Graduate Management Admission Council®

Creating Access to Graduate Business Education®

MBA.COM REGISTRANTS SURVEY COMPREHENSIVE DATA REPORT OCTOBER 2006

Introduction

In October 2005, the Graduate Management Admission Council® (GMAC®) surveyed 5,404 registrants of the Web site (www.mba.com) that GMAC® created for prospective business school students. One year later GMAC® sent a follow-up survey to the 4,239 respondents who had plans to apply to and attend graduate business school. The primary purpose of the current survey is to follow the progress of prospective business school students in their pursuit of an MBA degree and to understand the decision-making process they use when selecting which graduate management schools to apply to and attend.

This report intends to help graduate business school professionals:

- explore the application process from the applicant's perspective;
- better understand how advertisements, school Web sites, and published rankings affect the decision-making process;
- determine the aspects of graduate business schools and the type of information that prospective students use and deem important when selecting schools to apply to and attend; and
- learn about the characteristics of the schools prospective students apply to and attend.

The Survey Sample

The sample for this follow-up survey includes the respondents to the 2005 mba.com Registrant Survey who had begun the application process for, were planning to apply to, or were still deciding whether to apply to graduate business school at the time of the October 2005 survey.

On October 4, 2006, an invitation e-mail was sent to the sample, and a reminder e-mail was sent on October 18 to the sample members who had not yet responded to the survey or who had only partially completed it. The questionnaire was available at the online survey site from October 4 to November 1, 2006. As an incentive for people to participate in the survey, GMAC® offered to place the respondents in a drawing for one of four US$500 AMEX® gift checks.

Of the 4,239 contacts initiated for the 2006 mba.com Registrant Follow-up Survey, 1,058 people responded—a 25% response rate.

NOTE: Statistical tests were performed on all contingency tables. A 95 % confidence interval served as the cutoff point for significance. Bolded items represent items in the contingency table that affect the statistic of the table. Response percentages in tables may not always add up to 100% due to rounding.

Table of Contents

B-School Pipeline

This section of the report describes the current status of respondents who registered on mba.com—the GMAC® Internet portal for prospective students and the GMAT® exam—between September 1, 2004, and August 31, 2005, and indicated they were applying to, planning to apply to, or were in the process of making a decision about whether to apply to a graduate business school.

B-School Pipeline Status

Nearly one-third (31%) of the respondents were enrolled in a graduate business program at the time of the 2006 survey and another 5% were admitted to a school but not yet enrolled. About one in eight (12%) were in the process of applying to graduate business school and 27% were still planning to apply. Additionally, one in eight (12%) were still deciding whether to apply to a graduate business school. One in ten respondents to the current survey decided to postpone their plans to apply to a graduate business school and 4% decided not to attend graduate business school.

B-School Pipeline Status	
Status	***(n* = 1,058*)***
Student in a graduate business program	31%
Admitted to a b-school, but not yet enrolled	5%
Applying to b-school	12%
Planning to apply to b-school	27%
Deciding whether to apply to b-school	12%
Decided to postpone b-school	10%
Do not plan to attend b-school	4%
Total	100%

Women are nearly twice as likely as men to still be considering whether to apply to a graduate business school approximately one year after registering on mba.com—a statistically significant difference.

B-School Pipeline Status, by Gender*		
	Male	**Female**
Status	***(n* = 697*)***	***(n* = 361*)***
Student in a graduate business program	30%	31%
Admitted to a b-school, but not yet enrolled	5%	4%
Applying to b-school	12%	12%
Planning to apply to b-school	29%	23%
Deciding whether to apply to b-school	**9%**	**16%**
Decided to postpone b-school	10%	9%
Do not plan to attend b-school	3%	5%
Total	100%	100%
*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold in the contingency table significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the table.		

Respondents from the United States are significantly more likely than respondents from Africa to have enrolled in a graduate business program at the time of the survey. However, respondents from Africa are the most likely to report having been admitted but not yet enrolled in a graduate business program. Asian respondents are about twice as likely as respondents from the United States to still be planning to apply to a graduate business school. Additionally, respondents from the United States are the most likely to have dropped out of the b-school pipeline.

B-School Pipeline Status, by World Region*

Status	Asia *(n = 385)*	Africa *(n = 119)*	United States *(n = 318)*	Canada *(n = 37)*	Latin America *(n = 49)*	Europe *(n = 128)*
Student in a graduate business program	26%	**14%**	**44%**	19%	22%	31%
Admitted to a b-school, but not yet enrolled	3%	**11%**	4%	8%	4%	5%
Applying to b-school	14%	**19%**	11%	3%	10%	8%
Planning to apply to b-school	**33%**	31%	**17%**	35%	33%	30%
Deciding whether to apply to b-school	11%	8%	11%	16%	16%	12%
Decided to postpone b-school	10%	11%	7%	19%	12%	10%
Do not plan to attend b-school	2%	4%	**6%**	0%	2%	3%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

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

Statistically, there are no differences in the status of respondents by age, U.S. subgroup, or undergraduate major.

Progression in the Pipeline

Nearly three-fifths (57%) of the respondents who had applied to graduate business school at the time of the 2005 survey are currently enrolled in a graduate business program, which is a significantly higher percent than that of all other respondents. Additionally, respondents who had applied in 2005 are more likely to have been admitted but not yet enrolled in a graduate business program. About two-fifths (39%) of respondents who had plans to apply in 2005 were still planning to apply in 2006. One in ten (10%) of the respondents who were not sure whether they would apply to graduate business school in 2005 have since dropped out of the business school pipeline—a statistically significant difference compared with other respondents.

Progression in the B-School Pipeline*

	Status in October 2005		
Status in October 2006	Applied *(n = 361)*	Plan to Apply *(n = 548)*	Not Sure if I Will Apply *(n = 149)*
Student in a graduate business program	**57%**	**19%**	**9%**
Admitted to a b-school, but not yet enrolled	**7%**	4%	3%
Applying to b-school	12%	13%	10%
Planning to apply to b-school	**11%**	**39%**	23%
Deciding whether to apply to b-school	2%	12%	32%

Progression in the B-School Pipeline*			
	Status in October 2005		
Status in October 2006	Applied *(n = 361)*	Plan to Apply *(n = 548)*	Not Sure if I Will Apply *(n = 149)*
Decided to postpone b-school	7%	11%	12%
Do not plan to attend b-school	3%	2%	**10%**
Total	100%	100%	100%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold in the contingency table significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the table.			

Reasons for Postponing Graduate Business School

Respondents who indicated that they were postponing the pursuit of a graduate business degree were asked to indicate the reasons for their decision. About two-fifths (42%) stated that a graduate business program would require more money than they are currently willing to invest. Approximately one-quarter (26%) indicated that they need more time to prepare their applications. Another 22% said they postponed their education because their employment situation has changed, and 17% reported that they changed their career plans. Furthermore, 15% reported that the education would require more time than they were willing to invest at the moment. Other reasons for postponing graduate business school included job prospects being too uncertain to make a commitment (13%), family reasons (13%), and not being sure enough about the future to make a commitment (12%).

Reasons for Postponing Graduate Business School	
Reasons	***(n = 103)***
It would require more money than I am willing to invest right now.	42%
I need more time to prepare for the application process.	26%
My employment situation changed.	22%
My career plans have changed.	17%
It would require more time than I am willing to invest right now.	15%
Job prospects are too uncertain to make a commitment.	13%
Family reasons	13%
I am not sure enough about my future to make a commitment.	12%
It would require more energy than I am willing to invest right now.	9%
I'm not ready to make a dramatic change in my current job/life situation.	5%
I would have to postpone other personal plans, such as marriage, or having a child.	5%
I plan to move to a new area.	5%
Heath reasons	3%
Military obligations	2%
Other	12%
Responses add up to more than 100% due to multiple selections.	

Reasons for Deciding Not to Attend Graduate Business School

Respondents who indicate that they have decided not to pursue a graduate business degree were asked to report the reasons for dropping out of the business school pipeline. Nearly one-third (30%) reported that they plan to pursue a different graduate degree. Some of the other degrees these respondents plan to pursue include law degrees (12%), Ph.D.'s (6%), technical degrees (6%), and education degrees (6%). Additionally, 24% of these respondents indicated that graduate business school would require more money than they are willing to invest, 24% reported that their career plans changed, and 21% said they do not think they need an MBA for what they plan in life. Furthermore, 18% stated that it would require more energy than they are willing to invest, 15% said it would require more time than they are willing to invest, and 15% reported that their employment situation changed. One in eight (12%) reported that they dropped out of the b-school pipeline because the application process was too demanding.

Reasons for Deciding Not to Attend Graduate Business School	
Reasons	***(n = 33)***
I plan to pursue a different graduate degree.	30%
It would require more money than I am willing to invest.	24%
My career plans have changed.	24%
I do not think I need an MBA for what I plan in my life.	21%
It would require more energy than I am willing to invest.	18%
It would require more time than I am willing to invest.	15%
My employment situation changed.	15%
The application process is too demanding.	12%
I would have to postpone other personal plans, such as marriage, or having a child.	9%
Job prospects are too uncertain to make a commitment.	9%
I am not sure enough about my future to make a commitment.	6%
Family reasons	6%
Heath reasons	6%
I do not think I will get into my school of choice.	6%
I have had enough of the academic life.	3%
I plan to move to a new area.	3%
Other	21%
Responses add up to more than 100% due to multiple selections.	

Deciding to Pursue an Advanced Degree in Business

This section of the report presents the decision-making process for enrollment in a graduate business program—the decision to pursue the MBA degree. What prospective students wish to learn in graduate business school is also explored in this section. The influence of b-school advertisements in the decision, the information sought at school Web sites, the influence of a Web site on the decision to apply to the MBA program, and the influence of published rankings are examined as well.

Primary Reason for Pursuing an Advanced Degree in Business

Respondents were asked to indicate their primary reason for choosing to pursue an advanced degree in business. The open-ended comments provided by the respondents were recoded into eight primary categories: career enhancement, career switching, skill development, personal development, international exposure and employment opportunities, increase in potential earnings, assistance in entrepreneurial endeavors, and networking opportunities.

Three-fifths (60%) of respondents indicated that the primary reason they plan to pursue an advanced degree in business is to enhance their career. Additionally, one-quarter (25%) cited skill development, one in eight (12%) specified personal development, and one in ten (10%) reported that they are pursuing an advanced degree in business to switch careers.

Primary Reasons for Pursuing an Advanced Degree in Business	
Reason	***(n = 944)***
Career enhancement	60%
Skill development	25%
Personal development	12%
Career switching	10%
Increase in income potential	6%
Assist in entrepreneurial endeavors	5%
International employment/exposure	4%
Networking opportunities	2%
Responses add up to more than 100% due to multiple selections.	

Men (6%) were twice as likely as women (3%) to indicate that they plan to pursue an advanced degree in business to assist in their future entrepreneurial endeavors—a statistically significant difference.

Primary Reasons for Pursuing an Advanced Degree in Business, by Gender*		
	Male	**Female**
Reason	***(n = 697)***	***(n = 361)***
Career enhancement	57%	65%
Skill development	27%	23%
Personal development	11%	13%
Career switching	11%	8%
Increase in income potential	6%	7%

Primary Reasons for Pursuing an Advanced Degree in Business, by Gender*		
	Male	**Female**
Reason	***(n = 697)***	***(n = 361)***
Assist in entrepreneurial endeavors*	**6%**	**3%**
International employment/exposure	4%	3%
Networking opportunities	2%	2%

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

Respondents age 25 to 28 proved the least likely to indicate that they plan to pursue an advanced degree in business to develop personally, but they were more likely than respondents age 24 and younger and respondents age 33 and older to cite career switching as a reason. Respondents age 24 and younger were most likely of the respondents to indicate that they plan to pursue the degree to assist them in future entrepreneurial endeavors. Those age 29 to 32 were most likely of all respondents to cite networking opportunities as a reason for pursuing the degree.

Primary Reasons for Pursuing an Advanced Degree in Business, by Age				
	24 and Younger	**25 to 28**	**29 to 32**	**33 and Older**
Reason	***(n = 196)***	***(n =334)***	***(n =207)***	***(n =205)***
Career enhancement	58%	59%	56%	65%
Skill development	26%	24%	27%	26%
Personal development*	14%	**8%**	11%	16%
Career switching*	**6%**	**14%**	12%	**6%**
Increase in income potential	6%	6%	5%	8%
Assist in entrepreneurial endeavors*	**9%**	4%	2%	4%
International employment/exposure	2%	4%	6%	4%
Networking opportunities *	1%	2%	**4%**	<1%

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

Canadian respondents were the most likely to indicate career enhancement as a reason for pursuing the degree. Respondents from Africa were more than twice as likely as respondents from the United States to cite skill development, and African respondents were the least likely of the respondents to cite career switching. Asian and African respondents were more likely than respondents from the United States and Europe to indicate a plan to pursue the degree to assist them in entrepreneurial endeavors. Respondents from Latin America were more likely than respondents from the United States to cite international employment and exposure.

.

Primary Reasons for Pursuing an Advanced Degree in Business, by World Region						
Reason	**Asia** *(n =351)*	**Africa** *(n =106)*	**United States** *(n =279)*	**Canada** *(n =36)*	**Latin America** *(n =38)*	**Europe** *(n =116)*
Career enhancement*	56%	58%	60%	**81%**	58%	62%
Skill development*	27%	**38%**	**18%**	17%	39%	22%
Personal development	10%	11%	14%	6%	13%	14%
Career switching*	13%	**2%**	13%	8%	3%	9%
Increase in income potential	5%	8%	9%	6%	0%	4%
Assist in entrepreneurial endeavors*	**7%**	**9%**	**2%**	6%	5%	**0%**
International employment/exposure*	5%	3%	**<1%**	3%	**13%**	4%
Networking opportunities	2%	1%	2%	3%	0%	3%

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

Respondents with science degrees were more than three times as likely as respondents with business degrees to indicate career switching as a reason for pursuing an advanced degree in business—a statistically significant difference.

Primary Reasons for Pursuing an Advanced Degree in Business, by Undergraduate Major				
Skills/Abilities	**Science** *(n = 325)*	**Business** *(n = 308)*	**Humanities** *(n = 51)*	**Social Science** *(n = 155)*
Career enhancement	55%	64%	61%	58%
Skill development	27%	26%	18%	30%
Personal development	8%	12%	16%	11%
Career switching*	**17%**	**5%**	12%	12%
Increase in income potential	4%	7%	8%	8%
Assist in entrepreneurial endeavors	6%	4%	2%	4%
International employment/exposure	4%	4%	2%	4%
Networking opportunities	2%	2%	0%	4%

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

Statistically, there were no differences in the reasons for pursuing an advanced degree in business by U.S. subgroup.

Skills and Abilities Students Seek to Improve in an MBA Program

Respondents were asked to select from a list of skills and abilities those which they hope to improve during an MBA program. The vast majority responded that they hope to improve their strategic thinking abilities (81%), leadership skills (77%), analytical thinking abilities (68%), strategic planning skills (66%), and career management abilities (65%). Additionally, 62% want to improve their ability to analyze, organize and interpret statistical data, 60% hope to enhance their creative problem-solving skills, and 60% look to grow their networking skills. Furthermore, more than one-half of the respondents hope to improve their oral communication skills, ability to conduct financial analyses, ability to manage change, and interpersonal skills.

