)					
		United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America	Africa/Middle East
Ability to influence others	Mean	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.5	4.2
	Standard Error	.02	.04	.04	.06	.05	.10
	Valid N	N=2,322	N=312	N=361	N=182	N=161	N=61
Networking skills*	Mean	3.9	4.0	4.0	3.9	4.2	4.0
	Standard Error	.02	.05	.05	.07	.06	.12
	Valid N	N=2,322	N=312	N=361	N=182	N=161	N=61
Mentoring skills*	Mean	3.3	3.4	3.3	3.4	3.6	3.1
	Standard Error	.02	.06	.06	.08	.08	.14
	Valid N	N=2,322	N=312	N=361	N=182	N=161	N=61
Giving constructive feedback*	Mean	3.7	3.9	3.8	3.6	4.0	3.8
	Standard Error	.02	.05	.05	.08	.07	.11
	Valid N	N=2,322	N=312	N=361	N=182	N=161	N=61
Cross-cultural sensitivity*	Mean	3.5	3.8	3.6	3.3	3.7	3.6
	Standard Error	.02	.06	.06	.09	.09	.16
	Valid N	N=2,322	N=312	N=361	N=182	N=161	N=61
Managing organizational politics	Mean	3.9	3.7	3.7	3.8	3.9	3.9
	Standard Error	.02	.06	.06	.08	.08	.13
	Valid N	N=2,322	N=312	N=361	N=182	N=161	N=61
Negotiation skills*	Mean	3.7	4.0	4.0	3.8	4.2	4.1
	Standard Error	.02	.05	.05	.07	.07	.11
	Valid N	N=2,322	N=312	N=361	N=182	N=161	N=61

Importance of Interpersonal and Communication Skills for Current Job, by Citizenship (Mean Scores)

Skills		Citizenship (World Regions)					
		United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America	Africa/Middle East
Understanding business problems from diverse perspectives*	Mean	4.0	4.3	4.3	4.1	4.4	4.1
	Standard Error	.02	.04	.04	.07	.06	.12
	Valid N	N=2,321	N=312	N=361	N=182	N=161	N=61
Meeting management	Mean	3.8	4.0	3.9	3.8	4.0	3.9
	Standard Error	.02	.05	.05	.07	.07	.12
	Valid N	N=2,322	N=312	N=361	N=182	N=161	N=61
Leadership skills*	Mean	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.0	4.3	4.0
	Standard Error	.02	.05	.05	.07	.06	.10
	Valid N	N=2,322	N=312	N=361	N=182	N=161	N=61
Managing expectations/ managing up	Mean	4.1	4.2	4.0	4.1	4.2	4.1
	Standard Error	.02	.05	.05	.07	.06	.12
	Valid N	N=2,322	N=312	N=361	N=182	N=161	N=61
Listening skills*	Mean	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3
	Standard Error	.01	.04	.04	.06	.05	.09
	Valid N	N=2,321	N=312	N=361	N=182	N=161	N=61
Communicating with diplomacy and tact*	Mean	4.4	4.2	4.2	4.3	4.3	4.3
	Standard Error	.02	.05	.04	.06	.06	.10
	Valid N	N=2,322	N=312	N=361	N=182	N=161	N=61
Presentation skills*	Mean	4.0	4.1	4.0	4.1	4.4	4.1
	Standard Error	.02	.05	.05	.07	.06	.13
	Valid N	N=2,322	N=312	N=361	N=182	N=161	N=61
Writing skills*	Mean	4.0	3.8	3.7	4.0	3.8	4.1
	Standard Error	.02	.05	.05	.06	.07	.12
	Valid N	N=2,322	N=312	N=361	N=182	N=161	N=61

Scale: 1 = Not at all important to 5 = Extremely important. *ANOVA; $p < .05$.

**Importance of Interpersonal and Communication Skills for Current Job, by School Location
(Mean Scores)**

Skills		School Location (World Region)				
		United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America
Ability to influence others	Mean	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	—
	Standard Error	.02	.07	.04	.06	—
	Valid N	N=2,682	N=114	N=336	N=193	N=27
Networking skills*	Mean	3.9	4.1	4.1	3.8	—
	Standard Error	.02	.07	.05	.07	—
	Valid N	N=2,682	N=114	N=336	N=193	N=27
Mentoring skills	Mean	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	—
	Standard Error	.02	.10	.06	.08	—
	Valid N	N=2,682	N=114	N=336	N=193	N=27
Giving constructive feedback	Mean	3.8	3.8	3.9	3.6	—
	Standard Error	.02	.08	.05	.07	—
	Valid N	N=2,682	N=114	N=336	N=193	N=27
Cross-cultural sensitivity*	Mean	3.5	3.8	3.7	3.3	—
	Standard Error	.02	.10	.06	.09	—
	Valid N	N=2,682	N=114	N=336	N=193	N=27
Managing organizational politics	Mean	3.8	3.6	3.8	3.7	—
	Standard Error	.02	.10	.06	.08	—
	Valid N	N=2,682	N=114	N=336	N=193	N=27
Negotiation skills*	Mean	3.8	4.1	4.1	3.8	—
	Standard Error	.02	.09	.05	.07	—
	Valid N	N=2,682	N=114	N=336	N=193	N=27
Understanding business problems from diverse perspectives*	Mean	4.1	4.2	4.3	4.0	—
	Standard Error	.02	.08	.05	.07	—
	Valid N	N=2,681	N=114	N=336	N=193	N=27
Meeting management	Mean	3.9	3.8	3.9	3.8	—
	Standard Error	.02	.08	.05	.06	—
	Valid N	N=2,682	N=114	N=336	N=193	N=27
Leadership skills*	Mean	4.1	4.0	4.1	4.0	—
	Standard Error	.02	.08	.05	.07	—
	Valid N	N=2,682	N=114	N=336	N=193	N=27
Managing expectations/managing up	Mean	4.1	4.2	4.1	4.1	—
	Standard Error	.02	.07	.05	.06	—
	Valid N	N=2,682	N=114	N=336	N=193	N=27

Importance of Interpersonal and Communication Skills for Current Job, by School Location (Mean Scores)

Skills		School Location (World Region)				
		United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America
Listening skills*	Mean	4.4	4.2	4.2	4.2	—
	Standard Error	.01	.07	.04	.05	—
	Valid N	N=2,681	N=114	N=336	N=193	N=27
Communicating with diplomacy and tact	Mean	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.2	—
	Standard Error	.01	.08	.04	.06	—
	Valid N	N=2,682	N=114	N=336	N=193	N=27
Presentation skills	Mean	4.0	4.1	4.1	4.0	—
	Standard Error	.02	.08	.05	.07	—
	Valid N	N=2,682	N=114	N=336	N=193	N=27
Writing skills*	Mean	4.0	3.7	3.8	3.9	—
	Standard Error	.02	.09	.05	.06	—
	Valid N	N=2,682	N=114	N=336	N=193	N=27

—Data not shown because N < 50. Scale: 1 = Not at all important to 5 = Extremely important. *ANOVA; p < .05.

Importance of Interpersonal and Communication Skills for Current Job, by US Subgroups (Mean Scores)

Skills		US Subgroups		
		Non-Hispanic White	Asian American	Underrepresented Minorities
Ability to influence others*	Mean	4.3	4.4	4.4
	Standard Error	.02	.06	.06
	Valid N	N=1,857	N=163	N=172
Networking skills	Mean	3.9	4.1	4.0
	Standard Error	.02	.07	.07
	Valid N	N=1,857	N=163	N=172
Mentoring skills	Mean	3.3	3.2	3.3
	Standard Error	.03	.09	.08
	Valid N	N=1,857	N=163	N=172
Giving constructive feedback	Mean	3.7	3.7	3.9
	Standard Error	.02	.07	.07
	Valid N	N=1,857	N=163	N=172
Cross-cultural sensitivity*	Mean	3.4	3.7	3.8
	Standard Error	.03	.08	.08
	Valid N	N=1,857	N=163	N=172

**Importance of Interpersonal and Communication Skills for Current Job, by US Subgroups
(Mean Scores)**

Skills		US Subgroups		
		Non-Hispanic White	Asian American	Underrepresented Minorities
Managing organizational politics*	Mean	3.8	4.0	4.1
	Standard Error	.02	.08	.07
	Valid N	N=1,857	N=163	N=172
Negotiation skills*	Mean	3.7	3.8	4.0
	Standard Error	.02	.08	.07
	Valid N	N=1,857	N=163	N=172
Understanding business problems from diverse perspectives	Mean	4.0	4.2	4.1
	Standard Error	.02	.07	.07
	Valid N	N=1,856	N=163	N=172
Meeting management*	Mean	3.8	3.9	4.0
	Standard Error	.02	.07	.07
	Valid N	N=1,857	N=163	N=172
Leadership skills*	Mean	4.1	4.1	4.3
	Standard Error	.02	.07	.07
	Valid N	N=1,857	N=163	N=172
Managing expectations/ managing up	Mean	4.1	4.3	4.2
	Standard Error	.02	.07	.06
	Valid N	N=1,857	N=163	N=172
Listening skills	Mean	4.4	4.4	4.5
	Standard Error	.02	.05	.05
	Valid N	N=1,856	N=163	N=172
Communicating with diplomacy and tact	Mean	4.3	4.4	4.5
	Standard Error	.02	.06	.05
	Valid N	N=1,857	N=163	N=172
Presentation skills	Mean	4.0	4.0	4.1
	Standard Error	.02	.08	.07
	Valid N	N=1,857	N=163	N=172
Writing skills	Mean	4.0	3.9	4.0
	Standard Error	.02	.08	.07
	Valid N	N=1,857	N=163	N=172

Scale: 1 = Not at all important to 5 = Extremely important. *ANOVA, $p < .05$.

Compensation Data

Respondents who indicated they were currently working were asked to report their current annual base salary before taxes.

Current Annual Base Salary

US Dollars	Mean	Median	Standard Error	Valid N
Annual base salary (USD)	\$96,107	\$91,300	\$972	N=2,875

Current Annual Base Salary, by Graduation Year

US Dollars	Graduation Year									
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Mean*	\$132,549	\$125,481	\$109,868	\$117,312	\$108,769	\$111,926	\$103,203	\$89,530	\$83,388	\$80,381
Median	\$130,000	\$114,500	\$105,000	\$110,000	\$106,000	\$105,000	\$98,000	\$90,000	\$80,000	\$79,271
Standard Error	\$6,104	\$7,868	\$4,121	\$4,892	\$4,067	\$3,399	\$2,668	\$1,814	\$2,304	\$1,399
Valid N	N=63	N=104	N=90	N=137	N=228	N=292	N=407	N=321	N=513	N=715

*One-way ANOVA, p < .05

Current Annual Base Salary, by Program Type

US Dollars	Program Type			
	Full-Time MBA	Part-Time MBA	EMBA	Other Degree
Mean*	\$96,759	\$89,991	\$120,497	\$72,713
Median	\$93,260	\$85,000	\$115,000	\$65,000
Standard Error	\$1,236	\$1,625	\$4,493	\$2,981
Valid N	N=1,759	N=715	N=253	N=134

*One-way ANOVA, p < .05

Current Annual Base Salary, by Gender

US Dollars	Gender	
	Male	Female
Mean*	\$101,447	\$82,371
Median	\$95,000	\$80,000
Standard Error	\$1,186	\$1,562
Valid N	N=2,067	N=803

*One-way ANOVA, p < .05

Current Annual Base Salary, by Age

US Dollars	Age at time of survey		
	27 and younger	28 to 34	35 and older
Mean*	\$80,563	\$99,572	\$105,870
Median	\$75,000	\$95,000	\$100,000
Standard Error	\$2,137	\$1,161	\$2,407
Valid N	N=707	N=1,607	N=556

*One-way ANOVA, p < .05

Current Annual Base Salary, by Citizenship

US Dollars	Citizenship (World Regions)					
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America	Africa/Middle East
Mean*	\$96,666	\$80,057	\$112,196	\$87,404	\$94,119	\$94,255
Median	\$92,000	\$77,781	\$105,459	\$81,136	\$91,000	\$89,249
Standard Error	\$1,096	\$4,048	\$3,354	\$2,943	\$5,912	\$6,278
Valid N	N=2,009	N=255	N=278	N=143	N=132	N=46

*One-way ANOVA, p < .05

Current Annual Base Salary, by School Location

US Dollars	School Location (World Region)				
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America
Mean*	\$97,468	\$61,422	\$104,699	\$86,645	\$38,739
Median	\$92,500	\$50,911	\$101,160	\$79,271	\$31,194
Standard Error	\$1,101	\$4,702	\$3,274	\$2,633	\$5,315
Valid N	N=2,314	N=83	N=252	N=160	N=19

*One-way ANOVA, p < .05

Current Annual Base Salary, by US Subgroups

US Dollars	US Subgroups		
	Non-Hispanic White	Asian American	Underrepresented Minorities
Mean*	\$95,822	\$111,241	\$90,955
Median	\$91,119	\$100,000	\$90,000
Standard Error	\$1,210	\$5,816	\$3,169
Valid N	N=1,629	N=135	N=139

*One-way ANOVA, p < .05

Respondents who indicated they were currently employed were asked to report any additional compensation they may receive.

Additional Compensation

US Dollars	Mean	Median	Standard Error	Valid N
Additional Compensation	\$36,068	\$15,000	\$1,749	N=2,140

Additional Compensation, by Graduation Year

US Dollars	Graduation Year									
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Mean*	\$72,299	\$52,126	\$41,920	\$67,255	\$34,398	\$48,960	\$33,923	\$41,101	\$22,303	\$25,490
Median	\$27,989	\$20,000	\$20,000	\$25,000	\$17,704	\$20,376	\$19,277	\$15,000	\$10,327	\$13,139
Standard Error	\$18,618	\$9,765	\$6,847	\$11,867	\$3,931	\$4,721	\$2,817	\$10,935	\$1,786	\$1,759
Valid N	N=50	N=81	N=67	N=111	N=191	N=240	N=316	N=233	N=367	N=480

*One-way ANOVA, p < .05

Additional Compensation, by Program Type

US Dollars	Program Type			
	Full-Time MBA	Part-Time MBA	EMBA	Other Degree
Mean*	\$39,539	\$27,072	\$41,531	\$21,337
Median	\$17,000	\$12,000	\$25,000	\$10,164
Standard Error	\$2,580	\$2,092	\$3,931	\$3,304
Valid N	N=1,351	N=490	N=206	N=82

*One-way ANOVA, p < .05

Additional Compensation, by Gender

US Dollars	Gender	
	Male	Female
Mean*	\$40,551	\$22,446
Median	\$18,500	\$10,000
Standard Error	\$2,242	\$1,712
Valid N	N=1,613	N=523

*One-way ANOVA, p < .05

Additional Compensation, by Age

US Dollars	Age at time of survey		
	27 and younger	28 to 34	35 and older
Mean*	\$28,711	\$40,282	\$32,636
Median	\$10,000	\$19,777	\$15,000
Standard Error	\$5,093	\$2,039	\$2,425
Valid N	N=509	N=1,234	N=393

*One-way ANOVA, $p < .05$ **Additional Compensation, by Citizenship**

US Dollars	Citizenship (World Regions)					
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America	Africa/Middle East
Mean	\$36,128	\$31,613	\$40,047	\$28,900	\$38,302	\$52,659
Median	\$15,000	\$14,630	\$22,045	\$13,989	\$21,996	\$13,000
Standard Error	\$2,233	\$5,595	\$3,768	\$5,597	\$5,720	\$26,597
Valid N	N=1,464	N=193	N=232	N=102	N=109	N=31

No statistical differences found.

Additional Compensation, by School Location

US Dollars	School Location (World Region)				
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America
Mean	\$35,209	\$16,650	\$50,609	\$34,657	\$9,049
Median	\$15,000	\$9,899	\$20,042	\$13,989	\$3,750
Standard Error	\$1,477	\$2,096	\$12,363	\$6,913	\$2,957
Valid N	N=1,704	N=57	N=212	N=118	N=12

No statistical differences found.

Additional Compensation, by US Subgroups

US Dollars	US Subgroups		
	Non-Hispanic White	Asian American	Underrepresented Minorities
Mean	\$34,534	\$56,090	\$33,265
Median	\$15,000	\$16,395	\$11,750
Standard Error	\$1,696	\$25,328	\$5,893
Valid N	N=1,180	N=97	N=100

No statistical differences found.

Self-Employed Respondent Data

Respondents who indicated they are self-employed or are a small-business owner were asked, “Approximately how many hours do you work in a typical week”?

Typical Number of Hours Worked

Statistic	Median	Mean	Standard Error	Valid N
Hours worked in a typical week	50.0	46.7	1.08	N=259

Typical Number of Hours Worked, by Gender

Statistic	Gender	
	Male	Female
Mean*	48.9	40.5
Standard Error	1.26	2.01
Valid N	N=188	N=69

—Data not shown because N < 50.

*ANOVA; p < .05.

Typical Number of Hours Worked, by Age

Statistic	Age at time of survey		
	27 and younger	28 to 34	35 and older
Mean	—	47.7	47.7
Standard Error	—	1.36	1.85
Valid N	N=47	N=133	N=77

—Data not shown because N < 50.

No statistical differences found.

Organization Size

Respondents who indicated they were self-employed or small-business owners were asked to indicate how many people are employed at their business location and at all business locations.

Organization Size (All Locations)

Response	Percentage
Fewer than 5	58%
5 to 9	12%
10 to 24	14%
25 to 49	5%
50 to 99	4%

Organization Size (All Locations)

Response	Percentage
100 to 249	2%
250 to 499	1%
500 to 999	2%
1,000 to 2,499	0%
2,500 to 4,999	0%
5,000 to 9,999	1%
10,000 to 24,999	1%
25,000 or more	0%
Don't know	1%
	100%
Total	N=258

Organization Size (Location of Employment)

Response	Percentage
Fewer than 5	67%
5 to 9	10%
10 to 24	12%
25 to 49	3%
50 to 99	5%
100 to 249	1%
250 to 499	0%
500 to 999	0%
1,000 to 2,499	0%
2,500 to 4,999	0%
5,000 to 9,999	0%
10,000 to 24,999	0%
25,000 or more	0%
Don't know	0%
	100%
Total	N=258

Organization Size (All Locations), by Gender

Response	Gender	
	Male	Female
Fewer than 1,000	97%	97%
1,001 to 24,999	2%	3%

Organization Size (All Locations), by Gender

Response	Gender	
	Male	Female
25,000 or more	1%	0%
	100%	100%
Total	N=186	N=68

No statistical differences found.

Organization Size (Location of Employment), by Gender

Response	Gender	
	Male	Female
Fewer than 1,000	100%	100%
1,001 to 24,999	0%	0%
25,000 or more	0%	0%
	100%	100%
Total	N=186	N=68

No statistical differences found.

Organization Size (All Locations), by Age

Response	Age at time of survey		
	27 and younger	28 to 34	35 and older
Fewer than 1,000	—	98%	96%
1,001 to 24,999	—	2%	3%
25,000 or more	—	0%	1%
	—	100%	100%
Total	N=46	N=132	N=76

—Data not shown because N < 50. No statistical differences found.

Organization Size (Location of Employment), by Age

Response	Age at time of survey		
	27 and younger	28 to 34	35 and older
Fewer than 1,000	—	100%	100%
1,001 to 24,999	—	0%	0%
25,000 or more	—	0%	0%
	—	100%	100%
Total	N=46	N=132	N=76

—Data not shown because N < 50.
No statistical differences found.

Organization Focus

Respondents who indicated they were self-employed or small-business owners were asked, “Does your organization primarily have a local, regional, national, or multinational focus?”

Primary Focus of Organization

Response	Percentage
Local	24%
Regional	21%
National	29%
Multinational	27%
	100%
Total	N=258

Primary Focus of Organization, by Gender

Response	Gender	
	Male	Female
Local	21%	32%
Regional	20%	23%
National	29%	28%
Multinational	30%	17%
	100%	100%
Total	N=187	N=69

No statistical differences found.

Primary Focus of Organization, by Age

Response	Age at time of survey		
	27 and younger	28 to 34	35 and older
Local	—	20%	29%
Regional	—	21%	24%
National	—	29%	24%
Multinational	—	30%	24%
	—	100%	100%
Total	N=47	N=133	N=76

—Data not shown because N < 50. No statistical differences found.

Business Location

Respondents who indicated they were self-employed or small-business owners were asked, “Are you currently working in your country of citizenship?”

Location of Business Owned

Response	Percentage
Within country of citizenship	82%
Outside country of citizenship	18%
	100%
Total	N=258

*Chi-squared; $p < .05$.

Location of Business Owned, by Gender

Response	Gender	
	Male	Female
Within country of citizenship	81%	84%
Outside country of citizenship	19%	16%
	100%	100%
Total	N=187	N=69

—Data not shown because $N < 50$. No statistical differences found.

Location of Business Owned, by Age

Response	Age at time of survey		
	27 and younger	28 to 34	35 and older
Within country of citizenship	—	81%	86%
Outside country of citizenship	—	19%	14%
	—	100%	100%
Total	N=47	N=133	N=76

—Data not shown because $N < 50$. No statistical differences found.

Business Industry

Respondents who indicated they were self-employed or small business owner were asked, “In what business or industry do you currently work?”

Current Industry of Employment

Industry	Percentage
Consulting	37%
Products/services	24%
Technology	15%
Finance/accounting	12%
Health care/pharmaceuticals	4%
Manufacturing	4%
Nonprofit/government	3%
Energy/utilities	2%
	100%
Total	N=248

Current Employment Industry, by Gender

Industry	Gender	
	Male	Female
Consulting	35%	42%
Energy/utilities	2%	2%
Finance/accounting	14%	6%
Health care/pharmaceuticals	5%	3%
Technology	16%	11%
Manufacturing	4%	2%
Nonprofit/government	2%	5%
Products/services	22%	30%
	100%	100%
Total	N=182	N=64

No statistical differences found.

Current Employment Industry, by Age*

Industry	Age at time of survey		
	27 and younger	28 to 34	35 and older
Consulting	—	34%	52%
Energy/utilities	—	2%	1%
Finance/accounting	—	16%	8%
Health care/pharmaceuticals	—	3%	8%
Technology	—	17%	7%
Manufacturing	—	4%	4%

Current Employment Industry, by Age*

Industry	Age at time of survey		
	27 and younger	28 to 34	35 and older
Nonprofit/government	—	2%	4%
Products/services	—	22%	15%
	—	100%	100%
Total	N=44	N=129	N=73

—Data not shown because N < 50. *Chi-squared; p < .05.

Unemployment Data

Respondents who indicated they were not currently working were asked, “Are you currently searching for a job?”

Currently Seeking Employment

Response	Percentage
Yes	84%
No	16%
	100%
Total	N=247

Currently Seeking Employment, by Gender

Response	Gender	
	Male	Female
Yes	85%	82%
No	15%	18%
	100%	100%
Total	N=143	N=104

No statistical differences found.

Currently Seeking Employment, by Age

Response	Age at time of survey		
	27 and younger	28 to 34	35 and older
Yes	75%	84%	92%
No	25%	16%	8%
	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=56	N=131	N=60

No statistical differences found.

Currently Seeking Employment, by Age

Response	Age at time of survey		
	27 and younger	28 to 34	35 and older
Yes	75%	84%	92%
No	25%	16%	8%
	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=56	N=131	N=60

Reasons for Unemployment

Respondents who indicated they were not currently working were asked, “What are the primary reasons you are not working?”

Primary Reasons for Not Working

Reasons	Percentage
Unable to find a job	74%
Currently involved in an internship or work project	10%
Family reasons	5%
Health reasons	2%
Military obligations	0%
Have recently moved	10%
Continuing my education	12%
Work permit or visa issues	13%
Other	15%
Total	N=198

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

Primary Reasons for Not Working, by Gender

Reasons	Male	Female
Unable to find a job*	75%	64%
Currently involved in an internship or work project	6%	4%
Family reasons*	6%	13%
Health reasons	1%	3%
Military obligations	0%	0%
Have recently moved	9%	12%
Continuing my education	10%	10%
Work permit or visa issues*	12%	3%

Primary Reasons for Not Working, by Gender

Other	14%	18%
Total	N=232	N=146

Responses may add to more than 100% due to multiple selections. *Chi-square; $p < .05$.

Primary Reasons for Not Working, by Age

Reasons	27 and younger	28 to 34	35 and older
Unable to find a job	61%	74%	74%
Currently involved in an internship or work project	6%	6%	3%
Family reasons	11%	9%	5%
Health reasons	2%	2%	2%
Military obligations	0%	0%	0%
Have recently moved*	19%	9%	2%
Continuing my education	14%	9%	9%
Work permit-visa issues	9%	9%	7%
Other	17%	13%	20%
Total	N=95	N=191	N=92

Responses may add to more than 100% due to multiple selections. *Chi-square; $p < .05$.

Respondents who indicated they were not currently working and were actively seeking employment were asked, "What are the primary reasons you have not been able to find employment?"

Primary Reasons Alumni Were Unable to Find Employment

Response	Percentage
There are no job openings for which to interview	45%
<i>I am interviewing, but I haven't received job offers because I...</i>	
Am overqualified	47%
Lack relevant industry or functional experience	39%
Lack sufficient years of work experience	19%
Am trying to re-enter the job market after taking a break	12%
Require work permit or visa	7%
<i>I can't find a job that...</i>	
Interests me	29%
Pays enough	33%
Has decent benefits	8%
Is close to home	18%
Total	N=138

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

Primary Reasons Alumni Were Unable to Find Employment, by Gender

Response	Gender	
	Male	Female
There are no job openings for which to interview	45%	45%
<i>I am interviewing, but I haven't received job offers because I...</i>		
Am overqualified	56%	34%
Lack relevant industry or functional experience	43%	34%
Lack sufficient years of work experience	23%	13%
Am trying to re-enter the job market after taking a break	13%	11%
Require work permit or visa	11%	0%
<i>I can't find a job that...</i>		
Interests me	29%	29%
Pays enough	32%	36%
Has decent benefits	7%	9%
Is close to home	18%	18%
Total	N=82	N=56

Responses may add to more than 100% due to multiple selections.
No statistical differences found.

Industry of Job Search

Respondents who indicated they were currently unemployed and were searching for a job were asked, "In what business or industry are you seeking employment?"

Industry of Job Search

Industry	Percentage
Consulting	19%
Energy/utilities	3%
Finance/accounting	21%
Health care/pharmaceuticals	7%
Technology	16%
Manufacturing	3%
Nonprofit/government	9%
Products/services	23%
	100%
Total	N=151

Industry of Job Search, by Gender*

Industry	Gender	
	Male	Female
Consulting	18%	20%
Energy/utilities	4%	0%
Finance/accounting	23%	19%
Health care/pharmaceuticals	7%	7%
Technology	22%	7%
Manufacturing	4%	0%
Nonprofit/government	4%	15%
Products/services	17%	32%
	100%	100%
Total	N=92	N=59

*Chi-squared; p < .05.

Searched Job Function

Respondents who indicated they were currently unemployed and were searching for a job were asked, “What job function do you seek to perform?”

Job Function Targeted in Job Search

Function	Percentage
Marketing/sales	30%
Operations/logistics	10%
Consulting	14%
General management	15%
Finance/accounting	24%
Human resources	4%
IT/MIS	4%
	100%
Total	N=153

Job Function Targeted in Job Search, by Gender

Function	Gender	
	Male	Female
Marketing/sales	28%	33%
Operations/logistics	12%	7%
Consulting	13%	15%

Job Function Targeted in Job Search, by Gender

Function	Gender	
	Male	Female
General management	12%	20%
Finance/accounting	28%	17%
Human resources	2%	7%
IT/MIS	5%	2%
	100%	100%
Total	N=93	N=60

No statistical differences found.

III. Perspectives on Ethics Education**Key Findings**

- Overall, 52 percent of alumni indicated they never worried and 31 percent rarely worried about being taught questionable values during their graduate management education experience.
- Only 41 percent of alumni indicated that ethics education during their graduate management education influences their current on-the-job decision-making a great deal or a good amount.
- One in two respondents indicated that the recent economic crisis and corporate scandals have created an atmosphere of distrust of corporations. About half of the alumni strongly agreed their employer promotes and upholds ethical business practices, and they trust their employer to behave ethically.
- Alumni that graduated from executive MBA programs (26%) were more likely than alumni of full-time MBA programs (17%) to indicate the recent economic crisis and corporate scandals caused companies to act more ethically and openly
- Full-time MBA alumni were more likely than were others to feel that the recent crisis has negatively affected the perceptions of graduate management education in the marketplace.

Perceptions of the Economy

Respondents were asked, “How would you describe the current state of the global economy and your national economy”?

Perceptions of the Economy

Response	Very Strong	Strong	Stable	Weak	Very Weak	Total
Current state of the global economy	0%	1%	27%	65%	6%	N=3,960
Current state of your national economy	0%	3%	26%	56%	15%	N=3,964

Perceptions of the Economy (Mean Scores)

Response	Mean	Standard Error	Valid N
State of global economy	2.2	.01	N=3,960
State of national economy	2.2	.01	N=3,964

Scale: 1 = very weak to 5 = very strong.