Areas You Hope to Improve During an MBA Program	
Skills/Abilities	***(n = 1,003)***
Strategic thinking	81%
Leadership skills	77%
Analytical thinking	68%
Developing a strategic plan	66%
Managing your career	65%
Analyzing, organizing, and interpreting statistical data	62%
Developing creative problem-solving skills	60%
Networking skills	60%
Oral communication skills	59%
Conducting financial analyses and preparing a budget	58%
Managing change	58%
Interpersonal skills	56%
Conducting cost/benefit analyses of proposed changes	49%
Written communication skills	47%
Integrating information from a wide variety of sources	45%
Designing and conducting market research	41%
Recruiting, managing, and maintaining staff	41%
Stress management	40%
Technical skills for your specialty	35%
Computer and related technological skills	26%
Responses add up to more than 100% due to multiple selections.	

Respondents who had applied to a graduate business program at the time of the current survey are significantly more likely than respondents who were not sure whether they would apply to hope to improve their leadership skills. Additionally, those who had applied were most likely of all respondents to indicate a need to improve their analytical thinking abilities.

Respondents who were still undecided about whether to apply to a graduate business school were the least likely to indicate a desire to improve their career management skills, networking skills, oral communication skills, interpersonal skills, written communication skills, and ability to integrate information from a wide variety of sources.

Conducting financial analyses, along with designing and conducting market research are skills that respondents who still plan to apply to graduate business school hope to improve at a significantly higher percentage compared to other respondents.

Areas You Hope to Improve During an MBA Program by Current Status			
	Status in October 2006		
Skills/Abilities	Applied *(n = 497)*	Plan to Apply *(n = 288)*	Not Sure if I Will Apply *(n = 218)*
Strategic thinking	80%	84%	79%
Leadership skills*	**80%**	75%	**72%**
Analytical thinking*	**71%**	67%	61%
Developing a strategic plan	66%	69%	61%
Managing your career*	67%	67%	**56%**
Analyzing, organizing, and interpreting statistical data	62%	64%	59%
Developing creative problem-solving skills	60%	64%	54%
Networking skills*	65%	59%	**50%**
Oral communication skills*	63%	59%	**49%**
Conducting financial analyses and preparing a budget*	56%	**65%**	54%
Managing change	59%	60%	52%
Interpersonal skills*	60%	56%	**48%**
Conducting cost/benefit analyses of proposed changes	48%	53%	46%
Written communication skills*	50%	47%	**39%**
Integrating information from a wide variety of sources*	48%	48%	**37%**
Designing and conducting market research*	39%	**47%**	36%
Recruiting, managing, and maintaining staff	43%	41%	36%
Stress management	41%	41%	39%
Technical skills for your specialty	36%	37%	32%
Computer and related technological skills	25%	31%	22%

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

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

Respondents age 24 years and younger are more likely than others to indicate a hope to improve the following skills during an MBA program: strategic thinking; analytical thinking; the analysis, organization and interpretation of statistical data; creative problem-solving; oral communication; the integration of information from a wide variety of sources; market research design and performance; stress management; technical skills for their specialty; and computer and related technological skills.

Areas You Hope to Improve During an MBA Program, by Age				
Skills/Abilities	24 and Younger *(n = 202)*	25 to 28 *(n =363)*	29 to 32 *(n =220)*	33 and Older *(n =216)*
Strategic thinking*	**87%**	77%	78%	85%
Leadership skills	78%	78%	76%	75%
Analytical thinking*	**76%**	64%	63%	74%
Developing a strategic plan	69%	64%	61%	71%
Managing your career	63%	65%	66%	64%
Analyzing, organizing, and interpreting statistical data*	**71%**	62%	55%	61%
Developing creative problem-solving skills*	**71%**	58%	53%	61%
Networking skills	62%	59%	61%	60%
Oral communication skills*	**69%**	58%	52%	56%
Conducting financial analyses and preparing a budget	58%	57%	56%	59%
Managing change	61%	55%	55%	63%
Interpersonal skills	65%	55%	53%	54%
Conducting cost/benefit analyses of proposed changes	49%	47%	48%	53%
Written communication skills	51%	45%	42%	51%
Integrating information from a wide variety of sources*	**54%**	40%	41%	50%
Designing and conducting market research*	**50%**	38%	39%	37%
Recruiting, managing, and maintaining staff	47%	40%	34%	43%
Stress management*	**49%**	43%	33%	36%
Technical skills for your specialty*	**44%**	31%	33%	38%
Computer and related technological skills*	**35%**	21%	21%	31%

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

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

Respondents from Latin America and Europe are less likely than others to hope to improve their analytical thinking abilities during an MBA program. Additionally, those from Latin America are less likely than all other respondents to hope to improve their ability to analyze, organize, and interpret statistical data; manage change; and design and conduct market research.

Respondents from Asia and Africa are more likely than others to hope to improve their interpersonal skills. Additionally, respondents from Africa are significantly more likely than respondents from Europe to hope to improve their ability to integrate information and to enhance their technical skills.

Areas You Hope to Improve During an MBA Program, by World Region						
Skills/Abilities	Asia *(n =375)*	Africa *(n =111)*	United States *(n =290)*	Canada *(n =37)*	Latin America *(n =47)*	Europe *(n =124)*
Strategic thinking	82%	79%	79%	73%	79%	86%
Leadership skills	81%	77%	72%	81%	74%	78%
Analytical thinking*	70%	75%	69%	62%	**57%**	**59%**
Developing a strategic plan	69%	76%	62%	65%	68%	60%
Managing your career	64%	70%	64%	73%	53%	63%

Areas You Hope to Improve During an MBA Program, by World Region						
Skills/Abilities	**Asia** *(n =375)*	**Africa** *(n =111)*	**United States** *(n =290)*	**Canada** *(n =37)*	**Latin America** *(n =47)*	**Europe** *(n =124)*
Analyzing, organizing, and interpreting statistical data*	62%	64%	68%	65%	**43%**	55%
Developing creative problem-solving skills	59%	73%	58%	65%	60%	56%
Networking skills	63%	59%	61%	70%	51%	54%
Oral communication skills	63%	54%	59%	51%	47%	56%
Conducting financial analyses and preparing a budget	57%	57%	59%	68%	53%	56%
Managing change*	65%	64%	51%	62%	**38%**	57%
Interpersonal skills*	**62%**	**63%**	50%	43%	51%	55%
Conducting cost/benefit analyses of proposed changes	49%	59%	48%	59%	45%	45%
Written communication skills	48%	53%	47%	35%	38%	44%
Integrating information from a wide variety of sources*	48%	**57%**	44%	51%	34%	**35%**
Designing and conducting market research*	42%	47%	39%	54%	**19%**	39%
Recruiting, managing, and maintaining staff	38%	50%	41%	49%	32%	43%
Stress management	44%	44%	34%	30%	34%	41%
Technical skills for your specialty*	34%	**47%**	36%	30%	36%	**26%**
Computer and related technological skills*	23%	**47%**	28%	30%	17%	**12%**

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

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

Statistically, Asian Americans are more likely than other U.S. respondents to hope to improve their interpersonal skills and stress management abilities during an MBA program. There are statistically no other differences by U.S. subgroup.

Areas You Hope to Improve During an MBA Program, by U.S. Subgroup				
Skills/Abilities	**Asian American** *(n = 34)*	**African American** *(n = 42)*	**White** *(n = 170)*	**Hispanic** *(n = 18)*
Strategic thinking	79%	74%	79%	94%
Leadership skills	85%	69%	70%	83%
Analytical thinking	65%	67%	72%	72%
Developing a strategic plan	68%	57%	65%	72%
Managing your career	68%	55%	66%	72%
Analyzing, organizing, and interpreting statistical data	65%	62%	69%	72%
Developing creative problem-solving skills	53%	62%	59%	61%
Networking skills	79%	50%	61%	67%
Oral communication skills	62%	57%	59%	67%
Conducting financial analyses and preparing a budget	65%	52%	62%	50%
Managing change	59%	50%	49%	61%
Interpersonal skills*	**74%**	40%	49%	56%
Conducting cost/benefit analyses of proposed changes	50%	43%	52%	39%
Written communication skills	53%	52%	44%	67%
Integrating information from a wide variety of sources	59%	31%	45%	39%

Areas You Hope to Improve During an MBA Program, by U.S. Subgroup				
Skills/Abilities	**Asian American** *(n = 34)*	**African American** *(n = 42)*	**White** *(n = 170)*	**Hispanic** *(n = 18)*
Designing and conducting market research	59%	38%	38%	39%
Recruiting, managing, and maintaining staff	44%	40%	40%	56%
Stress management*	**53%**	21%	34%	44%
Technical skills for your specialty	50%	29%	37%	33%
Computer and related technological skills	38%	24%	29%	17%

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

Respondents with a humanities or social science degree are less likely than others to indicate a hope to improve strategic thinking abilities and interpersonal skills. Those with a science degree are the most likely of the respondents to hope to improve their leadership skills, and they are less likely than respondents with a business degree to hope to improve their computer and related technological skills. Respondents with a business degree are less likely than all other respondents to hope to improve their ability to conduct financial analyses and more likely than others to hope to improve technical skills for their specialty.

Areas You Hope to Improve During an MBA Program, by Undergraduate Major				
Skills/Abilities	**Science** *(n = 346)*	**Business** *(n = 331)*	**Humanities** *(n = 55)*	**Social Science** *(n = 161)*
Strategic thinking*	84%	82%	**71%**	**74%**
Leadership skills*	**82%**	74%	78%	71%
Analytical thinking	64%	72%	65%	68%
Developing a strategic plan	69%	67%	64%	63%
Managing your career	64%	64%	73%	65%
Analyzing, organizing, and interpreting statistical data	62%	59%	67%	61%
Developing creative problem-solving skills	55%	61%	60%	61%
Networking skills	60%	62%	64%	56%
Oral communication skills	61%	60%	56%	49%
Conducting financial analyses and preparing a budget*	62%	**52%**	64%	60%
Managing change	62%	53%	53%	57%
Interpersonal skills*	59%	60%	**47%**	**47%**
Conducting cost/benefit analyses of proposed changes	52%	47%	47%	50%
Written communication skills	46%	49%	47%	42%
Integrating information from a wide variety of sources	44%	47%	49%	42%
Designing and conducting market research	43%	36%	44%	40%
Recruiting, managing, and maintaining staff	38%	37%	53%	43%
Stress management	42%	40%	42%	35%
Technical skills for your specialty*	30%	**40%**	29%	36%
Computer and related technological skills*	**18%**	**30%**	24%	29%

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

Statistically, there are no differences by gender in the skills and abilities that respondents hope to improve during an MBA program.

Advertisements for Graduate Business Programs

Respondents were asked to indicate whether they were exposed to various graduate business program advertisements in the last six months. Only 9% of respondents report that they did not encounter advertisements. The majority of respondents report that they encountered advertisements online (71%) and through the mail (58%). Additionally, 36% report that they encountered advertisements for graduate business programs in magazines and in newspapers. Slightly less than one in ten report encountering advertisements for graduate business programs on the radio or on television.

Advertisements for Graduate Business Programs Encountered in the Last Six Months	
Advertisements Encountered	***(n = 1,058)***
On television	9%
On the radio	9%
In newspapers	36%
In magazines	36%
Through the mail	58%
Online	71%
Have not encountered advertisements	9%
Responses add to more than 100% due to multiple selections.	

Not surprisingly, respondents who have applied to a graduate business programs are significantly more likely than other respondents to have encountered advertisements through the mail. Respondents who are not sure whether they will apply to a graduate business programs are less likely than others to report seeing advertisements online. Additionally, respondents who are not sure whether they will apply to a graduate business program are twice as likely as those who have applied and one and a half times as likely than those who plan to apply to have reported no encounters with advertisements for graduate business programs.

Advertisements for Graduate Business Programs Encountered in the Last Six Months, by Current Status			
	Status in October 2006		
Advertisements Encountered	**Applied** ***(n = 503)***	**Plan to Apply** ***(n = 288)***	**Not Sure if I Will Apply** ***(n = 224)***
On television	9%	8%	10%
On the radio	11%	6%	8%
In newspapers	37%	35%	37%
In magazines	39%	36%	31%
Through the mail*	**65%**	53%	51%

Advertisements for Graduate Business Programs Encountered in the Last Six Months, by Current Status			
	Status in October 2006		
Advertisements Encountered	Applied *(n = 503)*	Plan to Apply *(n = 288)*	Not Sure if I Will Apply *(n = 224)*
Online*	75%	70%	**66%**
Have not encountered advertisements *	6%	9%	**12%**
Responses add to more than 100% due to multiple selections. *p ≤ .05; Items in bold in the contingency table significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the table.			

Women are significantly more likely than men to have encountered advertisements for graduate business programs on television. On the other hand, men are more likely to have encountered advertisements in newspapers and in magazines.

Advertisements for Graduate Business Programs Encountered in the Last Six Months, by Gender*		
	Male	Female
Advertisements Encountered	*(n = 697)*	*(n = 361)*
On television*	7%	**12%**
On the radio	8%	11%
In newspapers*	**40%**	29%
In magazines*	**41%**	27%
Through the mail	58%	57%
Online	71%	71%
Have not encountered advertisements	7%	11%
Responses add to more than 100% due to multiple selections. *p ≤ .05; Items in bold in the contingency table significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the table.		

Respondents age 33 and older are significantly more likely than respondents age 25 to 28 to have encountered graduate business program advertisements in newspapers—the only statistically significant difference by respondent age.

Advertisements for Graduate Business Programs Encountered in the Last Six Months, by Age				
	24 and Younger	25 to 28	29 to 32	33 and Older
Advertisements Encountered	*(n = 214)*	*(n = 379)*	*(n = 231)*	*(n = 232)*
On television	10%	6%	8%	13%
On the radio	7%	7%	10%	13%
In newspapers*	38%	**28%**	39%	**45%**
In magazines	35%	34%	39%	39%
Through the mail	61%	57%	56%	57%
Online	71%	67%	72%	77%
Have not encountered advertisements	10%	10%	7%	6%
Responses add to more than 100% due to multiple selections. *p ≤ .05; Items in bold in the contingency table significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the table.				

Respondents from the United States are significantly more likely compared with all other respondents to have encountered advertisements on television or radio. European respondents are statistically the most likely to have encountered advertisements in newspapers and magazines. Canadian respondents are the most likely to report that they have not encountered advertisements for graduate business programs in the last six months.

Advertisements for Graduate Business Programs Encountered in the Last Six Months, by World Region

Advertisements Encountered	Asia *(n = 385)*	Africa *(n = 119)*	United States *(n = 318)*	Canada *(n = 37)*	Latin America *(n = 49)*	Europe *(n = 128)*
On television*	5%	3%	**18%**	16%	6%	5%
On the radio*	2%	1%	**22%**	14%	2%	5%
In newspapers*	37%	42%	31%	41%	31%	**46%**
In magazines*	32%	33%	37%	27%	49%	**47%**
Through the mail	61%	53%	58%	38%	65%	61%
Online	67%	71%	77%	59%	76%	73%
Have not encountered advertisements*	7%	7%	11%	**22%**	4%	5%

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

Respondents with degrees in the humanities are more likely than respondents with degrees in science to have encountered advertisements on television. Additionally, respondents with degrees in the humanities and the social sciences are more likely than other respondents to have encountered advertisements on the radio.