Respondents were asked, "Please indicate your level of concern for yourself regarding each of the following aspects of the economy."

Level of Concern Regarding Aspects of the Economy

Aspects of the Economy	Extremely Concerned	Very Concerned	Somewhat Concerned	Not Very Concerned	Not at All Concerned	Total
Job stability	16%	24%	31%	23%	6%	N=3,961
Personal finances	12%	26%	37%	22%	4%	N=3,960
Inflation	9%	25%	37%	24%	4%	N=3,961
Interest rates	5%	21%	37%	31%	6%	N=3,960
The stock markets	5%	23%	46%	22%	4%	N=3,961
Health care costs	15%	30%	31%	18%	5%	N=3,961
Gas prices	5%	17%	39%	32%	7%	N=3,961
Food prices	4%	15%	36%	38%	7%	N=3,961
Real estate prices	10%	26%	35%	24%	5%	N=3,960

Respondents were asked, "Which of the following effects do you feel the recent economic crisis and corporate scandals have had on business?"

Effects of Recent Economic Crisis on Business

Response	Percentage
Created an atmosphere of distrust of corporations	55%
Promoted short- and long-term change in business practices	45%
Brought about short-term change, but will not change long-term business practices	34%
Negatively affected the perceptions of graduate management education in the marketplace	25%
Caused companies to act more openly	21%
Caused companies to act more ethically	19%
Had little or no effect on business practices	13%
Increased the respectability of a graduate management education	4%
Other	3%
None of the above	3%
Total	N=3,840

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

Effects of Recent Economic Crisis on Business, by Graduation Year

Response	Graduation Year									
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Created an atmosphere of distrust of corporations	62%	56%	56%	59%	59%	52%	57%	52%	54%	55%
Promoted short- and long-term change in business practices*	43%	47%	38%	42%	38%	40%	43%	45%	47%	49%
Caused companies to act more openly*	12%	20%	17%	14%	20%	21%	21%	19%	20%	23%
Caused companies to act more ethically*	16%	15%	15%	11%	13%	19%	20%	16%	19%	23%
Brought about short-term change, but will not change long-term business practices*	33%	40%	36%	36%	39%	38%	33%	34%	35%	29%
Negatively affected the perceptions of graduate management education in the marketplace*	21%	25%	24%	16%	19%	20%	25%	22%	24%	31%
Had little or no effect on business practices*	15%	15%	13%	18%	16%	17%	16%	13%	13%	10%
Increased the respectability of a graduate management education	5%	2%	2%	3%	3%	4%	4%	4%	5%	6%
Other	5%	5%	3%	2%	3%	2%	2%	3%	2%	3%
None of the above	6%	3%	2%	3%	3%	2%	2%	3%	3%	2%
Total	N=82	N=131	N=119	N=166	N=291	N=361	N=512	N=399	N=641	N=1,129

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

*Chi-squared; $p < .05$.

Effects of Recent Economic Crisis on Business, by Program Type

Response	Program Type			
	Full-Time MBA	Part-Time MBA	EMBA	Other Degree
Created an atmosphere of distrust of corporations	54%	59%	54%	57%
Promoted short- and long-term change in business practices	44%	47%	50%	47%
Caused companies to act more openly*	19%	24%	21%	26%
Caused companies to act more ethically*	17%	21%	26%	21%
Brought about short-term change, but will not change long-term business practices	35%	32%	31%	31%
Negatively affected the perceptions of graduate management education in the marketplace*	27%	20%	20%	22%

Effects of Recent Economic Crisis on Business, by Program Type

Response	Program Type			
	Full-Time MBA	Part-Time MBA	EMBA	Other Degree
Had little or no effect on business practices*	14%	14%	11%	8%
Increased the respectability of a graduate management education*	3%	5%	7%	10%
Other	3%	3%	2%	3%
None of the above	3%	3%	4%	0%
Total	N=2,397	N=887	N=327	N=209

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

*Chi-squared; $p < .05$.

Effects of Recent Economic Crisis on Business, by Gender

Response	Gender	
	Male	Female
Created an atmosphere of distrust of corporations	56%	55%
Promoted short- and long-term change in business practices*	43%	49%
Caused companies to act more openly	20%	22%
Caused companies to act more ethically	18%	20%
Brought about short-term change, but will not change long-term business practices*	36%	29%
Negatively affected the perceptions of graduate management education in the marketplace*	27%	19%
Had little or no effect on business practices*	15%	10%
Increased the respectability of a graduate management education	4%	5%
Other	2%	3%
None of the above	3%	3%
Total	N=2,697	N=1,134

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

*Chi-squared; $p < .05$.

Effects of Recent Economic Crisis on Business, by Citizenship

Response	Citizenship (World Regions)					
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America	Africa/Middle East
Created an atmosphere of distrust of corporations*	60%	34%	49%	57%	48%	58%
Promoted short- and long-term change in business practices*	46%	44%	37%	39%	52%	51%
Caused companies to act more openly*	21%	20%	13%	21%	25%	26%
Caused companies to act more ethically*	19%	22%	15%	17%	31%	18%
Brought about short-term change, but will not change long-term business practices*	33%	35%	40%	35%	24%	36%
Negatively affected the perceptions of graduate management education in the marketplace*	24%	29%	23%	35%	22%	27%
Had little or no effect on business practices*	13%	12%	18%	12%	10%	12%
Increased the respectability of a graduate management education*	4%	7%	4%	1%	6%	3%
Other	3%	2%	1%	2%	1%	3%
None of the above	2%	3%	3%	3%	4%	1%
Total	N=2,576	N=364	N=419	N=203	N=184	N=74

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

*Chi-squared; $p < .05$.

Effects of Recent Economic Crisis on Business, by School Location

Response	School Location (World Region)				
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America
Created an atmosphere of distrust of corporations*	57%	41%	49%	54%	—
Promoted short- and long-term change in business practices*	46%	42%	40%	43%	—
Caused companies to act more openly	21%	19%	16%	23%	—
Caused companies to act more ethically	19%	23%	15%	22%	—
Brought about short-term change, but will not change long-term business practices*	33%	43%	38%	33%	—

Effects of Recent Economic Crisis on Business, by School Location

Response	School Location (World Region)				
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America
Negatively affected the perceptions of graduate management education in the marketplace*	24%	26%	26%	35%	—
Had little or no effect on business practices	13%	14%	17%	10%	—
Increased the respectability of a graduate management education*	4%	6%	6%	1%	—
Other	3%	1%	2%	2%	—
None of the above	3%	2%	3%	5%	—
Total	N=2,989	N=124	N=404	N=221	N=32

—Data not shown because N < 50.

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

*Chi-squared; p < .05.

Effects of Recent Economic Crisis on Business, by US Subgroup*

Response	US Subgroups		
	Non-Hispanic White	Asian American	Underrepresented Minorities
Created an atmosphere of distrust of corporations	60%	50%	58%
Promoted short- and long-term change in business practices	46%	43%	51%
Caused companies to act more openly	22%	19%	22%
Caused companies to act more ethically	19%	19%	21%
Brought about short-term change, but will not change long-term business practices	31%	46%	35%
Negatively affected the perceptions of graduate management education in the marketplace	23%	24%	28%
Had little or no effect on business practices	13%	14%	12%
Increased the respectability of a graduate management education	4%	5%	7%
Other	3%	1%	4%
None of the above	2%	3%	4%
Total	N=2,048	N=191	N=193

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

*Chi-squared; p < .05.

Concern for Values Learned

Respondents were asked, “Please indicate how often you worried about being taught questionable values or methods during your graduate management education experience?”

Frequency of Concern for Learning Questionable Values During Graduate Business Education

Response	Percentage
Always	1%
Frequently	4%
Sometimes	12%
Rarely	31%
Never	52%
	100%
Total	N=3,825

Frequency of Concern for Learning Questionable Values, by Graduation Year (Mean Scores)

Statistic	Graduation Year									
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Mean*	1.5	1.7	1.7	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.9
Standard Error of Mean	.08	.07	.07	.07	.05	.04	.04	.05	.04	.03
Valid N	N=82	N=130	N=119	N=166	N=290	N=359	N=510	N=398	N=638	N=1,124

Scale: 1 = Never 5 = Always. *ANOVA; $p < .05$

Frequency of Concern for Learning Questionable Values, by Program Type (Mean Scores)

Statistic	Program Type			
	Full-Time MBA	Part-Time MBA	EMBA	Other Degree
Mean*	1.7	1.7	1.6	1.9
Standard Error	.02	.03	.05	.07
Valid N	N=2,388	N=884	N=325	N=208

Scale: 1 = Never 5 = Always. *ANOVA; $p < .05$

Frequency of Concern for Learning Questionable Values, by Gender (Mean Scores)

Statistic	Gender	
	Male	Female
Mean	1.7	1.7
Standard Error	.02	.03
Valid N	N=2,683	N=1,133

Scale: 1 = Never 5 = Always. No statistical differences found.

Frequency of Concern for Learning Questionable Values, by Age (Mean Scores)

Statistic	Age at time of survey		
	27 and younger	28 to 34	35 and older
Mean	1.7	1.7	1.8
Standard Error	.03	.02	.03
Valid N	N=927	N=2,102	N=787

Scale: 1 = Never 5 = Always. No statistical differences found.

Frequency of Concern for Learning Questionable Values, by Citizenship (Mean Scores)

Statistic	Citizenship (World Regions)					
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America	Africa/Middle East
Mean*	1.6	2.3	2.1	1.8	2.1	1.9
Standard Error of Mean	.02	.05	.05	.06	.09	.11
Valid N	N=2,570	N=361	N=417	N=202	N=182	N=73

Scale: 1 = Never 5 = Always. *ANOVA; $p < .05$

Frequency of Concern for Learning Questionable Values, by School Location (Mean Scores)

Statistic	School Location (World Region)				
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America
Mean*	1.6	2.3	2.1	1.9	2.8
Standard Error of Mean	.02	.10	.05	.06	.23
Valid N	N=2,979	N=124	N=402	N=220	N=32

Scale: 1 = Never 5 = Always. *ANOVA; $p < .05$

Frequency of Concern for Learning Questionable Values, by US Subgroup (Mean Scores)

Statistic	US Subgroups		
	Non-Hispanic White	Asian American	Underrepresented Minorities
Mean*	1.5	1.7	1.6
Standard Error of Mean	.02	.06	.06
Valid N	N=2,042	N=191	N=193

Scale: 1 = Never 5 = Always. No statistical differences found.

Ethics Education

Respondents were asked, "How was ethics incorporated into your graduate management education curriculum?"

Methods Used to Incorporate Ethics Into Curriculum

Response	Percentage
Honor code/code of ethics	52%
Required core courses	48%
Speakers	45%
Integrated case studies within some courses	43%
References in some courses	34%
Elective courses	30%
References in most courses	30%
Integrated case studies within most courses	21%
Workshops	18%
Outside assignments and projects	13%
Student-led clubs	13%
Other	1%
None of the above, ethics was not incorporated into curriculum	3%
Total	N=3,833

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

Methods Used to Incorporate Ethics Into Curriculum, by Graduation Year

Response	Graduation Year									
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Elective courses*	28%	27%	21%	23%	26%	28%	29%	28%	33%	33%
Integrated case studies within most courses*	12%	9%	10%	19%	19%	20%	21%	20%	24%	25%

Methods Used to Incorporate Ethics Into Curriculum, by Graduation Year

Response	Graduation Year									
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Integrated case studies within some courses	41%	41%	35%	43%	43%	46%	44%	43%	44%	41%
References in most courses*	18%	18%	16%	17%	26%	26%	34%	30%	33%	33%
References in some courses	37%	37%	41%	34%	32%	36%	31%	34%	34%	34%
Outside assignments and projects	9%	14%	10%	8%	12%	13%	13%	13%	15%	15%
Required core courses*	34%	29%	35%	40%	44%	50%	45%	53%	54%	50%
Honor code/code of ethics*	49%	34%	47%	45%	50%	54%	53%	48%	55%	57%
Speakers*	37%	34%	38%	36%	42%	46%	46%	49%	49%	46%
Workshops	10%	11%	16%	17%	16%	19%	19%	21%	20%	18%
Student-led clubs	16%	6%	13%	9%	9%	13%	14%	14%	15%	13%
Other	4%	2%	0%	0%	1%	1%	1%	0%	1%	1%
None of the above, ethics was not incorporated into curriculum	2%	9%	7%	4%	3%	2%	3%	4%	3%	2%
Total	N=82	N=131	N=119	N=166	N=290	N=360	N=511	N=399	N=641	N=1,125

Responses add to more than 100% because of multiple selections.*Chi-squared; p < .05.

Methods Used to Incorporate Ethics Into Curriculum, by Program Type

Response	Program Type			
	Full-Time MBA	Part-Time MBA	EMBA	Other Degree
Elective courses*	34%	26%	10%	28%
Integrated case studies within most courses	21%	21%	23%	20%
Integrated case studies within some courses	44%	40%	44%	40%
References in most courses	29%	29%	31%	32%
References in some courses	34%	33%	33%	36%
Outside assignments and projects*	14%	10%	14%	14%
Required core courses	50%	45%	47%	44%
Honor code/code of ethics*	56%	44%	53%	51%
Speakers*	50%	33%	45%	38%
Workshops*	22%	11%	13%	13%
Student-led clubs*	17%	4%	4%	11%
Other	1%	1%	1%	1%
None of the above, ethics was not incorporated into curriculum	3%	3%	4%	1%
Total	N=2,393	N=886	N=326	N=208

Responses add to more than 100% because of multiple selections. *Chi-squared; p < .05.

Methods Used to Incorporate Ethics Into Curriculum, by Gender

Response	Gender	
	Male	Female
Elective courses	30%	29%
Integrated case studies within most courses	22%	20%
Integrated case studies within some courses	43%	42%
References in most courses	30%	29%
References in some courses	33%	35%
Outside assignments and projects	14%	12%
Required core courses	48%	47%
Honor code/code of ethics	54%	50%
Speakers*	49%	36%
Workshops*	20%	13%
Student-led clubs	13%	13%
Other	1%	1%
None of the above, ethics was not incorporated into curriculum	3%	2%
Total	N=2,690	N=1,134

Responses add to more than 100% because of multiple selections. *Chi-squared; $p < .05$.