Advertisements for Graduate Business Programs Encountered in the Last Six Months, by Undergraduate Major

Advertisements Encountered	Science *(n = 361)*	Business *(n = 349)*	Humanities *(n = 59)*	Social Science *(n = 171)*
On television*	**5%**	10%	**15%**	9%
On the radio*	6%	7%	**14%**	**13%**
In newspapers	37%	34%	32%	36%
In magazines	36%	34%	39%	38%
Through the mail	59%	56%	58%	63%
Online	70%	71%	78%	73%
Have not encountered advertisements	9%	9%	5%	8%

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

Statistically, there are no differences by U.S. subgroup in the exposure to various modes of advertisement.

Influence of Advertisement in Decision to Pursue Degree

Respondents who encountered various advertisements in the last six months were asked to indicate how influential those advertisements were in their decision to pursue an advanced degree in business. As shown, fewer than half of the respondents indicate that the advertisements were extremely or very influential in their decision to pursue an advanced degree in business. However, advertisements encountered online, in the newspaper, and in magazines, on average, were rated as most influential in the decision.

How Influential Were the Advertisements in Your Decision to Pursue an Advanced Degree in Business							
Advertisements Encountered	**Mean†**	**Extremely Influential**	**Very Influential**	**Somewhat Influential**	**Not Very Influential**	**Not At All Influential**	**Total**
Online (*n = 753)*	2.8	9%	20%	28%	23%	20%	100%
In newspapers (*n = 384)*	2.8	8%	19%	34%	21%	18%	100%
In magazines (*n = 381)*	2.8	6%	24%	31%	19%	20%	100%
Through the mail (*n = 610)*	2.7	6%	21%	28%	23%	21%	100%
On television (*n = 94)*	2.3	3%	12%	27%	30%	29%	100%
On the radio (*n = 93)*	2.1	1%	13%	20%	26%	40%	100%
†Scale: Extremely influential = 5; Very influential = 4; Somewhat influential = 3; Not very influential = 2; Not at all influential = 1.							

Men are significantly more likely to report that they are influenced by advertisements compared with women.

How Influential Were the Advertisements in Your Decision to Pursue an Advanced Degree in Business (Mean Score†), by Gender		
Advertisements Encountered	**Male**	**Female**
Online*	**2.9**	**2.6**
In newspapers*	**2.8**	**2.5**
In magazines*	**2.8**	**2.4**
Through the mail*	**2.9**	**2.6**
On television*	**2.4**	**1.7**
On the radio	2.3	1.7
†Scale: Extremely influential = 5; Very influential = 4; Somewhat influential = 3; Not very influential = 2; Not at all influential = 1. *p ≤ .05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.		

Respondents age 24 and younger are more likely to be influenced by advertisements in newspapers, magazines, and the mail compared with respondents age 25 to 28.

How Influential Were the Advertisements in Your Decision to Pursue an Advanced Degree in Business (Mean Score†), by Age				
Advertisements Encountered	**24 and Younger**	**25 to 28**	**29 to 32**	**33 and Older**
Online	2.9	2.7	2.7	2.7
In newspapers*	**3.1**	**2.6**	2.8	2.7
In magazines*	**3.1**	**2.5**	2.7	2.9

How Influential Were the Advertisements in Your Decision to Pursue an Advanced Degree in Business (Mean Score†), by Age				
Advertisements Encountered	**24 and Younger**	**25 to 28**	**29 to 32**	**33 and Older**
Through the mail*	**2.9**	**2.5**	2.6	2.8
On television	2.5	2.5	2.2	2.2
On the radio	1.8	2.0	2.0	2.3
†Scale: Extremely influential = 5; Very influential = 4; Somewhat influential = 3; Not very influential = 2; Not at all influential = 1. *p ≤ .05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.				

Respondents in Asia are more likely than respondents from the United States to be influenced by advertisements on television. Asian, African, and European respondents are more likely than U.S. respondents to be influenced by advertisements in newspapers. Additionally, respondents from Asia, Africa, and Latin America are more likely than U.S. respondents to be influenced by advertisements in magazines. Respondents from Africa are most likely of the respondents to be influenced by advertisements received in the mail.

How Influential Were the Advertisements in Your Decision to Pursue an Advanced Degree in Business (Mean Score†), by World Region						
Advertisements Encountered	**Asia**	**Africa**	**United States**	**Canada**	**Latin America**	**Europe**
Online*	3.0	3.7	2.2	2.6	2.7	2.7
In newspapers*	**3.1**	**3.1**	**2.2**	2.6	2.5	**2.9**
In magazines*	**3.0**	**3.4**	**2.2**	2.7	**3.3**	2.7
Through the mail*	3.0	**3.5**	2.1	2.1	2.6	2.7
On television*	**3.2**	3.3	**1.9**	2.3	2.0	2.8
On the radio	2.7	2.0	2.0	2.6	1.0	2.5
†Scale: Extremely influential = 5; Very influential = 4; Somewhat influential = 3; Not very influential = 2; Not at all influential = 1. *p ≤ .05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.						

Asian American respondents are more likely than whites to be influenced by advertisements they encounter in magazines.

How Influential Were the Advertisements in Your Decision to Pursue an Advanced Degree in Business (Mean Score†), by U.S. Subgroups				
Advertisements Encountered	**Asian Americans**	**African Americans**	**White**	**Hispanic**
Online*	2.7	2.6	2.1	1.9
In newspapers	3.0	1.9	2.0	2.1
In magazines*	**3.1**	2.3	**2.0**	2.2
Through the mail	2.6	2.2	2.0	1.6
On television	2.3	2.0	1.9	1.0
On the radio	1.7	2.2	2.0	1.8
†Scale: Extremely influential = 5; Very influential = 4; Somewhat influential = 3; Not very influential = 2; Not at all influential = 1. *p ≤ .05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.				

Respondents with degrees in science and business are more likely to be influenced by advertisements in the mail compared to respondents with degrees in the humanities. Additionally, respondents with degrees in the sciences are more likely than respondents with degrees in the humanities to be influenced by advertisements encountered online.

How Influential Were the Advertisements in Your Decision to Pursue an Advanced Degree in Business (Mean Score†), by Undergraduate Major				
Advertisements Encountered	**Science**	**Business**	**Humanities**	**Social Science**
Online*	**2.8**	2.7	**2.3**	2.7
In newspapers	2.8	2.7	2.4	2.7
In magazines	2.7	2.9	2.4	2.6
Through the mail*	**2.7**	**2.8**	**2.0**	2.5
On television	2.1	2.3	2.3	2.4
On the radio	2.3	2.1	2.1	2.0
†Scale: Extremely influential = 5; Very influential = 4; Somewhat influential = 3; Not very influential = 2; Not at all influential = 1. *p ≤ .05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.				

Influence of Advertisement in Decision to Consider Program Advertised

Respondents who encountered various advertisements for business programs in the last six months were also asked to indicate how influential these advertisements were in their decision to consider the program advertised. As shown, respondents do not consider the advertisements to be very influential in their decision to consider a program advertised. However, of the various advertisements received, respondents rated the advertisement delivery methods by influence on the decision to consider a program as follows: online; mail; newspapers, magazines, television, and radio.

How Influential Were the Advertisements in Your Decision to Consider Program Advertised							
Advertisements Encountered	**Mean†**	**Extremely Influential**	**Very Influential**	**Somewhat Influential**	**Not Very Influential**	**Not At All Influential**	**Total**
Online (*n = 753)*	2.8	9%	21%	29%	22%	18%	100%
Through the mail (*n = 610)*	2.8	7%	23%	29%	21%	20%	100%
In newspapers (*n = 384)*	2.7	8%	20%	30%	23%	19%	100%
In magazines (*n = 381)*	2.7	8%	19%	32%	22%	19%	100%
On television (*n = 94)*	2.1	4%	7%	20%	30%	38%	100%
On the radio (*n = 93)*	2.1	2%	11%	19%	26%	42%	100%
†Scale: Extremely influential = 5; Very influential = 4; Somewhat influential = 3; Not very influential = 2; Not at all influential = 1.							

Men are significantly more likely than women to report that the advertisements they encounter are more influential in the decision to consider a program.

How Influential Were the Advertisements in Your Decision to Consider Program Advertised (Mean Score†), by Gender		
Advertisements Encountered	**Male**	**Female**
Online*	**2.9**	**2.6**
Through the mail*	**2.9**	**2.6**
In newspapers*	**2.8**	**2.5**
In magazines*	**2.8**	**2.4**
On television*	**2.4**	**1.7**
On the radio*	**2.3**	**1.7**
†Scale: Extremely influential = 5; Very influential = 4; Somewhat influential = 3; Not very influential = 2; Not at all influential = 1.		
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.		

Respondents age 24 and younger were more likely than older respondents to indicate that the advertisements they encountered in magazines and through the mail were influential in their decision to consider the program advertised.

How Influential Were the Advertisements in Your Decision to Consider Program Advertised (Mean Score†), by Age				
Advertisements Encountered	**24 and Younger**	**25 to 28**	**29 to 32**	**33 and Older**
Online	3.0	2.7	2.8	2.8
Through the mail*	**3.0**	2.6	2.7	2.9
In newspapers	2.9	2.7	2.8	2.6
In magazines*	**3.0**	2.6	2.6	2.8
On television	2.4	2.1	1.7	2.1
On the radio	2.1	1.8	2.0	2.2
†Scale: Extremely influential = 5; Very influential = 4; Somewhat influential = 3; Not very influential = 2; Not at all influential = 1.				
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.				

Respondents from the United States report that they are less influenced by advertisements compared to all other respondents, except Canadians, in their decision to consider a program.

How Influential Were the Advertisements in Your Decision to Consider Program Advertised (Mean Score†), by World Region						
Advertisements Encountered	**Asia**	**Africa**	**United States**	**Canada**	**Latin America**	**Europe**
Online*	3.1	3.7	**2.2**	2.6	3.1	2.7
Through the mail*	3.0	3.6	**2.3**	2.0	3.0	2.8
In newspapers*	3.0	3.1	**2.1**	2.6	2.7	2.8
In magazines*	2.9	3.5	**2.1**	2.3	3.4	2.9
On television*	**3.0**	**3.0**	**1.7**	**3.0**	1.7	2.0
On the radio*	**3.0**	**2.0**	**1.9**	2.8	2.0	**2.5**
†Scale: Extremely influential = 5; Very influential = 4; Somewhat influential = 3; Not very influential = 2; Not at all influential = 1.						
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.						

Respondents with degrees in science and business are more likely than respondents with degrees in the humanities to be influenced by advertisements encountered through the mail.

How Influential Were the Advertisements in Your Decision to Consider Program Advertised (Mean Score†), by Undergraduate Major				
Advertisements Encountered	**Science**	**Business**	**Humanities**	**Social Science**
Online	2.8	2.8	2.4	2.8
Through the mail*	**2.7**	**3.0**	**2.1**	2.7
In newspapers	2.7	2.7	2.3	2.7
In magazines	2.7	2.8	2.4	2.6
On television	2.1	2.2	1.3	1.9
On the radio	2.2	2.1	1.6	2.0
†Scale: Extremely influential = 5; Very influential = 4; Somewhat influential = 3; Not very influential = 2; Not at all influential = 1. *p ≤ .05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.				

There are no statistical differences in the influence of advertisements on a respondent's decision to consider the program advertised by U.S. subgroup.

School Web Sites

The vast majority of respondents (94%) have visited Web sites for the schools to which they applied or are planning to apply.

Have You Visited the Web Sites of the Schools You Applied/Plan to Apply	
Visited Web Site?	***(n = 1,006)***
Yes	94%
No	6%
Total	100%

Respondents who had applied to a graduate business program at the time of the current survey are significantly more likely than respondents who had not to have visited the schools' Web sites.

Have You Visited the Web Sites of the Schools You Applied/Plan to Apply, by Current Status*			
	Status in October 2006		
	Applied	**Plan to Apply**	**Not Sure if I Will Apply**
Visited Web Site?	***(n = 499)***	***(n = 288)***	***(n = 219)***
Yes	**98%**	91%	88%
No	2%	9%	12%
Total	100%	100%	100%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold in the contingency table significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the table.			

There are no statistical differences by gender, age, world region, U.S. subgroup, or undergraduate major in the percentage of respondents who visit the school Web site for the program to which they have applied or plan to apply.

Information Sought at School Web Site

Costs and tuition are the most sought-after information at school Web sites, followed by admissions criteria and process, applications and deadlines, and program types. Also, more than half of the respondents who visited the school Web site sought information about the curriculum, financial aid, specializations or concentrations available, and job placement statistics.

Type of Information Sought at School Web Site	
Information about…	***(n = 940)***
Costs and tuition	86%
Admissions criteria and process	83%
Applications and deadlines	77%
Program types (e.g., full-time, part-time, executive)	71%
Curriculum	67%
Financial aid	66%
Specializations or concentrations available	55%
Job placement statistics	55%
Career services	48%
Faculty	43%
Accreditation status	42%
Facilities	38%
Services for international students	37%
Program mission	34%
MBA alumni	34%
International program/exchange opportunities	33%
Student activities	32%
Student body	28%
Joint and dual degree programs	25%
Campus visits	21%
Responses add to more than 100% due to multiple selections.	

Respondents who are still unsure whether they will apply to a graduate business program are the least likely of the respondents to have visited a school Web site to obtain information about admissions criteria and process, applications and deadlines, career services, faculty, program mission, and campus visits. Respondents who have applied to graduate business programs are more likely than those still deciding to have visited the Web site to obtain information about student activities and the student body. Respondents who are planning to apply are more likely than other respondents to have visited the Web site to gather information about financial aid, services for international students, and international program/exchange opportunities.

Type of Information Sought at School Web Site, by Current Status			
	Status in October 2006		
Information about…	Applied *(n = 487)*	Plan to Apply *(n = 261)*	Not Sure if I Will Apply *(n = 192)*
Costs and tuition	88%	87%	83%
Admissions criteria and process*	87%	83%	**75%**
Applications and deadlines*	82%	75%	**68%**
Program types (e.g., full-time, part-time, executive)	69%	74%	74%
Curriculum	69%	64%	64%
Financial aid*	63%	**73%**	66%
Specializations or concentrations available	57%	54%	51%
Job placement statistics	57%	54%	52%
Career services*	50%	51%	**40%**
Faculty*	45%	48%	**35%**
Accreditation status	40%	44%	42%
Facilities	39%	39%	34%
Services for international students*	33%	**46%**	36%
Program mission*	35%	39%	**27%**
MBA alumni	36%	36%	28%
International program/exchange opportunities*	29%	**41%**	33%
Student activities*	**37%**	32%	**21%**
Student body*	**33%**	25%	**21%**
Joint and dual degree programs	22%	29%	26%
Campus visits*	25%	22%	**11%**

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

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

Women are more likely than men to visit a school Web site for information about program types and joint/dual degree programs. Men are more likely than women to visit the school Web site for information about job placement statistics, career services, faculty, services for international students, MBA alumni, international program/exchange opportunities, and student activities.

Type of Information Sought at School Web Site, by Gender		
	Male	Female
Information about…	*(n = 620)*	*(n = 320)*
Costs and tuition	87%	86%
Admissions criteria and process	83%	84%
Applications and deadlines	76%	79%
Program types (e.g., full-time, part-time, executive)*	**68%**	**79%**
Curriculum	65%	70%
Financial aid	67%	65%
Specializations or concentrations available	54%	57%
Job placement statistics*	**59%**	**48%**
Career services*	**52%**	**41%**
Faculty*	**47%**	**36%**
Accreditation status	41%	42%

Type of Information Sought at School Web Site, by Gender		
	Male	**Female**
Information about…	***(n = 620)***	***(n = 320)***
Facilities	40%	35%
Services for international students*	**40%**	**32%**
Program mission	35%	33%
MBA alumni*	**40%**	**23%**
International program/exchange opportunities*	**35%**	**28%**
Student activities*	**35%**	**26%**
Student body	28%	28%
Joint and dual degree programs*	**21%**	**31%**
Campus visits	22%	21%
Responses add to more than 100% due to multiple selections. *p ≤ .05; Items in bold in the contingency table significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the table		

Respondents age 24 and younger are more likely than other respondents to have sought information about admissions criteria and processes, and they are more likely than respondents age 33 and older to have sought information about services for international students. Respondents age 24 and younger are also more likely than respondents age 25 to 28 to have sought information about joint and dual degree programs. Respondents age 33 and older are the least likely of the respondents to have sought information about job placement statistics, career services, student activities, and the student body. Additionally, respondents age 25 to 28 are more likely than respondents age 33 and older to have sought information about campus visits.

Type of Information Sought at School Web Site, by Age				
	24 and Younger	**25 to 28**	**29 to 32**	**33 and Older**
Information about…	***(n = 189)***	***(n = 338)***	***(n = 207)***	***(n = 204)***
Costs and tuition	90%	84%	87%	85%
Admissions criteria and process*	**90%**	79%	80%	87%
Applications and deadlines	80%	77%	75%	76%
Program types (e.g., full-time, part-time, executive)	69%	69%	71%	78%
Curriculum	67%	64%	65%	72%
Financial aid	72%	68%	65%	59%
Specializations or concentrations available	59%	54%	54%	55%
Job placement statistics*	64%	59%	55%	**40%**
Career services*	54%	51%	45%	**41%**
Faculty	49%	39%	46%	43%
Accreditation status*	45%	35%	36%	**56%**
Facilities	39%	37%	40%	39%
Services for international students*	**49%**	37%	37%	**27%**
Program mission	31%	34%	36%	35%
MBA alumni	34%	33%	41%	29%
International program/exchange opportunities	32%	37%	32%	27%
Student activities*	35%	36%	36%	**21%**
Student body*	29%	31%	32%	**18%**
Joint and dual degree programs*	**33%**	**19%**	26%	25%

Type of Information Sought at School Web Site, by Age				
	24 and Younger	**25 to 28**	**29 to 32**	**33 and Older**
Information about…	***(n = 189)***	***(n = 338)***	***(n = 207)***	***(n = 204)***
Campus visits*	21%	**26%**	20%	**16%**

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

Respondents from the United States are more likely those from other regions of the world to have sought information about program types, curriculum, specializations and concentrations available. Respondents from Asia and Africa are more likely than respondents from the United States to have sought information about financial aid. Additionally, respondents from Asia are more likely than respondents from the United States to have sought information about job placement statistics, faculty, MBA alumni, and student activities. Respondents from Asia are also the most likely of all respondents to have sought information about career services. Respondents from Africa are more likely than other respondents to have sought information about accreditation status at the school's Web site, and they are the least likely to have sought information about the student body. Respondents from Africa and Latin America are the least likely of the respondents to have sought information about campus visits.

Type of Information Sought at School Web Site, by World Region						
	Asia	**Africa**	**United States**	**Canada**	**Latin America**	**Europe**
Information about…	***(n = 353)***	***(n = 99)***	***(n = 275)***	***(n = 34)***	***(n = 46)***	***(n = 115)***
Costs and tuition	88%	88%	85%	82%	87%	85%
Admissions criteria and process	84%	80%	86%	82%	74%	84%
Applications and deadlines	78%	75%	80%	74%	83%	72%
Program types (e.g., full-time, part-time, executive)*	70%	66%	**79%**	71%	61%	68%
Curriculum*	64%	56%	**80%**	62%	59%	60%
Financial aid*	**75%**	**80%**	**55%**	50%	67%	59%
Specializations or concentrations available*	56%	46%	**63%**	44%	50%	50%
Job placement statistics*	**66%**	53%	**45%**	53%	52%	47%
Career services*	**58%**	46%	41%	29%	50%	43%
Faculty*	**54%**	35%	**33%**	41%	39%	44%
Accreditation status*	38%	**63%**	40%	44%	39%	42%
Facilities*	**45%**	43%	32%	24%	41%	34%
Services for international students*	53%	60%	**2%**	18%	59%	45%
Program mission	39%	34%	29%	26%	35%	34%
MBA alumni*	**43%**	31%	**25%**	21%	35%	37%
International program/exchange opportunities*	37%	**49%**	**16%**	21%	**52%**	42%
Student activities*	**42%**	28%	**25%**	18%	37%	28%
Student body*	32%	**18%**	31%	21%	20%	26%
Joint and dual degree programs	26%	18%	28%	26%	24%	18%
Campus visits*	23%	**11%**	27%	24%	**11%**	17%

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

Asian American respondents are more likely than other U.S. respondents to have sought information about career services, student activities, and the student body at the school Web site. There are no other statistically significant differences by U.S. subgroup in the type of information sought.

Type of Information Sought at School Web Site, by U.S. Subgroup				
Information about…	**Asian American** *(n = 32)*	**African American** *(n = 41)*	**White** *(n = 161)*	**Hispanic** *(n = 17)*
Costs and tuition	81%	78%	88%	82%
Admissions criteria and process	84%	78%	89%	94%
Applications and deadlines	88%	78%	81%	71%
Program types (e.g., full-time, part-time, executive)	78%	83%	80%	76%
Curriculum	75%	85%	82%	76%
Financial aid	69%	59%	52%	47%
Specializations or concentrations available	72%	63%	62%	59%
Job placement statistics	63%	44%	43%	41%
Career services*	**66%**	39%	37%	47%
Faculty	50%	29%	32%	41%
Accreditation status	41%	39%	37%	41%
Facilities	38%	32%	33%	29%
Services for international students	6%	0%	2%	6%
Program mission	47%	37%	27%	24%
MBA alumni	34%	29%	20%	35%
International program/exchange opportunities	25%	5%	16%	18%
Student activities*	**44%**	29%	23%	12%
Student body*	**56%**	34%	27%	24%
Joint and dual degree programs	28%	29%	29%	24%
Campus visits	44%	27%	24%	29%

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

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

Respondents with degrees in science are more likely than respondents with degrees in business to have sought information on the school Web site about job placement statistics and MBA alumni. Additionally, respondents with degrees in business are the least likely of the respondents to have sought information about student activities.

Type of Information Sought at School Web Site, by Undergraduate Major				
Information about…	**Science** *(n = 331)*	**Business** *(n = 306)*	**Humanities** *(n = 50)*	**Social Science** *(n = 149)*
Costs and tuition	84%	90%	80%	86%
Admissions criteria and process	85%	80%	76%	85%
Applications and deadlines	76%	76%	70%	85%
Program types (e.g., full-time, part-time, executive)	69%	74%	70%	72%
Curriculum	63%	68%	60%	70%

Type of Information Sought at School Web Site, by Undergraduate Major				
Information about…	**Science** *(n = 331)*	**Business** *(n = 306)*	**Humanities** *(n = 50)*	**Social Science** *(n = 149)*
Financial aid	70%	63%	62%	68%
Specializations or concentrations available	54%	54%	48%	62%
Job placement statistics*	**63%**	**48%**	54%	54%
Career services	52%	44%	44%	54%
Faculty	48%	40%	32%	42%
Accreditation status	38%	42%	42%	42%
Facilities	40%	34%	40%	40%
Services for international students	42%	36%	24%	35%
Program mission	35%	33%	36%	36%
MBA alumni*	**41%**	**28%**	34%	34%
International program/exchange opportunities	31%	35%	28%	34%
Student activities*	37%	**27%**	28%	36%
Student body	29%	25%	28%	35%
Joint and dual degree programs	22%	22%	32%	26%
Campus visits	24%	20%	18%	21%

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

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

Influence of School Web Site in Decision to Apply to MBA Program

Respondents who applied to graduate business school at the time of the survey and visited the Web site of the school to which they applied were asked to indicate the influence the school Web site had in their decision to apply to the MBA program. Overall, 31% of respondents indicate that the Web site was extremely influential, and 39% state that the Web site was very influential in their decision to apply to the MBA program.

Influence of School Web Site in Decision to Apply to MBA Program	
Response	*(n = 487)*
Extremely influential	31%
Very influential	39%
Somewhat influential	23%
Not very influential	6%
Not at all influential	2%
Total	100%

Respondents from Africa are more likely than respondents from the United States to say that they are influenced by the school Web site. However, for all other demographic characteristics, the influence of the school Web site is statistically similar.

Influence of School Web Site in Decision to Apply to MBA Program, by Demographic Characteristics	
Demographic Characteristics	**Percent Extremely or Very Influential**
Gender	
Male	73%
Female	65%
Age	
24 and younger	67%
25 to 28	64%
29 to 32	76%
33 and older	76%
World Region*	
Asia	75%
Africa	**88%**
United States	**63%**
Canada	45%
Latin America	66%
Europe	72%
U.S. Subgroup	
Asian American	45%
African American	62%
White	64%
Hispanic	75%
Undergraduate Major	
Science	73%
Business	71%
Humanities	62%
Social Science	63%
*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold in the contingency table significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the table	

Published Rankings

Respondents were asked to report the influence that various published rankings had on their decision to apply to certain programs. Respondents rated Business Week® as the most influential published ranking, followed closely behind by U.S. News & World Report®, The Wall Street Journal®, and the Financial Times®.

How Influential Are Each of the Published Rankings in Your Decision to Apply to a Certain Program							
Published Ranking	(*n* = 1,005)						
	Mean†	Extremely Influential	Very Influential	Somewhat Influential	Not Very Influential	Not At All Influential	Don't Know
Business Week®	3.5	15%	29%	23%	6%	7%	19%
U.S. News & World Report®	3.3	11%	22%	19%	9%	8%	31%
Financial Times®	3.2	13%	22%	21%	8%	11%	25%
The Wall Street Journal®	3.2	10%	23%	22%	8%	9%	26%
Forbes Inc.	3.1	9%	19%	22%	9%	12%	29%
Economist Intelligence Unit. Which MBA?	3.0	8%	13%	16%	8%	12%	43%
Canadian Business Magazine	2.2	2%	5%	11%	9%	16%	57%
Asia Inc.	2.2	1%	6%	11%	10%	17%	56%
† Scale: Extremely influential = 5; Very influential = 4; Somewhat influential = 3; Not very influential = 2; Not at all influential = 1; Don't know is excluded.							

Men are more likely than women to consider each of the published rankings, except for The Wall Street Journal® and Forbes, Inc., as influential in their decision to apply to a certain program.

How Influential Are Each of the Published Rankings in Your Decision to Apply to a Certain Program (Mean Score†), by Gender *		
Published Ranking	Male	Female
Business Week®*	**3.5**	**3.4**
U.S. News & World Report®*	**3.4**	**3.1**
Financial Times®*	**3.4**	**3.0**
The Wall Street Journal®	3.3	3.2
Forbes Inc.	3.1	3.0
Economist Intelligence Unit. Which MBA?*	**3.1**	**2.7**
Canadian Business Magazine*	**2.3**	**2.1**
Asia Inc.*	**2.3**	**2.0**
† Scale: Extremely influential = 5; Very influential = 4; Somewhat influential = 3; Not very influential = 2; Not at all influential = 1; Don't know is excluded.		
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.		

Respondents age 24 and younger rate the influence of the following published rankings higher than respondents who are older, including those by Business Week®, U.S. News & World Report®, Financial Times®, Forbes, Inc., Economist Intelligence Unit. Which MBA?, and Asia Inc.

How Influential Are Each of the Published Rankings in Your Decision to Apply to a Certain Program (Mean Score†), by Age				
Published Ranking	**24 and Younger**	**25 to 28**	**29 to 32**	**33 and Older**
Business Week®*	**3.6**	3.5	**3.6**	**3.2**
U.S. News & World Report®*	**3.4**	**3.4**	3.2	**3.0**
Financial Times®*	**3.5**	3.2	3.3	**3.0**
The Wall Street Journal®	3.4	3.2	3.3	3.0
Forbes Inc.*	**3.3**	3.0	3.0	**2.9**
Economist Intelligence Unit. Which MBA?*	**3.2**	**2.8**	2.9	3.0
Canadian Business Magazine	2.5	2.2	2.0	2.2
Asia Inc.*	**2.5**	2.2	2.2	**2.0**

† Scale: Extremely influential = 5; Very influential = 4; Somewhat influential = 3; Not very influential = 2; Not at all influential = 1; Don't know is excluded.

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

Business Week® is less influential with Canadian respondents compared to respondents of all other regions. Additionally, Asian and African respondents consider Business Week® more influential compared with respondents in the United States. Respondents in the United States, Asia, and Africa consider U.S. News and World Report® more influential compared with respondents from Canada. Respondents in the United States and Canada are the least likely compared with other respondents to consider the Financial Times® influential. Forbes Inc. is more influential among respondents from Asia and Africa compared with respondents from the United States or Canada. Respondents from the United States are the least likely of respondents to consider Economist Intelligence Unit. Which MBA? as influential. Respondents from Asia, Africa, Canada, and Latin America are more likely than respondents from the United States and Europe to consider the Canadian Business Magazine as influential. Additionally, respondents from Asia and Africa are more likely than other respondents to consider Asia Inc. as influential.

How Influential Are Each of the Published Rankings in Your Decision to Apply to a Certain Program (Mean Score†), by World Region						
Published Ranking	**Asia**	**Africa**	**United States**	**Canada**	**Latin America**	**Europe**
Business Week®*	**3.7**	**3.8**	**3.3**	**2.6**	**3.5**	**3.3**
U.S. News & World Report®*	**3.4**	**3.4**	**3.3**	**2.1**	3.1	2.9
Financial Times®*	3.5	3.6	**2.4**	**2.7**	3.5	3.6
The Wall Street Journal®*	3.4	3.6	3.1	**2.2**	3.2	3.4
Forbes Inc.*	**3.2**	**3.3**	**2.9**	**2.4**	3.1	3.2
Economist Intelligence Unit. Which MBA?*	3.2	3.8	**2.1**	2.7	3.3	3.2
Canadian Business Magazine*	**2.6**	**2.7**	1.5	**2.8**	**2.6**	2.1
Asia Inc.*	**2.8**	**2.4**	1.5	1.7	2.2	1.8

† Scale: Extremely influential = 5; Very influential = 4; Somewhat influential = 3; Not very influential = 2; Not at all influential = 1; Don't know is excluded.

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

Asian Americans are more likely than whites to consider the Canadian Business Magazine influential. Additionally, Asian Americans are more likely than African Americans and whites to consider Asia Inc. influential.