Methods Used to Incorporate Ethics Into Curriculum, by Citizenship

Response	Citizenship (World Regions)					
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America	Africa/Middle East
Elective courses	29%	33%	34%	27%	28%	34%
Integrated case studies within most courses*	23%	19%	13%	15%	22%	18%
Integrated case studies within some courses*	45%	41%	36%	40%	36%	42%
References in most courses*	33%	22%	24%	21%	23%	27%
References in some courses	34%	26%	35%	37%	34%	35%
Outside assignments and projects*	15%	14%	8%	9%	10%	15%
Required core courses*	50%	40%	37%	54%	50%	46%
Honor code-code of ethics*	59%	47%	30%	33%	53%	36%
Speakers	46%	44%	41%	45%	43%	34%
Workshops	18%	21%	19%	21%	18%	19%
Student-led clubs	13%	11%	15%	14%	9%	11%
Other	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	3%

Methods Used to Incorporate Ethics Into Curriculum, by Citizenship

None of the above, ethics was not incorporated into curriculum	2%	4%	7%	5%	2%	4%
Total	N=2,576	N=361	N=418	N=203	N=181	N=74

Responses add to more than 100% because of multiple selections. No statistical differences found.

Methods Used to Incorporate Ethics Into Curriculum, by School Location

Response	School Location (World Region)				
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America
Elective courses	29%	36%	34%	29%	—
Integrated case studies within most courses*	23%	15%	15%	16%	—
Integrated case studies within some courses*	44%	45%	35%	41%	—
References in most courses*	32%	19%	21%	21%	—
References in some courses	34%	27%	33%	39%	—
Outside assignments and projects*	14%	7%	12%	9%	—
Required core courses*	50%	22%	39%	57%	—
Honor code-code of ethics	59%	36%	23%	32%	—
Speakers*	46%	35%	45%	43%	—
Workshops	18%	12%	22%	18%	—
Student-led clubs*	12%	10%	18%	12%	—
Other	1%	1%	0%	0%	—
None of the above, ethics was not incorporated into curriculum	2%	10%	7%	4%	—
Total	N=2,985	N=124	N=403	N=221	N=31

—Data not shown because N < 50.

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

*Chi-squared; p < .05.

Methods Used to Incorporate Ethics Into Curriculum, by US Subgroup

Response	US Subgroups		
	Non-Hispanic White	Asian American	Underrepresented Minorities
Elective courses	29%	34%	27%
Integrated case studies within most courses	23%	21%	26%

Methods Used to Incorporate Ethics Into Curriculum, by US Subgroup

Response	US Subgroups		
	Non-Hispanic White	Asian American	Underrepresented Minorities
Integrated case studies within some courses	45%	42%	45%
References in most courses	33%	26%	30%
References in some courses	35%	36%	31%
Outside assignments and projects	15%	11%	13%
Required core courses	51%	46%	49%
Honor code-code of ethics	59%	53%	63%
Speakers	47%	47%	43%
Workshops	17%	18%	22%
Student-led clubs	13%	18%	9%
Other	1%	1%	3%
None of the above, ethics was not incorporated into curriculum	2%	3%	2%
Total	N=2,047	N=192	N=193

Responses add to more than 100% because of multiple selections.
No statistical differences found.

Impact of Ethics Education

Respondents who indicated ethics education was incorporated into their curriculum in some capacity were asked, "To what extent does the ethics education you were taught during your graduate management education influence your decision-making process?"

Impact of Ethics Education on Decision-Making Process

Response	Percentage
A great deal	13%
A good amount	28%
Some	31%
A little	15%
Not at all	14%
	100%
Total	N=3,713

Impact of Ethics Education on Decision-Making Process, by Graduation Year (Mean Scores)

Statistic	Graduation Year									
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Mean*	2.8	2.9	2.8	2.9	2.8	2.8	3.2	3.1	3.2	3.3
Standard Error of Mean	.14	.10	.12	.10	.07	.06	.05	.06	.05	.04
Valid N	N=80	N=119	N=111	N=159	N=282	N=352	N=497	N=384	N=620	N=1101

Scale: 1 = Not at all, 5 = A great deal.

*ANOVA; p < .05

Impact of Ethics Education on Decision-Making Process, by Program Type (Mean Scores)

to	Program Type			
	Full-Time MBA	Part-Time MBA	EMBA	Other Degree
Mean*	3.1	3.1	3.3	3.4
Standard Error of Mean	.03	.04	.06	.08
Valid N	N=2,322	N=857	N=311	N=205

Scale: 1 = Not at all, 5 = A great deal. *ANOVA; p < .05

Impact of Ethics Education on Decision-Making Process, by Gender (Mean Scores)

Statistic	Gender	
	Male	Female
Mean	3.1	3.1
Standard Error of Mean	.02	.04
Valid N	N=2,599	N=1,106

Scale: 1 = Not at all, 5 = A great deal.

No statistical differences found.

Impact of Ethics Education on Decision-Making Process, by Age (Mean Scores)

Statistic	Age at time of survey		
	27 and younger	28 to 34	35 and older
Mean*	3.1	3.1	3.2
Standard Error of Mean	.04	.03	.05
Valid N	N=906	N=2,041	N=758

Scale: 1 = Not at all, 5 = A great deal. *ANOVA; p < .05

Impact of Ethics Education on Decision-Making Process, by Citizenship (Mean Scores)

Statistic	Citizenship (World Regions)					
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America	Africa/Middle East
Mean*	3.1	3.5	3.1	2.7	3.3	3.4
Standard Error of Mean	.02	.06	.06	.09	.10	.15
Valid N	N=2,516	N=348	N=389	N=192	N=178	N=71

Scale: 1 = Not at all, 5 = A great deal. *ANOVA; p < .05

Impact of Ethics Education on Decision-Making Process, by School Location (Mean Scores)

Statistic	School Location (World Region)				
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America
Mean*	3.1	3.4	3.0	2.9	—
Standard Error of Mean	.02	.11	.06	.09	—
Valid N	N=2,917	N=112	N=374	N=212	N=32

—Data not shown because N < 50. Scale: 1 = Not at all, 5 = A great deal. *ANOVA; p < .05

Impact of Ethics Education on Decision-Making Process, by US Subgroup (Mean Scores)

Statistic	US Subgroups		
	Non-Hispanic White	Asian American	Underrepresented Minorities
Mean*	3.0	3.2	3.3
Standard Error of Mean	.03	.09	.10
Valid N	N=2,002	N=186	N=189

Scale: 1 = Not at all, 5 = A great deal. *ANOVA; p < .05

Ethical Business Practices

Respondents who indicated they were currently employed were asked, “Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements about ethical business practices.”

Ethical Practices of Employer

Response	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
My employer promotes and upholds ethical business practices.	52%	36%	9%	2%	1%	N=3,211
I trust my employer to behave ethically in its business practices.	50%	37%	10%	2%	1%	N=3,212

Ethical Practices of Employer (Mean Scores)

Response	Mean	Standard Error	Valid N
My employer promotes and upholds ethical business practices.	4.4	.01	N=3,211
I trust my employer to behave ethically in its business practices.	4.3	.01	N=3,211

Scale: 1 = Strongly disagree to 5 = Strongly agree.

Ethical Practices of Employer, by Graduation Year (Mean Scores)

Response		Graduation Year									
		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
My employer promotes and upholds ethical business practices.	Mean	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.4	4.4
	Standard Error	.09	.07	.08	.06	.05	.04	.04	.04	.03	.03
	Valid N	N=69	N=114	N=98	N=139	N=251	N=322	N=444	N=351	N=565	N=852
I trust my employer to behave ethically in its business practices.	Mean	4.3	4.3	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.3	4.4
	Standard Error	.09	.07	.08	.06	.05	.04	.04	.05	.03	.03
	Valid N	N=69	N=114	N=98	N=139	N=251	N=322	N=444	N=351	N=565	N=852

Scale: 1 = Strongly disagree to 5 = Strongly agree. No statistical differences found.

Ethical Practices of Employer, by Program Type (Mean Scores)

Response		Program Type			
		Full-Time MBA	Part-Time MBA	EMBA	Other Degree
My employer promotes and upholds ethical business practices.*	Mean	4.4	4.3	4.5	4.4
	Standard Error	.02	.03	.05	.06
	Valid N	N=1,954	N=798	N=283	N=160
I trust my employer to behave ethically in its business practices.*	Mean	4.3	4.3	4.4	4.3
	Standard Error	.02	.03	.05	.07
	Valid N	N=1,954	N=798	N=283	N=160

Scale: 1 = Strongly disagree to 5 = Strongly agree. *ANOVA; p < .05

Ethical Practices of Employer, by Gender (Mean Scores)

Response		Gender	
		Male	Female
My employer promotes and upholds ethical business practices.	Mean	4.4	4.3
	Standard Error	.02	.03
	Valid N	N=2,287	N=918
I trust my employer to behave ethically in its business practices.	Mean	4.3	4.3
	Standard Error	.02	.03
	Valid N	N=2,287	N=918

Scale: 1 = Strongly disagree to 5 = Strongly agree. No statistical differences found.

Ethical Practices of Employer, by Age (Mean Scores)

Response		Age at time of survey		
		27 and younger	28 to 34	35 and older
My employer promotes and upholds ethical business practices.	Mean	4.4	4.3	4.3
	Standard Error	.03	.02	.03
	Valid N	N=794	N=1,782	N=629
I trust my employer to behave ethically in its business practices.	Mean	4.4	4.3	4.3
	Standard Error	.03	.02	.03
	Valid N	N=794	N=1,782	N=629

Scale: 1 = Strongly disagree to 5 = Strongly agree. No statistical differences found.

Ethical Practices of Employer, by Citizenship (Mean Scores)

Response		Citizenship (World Regions)					
		United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America	Africa/Middle East
My employer promotes and upholds ethical business practices.*	Mean	4.4	4.2	4.2	4.3	4.6	4.3
	Standard Error	.02	.05	.05	.06	.05	.11
	Valid N	N=2,208	N=302	N=321	N=160	N=152	N=54
I trust my employer to behave ethically in its business practices.*	Mean	4.4	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.5	4.4
	Standard Error	.02	.05	.05	.06	.05	.11
	Valid N	N=2,208	N=302	N=321	N=160	N=152	N=54

Scale: 1 = Strongly disagree to 5 = Strongly agree. *ANOVA; $p < .05$

Ethical Practices of Employer, by School Location (Mean Scores)

Response		School Location (World Region)				
		United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America
My employer promotes and upholds ethical business practices.*	Mean	4.4	4.0	4.1	4.3	—
	Standard Error	.02	.09	.05	.06	—
	Valid N	N=2,552	N=105	N=294	N=177	N=26
I trust my employer to behave ethically in its business practices.*	Mean	4.4	4.0	4.1	4.3	—
	Standard Error	.02	.09	.05	.06	—
	Valid N	N=2,552	N=105	N=294	N=177	N=26

—Data not shown because N < 50. Scale: 1 = Strongly disagree to 5 = Strongly agree. *ANOVA; p < .05

Ethical Practices of Employer, by US Subgroups (Mean Scores)

Response		US Subgroups		
		Non-Hispanic White	Asian American	Underrepresented Minorities
My employer promotes and upholds ethical business practices.*	Mean	4.4	4.2	4.3
	Standard Error	.02	.07	.07
	Valid N	N=1,762	N=159	N=162
I trust my employer to behave ethically in its business practices.*	Mean	4.4	4.2	4.2
	Standard Error	.02	.07	.07
	Valid N	N=1,762	N=159	N=162

Scale: 1 = Strongly disagree to 5 = Strongly agree.*ANOVA; p < .05

IV. Perspectives on Graduate Business Institutions**Key Findings**

- The vast majority of alumni (91%) indicated they recommended their school to someone else. Their decision to make the recommendation was influenced most by the faculty at the school they attended.
- Four in five alumni indicated they were prepared for their professional career as a result of the graduate business institution they attended.
- Three-quarters of alumni indicated they receive sufficient communications from their school. One in five alumni, however, indicated they would like to receive more communications from their alma mater.

- The preferred mode of communication for the majority of the respondents (89%) was email newsletters.
- The top three areas of information alumni would like to learn about from their school were alumni events, networking opportunities, and job opportunities.
- Two out of five alumni indicated they frequently or occasionally attend alumni social networking events. In addition, 30 percent reported they frequently or occasionally make financial donations to their school.
- About half of alumni indicated they continue to use career and library services at their alma mater.

Respondents were asked, “How well prepared were you for your professional career as a result of the graduate business institution you attended?”

Level of Preparedness for Professional Career After Graduation

Response	Percentage
Very well prepared	33%
Well prepared	49%
Somewhat prepared	15%
Not well prepared	2%
Not very well prepared	1%
	100%
Total	N=3,798

Level of Preparedness for Professional Career After Graduation, by Graduation Year (Mean Scores)

Statistic	Graduation Year									
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Mean	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.2	4.1	4.1	4.2	4.0	4.1	4.2
Standard Error of Mean	.08	.06	.08	.05	.04	.04	.04	.04	.03	.02
Valid N	N=82	N=129	N=118	N=164	N=289	N=355	N=504	N=395	N=637	N=1,116

Scale: 1 = Not very well prepared to 5 = Very well prepared. No statistical differences found.

Level of Preparedness for Professional Career After Graduation, by Program Type (Mean Scores)

Statistic	Program Type			
	Full-Time MBA	Part-Time MBA	EMBA	Other Degree
Mean*	4.2	4.0	4.3	4.2
Standard Error of Mean	.02	.03	.04	.05
Valid N	N=2,372	N=877	N=323	N=206

Scale: 1 = Not very well prepared to 5 = Very well prepared. *ANOVA; $p < .05$

Level of Preparedness for Professional Career After Graduation, by Gender (Mean Scores)

Statistic	Gender	
	Male	Female
Mean*	4.2	4.0
Standard Error of Mean	.02	.02
Valid N	N=2,665	N=1,124

Scale: 1 = Not very well prepared to 5 = Very well prepared.
*ANOVA; $p < .05$

Level of Preparedness for Professional Career After Graduation, by Age (Mean Scores)

Statistic	Age at time of survey		
	27 and younger	28 to 34	35 and older
Mean	4.1	4.1	4.1
Standard Error of Mean	.02	.02	.03
Valid N	N=917	N=2,087	N=785

Scale: 1 = Not very well prepared to 5 = Very well prepared.
No statistical differences found.

Level of Preparedness for Professional Career After Graduation, by Citizenship (Mean Scores)

Statistic	Citizenship (World Regions)					
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America	Africa/Middle East
Mean*	4.2	3.9	4.1	3.9	4.3	4.1
Standard Error of Mean	.02	.04	.04	.06	.05	.08
Valid N	N=2,554	N=356	N=414	N=201	N=180	N=73

Scale: 1 = Not very well prepared to 5 = Very well prepared.
*ANOVA; $p < .05$

**Level of Preparedness for Professional Career After Graduation, by School Location
(Mean Scores)**

Statistic	School Location (World Region)				
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America
Mean*	4.2	3.8	4.1	3.9	—
Standard Error of Mean	.01	.08	.04	.06	—
Valid N	N=2,957	N=123	N=401	N=218	N=32

—Data not shown because N < 50.