How Influential Are Each of the Published Rankings in Your Decision to Apply to a Certain Program (Mean Score†), by U.S. Subgroups

Published Ranking	Asian Americans	African Americans	White	Hispanic
Business Week®	3.4	3.5	3.2	3.5
U.S. News & World Report®	3.6	3.2	3.2	3.4
Financial Times®	2.9	2.5	2.3	2.5
The Wall Street Journal®	3.2	2.9	3.0	3.5
Forbes Inc.	2.8	3.1	2.8	3.1
Economist Intelligence Unit. Which MBA?*	2.5	2.6	1.9	2.8
Canadian Business Magazine*	**2.1**	1.4	**1.4**	1.7
Asia Inc.*	**2.1**	**1.3**	**1.4**	1.7

† Scale: Extremely influential = 5; Very influential = 4; Somewhat influential = 3; Not very influential = 2; Not at all influential = 1; Don't know is excluded.

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

Respondents with degrees in science are more likely than those with degrees in the social sciences to rate Asia Inc. as influential.

How Influential Are Each of the Published Rankings in Your Decision to Apply to a Certain Program (Mean Score†), by Undergraduate Major

Published Ranking	Science	Business	Humanities	Social Science
Business Week®	3.5	3.5	3.4	3.4
U.S. News & World Report®	3.4	3.1	3.4	3.2
Financial Times®	3.3	3.3	2.9	3.1
The Wall Street Journal®	3.2	3.3	3.3	3.2
Forbes Inc.	3.1	3.1	3.1	2.8
Economist Intelligence Unit. Which MBA?	3.0	3.0	2.5	2.9
Canadian Business Magazine	2.3	2.2	2.0	2.0
Asia Inc.*	**2.4**	2.2	2.1	**1.9**

† Scale: Extremely influential = 5; Very influential = 4; Somewhat influential = 3; Not very influential = 2; Not at all influential = 1; Don't know is excluded.

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

Application and Enrollment Behavior

This section of the report explores application and enrollment behavior of the respondents. The types of MBA programs considered, the number of applications submitted, school choice, and enrollment decisions are presented in this section.

Graduate Business Programs Considered

Respondents were asked to indicate the types of MBA programs they considered as they applied to or as they decided to apply to graduate business school. Among all respondents, 58% considered a full-time two-year traditional MBA program, 32% considered a full-time one-year accelerated MBA program, 34% considered a part-time MBA program, 16% considered an executive MBA program, and 13% considered an online/distance learning program. Among respondents who have not yet submitted an application, only 3% indicate that they are not sure ofthe type of program to which they will apply.

Graduate Business Programs Considered

Program Type	All Respondents (*n* = 908)	Respondents Who Have Applied (*n* = 498)	Respondents Who Have Not Yet Applied (*n* = 410)
Full-Time MBA Two-Year Traditional	58%	59%	56%
Full-Time MBA One-Year Accelerated	32%	31%	34%
Part-Time MBA	34%	30%	39%
Executive MBA	16%	12%	21%
Online/distance learning	13%	11%	16%
Not sure	1%	Not applicable	3%

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

Men are more likely than women to consider a full-time two-year traditional MBA program. Women are more likely than men to consider a part-time or online/distance learning MBA program.

Graduate Business Programs Considered, by Gender

Program Type	Male (*n* = 600)	Female (*n* = 308)
Full-Time MBA Two-Year Traditional*	**61%**	**51%**
Full-Time MBA One-Year Accelerated	34%	29%
Part-Time MBA*	**29%**	**44%**
Executive MBA	17%	14%
Online/distance learning*	**11%**	**17%**
Not sure	1%	1%

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

Younger respondents are more likely than older respondents to consider a full-time two-year traditional MBA program. Respondents age 33 and older are more likely than younger respondents to consider a part-time, executive, and online/distance learning program. Statistically, there is no difference by age in the percentage of respondents who consider a full-time one-year accelerated program.

Graduate Business Programs Considered, by Age				
Program Type	24 and Younger (*n* = 177)	25 to 28 (*n* = 331)	29 to 32 (*n* = 199)	33 and Older (*n* = 199)
Full-Time MBA Two-Year Traditional*	**70%**	**65%**	55%	**36%**
Full-Time MBA One-Year Accelerated	34%	30%	38%	29%
Part-Time MBA*	27%	30%	35%	**47%**
Executive MBA*	10%	10%	16%	**32%**
Online/distance learning*	10%	7%	12%	**27%**
Not sure	2%	1%	1%	2%

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

Respondents from Asia are more likely than all other respondents to consider a full-time two-year traditional program. Additionally, respondents from Asia and Latin America are more likely than respondents from the United States to consider a full-time one-year accelerated program. Canadian and U.S. respondents are more likely than all other respondents to consider a part-time program. Respondents from the United States are also more likely than Asian respondents to consider an online/distance learning program. Statistically, there is no difference by world region in the percentage of respondents who consider an executive program.

Graduate Business Programs Considered, by World Region						
Program Type	Asia (*n* = 336)	Africa (*n* = 99)	United States (*n* = 272)	Canada (*n* = 30)	Latin America (*n* = 42)	Europe (*n* = 111)
Full-Time MBA Two-Year Traditional*	**71%**	48%	49%	40%	64%	48%
Full-Time MBA One-Year Accelerated*	**38%**	39%	**17%**	30%	**50%**	40%
Part-Time MBA*	19%	28%	**60%**	**53%**	29%	22%
Executive MBA	14%	12%	17%	23%	12%	23%
Online/distance learning*	**8%**	18%	**18%**	23%	7%	10%
Not sure	1%	0%	1%	3%	2%	3%

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

Respondents with degrees in business are less likely than others to consider a full-time two-year traditional program. Respondents with degrees in the social sciences are less likely than others to consider a full-time one-year accelerated program. Respondents with science degree are the least likely to consider a part-time program, and respondents with degrees in the humanities are the most likely to consider an executive program.

Graduate Business Programs Considered, by Undergraduate Major				
Program Type	Science (*n* = 306)	Business (*n* = 304)	Humanities (*n* = 49)	Social Science (*n* = 149)
Full-Time MBA Two-Year Traditional*	63%	**49%**	47%	64%
Full-Time MBA One-Year Accelerated*	36%	32%	24%	**23%**
Part-Time MBA*	**27%**	40%	45%	37%
Executive MBA*	18%	15%	**27%**	11%
Online/distance learning	12%	12%	14%	13%
Not sure	1%	1%	4%	1%
Responses may add to more than 100% due to multiple selections. *$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table				

Statistically, there is no difference by U.S. subgroup in the percentage of respondents considering the various program types.

Number of Applications Submitted to Graduate Business Programs

Overall, respondents who submitted an application by the time of the survey, submitted 3.5 applications to various MBA programs on average. Respondents who considered a full-time two-year MBA program submitted an average of four applications to these programs. Respondents who considered a full-time one-year accelerated program submitted two applications to these programs on average. Respondents who considered a part-time, executive, or online/distance learning program submitted less than two applications on average to each of these programs.

Average Number of Application Submitted, by Program Type	
Program Type	All Respondents Who Submitted an Application (*n* = 498)
Full-Time MBA Two-Year Traditional	4.1
Full-Time MBA One-Year Accelerated	2.0
Part-Time MBA	1.4
Executive MBA	1.5
Online/distance learning	1.5
Total	3.5

Men and women who apply to each of the various programs submit a statistically similar number of applications, on average. However, men send more applications, in total, compared with women.

Average Number of Application Submitted, by Program Type and Gender		
	Male	**Female**
Program Type	**(*n* = 332)**	**(*n* = 166)**
Full-Time MBA Two-Year Traditional	4.2	3.6
Full-Time MBA One-Year Accelerated	2.0	2.1
Part-Time MBA	1.4	1.4
Executive MBA	1.6	1.1
Online/distance learning	1.5	1.4
Total*	**3.8**	**3.0**
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.		

Among respondents who submit applications to full-time two-year traditional programs, younger respondents apply to more programs compared with older respondents. Additionally, younger respondents submit more applications, in total, to programs compared with older respondents.

Average Number of Application Submitted, by Program Type and Age				
	24 and Younger	**25 to 28**	**29 to 32**	**33 and Older**
Program Type	**(*n* = 86)**	**(*n* = 189)**	**(*n* = 107)**	**(*n* = 115)**
Full-Time MBA Two-Year Traditional*	5.1	4.2	3.4	3.2
Full-Time MBA One-Year Accelerated	2.2	1.8	2.1	2.3
Part-Time MBA	1.4	1.5	1.1	1.4
Executive MBA	1.0	1.6	1.3	1.6
Online/distance learning	1.8	1.4	1.2	1.5
Total*	4.5	3.7	3.0	2.9
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.				

Respondents from Asia submit more applications to full-time two-year traditional programs compared with other respondents. Additionally, Asian respondents submit, in total, more applications compared with respondents from Africa, the United States, and Europe.

Average Number of Application Submitted, by Program Type and World Region						
	Asia	**Africa**	**United States**	**Canada**	**Latin America**	**Europe**
Program Type	**(*n* = 166)**	**(*n* = 53)**	**(*n* = 183)**	**(*n* = 11)**	**(*n* = 18)**	**(*n* = 57)**
Full-Time MBA Two-Year Traditional*	**5.3**	3.1	3.1	3.2	2.5	3.2
Full-Time MBA One-Year Accelerated	2.5	1.7	1.3	1.0	2.6	1.9
Part-Time MBA	1.2	1.1	1.5	1.0	0.7	1.3
Executive MBA	2.1	1.8	1.2	2.3	1.0	1.1
Online/distance learning	1.6	1.7	1.2	4.0	1.0	2.3
Total*	**5.0**	**2.8**	**2.7**	3.2	3.2	**2.6**
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.						

Respondents with degrees in science submit, in total, more applications compared with respondents with degrees in the humanities.

Average Number of Application Submitted, by Program Type and Undergraduate Major				
Program Type	Science (*n* = 175)	Business (*n* = 169)	Humanities (*n* = 27)	Social Science (*n* = 83)
Full-Time MBA Two-Year Traditional	4.3	4.1	2.8	4.2
Full-Time MBA One-Year Accelerated	2.2	2.1	1.5	1.8
Part-Time MBA	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.7
Executive MBA	1.5	1.5	.8	1.6
Online/distance learning	1.3	1.9	1.0	1.3
Total*	**4.1**	3.3	**2.1**	3.7
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.				

Statistically, there is no difference in the total number of applications submitted or in the number submitted to the various programs by U.S. subgroup.

Applications to Graduate Business Schools

Respondents were asked to indicate the number of graduate business schools to which they submitted an application. On average, respondents applied to three graduate business schools, and respondents were admitted to 1.5 graduate business schools on average. They were declined admission to average of one school, and they are waiting on a decision from nearly one school, on average.

Average Number of Applications to Graduate Business Schools	
Number of Graduate Business School To Which…	(*n* = 496)
You applied	2.9
You have been admitted	1.5
You were declined admission	0.9
You have not yet received a final decision	0.5

Men apply to significantly more graduate business schools compared with women. Additionally, men have been declined by more schools compared with women.

Average Number of Applications to Graduate Business Schools, by Gender		
Number of Graduate Business School To Which…	Male (*n* = 265)	Female (*n* = 140)
You applied*	**3.2**	**2.3**
You have been admitted	1.5	1.3
You were declined admission*	**1.1**	**0.5**
You have not yet received a final decision	0.5	0.4
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.		

Respondents age 24 and younger apply to more graduate business schools than older respondents. Additionally, respondents age 24 and younger are admitted to more graduate business schools compared with respondents age 33 and older.

Average Number of Applications to Graduate Business Schools, by Age				
Number of Graduate Business School To Which…	**24 and Younger**	**25 to 28**	**29 to 32**	**33 and Older**
	(*n* = 71)	**(*n* = 159)**	**(*n* = 83)**	**(*n* = 92)**
You applied*	**3.8**	2.9	2.6	2.5
You have been admitted*	**1.8**	1.5	1.4	**1.2**
You were declined admission	1.5	0.8	0.8	0.7
You have not yet received a final decision	0.6	0.5	0.3	0.6
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.				

Asian respondents apply to significantly more graduate business schools compared with other respondents but are declined admission to more schools compared to all other respondents as well. Additionally, respondents from Asia are accepted to more schools compared with respondents from Africa, and respondents from Africa are awaiting final decision from more schools compared with all other respondents.

Average Number of Applications to Graduate Business Schools, by World Region						
Number of Graduate Business School To Which…	**Asia**	**Africa**	**United States**	**Canada**	**Latin American**	**Europe**
	(*n* = 132)	**(*n* = 35)**	**(*n* = 163)**	**(*n* = 9)**	**(*n* = 14)**	**(*n* = 46)**
You applied*	**4.1**	2.7	2.3	2.4	2.7	1.8
You have been admitted*	**1.7**	**1.1**	1.4	1.8	1.4	1.3
You were declined admission*	**1.8**	0.5	0.5	0.4	0.9	0.3
You have not yet received a final decision*	0.6	**1.1**	0.4	0.2	0.4	0.2
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.						

Asian American respondents apply, on average, to a greater number of graduate business schools compared with African Americans. Asian Americans are also accepted to a greater number of graduate business schools compared with African Americans and whites, but they are declined admission to a greater number of schools compared with whites.

Average Number of Applications to Graduate Business Schools, by U.S. Subgroup				
Number of Graduate Business School To Which…	**Asian American**	**African American**	**White**	**Hispanic**
	(*n* = 18)	**(*n* = 20)**	**(*n* = 98)**	**(*n* = 11)**
You applied*	**3.5**	**1.8**	2.2	1.9
You have been admitted*	**1.9**	**1.1**	**1.3**	1.4
You were declined admission*	**1.3**	0.3	**0.5**	0.3
You have not yet received a final decision	0.3	0.5	0.4	0.3
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.				

Respondents with degrees in science are declined admission by more graduate business schools than respondents with degrees in business.

Average Number of Applications to Graduate Business Schools, by Undergraduate Major				
Number of Graduate Business School To Which…	**Science**	**Business**	**Humanities**	**Social Science**
	(*n* = 136)	**(*n* = 148)**	**(*n* = 18)**	**(*n* = 66)**
You applied*	3.3	2.5	1.8	3.2
You have been admitted	1.5	1.4	1.2	1.6
You were declined admission*	**1.4**	**0.6**	0.4	1.0
You have not yet received a final decision	0.5	0.5	0.1	0.6
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.				

School Choice

Respondents who indicate that they applied to more than one graduate business school were asked to indicate whether they had a preferred school (i.e., first-choice, second-choice), a safety school (one they felt sure they would be admitted into), and a stretch school (one for which they were not sure they would meet the admission criteria). Overall, the vast majority (91%) of respondents who applied to more than one school had a preferred school, and 70% had a safety school to which they applied. Additionally, 55% of respondents who applied to more than one school had a stretch school to which they applied.

School Choice	
Of the schools to which you applied, did you have at least one…	***(n = 300)***
Preferred school	91%
Safety school	70%
Stretch school	55%

Statistically, there is no difference by gender, age, world region, U.S. subgroup, or undergraduate major in the percentage of respondents who have a preferred school, a safety school, or a stretch school.

Enrollment Decision

Program Choice

Respondents who had enrolled in a graduate business program at the time of the survey and applied to more than one graduate business school were asked to indicate the outcome of the application and decision. More than half (57%) report that they attend their first-choice graduate business school. One in eight (12%) were admitted to their first-choice school but attend a different school, and one third (32%) were not admitted to their first choice school and now attend a different school.

Application Outcomes (Enrolled Respondents)	
Response	***(n = 189)***
I attend my first choice graduate business school	57%
I was admitted to my first choice, but attend a different school	12%
I was not admitted to my first choice, and now attend a different school	32%
Total	100%

Statistically, there is no difference in the application outcome of enrolled respondents by gender, age, world region, U.S. subgroup, and undergraduate major.

Program Enrolled

Respondents who were enrolled in an MBA program at the time of the survey were asked to indicate the type of program in which they enrolled. Overall, 45% of enrolled respondents were students at full-time two-year traditional MBA programs, and 17% were enrolled in a full-time one-year accelerated program. About a quarter (24%) were enrolled in a part-time program and 8% were enrolled in an executive program. Additionally, 6% of the enrolled respondents were students at an online/distance learning program.

Program in Which Respondent Enrolled	
Program Type	***(n = 319)***
Full-Time MBA Two-Year Traditional	45%
Full-Time MBA One-Year Accelerated	17%
Part-Time MBA	24%
Executive MBA	8%
Online/distance learning	6%
Total	100%

Men are significantly more likely than women to be enrolled in a full-time two-year traditional MBA program. Women are significantly more likely than men to be enrolled in a part-time MBA program.

Program in Which Respondent Enrolled, by Gender*		
	Male	**Female**
Program Type	**(*n* = 208)**	**(*n* = 111)**
Full-Time MBA Two-Year Traditional	51%	**34%**
Full-Time MBA One-Year Accelerated	15%	21%
Part-Time MBA	20%	**32%**
Executive MBA	10%	5%
Online/distance learning	4%	8%
Total	100%	100%
*$p \leq .05$; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.		

Respondents age 33 and older are significantly less likely than younger respondents to be enrolled in a full-time two-year traditional program. On the other hand, respondents age 33 and older are significantly more likely to be enrolled in an executive program compared with respondents 28 and younger.

Program in Which Respondent Enrolled, by Age*				
Program Type	24 and Younger (*n* = 61)	25 to 28 (*n* = 119)	29 to 32 (*n* = 69)	33 and Older (*n* = 70)
Full-Time MBA Two-Year Traditional	51%	52%	45%	**30%**
Full-Time MBA One-Year Accelerated	21%	16%	22%	10%
Part-Time MBA	20%	25%	20%	29%
Executive MBA	**2%**	**3%**	9%	**23%**
Online/distance learning	7%	4%	4%	9%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.				

Due to small sample sizes among respondents from Africa, Canada, and Latin America, these world regions are excluded from the statistical testing. Asian respondents are twice as likely, a statistically significant difference, compared with respondents from the United States and Europe to be enrolled in a full-time two-year traditional program. European respondents are more likely than Asian and U.S. respondents to be enrolled in a full-time one-year accelerated or executive program. Finally, respondents from the United States are more likely than respondents from Asia or Europe to be enrolled in a part-time program.

Program in Which Respondent Enrolled, by World Region						
	World Region*			(*excluded from statistical analysis due to small sample size*)		
Program Type	Asia (*n* = 99)	United States (*n* = 137)	Europe (*n* = 40)	Africa (*n* = 17)	Canada (*n* = 7)	Latin America (*n* = 11)
Full-Time MBA Two-Year Traditional	**61%**	37%	30%	29%	57%	64%
Full-Time MBA One-Year Accelerated	18%	10%	**35%**	29%	0%	27%
Part-Time MBA	12%	**39%**	13%	29%	14%	0%
Executive MBA	4%	6%	**20%**	12%	29%	9%
Online/distance learning	5%	8%	3%	0%	0%	0%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.						

Due to small sample sizes, statistical testing by U.S. subgroup and undergraduate major is not conducted for program type in which the respondents enrolled.

School Location

Enrolled Respondents

Respondents who were enrolled in a program at the time of the survey were asked to indicate the location of the program in which they enrolled. Overall, 62% of respondents enrolled in a program in their country of citizenship, and 38% enrolled in a program outside their country of citizenship.

Program Location (Enrolled Respondents)	
Is the school located…	Percent (*n* = 313)
Outside your country of citizenship	38%
Inside your country of citizenship	62%
Total	100%

Respondents who report that they enrolled in a program outside their country of citizenship were asked to indicate in which country the program is located. Nearly three-fifths (57%) are enrolled in the United States, 13% in the United Kingdom, 8% in Canada, and 5% in France.

Country in which Program is Located (Enrolled Respondents)	
Country	Percent (*n* = 120)
United States of America	57%
United Kingdom	13%
Canada	8%
France	5%
Australia	3%
Spain	3%
Portugal	2%
Singapore	2%
United Arab Emirates	2%
Belgium	1%
Germany	1%
India	1%
Italy	1%
Pakistan	1%
Philippines	1%
South Africa	1%
Sweden	1%
Total	100%

Men are significantly more likely than women to be enrolled in a program located outside their country of citizenship.

Program Location, by Gender* (Enrolled Respondents)		
Is the school located…	**Male (*n* = 206)**	**Female (*n* = 107)**
Outside your country of citizenship	44%	**27%**
Inside your country of citizenship	56%	73%
Total	100%	100%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.		

None of the respondents from the United States report that they enrolled in a program outside their country of citizenship, which is a statistically significant difference.

Program Location, by World Region* (Enrolled Respondents)						
Is the school located…	**Asia (*n* = 96)**	**Africa (*n* = 16)**	**United States (*n* = 136)**	**Canada (*n* = 7)**	**Latin America (*n* = 10)**	**Europe (*n* = 40)**
Outside your country of citizenship	73%	63%	**0%**	71%	70%	58%
Inside your country of citizenship	27%	38%	100%	29%	30%	43%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.						

Statistically, there is no difference by age and undergraduate major in the location of the program in which respondents enrolled.

Respondents Not Yet Enrolled

Respondents who were not yet enrolled in a program at the time of the survey were asked to indicate the location of the program in which they plan to enroll. Overall, 63% report that they plan to enroll in a program outside their country of citizenship, and 31% plan to enroll in a program inside their country of citizenship. Another 6% are not sure of the location of the program where they plan to enroll.

Program Location (Non-enrolled Respondents)	
Planned Location	**Percent (*n* = 464)**
Outside your country of citizenship	63%
Inside your country of citizenship	31%
Not sure	6%
Total	100%

Men are significantly more likely than women to indicate that they plan to enroll in a program outside their country of citizenship, whereas women are more likely to plan to enroll in a program inside their country of citizenship.

Program Location, by Gender* (Non-enrolled Respondents)		
Planned Location	**Male (*n* = 326)**	**Female (*n* = 138)**
Outside your country of citizenship	**70%**	46%
Inside your country of citizenship	25%	**44%**
Not sure	5%	9%
Total	100%	100%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.		

Respondents ages 33 and older are the most likely of all respondents to indicate that they plan to enroll in a program inside their country of citizenship and the least likely to plan to enroll in a program outside their country of citizenship.

Program Location, by Age* (Non-enrolled Respondents)				
Planned Location	**24 and Younger (*n* = 91)**	**25 to 28 (*n* = 178)**	**29 to 32 (*n* = 96)**	**33 and Older (*n* = 97)**
Outside your country of citizenship	68%	65%	71%	**46%**
Inside your country of citizenship	23%	30%	23%	**47%**
Not sure	9%	5%	6%	6%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.				

Respondents from the United States are the least likely of the respondents to plan to enroll in a program outside their country of citizenship and the most likely to plan to enroll in a program inside their country of citizenship.

Program Location, by World Region* (Non-enrolled Respondents)						
Planned Location	**Asia (*n* = 192)**	**Africa (*n* = 71)**	**United States (*n* = 99)**	**Canada (*n* = 17)**	**Latin America (*n* = 23)**	**Europe (*n* = 56)**
Outside your country of citizenship	81%	85%	**2%**	29%	87%	82%
Inside your country of citizenship	16%	11%	**90%**	59%	4%	9%
Not sure	4%	4%	8%	12%	9%	9%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
*p ≤ .05; Items in bold significantly affect the overall X^2 statistic of the contingency table.						

Statistically, there is no difference by U.S. subgroup and undergraduate major in the location of the program in which respondents plan to enroll.

School Selection

This section of the report explores the types of information used in choosing which graduate business schools to apply to and attend. Rankings of the general categories of information, rating of the specific components of information for each category, and standardized scores for each component used to evaluate the components of information across general categories are reported in this section.

Ranking of Key Aspects in Choosing a Graduate Business School

This section of the report presents respondent rankings of various categories of information used when choosing graduate business schools. Respondents were asked to rank each category from most important (6) to least important (1). The six key aspects that respondents ranked include financial aspects (financial costs, availability of scholarships), specific aspect about the program (length, type, location), student class profile (women, minorities, nationalities, age, experience), curriculum aspects (study abroad opportunities, specific curriculum offered), career aspects (career services offered, job placement opportunities), and the quality/reputation of the graduate business school (faculty, rankings, accreditation).

The three aspects of graduate business schools that respondents rank as most important when determining which school to attend are the quality and reputation of the graduate business school, career aspects, and financial aspects. Quality and reputation of the graduate business school is ranked highest by 45% of the respondents and among the top three for 86% of respondents. In comparison, 58% ranked career aspects in their top three, 53% ranked financial aspects in the top three, and less than half of the respondents ranked curriculum aspects, specific aspects of the program, and student class profile in their top three aspects when choosing a graduate business school.

Ranking of Key Aspects in Choosing a Graduate Business School				
	Statistic			
	(*n* = 993)			
Key Aspect	Mean†	Percent Ranked 1st	Percent Ranked 2nd	Percent Ranked 3rd
Quality/reputation of the graduate business school	4.9	45%	24%	17%
Career aspects	3.8	14%	24%	20%
Financial aspects	3.6	17%	19%	17%
Curriculum aspects	3.5	11%	15%	22%
Specific aspects of the program	3.4	13%	15%	18%
Student class profile	1.8	2%	3%	6%
†Scale: (6) most important to (1) least important.				

Statistically, men consider career aspects as more important than women do. Women, on the other hand, consider the specific aspects of the program more important in their decision compared with men—specific aspects of the program are ranked second highest among women.

Ranking of Key Aspects in Choosing a Graduate Business School, (Mean Score†), by Gender		
Key Aspect	**Male (*n* = 662)**	**Female (*n* = 331)**
Quality/reputation of the graduate business school	5.0	4.8
Career aspects*	**3.9**	**3.6**
Financial aspects	3.6	3.6
Curriculum aspects	3.5	3.6
Specific aspects of the program*	**3.3**	**3.7**
Student class profile	1.9	1.8
†Scale: (6) most important to (1) least important. * $p \leq .05$, Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.		

Respondents age 33 and older rank career aspects significantly lower compared to younger respondents. However, respondents age 33 and older rank financial aspects significantly higher compared with respondents age 25 to 28 and specific aspects of the program significantly higher compared with those age 28 and younger. Additionally, respondents age 33 and older rank the student class profile significantly lower compared with respondents age 29 to 32.

Ranking of Key Aspects in Choosing a Graduate Business School, (Mean Score†), by Age				
Key Aspect	**24 and Younger (*n* = 197)**	**25-28 (*n* = 361)**	**29-32 (*n* = 218)**	**33 and Older (*n* = 215)**
Quality/reputation of the graduate business school	4.9	4.9	4.9	4.8
Career aspects*	**4.0**	**4.0**	**3.8**	3.3
Financial aspects*	3.6	**3.5**	3.4	**3.9**
Curriculum aspects	3.6	3.4	3.5	3.5
Specific aspects of the program*	**3.3**	**3.3**	3.5	**3.8**
Student class profile*	1.7	2.0	**2.0**	**1.7**
†Scale: (6) most important to (1) least important. * $p \leq .05$, Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.				

Respondents from Asia rank career aspects significantly higher compared with respondents from the United States and Latin America. Additionally, respondents from Europe rank career aspects significantly higher compared with U.S. respondents.

Respondents from Africa rank financial aspects significantly higher compared with respondents from Asia, the United States, and Canada. Additionally, Asians rank financial aspects significantly higher compared with respondents from the United States.

Respondents from the United States rank the specific aspects of the program significantly higher compared with all other respondents, except for Canadians. Additionally, Canadians rank the specific aspects of the program significantly higher compared with respondents from Asia.

Ranking of Key Aspects in Choosing a Graduate Business School, (Mean Score†), by Country of Citizenship

Key Aspect	Asia (*n* = 369)	Africa (*n* = 108)	United States (*n* = 288)	Canada (*n* = 37)	Latin America (*n* = 47)	Europe (*n* = 124)
Quality/reputation of the graduate business school	5.0	4.8	4.8	4.6	4.9	5.0
Career aspects*	**4.1**	3.8	**3.4**	3.8	**3.3**	**3.9**
Financial aspects*	**3.7**	**4.3**	**3.2**	**3.0**	3.6	3.5
Curriculum aspects*	3.4	3.4	3.6	3.9	3.9	3.4
Specific aspects of the program*	**3.0**	**3.2**	**4.1**	**4.1**	**3.1**	**3.4**
Student class profile	1.9	1.7	1.9	1.7	2.1	1.7

†Scale: (6) most important to (1) least important.
* $p \leq .05$, Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.

Asian Americans rank career aspects significantly higher compared with African Americans and whites, but African Americans rank financial aspects significantly higher compared with Asian Americans and whites.

Ranking of Key Aspects in Choosing a Graduate Business School, (Mean Score†), by U.S. Subgroup

Key Aspect	Asian American (*n* = 34)	African American (*n* = 42)	White (*n* = 169)	Hispanic (*n* = 18)
Quality/reputation of the graduate business school	5.1	4.9	4.7	5.1
Career aspects*	**4.1**	**3.1**	**3.4**	3.2
Financial aspects*	**2.7**	**4.0**	**3.1**	2.7
Curriculum aspects	3.2	3.3	3.8	3.8
Specific aspects of the program*	3.6	3.7	4.2	4.1
Student class profile	2.2	2.0	1.8	2.2

†Scale: (6) most important to (1) least important.
* $p \leq .05$, Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.

Respondents enrolled in a full-time program rate the quality and reputation of the school significantly higher compared with respondents enrolled in a part-time program. Additionally, respondents enrolled in a full-time program rate career aspects significantly higher compared with respondents enrolled in part-time or executive programs. In contrast, respondents enrolled in a full-time program rate the specific aspects of the program significantly lower than respondents enrolled in part-time or executive programs.

Ranking of Key Aspects in Choosing a Graduate Business School, (Mean Score†), by Type of Program Enrolled			
Key Aspect	Full-Time (*n* = 193)	Part-Time (*n* = 75)	Executive (*n* = 26)
Quality/reputation of the graduate business school*	**5.1**	**4.6**	5.0
Career aspects*	**4.0**	3.3	3.2
Financial aspects	3.3	3.3	2.8
Curriculum aspects	3.3	3.7	3.8
Specific aspects of the program*	**3.4**	4.3	4.3
Student class profile	2.1	1.8	1.8
†Scale: (6) most important to (1) least important. * p ≤ .05, Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.			

Specific Components of Key Aspects

For each of the top three aspects selected in the previous section, respondents were presented a list of specific components of information to rate. Respondents were asked to rate each component from extremely important (7) to not at all important (1).

Quality and Reputation of Graduate Business School

Overall, 86% of respondents ranked the quality and reputation of the graduate business school among the top three aspects used when choosing a graduate business school to attend. The top three components of quality and reputation deemed important by the respondents are the quality of the faculty, job placement reputation of the school, and accreditation.