Scale: 1 = Not very well prepared to 5 = Very well prepared. *ANOVA; p < .05

**Level of Preparedness for Professional Career After Graduation, by US Subgroups
(Mean Scores)**

Statistic	US Subgroups		
	Non-Hispanic White	Asian American	Underrepresented Minorities
Mean*	4.2	4.0	4.3
Standard Error of Mean	.02	.06	.05
Valid N	N=2,029	N=189	N=193

Scale: 1 = Not very well prepared to 5 = Very well prepared. *ANOVA; p < .05

Retrospective Decisions

Respondents who graduated in 2009 were asked, “Knowing what you know now, would you say you made the right decision in pursuing your graduate management degree, the school you chose to attend, the type of program in which you enrolled, and your academic concentration?”

Retrospective Decisions About Graduate Management Education (Class of 2009)

Decisions	Definitely Yes	Probably Yes	Probably No	Definitely No	Total
Pursuing your graduate management degree	67%	23%	8%	2%	N=1,099
The school you chose to attend	53%	32%	9%	6%	N=1,099
The type of program in which you enrolled: full-time, part-time, executive, etc.	70%	19%	7%	4%	N=1,099
Your academic concentration	49%	35%	12%	3%	N=1,099

Retrospective Decisions About Graduate Management Education (Mean Scores) (Class of 2009)

Response	Mean	Standard Error	Valid N
Pursuing your graduate management degree	3.5	.02	N=1,099
The school you chose to attend	3.3	.03	N=1,099
The type of program in which you enrolled: full-time, part-time, executive, etc.	3.6	.02	N=1,099
Your academic concentration	3.3	.02	N=1,099

*Scale: 1 = Definitely no to 4 = Definitely yes.

Retrospective Decisions About Graduate Management Education, by Program Type (Mean Scores) (Class of 2009)

Decisions		Program Type			
		Full-Time MBA	Part-Time MBA	EMBA	Other Degree
Pursuing your graduate management degree	Mean	3.5	3.5	3.6	3.6
	Standard Error	.03	.05	.06	.06
	Valid N	N=577	N=239	N=122	N=161
The school you chose to attend*	Mean	3.3	3.3	3.5	3.3
	Standard Error	.04	.06	.07	.07
	Valid N	N=577	N=239	N=122	N=161
The type of program in which you enrolled: full-time, part-time, executive, etc.*	Mean	3.6	3.4	3.6	3.5
	Standard Error	.03	.06	.07	.06
	Valid N	N=577	N=239	N=122	N=161
Your academic concentration	Mean	3.3	3.2	3.4	3.3
	Standard Error	.03	.05	.07	.07
	Valid N	N=577	N=239	N=122	N=161

Scale: 1 = Definitely no to 4 = Definitely yes.

*ANOVA; p < .05.

Retrospective Decisions About Graduate Management Education, by Gender (Mean Scores) (Class of 2009)

Decisions		Gender	
		Male	Female
Pursuing your graduate management degree	Mean	3.5	3.6
	Standard Error	.03	.04
	Valid N	N=754	N=345

**Retrospective Decisions About Graduate Management Education,
by Gender (Mean Scores) (Class of 2009)**

Decisions		Gender	
		Male	Female
The school you chose to attend	Mean	3.3	3.3
	Standard Error	.03	.05
	Valid N	N=754	N=345
The type of program in which you enrolled: full-time, part-time, executive, etc.	Mean	3.6	3.6
	Standard Error	.03	.04
	Valid N	N=754	N=345
Your academic concentration	Mean	3.3	3.3
	Standard Error	.03	.04
	Valid N	N=754	N=345

Scale: 1 = Definitely no to 4 = Definitely yes.
No statistical differences found.

**Retrospective Decisions About Graduate Management Education,
by Age (Mean Scores) (Class of 2009)**

Decisions		Age at time of survey		
		27 and younger	28 to 34	35 and older
Pursuing your graduate management degree	Mean	3.6	3.5	3.6
	Standard Error	.05	.03	.04
	Valid N	N=238	N=584	N=277
The school you chose to attend*	Mean	3.3	3.3	3.4
	Standard Error	.06	.04	.05
	Valid N	N=238	N=584	N=277
The type of program in which you enrolled: full-time, part-time, executive, etc.	Mean	3.6	3.5	3.6
	Standard Error	.04	.03	.05
	Valid N	N=238	N=584	N=277
Your academic concentration*	Mean	3.4	3.2	3.4
	Standard Error	.05	.04	.05
	Valid N	N=238	N=584	N=277

Scale: 1 = Definitely no to 4 = Definitely yes. *ANOVA; $p < .05$.

**Retrospective Decisions About Graduate Management Education,
by Citizenship (Mean Scores) (Class of 2009)**

Decisions		Citizenship (World Regions)					
		United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America	Africa/Middle East
Pursuing your graduate management degree*	Mean	3.5	3.4	3.5	—	3.8	—
	Standard Error	.03	.07	.06	—	.05	—
	Valid N	N=716	N=121	N=116	N=45	N=72	N=29
The school you chose to attend	Mean	3.3	3.2	3.3	—	3.5	—
	Standard Error	.03	.07	.08	—	.09	—
	Valid N	N=716	N=121	N=116	N=45	N=72	N=29
The type of program in which you enrolled: full-time, part-time, executive, etc.*	Mean	3.6	3.4	3.6	—	3.8	—
	Standard Error	.03	.07	.06	—	.05	—
	Valid N	N=716	N=121	N=116	N=45	N=72	N=29
Your academic concentration	Mean	3.3	3.2	3.3	—	3.5	—
	Standard Error	.03	.07	.08	—	.09	—
	Valid N	N=716	N=121	N=116	N=45	N=72	N=29

—Data not shown because N < 50. Scale: 1 = Definitely no to 4 = Definitely yes. *ANOVA; p < .05.

**Retrospective Decisions About Graduate Management
Education, by School Location (Mean Scores) (Class of 2009)**

Decisions		School Location (World Region)				
		United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America
Pursuing your graduate management degree*	Mean	3.6	3.3	3.5	—	—
	Standard Error	.03	.11	.06	—	—
	Valid N	N=841	N=56	N=115	N=49	N=32
The school you chose to attend	Mean	3.3	3.2	3.3	—	—
	Standard Error	.03	.11	.07	—	—
	Valid N	N=841	N=56	N=115	N=49	N=32
The type of program in which you enrolled: full-time, part-time, executive, etc.*	Mean	3.6	3.3	3.6	—	—
	Standard Error	.03	.11	.06	—	—
	Valid N	N=841	N=56	N=115	N=49	N=32
Your academic concentration*	Mean	3.3	2.9	3.4	—	—
	Standard Error	.03	.12	.06	—	—
	Valid N	N=841	N=56	N=115	N=49	N=32

—Data not shown because N < 50. Scale: 1 = Definitely no to 4 = Definitely yes. *ANOVA; p < .05.

Retrospective Decisions About Graduate Management Education, by US Subgroups (Mean Scores) (Class of 2009)

Decisions		US Subgroups		
		Non-Hispanic White	Asian American	Underrepresented Minorities
Pursuing your graduate management degree	Mean	3.5	—	3.5
	Standard Error	.03	—	.11
	Valid N	N=580	N=49	N=57
The school you chose to attend	Mean	3.3	—	3.2
	Standard Error	.04	—	.13
	Valid N	N=580	N=49	N=57
The type of program in which you enrolled: full-time, part-time, executive, etc-	Mean	3.6	—	3.6
	Standard Error	.03	—	.10
	Valid N	N=580	N=49	N=57
Your academic concentration	Mean	3.3	—	3.5
	Standard Error	.03	—	.10
	Valid N	N=580	N=49	N=57

—Data not shown because N < 50. Scale: 1 = Definitely no to 4 = Definitely yes. No statistical differences found.

School Recommendations

Respondents were asked, “Have you ever recommended your graduate business school to someone interested in pursuing a graduate management business education?”

Recommended Graduate Business School to Someone

Response	Percentage
Yes	91%
No	9%
	100%
Total	N=3,773

Recommended Graduate Business School to Someone, by Graduation Year

Response	Graduation Year									
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Yes	93%	91%	89%	93%	93%	92%	95%	92%	89%	91%
No	7%	9%	11%	7%	7%	8%	5%	8%	11%	9%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=81	N=128	N=118	N=163	N=286	N=353	N=504	N=392	N=632	N=1,107

No statistical differences found.

Recommended Graduate Business School to Someone, by Program Type

Response	Program Type			
	Full-Time MBA	Part-Time MBA	EMBA	Other Degree
Yes	91%	91%	95%	89%
No	9%	9%	5%	11%
	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=2,355	N=871	N=322	N=205

No statistical differences found.

Recommended Graduate Business School to Someone, by Gender*

Response	Gender	
	Male	Female
Yes	92%	90%
No	8%	10%
	100%	100%
Total	N=2,646	N=1,118

*Chi-squared; p < .05.

Recommended Graduate Business School to Someone, by Age

Response	Age at time of survey		
	27 and younger	28 to 34	35 and older
Yes	91%	92%	90%
No	9%	8%	10%
	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=911	N=2,070	N=783

No statistical differences found.

Recommended Graduate Business School to Someone, by Citizenship

Response	Citizenship (World Regions)					
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America	Africa/Middle East
Yes	92%	89%	92%	91%	93%	95%
No	8%	11%	8%	9%	7%	5%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=2,539	N=352	N=410	N=201	N=178	N=73

No statistical differences found.

Recommended Graduate Business School to Someone, by School Location

Response	School Location (World Region)				
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America
Yes	91%	88%	94%	89%	—
No	9%	12%	6%	11%	—
	100%	100%	100%	100%	—
Total	N=2,936	N=121	N=399	N=218	N=32

—Data not shown because N < 50. No statistical differences found.

Recommended Graduate Business School to Someone, by US Subgroups

Response	US Subgroups		
	Non-Hispanic White	Asian American	Underrepresented Minorities
Yes	92%	88%	91%
No	8%	12%	9%
	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=2,017	N=188	N=192

No statistical differences found.

Respondents who indicated they recommended their graduate business school to someone were asked, “What aspects of your graduate business school influenced your willingness to recommend it to someone interested in pursuing a graduate management education?”

School Aspects Influencing Decision to Recommend

Response	Percentage
Faculty	74%
School culture	72%
Core courses	64%
Fellow students	61%
Elective courses	48%
Student activities	30%
Career services	24%
Other	10%
Total	N=3,445

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

School Aspects Influencing Decision to Recommend, by Graduation Year

Response	Graduation Year									
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Faculty	68%	63%	73%	77%	78%	72%	77%	73%	75%	75%
Core courses*	72%	57%	59%	64%	61%	65%	67%	63%	68%	63%
Elective courses*	51%	31%	47%	50%	46%	47%	46%	45%	55%	47%
Fellow students*	65%	55%	62%	63%	62%	67%	62%	60%	61%	58%
Student activities*	35%	22%	25%	42%	28%	32%	31%	27%	29%	31%
Career services*	37%	18%	26%	28%	19%	23%	24%	23%	26%	23%
School culture*	69%	66%	71%	83%	73%	76%	74%	67%	68%	72%
Other	13%	14%	11%	6%	9%	12%	9%	10%	8%	9%
Total	N=75	N=115	N=105	N=151	N=266	N=324	N=477	N=362	N=561	N=1,001

Responses add to more than 100% because of multiple selections. *Chi-squared; $p < .05$

School Aspects Influencing Decision to Recommend, by Program Type

Response	Program Type			
	Full-Time MBA	Part-Time MBA	EMBA	Other Degree
Faculty	75%	71%	80%	68%
Core courses*	61%	67%	76%	71%
Elective courses*	50%	49%	27%	47%
Fellow students*	66%	49%	66%	46%
Student activities*	39%	13%	15%	21%
Career services*	29%	15%	13%	23%
School culture*	78%	56%	70%	64%
Other	9%	12%	9%	9%
Total	N=2,151	N=789	N=306	N=182

Responses add to more than 100% because of multiple selections. *Chi-squared; $p < .05$

School Aspects Influencing Decision to Recommend, by Gender

Response	Gender	
	Male	Female
Faculty*	76%	70%
Core courses	65%	62%
Elective courses	49%	45%
Fellow students*	62%	58%
Student activities	30%	30%
Career services	25%	21%

School Aspects Influencing Decision to Recommend, by Gender

Response	Gender	
	Male	Female
School culture	72%	71%
Other	9%	12%
Total	N=2,434	N=1,003

Responses add to more than 100% due to multiple selections. *Chi-squared; $p < .05$

School Aspects Influencing Decision to Recommend, by Age

Response	Age at time of survey		
	27 and younger	28 to 34	35 and older
Faculty	74%	74%	76%
Core courses	62%	64%	69%
Elective courses	48%	50%	42%
Fellow students	59%	65%	53%
Student activities*	34%	33%	17%
Career services*	31%	24%	15%
School culture*	72%	74%	65%
Other	7%	10%	12%
Total	N=832	N=1,899	N=706

Responses add to more than 100% because of multiple selections. *Chi-squared; $p < .05$

School Aspects Influencing Decision to Recommend, by Citizenship

Response	Citizenship (World Regions)					
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America	Africa/Middle East
Faculty*	76%	73%	68%	73%	72%	72%
Core courses	64%	60%	69%	64%	65%	72%
Elective courses	46%	50%	53%	51%	45%	49%
Fellow students*	63%	54%	60%	56%	58%	51%
Student activities	29%	37%	35%	25%	30%	33%
Career services	24%	24%	23%	24%	24%	25%
School culture	72%	70%	74%	65%	80%	67%
Other	10%	8%	7%	8%	10%	17%
Total	N=2,327	N=311	N=374	N=181	N=165	N=69

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

*Chi-squared; $p < .05$

School Aspects Influencing Decision to Recommend, by School Location

Response	School Location (World Region)				
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America
Faculty*	76%	68%	63%	77%	—
Core courses	64%	59%	68%	64%	—
Elective courses	47%	48%	49%	52%	—
Fellow students*	62%	49%	67%	54%	—
Student activities	29%	34%	40%	24%	—
Career services	25%	18%	22%	23%	—
School culture	72%	62%	78%	64%	—
Other	10%	10%	7%	10%	—
Total	N=2,682	N=105	N=374	N=193	N=30

—Data not shown because N < 50.