Key Components of Quality/Reputation of Graduate Business School	
Key Components	Mean† (*n* = 828)
Quality of the faculty	6.3
Job placement reputation of the school	6.0
Accreditation of program	6.0
Local respect/reputation	5.9
Published ranking of the graduate management program	5.8
Successful alumni	5.8
Quality of current students	5.8
Rigor of academic program	5.8
Selectivity of admissions	5.6
†Scale: (7) extremely important to (1) not at all important.	

Women rate the following components of quality and reputation significantly higher compared with men: accreditation; local respect/reputation; quality of the current students; rigor of the academic program; and selectivity of admissions.

Key Components of Quality/Reputation of Graduate Business School (Mean Score†), by Gender		
Key Components	**Male (*n* = 559)**	**Female (*n* = 269)**
Quality of the faculty	6.3	6.4
Job placement reputation of the school	6.0	6.1
Accreditation of program*	**5.8**	**6.4**
Local respect/reputation*	**5.8**	**6.3**
Published ranking of the graduate management program	5.8	5.8
Successful alumni	5.7	5.9
Quality of current students*	**5.7**	**5.9**
Rigor of academic program*	**5.8**	**6.0**
Selectivity of admissions*	**5.5**	**5.7**
†Scale: (7) extremely important to (1) not at all important. * p ≤ .05, Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.		

Respondents age 33 and older rank the importance of job placement reputation and quality of the current students significantly lower than younger respondents. Published rankings are ranked as more important among respondents age 24 and younger compared with respondents age 33 and older. Respondents age 25 to 28 rank successful alumni and the selectivity of the program significantly higher compared with respondents age 33 and older.

Key Components of Quality/Reputation of Graduate Business School (Mean Score†), by Age				
Key Components	**24 and Younger (*n* = 162)**	**25-28 (*n* = 299)**	**29-32 (*n* = 185)**	**33 and Older (*n* = 180)**
Quality of the faculty	6.4	6.3	6.3	6.4
Job placement reputation of the school*	6.2	6.2	6.1	**5.6**
Accreditation of program	6.2	6.0	5.9	6.1
Local respect/reputation	6.0	5.9	5.9	6.0
Published ranking of the graduate management program*	**6.0**	5.8	5.8	**5.6**
Successful alumni*	5.7	**5.9**	5.7	**5.5**
Quality of current students*	5.9	5.8	6.0	**5.5**
Rigor of academic program	5.9	5.9	5.8	5.7
Selectivity of admissions*	5.7	**5.7**	5.6	**5.3**
†Scale: (7) extremely important to (1) not at all important. * p ≤ .05, Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.				

Respondents from Asia rate job placement reputation and selectivity of admissions significantly higher than respondents from the United States. U.S. and African respondents rate the local respect and reputation significantly higher compared with Asian respondents. Published ranking is rated higher among respondents from Asia and Africa compared with respondents from the United States.

Key Components of Quality/Reputation of Graduate Business School (Mean Score†), by Country of Citizenship						
Key Components	Asia (*n* = 322)	Africa (*n* = 82)	United States (*n* = 236)	Canada (*n* = 29)	Latin America (*n* = 41)	Europe (*n* = 102)
Quality of the faculty	6.3	6.5	6.3	6.2	6.4	6.5
Job placement reputation of the school*	**6.2**	6.2	**5.7**	6.1	6.0	6.0
Accreditation of program	5.9	6.4	6.0	5.9	6.0	5.9
Local respect/reputation*	**5.8**	**6.2**	**6.1**	6.2	6.1	6.0
Published ranking of the graduate management program*	**5.9**	**6.2**	**5.5**	5.6	5.8	5.8
Successful alumni	5.8	5.8	5.8	5.7	5.5	5.8
Quality of current students	5.8	5.9	5.7	5.6	5.7	6.0
Rigor of academic program	5.8	6.1	5.8	5.6	5.7	5.9
Selectivity of admissions*	**5.7**	5.7	**5.4**	5.5	5.3	5.7

†Scale: (7) extremely important to (1) not at all important.

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

The only significant difference among U.S. subgroups is the rating of the quality of the faculty.

Key Components of Quality/Reputation of Graduate Business School, (Mean Score†), by U.S. Subgroup				
Key Components	Asian American (*n* = 31)	African American (*n* = 36)	White (*n* = 133)	Hispanic (*n* = 17)
Quality of the faculty*	6.0	6.6	6.2	6.4
Job placement reputation of the school	6.2	5.9	5.6	5.6
Accreditation of program	5.8	6.5	5.9	5.8
Local respect/reputation	6.0	6.4	5.9	6.3
Published ranking of the graduate management program	5.8	5.8	5.3	5.2
Successful alumni	5.8	6.0	5.6	5.8
Quality of current students	5.9	5.6	5.7	5.8
Rigor of academic program	5.7	6.1	5.7	5.8
Selectivity of admissions	5.3	5.6	5.3	5.5

†Scale: (7) extremely important to (1) not at all important.

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

Respondents enrolled in a full-time program rate the job placement reputation of the school significantly higher compared with respondents enrolled in executive programs.

Key Components of Quality/Reputation of Graduate Business School, (Mean Score†), by Type of Program Enrolled			
Key Components	Full-Time (*n* = 164)	Part-Time (*n* = 61)	Executive (*n* = 24)
Quality of the faculty	6.2	6.5	6.4
Job placement reputation of the school*	**6.2**	5.8	**5.2**
Accreditation of program	5.6	6.1	6.0
Local respect/reputation	6.1	6.4	6.0
Published ranking of the graduate management program	5.9	5.5	5.7
Successful alumni	6.0	5.9	5.7

Key Components of Quality/Reputation of Graduate Business School, (Mean Score†), by Type of Program Enrolled			
Key Components	Full-Time (*n* = 164)	Part-Time (*n* = 61)	Executive (*n* = 24)
Quality of current students	6.1	5.9	5.9
Rigor of academic program	5.8	5.9	5.8
Selectivity of admissions	5.7	5.3	5.8
†Scale: (7) extremely important to (1) not at all important.			
* p ≤ .05, Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.			

Career Aspects

Overall, 58% of respondents ranked career aspects among the three most important aspects used when choosing a graduate business school to attend. The top three career aspects rated as important among respondents are the quality of career services, the percent of the graduating class receiving job offers, and the starting annual base salary and other compensation of graduates.

Key Components of Career Aspects	
Key Components	Mean† (*n* = 571)
Quality career services	6.2
Percent of graduating class receiving job offers	6.1
Starting annual base salary and other compensation of graduates	6.1
Post-MBA industry and/or job function of alumni	5.8
Types of organizations, post-MBA (business, technical, medical)	5.7
Access to alumni network	5.5
Percent of graduating class seeking employment	5.5
Geographic locations of post-MBA jobs	5.2
†Scale: (7) extremely important to (1) not at all important.	

Women rate the quality of career services and the percentage of the graduating class seeking employment as more important compared with men.

Key Components of Career Aspects (Mean Score†), by Gender		
Key Components	Male (*n* = 408)	Female (*n* = 163)
Quality career services*	**6.1**	**6.3**
Percent of graduating class receiving job offers	6.1	6.2
Starting annual base salary and other compensation of graduates	6.1	6.1
Post-MBA industry and/or job function of alumni	5.8	5.8
Types of organizations, post-MBA (business, technical, medical)	5.6	5.7
Access to alumni network	5.6	5.5
Percent of graduating class seeking employment*	**5.4**	**5.8**
Geographic locations of post-MBA jobs	5.1	5.3
†Scale: (7) extremely important to (1) not at all important.		
* p ≤ .05, Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.		

Respondents age 25 to 28 consider access to the alumni network as more important compared with respondents age 24 and younger. There are no other statistically significantly differences by age for key components of career aspects.

Key Components of Career Aspects(Mean Score†), by Age				
Key Components	**24 and Younger (*n* = 129)**	**25-28 (*n* = 224)**	**29-32 (*n* = 126)**	**33 and Older (*n* = 90)**
Quality career services	6.1	6.2	6.1	6.2
Percent of graduating class receiving job offers	6.2	6.2	6.1	6.0
Starting annual base salary and other compensation of graduates	6.1	6.1	6.1	6.0
Post-MBA industry and/or job function of alumni	5.6	5.9	5.7	5.9
Types of organizations, post-MBA (business, technical, medical)	5.7	5.8	5.5	5.6
Access to alumni network*	**5.2**	**5.7**	5.6	5.5
Percent of graduating class seeking employment	5.7	5.5	5.5	5.2
Geographic locations of post-MBA jobs	5.0	5.3	5.1	5.3
†Scale: (7) extremely important to (1) not at all important.				
* p ≤ .05, Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.				

Asian respondents compared with respondents from Europe and the United States consider the types of organizations intended for post-MBA careers and the percentage of the graduating class seeking employment as more important. Respondents from the United States rate the geographic location of post-MBA jobs as more important compared with European respondents.

Key Components of Career (Mean Score†), by Country of Citizenship						
Key Components	**Asia (*n* = 246)**	**Africa (*n* = 62)**	**United States (*n* = 132)**	**Canada (*n* = 21)**	**Latin America (*n* = 19)**	**Europe (*n* = 78)**
Quality career services	6.3	6.2	6.1	6.3	6.0	5.9
Percent of graduating class receiving job offers*	6.3	6.1	6.0	6.7	6.3	5.8
Starting annual base salary and other compensation of graduates	6.2	6.0	6.0	6.4	5.9	5.9
Post-MBA industry and/or job function of alumni*	5.9	5.9	5.6	6.1	5.2	5.6
Types of organizations, post-MBA (business, technical, medical)*	**5.9**	5.8	**5.3**	5.9	5.4	**5.4**
Access to alumni network	5.6	5.3	5.7	5.6	5.7	5.5
Percent of graduating class seeking employment*	**5.7**	5.7	**5.2**	5.5	5.6	**5.0**
Geographic locations of post-MBA jobs*	5.2	4.9	**5.5**	5.9	5.1	**4.7**
†Scale: (7) extremely important to (1) not at all important						
* p ≤ .05, Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.						

The only significant difference among the key components of career aspects by U.S. subgroup is that African American respondents rate the percentage of graduates seeking employment as more important compared with white respondents.

Key Components of Career Aspects (Mean Score†), by U.S. Subgroup				
Key Components	**Asian American (*n* = 24)**	**African American (*n* = 14)**	**White (*n* = 76)**	**Hispanic (*n* = 7)**
Quality career services	6.2	6.4	6.1	6.1
Percent of graduating class receiving job offers	6.1	6.6	6.0	5.1
Starting annual base salary and other compensation of graduates	6.0	6.8	5.9	6.3
Post-MBA industry and/or job function of alumni	5.8	6.2	5.4	6.0
Types of organizations, post-MBA (business, technical, medical)	5.6	5.8	5.1	5.1
Access to alumni network	6.0	5.6	5.5	6.1
Percent of graduating class seeking employment*	5.7	**6.4**	**4.9**	4.9
Geographic locations of post-MBA jobs	5.4	6.2	5.3	5.4
†Scale: (7) extremely important to (1) not at all important.				
* $p \leq .05$, Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.				

There are no statistically significant differences in the ratings for the key components of career aspects by program type enrolled.

Financial Aspects

Overall, 53% of respondents ranked financial aspects among the three most important aspects used when choosing a graduate business school to attend. The top financial aspects rated as important among respondents are the total tuition and required fees, the availability of scholarships, the availability of research, teaching or other assistantships, and housing and other out-of-pocket living costs.

Key Components of Financial Aspects	
Key Components	**Mean† (*n* = 504)**
Total tuition and required fees for full length of program	6.3
Availability of scholarships	5.9
Availability of research, teaching, or other assistantships	5.1
Housing and other out-of-pocket living costs	5.1
Opportunity costs of lost wages and other compensation	4.9
Application fees of school	4.8
Availability of loans for non-native students	4.5
Availability of loans for domestic students	3.8
†Scale: (7) extremely important to (1) not at all important	

Women rate the following components of the financial aspects as more important compared with men: total tuition and required fees, the availability of scholarships, application fees of schools, and the availability of loans for domestic students. Men rate the following component higher than women do: housing and other out-of-pocket living costs and the availability of loans for non-native students.

Key Components of Financial Aspects (Mean Score†), by Gender		
Key Components	**Male (*n* = 341)**	**Female (*n* = 163)**
Total tuition and required fees for full length of program*	**6.2**	**6.5**
Availability of scholarships*	**5.7**	**6.1**
Availability of research, teaching, or other assistantships	5.2	5.1
Housing and other out-of-pocket living costs*	**5.4**	**4.6**
Opportunity costs of lost wages and other compensation	4.9	5.0
Application fees of school*	**4.6**	**5.0**
Availability of loans for non-native students*	**4.8**	**3.9**
Availability of loans for domestic students*	**3.5**	**4.4**

†Scale: (7) extremely important to (1) not at all important.
* $p \leq .05$, Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.

The availability of scholarships is significantly less important to respondents age 33 and older compared with younger respondents. Respondents age 33 and older are also less concerned than respondents age 28 and younger about the availability of loans for non-native students and the cost of housing and other out-of-pocket living expenses. Additionally, respondents age 33 and older place less importance than respondents age 24 and younger on the availability of research, teaching, or other assistantships.

Key Components of Financial Aspects (Mean Score†), by Age				
Key Components	**24 and Younger (*n* = 99)**	**25-28 (*n* = 181)**	**29-32 (*n* = 99)**	**33 and Older (*n* = 124)**
Total tuition and required fees for full length of program	6.5	6.3	6.2	6.4
Availability of scholarships*	6.0	6.0	6.0	**5.4**
Availability of research, teaching, or other assistantships*	**5.5**	5.2	5.1	**4.8**
Housing and other out-of-pocket living costs*	**5.5**	**5.4**	5.1	**4.5**
Opportunity costs of lost wages and other compensation	4.7	5.1	5.1	4.8
Application fees of school	4.6	4.9	4.9	4.6
Availability of loans for non-native students*	**5.2**	**4.7**	4.5	**3.8**
Availability of loans for domestic students	3.4	3.9	3.8	4.0

†Scale: (7) extremely important to (1) not at all important.
* $p \leq .05$, Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.

Asian and African respondents place more importance than respondents from the United States and Europe on the availability of research, teaching, or other assistantships. Respondents from the United States rate housing and other out-of-pocket living costs significantly lower compared with all other respondents. Asian respondents consider opportunity costs more important compared with respondents from Africa. Respondents from the United States and Canada,

compared with all other respondents, rate the availability of loans for non-native students significantly lower. However, respondents from the United States rate the availability of loans for domestic students significantly higher compared with all other respondents.

Key Components of Financial Aspects (Mean Score†), by Country of Citizenship						
Key Components	Asia (*n* = 204)	Africa (*n* = 72)	United States (*n* = 120)	Canada (*n* = 14)	Latin America (*n* = 27)	Europe (*n* = 54)
Total tuition and required fees for full length of program	6.3	6.4	6.4	6.5	6.4	6.1
Availability of scholarships*	6.0	6.0	5.5	5.3	6.1	5.9
Availability of research, teaching, or other assistantships*	**5.6**	**5.8**	**4.0**	4.9	5.0	**4.8**
Housing and other out-of-pocket living costs*	5.6	5.6	**3.9**	5.0	5.2	5.3
Opportunity costs of lost wages and other compensation*	**5.2**	**4.4**	4.9	5.2	5.2	4.8
Application fees of school	4.6	4.9	4.6	5.3	5.4	4.9
Availability of loans for non-native students*	5.4	5.6	**2.0**	**3.4**	6.1	5.0
Availability of loans for domestic students*	3.3	3.6	**5.3**	4.9	2.7	2.7

†Scale: (7) extremely important to (1) not at all important.
* $p \leq .05$, Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.