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

*Chi-squared; $p < .05$

School Aspects Influencing Decision to Recommend, by US Subgroups

Response	US Subgroups		
	Non-Hispanic White	Asian American	Underrepresented Minorities
Faculty	77%	70%	71%
Core courses	64%	61%	60%
Elective courses	46%	49%	45%
Fellow students	63%	67%	60%
Student activities	29%	30%	29%
Career services*	23%	33%	24%
School culture	71%	75%	74%
Other	11%	5%	10%
Total	N=1,861	N=166	N=174

Responses add to more than 100% because of multiple selections.*Chi-squared; $p < .05$

Communication Efforts

Respondents were asked, “As an alumnus, do you feel you are receiving sufficient communication from your graduate business school?”

Sufficiency of Communication Received From Graduate Business School

Response	Percentage
Yes, communication is sufficient.	76%
No, I would like to receive more communications.	21%
No, I receive too many communications.	3%
	100%
Total	N=3,788

Sufficiency of Communication Received From Graduate Business School, by Graduation Year*

Response	Graduation Year									
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Yes, communication is sufficient.	88%	83%	83%	87%	78%	83%	80%	74%	73%	71%
No, I would like to receive more communications.	10%	15%	14%	11%	17%	15%	18%	23%	25%	27%
No, I receive too many communications.	2%	2%	3%	2%	4%	2%	3%	3%	3%	2%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=82	N=128	N=118	N=163	N=288	N=355	N=503	N=394	N=636	N=1,112

*Chi-squared; $p < .05$

Sufficiency of Communication Received From Graduate Business School, by Program Type

Response	Program Type			
	Full-Time MBA	Part-Time MBA	EMBA	Other Degree
Yes, communication is sufficient.	76%	77%	79%	71%
No, I would like to receive more communications.	22%	21%	17%	27%
No, I receive too many communications.	2%	3%	4%	1%
	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=2,363	N=877	N=322	N=206

No statistical differences found.

Sufficiency of Communication Received From Graduate Business School, by Gender

Response	Gender	
	Male	Female
Yes, communication is sufficient.	76%	76%
No, I would like to receive more communications.	21%	21%
No, I receive too many communications.	3%	2%
	100%	100%
Total	N=2,658	N=1,121

No statistical differences found.

Sufficiency of Communication Received From Graduate Business School, by Age

Response	Age at time of survey		
	27 and younger	28 to 34	35 and older
Yes, communication is sufficient.	74%	77%	76%
No, I would like to receive more communications.	24%	20%	22%
No, I receive too many communications.	3%	3%	2%
	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=915	N=2,080	N=784

No statistical differences found.

Sufficiency of Communication Received From Graduate Business School, by Citizenship*

Response	Citizenship (World Regions)					
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America	Africa/Middle East
Yes, communication is sufficient.	78%	65%	75%	76%	73%	71%
No, I would like to receive more communications.	19%	34%	23%	20%	24%	27%
No, I receive too many communications.	3%	1%	2%	3%	3%	1%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=2,550	N=354	N=411	N=201	N=179	N=73

*Chi-squared; p < .05

Sufficiency of Communication Received From Graduate Business School, by School Location *

Response	School Location (World Region)				
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America
Yes, communication is sufficient.	77%	62%	73%	79%	—
No, I would like to receive more communications.	20%	36%	26%	18%	—
No, I receive too many communications.	3%	2%	1%	3%	—
	100%	100%	100%	100%	—
Total	N=2,951	N=121	N=399	N=218	N=32

—Data not shown because N < 50. *Chi-squared; p < .05

Sufficiency of Communication Received From Graduate Business School, by US Subgroup

Response	US Subgroups		
	Non-Hispanic White	Asian American	Underrepresented Minorities
Yes, communication is sufficient.	78%	77%	76%
No, I would like to receive more communications.	19%	20%	22%
No, I receive too many communications.	3%	3%	2%
	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=2,025	N=189	N=193

No statistical differences found.

Frequency of Contact

Respondents were asked to indicate the number of times they had been contacted by their graduate business school, either in the last six months or since they graduated.

Frequency of Contact Made by Graduate Business School

Response	Percentage
Never	6%
Once	6%
2 to 5 times	36%
6 to 9 times	20%
10 or more times	33%
	100%
Total	N=3,408

Frequency of Contact Made by Graduate Business School, by Graduation Year*

Response	Graduation Year									
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Never	1%	4%	7%	3%	6%	3%	4%	7%	6%	7%
Once	5%	8%	6%	7%	7%	4%	4%	7%	6%	8%
2 to 5 times	35%	36%	29%	36%	28%	35%	30%	30%	33%	45%
6 to 9 times	28%	26%	29%	23%	26%	21%	27%	23%	21%	8%
10 or more times	30%	26%	29%	32%	33%	35%	34%	34%	34%	32%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=74	N=117	N=111	N=151	N=269	N=316	N=450	N=362	N=571	N=979

*Chi-squared; p < .05

Frequency of Contact Made by Graduate Business School, by Program Type*

Response	Program Type			
	Full-Time MBA	Part-Time MBA	EMBA	Other Degree
Never	5%	6%	2%	10%
Once	6%	8%	6%	10%
2 to 5 times	34%	38%	35%	43%
6 to 9 times	21%	19%	17%	6%
10 or more times	33%	29%	39%	31%
	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=2,133	N=786	N=283	N=187

*Chi-squared; p < .05

Frequency of Contact Made by Graduate Business School, by Gender*

Response	Gender	
	Male	Female
Never	5%	7%
Once	6%	8%
2 to 5 times	35%	38%
6 to 9 times	19%	20%
10 or more times	35%	27%
	100%	100%
Total	N=2,374	N=1,026

*Chi-squared; $p < .05$ **Frequency of Contact Made by Graduate Business School, by Age***

Response	Age at time of survey		
	27 and younger	28 to 34	35 and older
Never	7%	5%	6%
Once	7%	6%	7%
2 to 5 times	38%	34%	37%
6 to 9 times	21%	19%	19%
10 or more times	27%	36%	31%
	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=855	N=1,845	N=700

*Chi-squared; $p < .05$ **Frequency of Contact Made by Graduate Business School, by Citizenship**

Response	Citizenship (World Regions)					
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America	Africa/Middle East
Never	6%	6%	4%	5%	6%	9%
Once	6%	9%	6%	7%	4%	2%
2 to 5 times	36%	37%	36%	32%	34%	41%
6 to 9 times	19%	17%	21%	25%	23%	14%
10 or more times	33%	32%	33%	31%	34%	34%
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=2,301	N=326	N=360	N=182	N=158	N=64

No statistical differences found.

Frequency of Contact Made by Graduate Business School, by School Location

Response	School Location (World Region)				
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America
Never	6%	2%	5%	4%	—
Once	7%	8%	5%	6%	—
2 to 5 times	36%	35%	34%	32%	—
6 to 9 times	19%	17%	20%	23%	—
10 or more times	32%	38%	35%	35%	—
	100%	100%	100%	100%	—
Total	N=2,664	N=102	N=357	N=197	N=28

—Data not shown because N < 50.
No statistical differences found.

Frequency of Contact Made by Graduate Business School, by US Subgroups

Response	US Subgroups		
	Non-Hispanic White	Asian American	Underrepresented Minorities
Never	6%	4%	7%
Once	7%	8%	3%
2 to 5 times	36%	32%	37%
6 to 9 times	19%	21%	18%
10 or more times	33%	35%	35%
	100%	100%	100%
Total	N=1,826	N=170	N=174

No statistical differences found.

Communication Preferences

Respondents were asked, “How would you like to receive communication from your graduate business school?”

Preferred Methods of Communication by Graduate Business School

Response	Percentage
Email newsletters	89%
Printed publications	43%
Social networking websites: Facebook, LinkedIn, etc.	40%
School website	35%
Personal contact	35%
Other	1%

Preferred Methods of Communication by Graduate Business School

Response	Percentage
None; I do not want my business school to contact me	2%
Total	N=3,781

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

Preferred Methods of Communication by Graduate Business School, by Graduation Year

Response	Graduation Year									
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
School website	39%	34%	35%	33%	38%	29%	38%	32%	33%	36%
Social networking websites: Facebook, LinkedIn, etc.	44%	31%	31%	35%	36%	34%	41%	38%	38%	46%
Email newsletters*	87%	90%	89%	91%	89%	88%	90%	89%	85%	90%
Printed publications*	35%	42%	33%	45%	42%	50%	48%	44%	48%	37%
Personal contact	30%	19%	25%	26%	30%	33%	35%	34%	37%	41%
Other	0%	0%	0%	1%	1%	1%	0%	1%	0%	1%
None; I do not want my business school to contact me	2%	2%	3%	2%	2%	2%	1%	3%	3%	1%
Total	N=82	N=128	N=118	N=163	N=286	N=354	N=505	N=393	N=635	N=1,108

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

*Chi-squared; $p < .05$

Preferred Methods of Communication by Graduate Business School, by Program Type

Response	Program Type			
	Full-Time MBA	Part-Time MBA	EMBA	Other Degree
School website	35%	32%	39%	33%
Social networking websites: Facebook, LinkedIn, etc.	40%	37%	44%	40%
Email newsletters	89%	87%	91%	87%
Printed publications	44%	42%	45%	38%
Personal contact*	40%	22%	36%	30%
Other	1%	0%	0%	1%
None; I do not want my business school to contact me	2%	3%	2%	1%
Total	N=2,362	N=871	N=322	N=206

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

*Chi-squared; $p < .05$

Preferred Methods of Communication by Graduate Business School, by Gender

Response	Gender	
	Male	Female
School website*	36%	31%
Social networking websites: Facebook, LinkedIn, etc.	40%	39%
Email newsletters	89%	88%
Printed publications*	45%	39%
Personal contact*	38%	29%
Other	0%	1%
None; I do not want my business school to contact me	2%	2%
Total	N=2,653	N=1,119

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

*Chi-squared; p < .05

Preferred Methods of Communication by Graduate Business School, by Age

Response	Age at time of survey		
	27 and younger	28 to 34	35 and older
School website*	31%	36%	36%
Social networking websites: Facebook, LinkedIn, etc.	39%	40%	39%
Email newsletters	87%	90%	89%
Printed publications	43%	44%	40%
Personal contact	33%	38%	32%
Other	0%	1%	1%
None; I do not want my business school to contact me	3%	2%	2%
Total	N=915	N=2,073	N=784

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

*Chi-squared; p < .05

Preferred Methods of Communication by Graduate Business School, by Citizenship

Response	Citizenship (World Regions)					
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America	Africa/Middle East
School website	34%	36%	36%	31%	42%	32%
Social networking websites: Facebook, LinkedIn, etc.*	39%	44%	40%	36%	44%	40%
Email newsletters	88%	89%	90%	90%	91%	89%
Printed publications	45%	37%	38%	41%	48%	29%
Personal contact	33%	43%	45%	31%	37%	36%
Other	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%
None; I do not want my business school to contact me	2%	2%	1%	3%	1%	0%
Total	N=2,546	N=352	N=411	N=201	N=178	N=73

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

*Chi-squared; $p < .05$

Preferred Methods of Communication by Graduate Business School, by School Location

Response	School Location (World Region)				
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America
School website	34%	36%	39%	29%	—
Social networking websites: Facebook, LinkedIn, etc.	40%	40%	44%	35%	—
Email newsletters	88%	98%	92%	89%	—
Printed publications	44%	36%	40%	40%	—
Personal contact*	33%	50%	51%	33%	—
Other	1%	1%	1%	0%	—
None; I do not want my business school to contact me	2%	0%	0%	3%	—
Total	N=2,944	N=121	N=399	N=218	N=32

—Data not shown because $N < 50$.

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

*Chi-squared; $p < .05$

Preferred Methods of Communication by Graduate Business School, by US Subgroups

Response	US Subgroups		
	Non-Hispanic White	Asian American	Underrepresented Minorities
School website	34%	35%	36%
Social networking websites: Facebook, LinkedIn, etc.*	38%	48%	49%
Email newsletters	88%	93%	85%
Printed publications	44%	46%	48%
Personal contact	32%	36%	35%
Other	0%	1%	2%
None; I do not want my business school to contact me	2%	2%	2%
Total	N=2,023	N=189	N=192

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

*Chi-squared; $p < .05$

Information Preferences

Respondents who selected methods for school communication efforts were asked, “What types of information would you like to receive from your graduate business school?”

Types of Information Preferred From School Communication Efforts

Response	Percentage
Alumni events	84%
Networking opportunities	74%
Job opportunities	69%
Lectures, academic speakers	61%
Conferences	55%
Continuing education	52%
University events	43%
Career fairs	35%
Community service, volunteer activities	31%
Fundraising	18%
Other	1%
Total	N=3,698

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

Types of Information Preferred from School Communication Efforts, by Graduation Year

Response	Graduation Year									
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Job opportunities*	61%	67%	62%	58%	58%	61%	70%	70%	74%	75%
Career fairs*	26%	23%	30%	21%	24%	28%	35%	32%	39%	43%
Alumni events	79%	78%	89%	87%	84%	83%	84%	82%	84%	86%
University events*	29%	39%	38%	42%	40%	40%	41%	42%	43%	47%
Lectures, academic speakers*	65%	57%	59%	58%	56%	62%	63%	61%	62%	61%
Conferences*	63%	42%	49%	61%	52%	57%	53%	59%	54%	57%
Continuing education	58%	45%	51%	54%	54%	50%	51%	51%	54%	53%
Community service, volunteer activities*	26%	18%	27%	23%	19%	29%	32%	33%	33%	34%
Fundraising	19%	19%	17%	19%	15%	18%	18%	16%	16%	19%
Networking opportunities*	75%	66%	68%	75%	64%	71%	75%	73%	76%	77%
Other	1%	2%	2%	1%	2%	1%	1%	0%	1%	1%
Total	N=80	N=125	N=114	N=159	N=280	N=346	N=498	N=381	N=615	N=1,091

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

*Chi-squared; $p < .05$

Types of Information Preferred From School Communication Efforts, by Program Type

Response	Program Type			
	Full-Time MBA	Part-Time MBA	EMBA	Other Degree
Job opportunities	69%	71%	66%	74%
Career fairs*	32%	40%	32%	42%
Alumni events*	87%	77%	85%	79%
University events*	41%	42%	53%	50%
Lectures, academic speakers*	58%	63%	77%	58%
Conferences	57%	52%	58%	55%
Continuing education*	49%	58%	62%	55%
Community service, volunteer activities	30%	32%	29%	31%
Fundraising	20%	13%	16%	15%
Networking opportunities*	77%	67%	75%	70%
Other	1%	1%	0%	2%
Total	N=2,309	N=849	N=318	N=202

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

*Chi-squared; $p < .05$

Types of Information Preferred From School Communication Efforts, by Gender

Response	Gender	
	Male	Female
Job opportunities	69%	69%
Career fairs	35%	35%
Alumni events	84%	84%
University events	43%	42%
Lectures, academic speakers	61%	60%
Conferences	57%	53%
Continuing education*	51%	55%
Community service, volunteer activities*	28%	37%
Fundraising	19%	15%
Networking opportunities*	74%	72%
Other	1%	1%
Total	N=2,596	N=1,093

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

*Chi-squared; $p < .05$

Types of Information Preferred From School Communication Efforts, by Age

Response	Age at time of survey		
	27 and younger	28 to 34	35 and older
Job opportunities	68%	70%	69%
Career fairs	34%	35%	35%
Alumni events	84%	86%	79%
University events	45%	40%	46%
Lectures, academic speakers*	53%	61%	71%
Conferences	51%	57%	57%
Continuing education*	45%	53%	60%
Community service, volunteer activities	31%	30%	31%
Fundraising	18%	19%	15%
Networking opportunities	72%	75%	74%
Other	1%	1%	1%
Total	N=886	N=2,032	N=771

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

*Chi-squared; $p < .05$

Types of Information Preferred From School Communication Efforts, by Citizenship

Response	Citizenship (World Regions)					
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America	Africa/Middle East
Job opportunities	68%	73%	69%	75%	80%	67%
Career fairs	33%	43%	35%	31%	46%	34%
Alumni events	84%	86%	85%	80%	81%	82%
University events*	44%	42%	37%	31%	51%	53%
Lectures, academic speakers	61%	54%	63%	70%	57%	58%
Conferences*	52%	56%	65%	64%	66%	58%
Continuing education	53%	44%	52%	57%	60%	41%
Community service, volunteer activities*	32%	36%	23%	25%	24%	29%
Fundraising*	17%	23%	16%	20%	16%	22%
Networking opportunities	72%	80%	78%	75%	76%	78%
Other	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	3%
Total	N=2,484	N=345	N=406	N=194	N=176	N=73

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

*Chi-squared; $p < .05$

Types of Information Preferred From School Communication Efforts, by School Location

Response	School Location (World Region)				
	United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America
Job opportunities	68%	78%	73%	72%	—
Career fairs*	34%	38%	37%	31%	—
Alumni events	84%	83%	88%	82%	—
University events	44%	44%	38%	32%	—
Lectures, academic speakers	59%	64%	64%	67%	—
Conferences*	53%	53%	67%	64%	—
Continuing education	52%	50%	52%	54%	—
Community service, volunteer activities	31%	31%	30%	28%	—
Fundraising	17%	23%	19%	17%	—
Networking opportunities	73%	77%	79%	77%	—
Other	1%	0%	1%	1%	—
Total	N=2,871	N=121	N=398	N=211	N=32

—Data not shown because $N < 50$.

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

*Chi-squared; $p < .05$

Types of Information Preferred From School Communication Efforts, by US Subgroups

Response	US Subgroups		
	Non-Hispanic White	Asian American	Underrepresented Minorities
Job opportunities	66%	74%	75%
Career fairs*	32%	41%	40%
Alumni events	84%	86%	85%
University events*	43%	39%	51%
Lectures, academic speakers	61%	58%	65%
Conferences	52%	49%	62%
Continuing education	53%	48%	60%
Community service, volunteer activities	32%	35%	36%
Fundraising	16%	18%	19%
Networking opportunities	72%	75%	75%
Other	1%	1%	1%
Total	N=1,973	N=185	N=189

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

*Chi-squared; $p < .05$

Campus Activity Participation

Respondents were asked, "How often have you used or participated in any of the following campus services or activities?"

Frequency of Participation in Campus Services/Activities

Response	Very Often	Sometimes	Not Very Often	Never	Total
Career services	20%	31%	25%	24%	N=3,797
Library services	18%	30%	27%	25%	N=3,798
Sports/recreational services	15%	25%	23%	37%	N=3,798
Alumni events	13%	36%	29%	22%	N=3,798
Campus speakers or workshops	20%	37%	22%	22%	N=3,797
Cultural or artistic activities	7%	26%	30%	38%	N=3,798

Frequency of Participation in Campus Services/Activities, by Graduation Year (Mean Scores)

Response		Graduation Year									
		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Career services*	Mean	2.4	2.3	2.3	2.4	2.4	2.3	2.5	2.4	2.6	2.6
	Standard Error	.11	.09	.10	.08	.06	.05	.05	.05	.04	.03
	Valid N	N=82	N=129	N=118	N=164	N=289	N=355	N=504	N=395	N=638	N=1,114
Library services*	Mean	2.2	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.3	2.5	2.7
	Standard Error	.12	.09	.10	.09	.06	.06	.05	.05	.04	.03
	Valid N	N=82	N=129	N=118	N=164	N=289	N=355	N=505	N=395	N=638	N=1,114
Sports-recreational services*	Mean	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.1	2.0	2.1	2.2	2.2	2.3	2.3
	Standard Error	.12	.09	.09	.09	.06	.06	.05	.05	.04	.03
	Valid N	N=82	N=129	N=118	N=164	N=289	N=355	N=505	N=395	N=638	N=1,114
Alumni events	Mean	2.2	2.2	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.5	2.4	2.4	2.5
	Standard Error	.10	.08	.10	.07	.06	.05	.04	.05	.04	.03
	Valid N	N=82	N=129	N=118	N=164	N=289	N=355	N=505	N=395	N=638	N=1,114
Campus speakers or workshops*	Mean	2.2	2.3	2.3	2.4	2.3	2.4	2.6	2.5	2.6	2.7
	Standard Error	.11	.08	.10	.09	.06	.06	.05	.05	.04	.03
	Valid N	N=82	N=129	N=118	N=164	N=289	N=355	N=505	N=395	N=637	N=1,114
Cultural or artistic activities*	Mean	2.0	1.9	1.9	2.0	1.8	1.9	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.2
	Standard Error	.11	.08	.08	.08	.05	.05	.04	.05	.04	.03
	Valid N	N=82	N=129	N=118	N=164	N=289	N=355	N=505	N=395	N=638	N=1,114

Scale: 1 = Never to 4 = Very often.

*ANOVA; $p < .05$

Frequency of Participation in Campus Services/Activities, by Program Type (Mean Scores)

Response		Program Type			
		Full-Time MBA	Part-Time MBA	EMBA	Other Degree
Career services*	Mean	2.8	2.0	1.9	2.3
	Standard Error	.02	.03	.05	.07
	Valid N	N=2,370	N=877	N=324	N=206
Library services*	Mean	2.5	2.2	2.1	2.6
	Standard Error	.02	.03	.05	.07
	Valid N	N=2,371	N=877	N=324	N=206
Sports/recreational services*	Mean	2.4	1.7	1.9	2.0
	Standard Error	.02	.03	.05	.08
	Valid N	N=2,371	N=877	N=324	N=206
Alumni events*	Mean	2.6	2.0	2.4	2.2
	Standard Error	.02	.03	.05	.07
	Valid N	N=2,371	N=877	N=324	N=206

Frequency of Participation in Campus Services/Activities, by Program Type (Mean Scores)

Response		Program Type			
		Full-Time MBA	Part-Time MBA	EMBA	Other Degree
Campus speakers or workshops*	Mean	2.7	2.1	2.4	2.3
	Standard Error	.02	.03	.05	.07
	Valid N	N=2,371	N=877	N=323	N=206
Cultural or artistic activities*	Mean	2.2	1.6	1.7	2.0
	Standard Error	.02	.03	.05	.06
	Valid N	N=2,371	N=877	N=324	N=206

Scale: 1 = Never to 4 = Very often.

*ANOVA; $p < .05$ **Frequency of Participation in Campus Services/Activities, by Gender (Mean Scores)**

Response		Gender	
		Male	Female
Career services*	Mean	2.5	2.4
	Standard Error	.02	.03
	Valid N	N=2,666	N=1,122
Library services*	Mean	2.4	2.4
	Standard Error	.02	.03
	Valid N	N=2,667	N=1,122
Sports/recreational services*	Mean	2.3	2.0
	Standard Error	.02	.03
	Valid N	N=2,667	N=1,122
Alumni events*	Mean	2.4	2.3
	Standard Error	.02	.03
	Valid N	N=2,667	N=1,122
Campus speakers or workshops*	Mean	2.6	2.5
	Standard Error	.02	.03
	Valid N	N=2,666	N=1,122
Cultural or artistic activities	Mean	2.0	2.0
	Standard Error	.02	.03
	Valid N	N=2,667	N=1,122

Scale: 1 = Never to 4 = Very often.

*ANOVA; $p < .05$

Frequency of Participation in Campus Services/Activities, by Age (Mean Scores)

Response		Age at time of survey		
		27 and younger	28 to 34	35 and older
Career services*	Mean	2.6	2.5	2.1
	Standard Error	.03	.02	.04
	Valid N	N=917	N=2,085	N=786
Library services*	Mean	2.5	2.4	2.4
	Standard Error	.03	.02	.04
	Valid N	N=917	N=2,085	N=787
Sports/recreational services*	Mean	2.4	2.2	1.8
	Standard Error	.04	.02	.03
	Valid N	N=917	N=2,085	N=787
Alumni events*	Mean	2.4	2.5	2.3
	Standard Error	.03	.02	.03
	Valid N	N=917	N=2,085	N=787
Campus speakers or workshops*	Mean	2.6	2.6	2.4
	Standard Error	.03	.02	.04
	Valid N	N=917	N=2,085	N=786
Cultural or artistic activities*	Mean	2.1	2.1	1.8
	Standard Error	.03	.02	.03
	Valid N	N=917	N=2,085	N=787

Scale: 1 = Never to 4 = Very often. *ANOVA; p < .05

Frequency of Participation in Campus Services/Activities, by Citizenship (Mean Scores)

Response		Citizenship (World Regions)					
		United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America	Africa/Middle East
Career services*	Mean	2.4	2.9	2.6	2.6	2.9	2.7
	Standard Error	.02	.05	.05	.07	.08	.12
	Valid N	N=2,555	N=354	N=414	N=201	N=180	N=73
Library services*	Mean	2.3	2.8	2.6	2.5	2.6	2.6
	Standard Error	.02	.05	.05	.07	.08	.13
	Valid N	N=2,556	N=354	N=414	N=201	N=180	N=73
Sports/recreational services*	Mean	2.1	2.4	2.4	2.2	2.6	2.3
	Standard Error	.02	.05	.05	.08	.08	.13
	Valid N	N=2,556	N=354	N=414	N=201	N=180	N=73

Frequency of Participation in Campus Services/Activities, by Citizenship (Mean Scores)

Response		Citizenship (World Regions)					
		United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America	Africa/Middle East
Alumni events*	Mean	2.3	2.6	2.6	2.4	2.7	2.5
	Standard Error	.02	.05	.05	.06	.07	.12
	Valid N	N=2,556	N=354	N=414	N=201	N=180	N=73
Campus speakers or workshops*	Mean	2.4	2.9	2.8	2.6	2.8	2.7
	Standard Error	.02	.05	.05	.07	.08	.12
	Valid N	N=2,555	N=354	N=414	N=201	N=180	N=73
Cultural or artistic activities*	Mean	1.9	2.4	2.1	1.9	2.4	2.3
	Standard Error	.02	.05	.05	.06	.07	.11
	Valid N	N=2,556	N=354	N=414	N=201	N=180	N=73

Scale: 1 = Never to 4 = Very often.

*ANOVA; p < .05

Frequency of Participation in Campus Services/Activities, by School Location (Mean Scores)

Response		School Location (World Region)				
		United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America
Career services*	Mean	2.4	2.4	2.7	2.7	—
	Standard Error	.02	.10	.05	.07	—
	Valid N	N=2,958	N=122	N=400	N=218	N=32
Library services*	Mean	2.3	2.7	2.6	2.6	—
	Standard Error	.02	.09	.05	.07	—
	Valid N	N=2,959	N=122	N=400	N=218	N=32
Sports/recreational services*	Mean	2.1	2.4	2.5	2.2	—
	Standard Error	.02	.09	.05	.07	—
	Valid N	N=2,959	N=122	N=400	N=218	N=32
Alumni events*	Mean	2.3	2.6	2.8	2.5	—
	Standard Error	.02	.08	.05	.06	—
	Valid N	N=2,959	N=122	N=400	N=218	N=32
Campus speakers or workshops*	Mean	2.5	2.7	2.9	2.7	—
	Standard Error	.02	.09	.05	.07	—
	Valid N	N=2,958	N=122	N=400	N=218	N=32
Cultural or artistic activities*	Mean	2.0	2.1	2.2	2.0	—
	Standard Error	.02	.09	.05	.06	—
	Valid N	N=2,959	N=122	N=400	N=218	N=32

—Data not shown because N < 50. Scale: 1 = Never to 4 = Very often. *ANOVA; p < .05

Frequency of Participation in Campus Services/Activities, by US Subgroups (Mean Scores)

Response		US Subgroups		
		Non-Hispanic White	Asian American	Underrepresented Minorities
Career services*	Mean	2.3	2.6	2.4
	Standard Error	.02	.08	.07
	Valid N	N=2,030	N=189	N=193
Library services	Mean	2.3	2.3	2.2
	Standard Error	.02	.07	.07
	Valid N	N=2,031	N=189	N=193
Sports/recreational services	Mean	2.1	2.2	2.0
	Standard Error	.02	.08	.08
	Valid N	N=2,031	N=189	N=193
Alumni events*	Mean	2.3	2.5	2.3
	Standard Error	.02	.08	.07
	Valid N	N=2,031	N=189	N=193
Campus speakers or workshops	Mean	2.4	2.5	2.5
	Standard Error	.02	.07	.08
	Valid N	N=2,030	N=189	N=193
Cultural or artistic activities*	Mean	1.9	2.1	2.0
	Standard Error	.02	.07	.07
	Valid N	N=2,031	N=189	N=193

Scale: 1 = Never to 4 = Very often.*ANOVA; $p < .05$

Respondents were asked, “As an alumnus, how often do you participate in the following activities?”

Frequency of Alumni Participation in Various Activities

Response	Frequently	Occasionally	Rarely	Never	Total
Make financial donations to your business school	9%	21%	23%	47%	N=3,790
Interview applicants for your admissions office	3%	9%	13%	74%	N=3,790
Attend alumni social-networking events	9%	33%	31%	27%	N=3,791
Recruit for new hires from your business school	7%	18%	21%	54%	N=3,791
Meet with prospective applicants as part of business school recruiting activities	6%	19%	19%	56%	N=3,791

Frequency of Alumni Participation in Various Activities, by Graduation Year (Mean Scores)

Response		Graduation Year									
		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
Make financial donations to your business school*	Mean	2.4	2.1	2.0	2.1	2.0	2.1	2.1	1.9	1.8	1.8
	Standard Error of Mean	.13	.09	.10	.09	.06	.05	.05	.05	.04	.03
	Valid N	N=82	N=128	N=118	N=163	N=288	N=355	N=503	N=394	N=637	N=1,113
Interview applicants for your admissions office*	Mean	1.5	1.4	1.5	1.6	1.4	1.6	1.4	1.4	1.3	1.4
	Standard Error of Mean	.09	.07	.08	.07	.05	.05	.04	.04	.03	.02
	Valid N	N=82	N=128	N=118	N=163	N=288	N=355	N=504	N=394	N=636	N=1,113
Attend alumni social-networking events	Mean	2.2	2.1	2.1	2.2	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3
	Standard Error of Mean	.10	.07	.09	.07	.05	.05	.04	.05	.04	.03
	Valid N	N=82	N=128	N=118	N=163	N=288	N=355	N=504	N=394	N=637	N=1,113
Recruit new hires from your business school	Mean	2.0	1.7	1.6	1.8	1.8	1.9	1.8	1.9	1.8	1.7
	Standard Error of Mean	.11	.08	.08	.08	.06	.05	.04	.05	.04	.03
	Valid N	N=82	N=128	N=118	N=163	N=288	N=355	N=504	N=394	N=637	N=1,113
Meet with prospective students as a part of business school recruiting activities	Mean	1.8	1.6	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.9	1.9	1.7	1.7	1.7
	Standard Error of Mean	.10	.07	.08	.08	.06	.05	.04	.05	.04	.03
	Valid N	N=82	N=128	N=118	N=163	N=288	N=355	N=504	N=394	N=637	N=1,113

Scale: 1 = Never to 4 = Frequently; *ANOVA; $p < .05$

Frequency of Alumni Participation in Various Activities, by Program Type (Mean Scores)

Response		Program Type			
		Full-Time MBA	Part-Time MBA	EMBA	Other Degree
Make financial donations to your business school*	Mean	2.0	1.6	2.0	1.7
	Standard Error of Mean	.02	.03	.05	.06
	Valid N	N=2,365	N=876	N=323	N=206
Interview applicants for your admissions office*	Mean	1.5	1.2	1.3	1.3
	Standard Error of Mean	.02	.02	.04	.05
	Valid N	N=2,366	N=876	N=322	N=206
Attend alumni social-networking events*	Mean	2.4	1.9	2.4	2.0
	Standard Error of Mean	.02	.03	.05	.07
	Valid N	N=2,366	N=876	N=323	N=206

Frequency of Alumni Participation in Various Activities, by Program Type (Mean Scores)

Response		Program Type			
		Full-Time MBA	Part-Time MBA	EMBA	Other Degree
Recruit new hires from your business school*	Mean	1.9	1.5	1.7	1.7
	Standard Error of Mean	.02	.03	.05	.07
	Valid N	N=2,366	N=876	N=323	N=206
Meet with prospective students as a part of business school recruiting activities*	Mean	1.9	1.4	1.7	1.6
	Standard Error of Mean	.02	.03	.05	.06
	Valid N	N=2,366	N=876	N=323	N=206

Scale: 1 = Never to 4 = Frequently

*ANOVA; p < .05

Frequency of Alumni Participation in Various Activities, by Gender (Mean Scores)

Response		Gender	
		Male	Female
Make financial donations to your business school*	Mean	2.0	1.8
	Standard Error of Mean	.02	.03
	Valid N	N=2,660	N=1,121
Interview applicants for your admissions office*	Mean	1.4	1.3
	Standard Error of Mean	.02	.02
	Valid N	N=2,660	N=1,121
Attend alumni social-networking events*	Mean	2.3	2.2
	Standard Error of Mean	.02	.03
	Valid N	N=2,661	N=1,121
Recruit new hires from your business school*	Mean	1.8	1.7
	Standard Error of Mean	.02	.03
	Valid N	N=2,661	N=1,121
Meet with prospective students as a part of business school recruiting activities*	Mean	1.8	1.7
	Standard Error of Mean	.02	.03
	Valid N	N=2,661	N=1,121

Scale: 1 = Never to 4 = Frequently

*ANOVA; p < .05

Frequency of Alumni Participation in Various Activities, by Age (Mean Scores)

Response		Age at time of survey		
		27 and younger	28 to 34	35 and older
Make financial donations to your business school*	Mean	1.9	2.0	1.8
	Standard Error of Mean	.03	.02	.03
	Valid N	N=916	N=2,080	N=785
Interview applicants for your admissions office*	Mean	1.4	1.5	1.3
	Standard Error of Mean	.03	.02	.02
	Valid N	N=916	N=2,080	N=785
Attend alumni social-networking events*	Mean	2.2	2.3	2.1
	Standard Error of Mean	.03	.02	.03
	Valid N	N=916	N=2,080	N=786
Recruit new hires from your business school*	Mean	1.8	1.9	1.5
	Standard Error of Mean	.03	.02	.03
	Valid N	N=916	N=2,080	N=786
Meet with prospective students as a part of business school recruiting activities*	Mean	1.7	1.8	1.6
	Standard Error of Mean	.03	.02	.03
	Valid N	N=916	N=2,080	N=786

Scale: 1 = Never to 4 = Frequently; *ANOVA; $p < .05$

Frequency of Alumni Participation in Various Activities, by Citizenship (Mean Scores)

Response		Citizenship (World Regions)					
		United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America	Africa/Middle East
Make financial donations to your business school*	Mean	2.0	1.8	1.6	1.8	1.8	1.7
	Standard Error of Mean	.02	.05	.04	.07	.07	.11
	Valid N	N=2,551	N=354	N=412	N=200	N=180	N=73
Interview applicants for your admissions office*	Mean	1.3	1.6	1.5	1.3	1.8	1.5
	Standard Error of Mean	.01	.05	.04	.05	.07	.12
	Valid N	N=2,551	N=354	N=412	N=200	N=180	N=73
Attend alumni social-networking events*	Mean	2.2	2.4	2.4	2.3	2.5	2.3
	Standard Error of Mean	.02	.05	.05	.06	.07	.12
	Valid N	N=2,552	N=354	N=412	N=200	N=180	N=73
Recruit new hires from your business school*	Mean	1.8	1.8	1.7	1.7	1.9	1.9
	Standard Error of Mean	.02	.05	.04	.07	.08	.12
	Valid N	N=2,552	N=354	N=412	N=200	N=180	N=73

Frequency of Alumni Participation in Various Activities, by Citizenship (Mean Scores)

Response		Citizenship (World Regions)					
		United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America	Africa/Middle East
Meet with prospective students as a part of business school recruiting activities*	Mean	1.7	2.0	1.8	1.8	2.1	2.0
	Standard Error of Mean	.02	.05	.05	.07	.07	.13
	Valid N	N=2,552	N=354	N=412	N=200	N=180	N=73

Scale: 1 = Never to 4 = Frequently

*ANOVA; $p < .05$

Frequency of Alumnus Participation in Various Activities, by School Location (Mean Scores)

Response		School Location (World Region)				
		United States	Asia/Pacific Islands	Europe	Canada	Latin America
Make financial donations to your business school*	Mean	2.0	1.6	1.6	1.7	–
	Standard Error of Mean	.02	.07	.04	.06	–
	Valid N	N=2,952	N=122	N=400	N=217	N=32
Interview applicants for your admissions office*	Mean	1.4	1.5	1.7	1.3	–
	Standard Error of Mean	.01	.07	.05	.05	–
	Valid N	N=2,952	N=122	N=400	N=217	N=32
Attend alumni social-networking events*	Mean	2.2	2.4	2.6	2.3	–
	Standard Error of Mean	.02	.07	.05	.06	–
	Valid N	N=2,953	N=122	N=400	N=217	N=32
Recruit new hires from your business school	Mean	1.8	1.7	1.7	1.7	–
	Standard Error of Mean	.02	.08	.04	.07	–
	Valid N	N=2,953	N=122	N=400	N=217	N=32
Meet with prospective students as a part of business school recruiting activities*	Mean	1.7	1.8	2.1	1.8	–
	Standard Error of Mean	.02	.08	.05	.07	–
	Valid N	N=2,953	N=122	N=400	N=217	N=32

—Data not shown because $N < 50$.

Scale: 1 = Never to 4 = Frequently

*ANOVA; $p < .05$

Frequency of Alumnus Participation in Various Activities, by US Subgroup (Mean Scores)

Response		US Subgroups		
		Non-Hispanic White	Asian American	Underrepresented Minorities
Make financial donations to your business school*	Mean	2.0	2.0	2.2
	Standard Error of Mean	.02	.07	.08
	Valid N	N=2,026	N=189	N=193
Interview applicants for your admissions office*	Mean	1.3	1.5	1.5
	Standard Error of Mean	.02	.06	.06
	Valid N	N=2,026	N=189	N=193
Attend alumni social-networking events*	Mean	2.1	2.3	2.3
	Standard Error of Mean	.02	.07	.07
	Valid N	N=2,027	N=189	N=193
Recruit new hires from your business school	Mean	1.8	1.9	1.8
	Standard Error of Mean	.02	.07	.07
	Valid N	N=2,027	N=189	N=193
Meet with prospective students as a part of business school recruiting activities*	Mean	1.6	1.9	1.8
	Standard Error of Mean	.02	.08	.07
	Valid N	N=2,027	N=189	N=193

Scale: 1 = Never to 4 = Frequently

*ANOVA; $p < .05$

Methodology

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

Survey Sample

The survey sample for this report includes prior survey respondents who agreed to further follow-up on the Global Management Education Graduate Surveys—formerly known as the Global MBA® Graduate survey—which have been administered annually among graduate business school classes since 2000.

On September 9, 2009, GMAC sent an email to the 26,144 sample members inviting them to participate in the research study. There were 2,434 email messages returned as undeliverable. The adjusted sample size was 23,710. A reminder email was sent on September 23 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 September 9 to October 1. As an incentive to participate in the survey, GMAC offered to place participants' names in a drawing for one US\$500 and four US\$100 AMEX gift checks.

Of the 23,710 emails delivered for the September 2009 Alumni Perspectives Survey, 3,966 people responded—a 17 percent adjusted response rate.

Response Rates

	Sample	Respondents	Response Rate	Adjusted Response Rate
Overall	26,144	3,966	15%	17%
Graduation Year*	Sample	Respondents	Response Rate	
2000	814	117	14%	
2001	1,791	162	9%	
2002	1,490	145	10%	
2003	1,884	196	10%	
2004	2,935	362	12%	
2005	3,378	544	16%	
2006	3,673	565	15%	
2007	2,681	586	22%	
2008	3,886	1,146	29%	
2009	3,648	1,208	33%	

*Adjusted response rate is not calculated for each graduation year because removal of undeliverables for specific years was not feasible.

Characteristics of Respondents

Respondents represent a broad cross section of graduate business alumni. Shown in the table below are the demographic characteristics of the respondents to the September 2009 Alumni Perspectives Survey and the sample from which they are drawn—prior respondents to the Global Management Graduate Education Surveys from 2000 to 2008.

The demographic characteristics of respondents to the 2009 survey reflect the sample of Global MBA Graduate Survey respondents in terms of program type, gender, age, country of citizenship, and race (for US respondents).

Year of Graduation

	Alumni Perspectives Survey Respondents <i>n</i> = 3,966	Global Management Education Graduate Survey Sample <i>n</i> = 47,465
2000	2%	5%
2001	3%	10%
2002	3%	10%
2003	4%	9%
2004	7%	8%
2005	9%	12%
2006	13%	13%
2007	10%	12%
2008	17%	10%
2009	31%	11%
Total	100%	100%

Program Type

	Alumni Perspectives Survey Respondents <i>n</i> = 3,966	Global Management Education Graduate Survey Sample <i>n</i> = 46,963
Full-Time	63%	66%
Part-Time	23%	25%
Executive	9%	7%
Other	6%	3%
Total	100%	100%

Gender of Respondents

	Alumni Perspectives Survey Respondents <i>n</i> = 3,966	Global Management Education Graduate Survey Sample <i>n</i> = 47,182
Male	70%	66%
Female	30%	34%
Total	100%	100%

Current Age

	Alumni Perspectives Survey Respondents <i>n</i> = 3,957	Global Management Education Graduate Survey Sample <i>n</i> = 47,130
27 and younger	24%	29%
28 to 34	55%	54%
35 and older	21%	18%
Total	100%	100%

Country of Citizenship

	Alumni Perspectives Survey Respondents <i>n</i> = 3,946	Global Management Education Graduate Survey Sample <i>n</i> = 46,983
United States	67%	61%
Asia	10%	16%
Europe	10%	11%
Canada	5%	5%
Latin America and the Caribbean	4%	5%
Africa and the Middle East	2%	3%
Total	100%	100%

US Subgroup

	Alumni Perspectives Survey Respondents <i>n</i> = 3,966	Global Management Education Graduate Survey Sample <i>n</i> = 26,489
Non-Hispanic White	84%	83%
Asian American	8%	9%
Underrepresented Minorities	8%	8%
Total	100%	100%

Online Questionnaire Administration

Online administration of the questionnaire 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, which eliminated the typical problems associated with item nonresponse. 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 those of race/ethnicity for non-US citizens.

Data Analysis

Two weeks before the completion of data collection, GMAC conducted a preliminary data analysis. Frequency distributions were examined for both topical questions and classification questions. Based on this examination, response categories for some questions were collapsed 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 US citizens), and citizenship. Researchers used a Chi-square analysis 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 percent due to rounding.

Category Definition

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

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

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

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

Contact Information

For questions or comments regarding the study findings, methodologies, or data, please contact the GMAC Research and Development Department at gmac-research@gmac.com.

Authorship

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

Sabeen Sheikh, Survey Research Manager, Research and Development, Graduate Management Admission Council (GMAC).

Acknowledgements

Gregg Schoenfeld, Associate Director, Research, Research and Development, Graduate Management Admission Council (GMAC), survey questionnaire development, editing of the manuscript for intellectual content, and final approval of the manuscript; Lawrence Rudner, Vice President, Research and Development, GMAC, review of manuscript; Veronica Sinz, Research Publications Manager, GMAC, writing and editorial services; and Paula Bruggeman, editorial services.

GMAC would like to thank the 3,966 graduate business alumni who completed the questionnaire. Without you, this report would not have been possible.

© 2009 Graduate Management Admission Council® (GMAC®). All rights reserved.

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

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