Statistically, African Americans consider the availability of scholarships as more important compared with whites. Asian Americans consider the availability of loans for non-native students as more important compared with African Americans and whites.

Key Components of Financial Aspects (Mean Score†), by U.S. Subgroup				
Key Components	Asian American (*n* = 10)	African American (*n* = 28)	White (*n* = 63)	Hispanic (*n* = 5)
Total tuition and required fees for full length of program	6.0	6.8	6.3	6.2
Availability of scholarships*	6.2	**6.3**	**5.0**	5.2
Availability of research, teaching, or other assistantships	4.7	4.6	3.7	3.8
Housing and other out-of-pocket living costs	5.3	3.2	3.6	4.2
Opportunity costs of lost wages and other compensation	5.7	4.9	4.6	4.8
Application fees of school	5.2	5.3	4.2	5.0
Availability of loans for non-native students*	**3.5**	**1.8**	**1.6**	3.4
Availability of loans for domestic students*	6.3	5.9	4.8	5.4

†Scale: (7) extremely important to (1) not at all important.
* $p \leq .05$, Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.

The availability of scholarships; the availability of research, teaching or other assistantships; housing and other out-of-pocket living costs; and the availability of loans for non-native students are considered more important to respondents enrolled in full-time programs compared with respondents enrolled in part-time programs.

Key Components of Financial Aspects(Mean Score†), by Type of Program Enrolled			
Key Components	Full-Time (*n* = 86)	Part-Time (*n* = 29)	Executive (*n* = 8)
Total tuition and required fees for full length of program	6.3	6.3	6.1
Availability of scholarships*	**5.6**	**4.1**	4.4
Availability of research, teaching, or other assistantships*	**5.0**	**3.0**	4.6
Housing and other out-of-pocket living costs*	**5.3**	**3.2**	3.8
Opportunity costs of lost wages and other compensation	4.7	4.7	5.1
Application fees of school	4.2	4.4	4.1
Availability of loans for non-native students*	**4.0**	**2.1**	2.9
Availability of loans for domestic students	3.7	4.2	4.4
†Scale: (7) extremely important to (1) not at all important.			
* $p \leq .05$, Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.			

Curriculum Aspects

Overall, 48% of respondents ranked curriculum among the top three aspects used when choosing a graduate business school to attend. The top three curriculum components rated as important among respondents are the specific curriculum offered, the primary method of instruction, and the language of instruction.

Key Components of Curriculum	
Key Components	Mean† (*n* = 468)
Specific curriculum offered	6.2
Primary method of instruction (e.g. case methods)	5.7
Language of instruction	5.2
Availability of overseas academic study tours	4.4
Availability of an international exchange program	4.2
Availability of a domestic exchange program	3.6
†Scale: (7) extremely important to (1) not at all important.	

Respondents age 28 and younger rate the availability of overseas academic study tours and the availability of an international exchange program higher compared with respondents age 33 and older. Younger respondents also consider the availability of a domestic exchange program significantly higher compared with older respondents.

Key Components of Curriculum (Mean Score†), by Age				
Key Components	24 and Younger (*n* = 101)	25-28 (*n* = 165)	29-32 (*n* = 99)	33 and Older (*n* = 102)
Specific curriculum offered	6.1	6.2	6.1	6.2
Primary method of instruction (e.g. case methods)	5.7	5.8	5.9	5.7
Language of instruction	5.5	5.2	5.0	5.1
Availability of overseas academic study tours*	**4.8**	**4.5**	4.3	**3.8**
Availability of an international exchange program*	**4.6**	**4.4**	4.1	**3.6**
Availability of a domestic exchange program*	4.0	3.6	3.4	3.3
†Scale: (7) extremely important to (1) not at all important.				
* $p \leq .05$, Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.				

Respondents from Asia and Africa rate the primary method of instruction as significantly more important compared with respondents from Europe and the United States. Additionally, compared with respondents from the United States, respondents from Asia and Africa rate the language of instruction as more important. Respondents in Asia, Africa, and Latin America rate the availability of overseas academic study tours and the availability of an international exchange program significantly higher compared with respondents from the United States and Europe. Furthermore, respondents from the United States rate the importance of the availability of a domestic exchange program lower compared with respondents from Asia, Africa and Europe.

Key Components of Curriculum (Mean Score†), by Country of Citizenship

Key Components	Asia (*n* = 160)	Africa (*n* = 43)	United States (*n* = 149)	Canada (*n* = 21)	Latin America (*n* = 27)	Europe (*n* = 57)
Specific curriculum offered	6.2	6.4	6.2	6.0	6.3	5.9
Primary method of instruction (e.g. case methods)*	**6.2**	**6.2**	**5.3**	5.9	5.7	**5.4**
Language of instruction*	**5.6**	**5.7**	**4.7**	5.8	4.6	5.1
Availability of overseas academic study tours*	**4.9**	**5.2**	**3.4**	4.2	**5.3**	**4.6**
Availability of an international exchange program*	**4.6**	**4.9**	**3.1**	4.0	**5.3**	**4.9**
Availability of a domestic exchange program*	**3.9**	**4.2**	**2.8**	4.0	3.9	**3.9**

†Scale: (7) extremely important to (1) not at all important.

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

Asian American rate the availability of a domestic exchange program of higher importance than Hispanics do.

Key Components of Curriculum (Mean Score†), by U.S. Subgroup

Key Components	Asian American (*n* = 17)	African American (*n* = 18)	White (*n* = 94)	Hispanic (*n* = 10)
Specific curriculum offered	6.4	6.4	6.2	6.3
Primary method of instruction (e.g. case methods)	5.4	5.7	5.1	6.0
Language of instruction	4.5	3.6	4.9	4.3
Availability of overseas academic study tours	4.4	2.8	3.4	3.0
Availability of an international exchange program	4.1	2.7	3.0	2.0
Availability of a domestic exchange program*	**3.9**	2.6	2.6	**1.6**

†Scale: (7) extremely important to (1) not at all important.

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

Respondents enrolled in full-time programs rate the availability of overseas academic study tours as more important compared with respondents enrolled in part-time programs. Additionally, respondents enrolled in full-time programs consider the availability of an international exchange program as more important compared with other respondents.

Key Components of Curriculum (Mean Score†), by Type of Program Enrolled			
Key Components	Full-Time (*n* = 84)	Part-Time (*n* = 41)	Executive (*n* = 16)
Specific curriculum offered	6.1	6.0	6.0
Primary method of instruction (e.g. case methods)	5.8	5.2	5.5
Language of instruction	5.3	5.3	4.4
Availability of overseas academic study tours*	**4.3**	**3.1**	3.7
Availability of an international exchange program*	**4.1**	2.8	2.3
Availability of a domestic exchange program	3.3	2.6	2.6
†Scale: (7) extremely important to (1) not at all important. * p ≤ .05, Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.			

There is no statistical differences in the ratings of importance for key components of the curriculum by gender.

Specific Aspects about the Program

Overall, 46% of the respondents ranked specific aspects of the program among the top three aspects used when choosing a graduate business school to attend. The three specific aspects of the program rated as most important among respondents are the program type offered, the quality of services, and the program completion time.

Key Components of Specific Aspects about the Program	
Key Components	Mean† (*n* = 449)
Program type offered (full-time, part-time, executive)	6.3
Quality of services	5.9
Program completion time (total length of program)	5.8
Course type offered (on-campus, off-campus, online/distance learning)	5.6
Convenient class schedules	5.5
Quality of facilities (classroom, computer labs, etc.)	5.5
Proximity to work or home	4.9
Average size of classes	4.6
Size of the incoming MBA class	4.3
Attractiveness of campus	4.1
†Scale: (7) extremely important to (1) not at all important.	

Women tend to rate the quality of services, convenient class schedules, and proximity to work or home as more important compared with men.

Key Components of Specific Aspects about the Program (Mean Score†), by Gender		
Key Components	Male (*n* = 268)	Female (*n* = 181)
Program type offered (full-time, part-time, executive)	6.2	6.4
Quality of services*	**5.8**	**6.1**
Program completion time (total length of program)	5.8	6.0
Course type offered (on-campus, off-campus,	5.6	5.7

Key Components of Specific Aspects about the Program (Mean Score†), by Gender		
Key Components	**Male (*n* = 268)**	**Female (*n* = 181)**
online/distance learning		
Convenient class schedules*	**5.3**	**5.9**
Quality of facilities (classroom, computer labs, etc.)	5.4	5.5
Proximity to work or home*	**4.6**	**5.3**
Average size of classes	4.5	4.8
Size of the incoming MBA class	4.3	4.2
Attractiveness of campus	4.2	4.1
†Scale: (7) extremely important to (1) not at all important. * $p \leq .05$, Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.		

Respondents age 33 and older rate the course type offered and the proximity to work or home higher compared with respondents age 25 to 28. Additionally, respondents age 33 and older rate convenient class schedule and the size of the incoming class higher compared with respondents age 29 to 32.

Key Components of Specific Aspects about the Program (Mean Score†), by Age				
Key Components	**24 and Younger (*n* = 77)**	**25-28 (*n* = 138)**	**29-32 (*n* = 106)**	**33 and Older (*n* = 128)**
Program type offered (full-time, part-time, executive)	6.2	6.2	6.2	6.4
Quality of services	6.0	5.9	6.0	5.9
Program completion time (total length of program)	5.9	5.7	5.8	6.0
Course type offered (on-campus, off-campus, online/distance learning)*	5.5	**5.4**	5.6	**6.0**
Convenient class schedules*	5.5	5.4	**5.2**	**5.9**
Quality of facilities (classroom, computer labs, etc.)	5.6	5.5	5.5	5.4
Proximity to work or home*	4.6	**4.5**	4.9	**5.3**
Average size of classes	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.3
Size of the incoming MBA class*	4.3	4.4	**4.6**	**3.9**
Attractiveness of campus	4.4	4.2	4.2	3.9
†Scale: (7) extremely important to (1) not at all important. * $p \leq .05$, Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.				

Respondents from Africa consider the quality of services more important compared with respondents from Asia, the United States, and Canada. Additionally, respondents from Africa consider program completion time more important compared with respondents from the United States. However, convenient class schedule is of more importance to respondents from the United States compared with respondents from Asia and Europe. The quality of the facilities is more important to respondents from Africa compared with respondents from the United States and Europe. Respondents from the United States consider the proximity to work or home as more important compared with respondents from Asia, Latin America, and Europe. Asian and African respondents consider the size of the incoming class as more important compared with respondents from the United States.

Key Components of Specific Aspects about the Program (Mean Score†), by Country of Citizenship						
Key Components	Asia (*n* = 117)	Africa (*n* = 39)	United States (*n* = 191)	Canada (*n* = 22)	Latin America (*n* = 17)	Europe (*n* = 58)
Program type offered (full-time, part-time, executive)	6.2	6.5	6.3	6.6	6.6	6.0
Quality of services*	**5.9**	**6.5**	**5.9**	**5.5**	6.0	5.9
Program completion time (total length of program)*	5.9	**6.3**	**5.6**	6.2	6.4	5.9
Course type offered (on-campus, off-campus, online/distance learning)	5.7	6.2	5.5	5.6	5.5	5.4
Convenient class schedules*	**5.1**	5.8	**5.9**	5.9	5.0	**5.1**
Quality of facilities (classroom, computer labs, etc.)*	5.6	**6.2**	**5.4**	5.4	5.4	**5.0**
Proximity to work or home*	**4.4**	5.2	**5.4**	5.2	**3.4**	**4.1**
Average size of classes	4.5	4.8	4.6	5.1	5.1	4.4
Size of the incoming MBA class*	**4.6**	**4.9**	**3.8**	4.3	4.3	4.4
Attractiveness of campus	4.6	4.9	3.8	3.6	4.1	4.0

†Scale: (7) extremely important to (1) not at all important.

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

Respondents enrolled in part-time programs rate the program type offered and proximity to work or home as more important compared with respondents enrolled in full-time programs. Convenient class schedule is more important to respondents enrolled in part-time and executive programs compared with respondents enrolled in full-time programs. Respondents enrolled in full-time programs, meanwhile, find the attractiveness of the campus more important compared with respondents enrolled in executive programs.

Key Components of Specific Aspects about the Program, (Mean Score†), by Type of Program Enrolled			
Key Components	Full-Time (*n* = 81)	Part-Time (*n* = 54)	Executive (*n* = 19)
Program type offered (full-time, part-time, executive)*	**5.9**	**6.5**	6.6
Quality of services	5.8	5.8	5.2
Program completion time (total length of program)	5.7	5.8	6.1
Course type offered (on-campus, off-campus, online/distance learning)	5.0	5.6	5.4
Convenient class schedules*	**4.8**	**6.4**	**6.1**
Quality of facilities (classroom, computer labs, etc.)	5.4	5.6	4.8
Proximity to work or home*	**4.2**	**5.9**	4.9
Average size of classes	4.7	4.7	4.4
Size of the incoming MBA class	4.5	3.9	4.2
Attractiveness of campus*	**4.6**	4.1	**3.5**

†Scale: (7) extremely important to (1) not at all important.

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

Statistically, there are no differences in the ratings of importance for specific aspects of the program by U.S. subgroup.

Student Class Profile

Overall, 11% of respondents ranked the student class profile among the three most important aspects used when choosing a graduate business school to attend. The top three student class profile components ranked by respondents are average years of work experience of the students, the proportion of international students, and the average age of the students.

Key Components of Student Class Profile	
Key Components	Mean† (*n* = 97)
Average years of work experience of students	5.4
Proportion of international students	5.0
Average age of students	4.7
Proportion of women	4.1
Proportion of underrepresented minority students	4.0
†Scale: (7) extremely important to (1) not at all important.	

The proportion of international students is more important to men than to women, but the proportion of women is more important to women than to men.

Key Components of Student Class Profile (Mean Score†), by Gender		
Key Components	Male (*n* = 68)	Female (*n* = 29)
Average years of work experience of students	5.6	5.0
Proportion of international students*	**5.3**	**4.4**
Average age of students	4.6	4.9
Proportion of women*	**3.7**	**5.1**
Proportion of underrepresented minority students	3.8	4.4
†Scale: (7) extremely important to (1) not at all important. * p ≤ .05, Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.		

The proportion of underrepresented minority students is significantly more important among African American respondents compared with whites.

Key Components of Student Class Profile (Mean Score†), by U.S. Subgroup				
Key Components	Asian American (*n* = 4)	African American (*n* = 5)	White (*n* = 14)	Hispanic (*n* = 2)
Average years of work experience of students	5.3	5.0	4.9	3.5
Proportion of international students	5.0	5.0	3.2	3.0
Average age of students	5.0	4.6	4.8	3.0
Proportion of women	4.3	6.4	4.5	3.0
Proportion of underrepresented minority students*	4.3	**6.8**	**3.2**	3.5
†Scale: (7) extremely important to (1) not at all important. * p ≤ .05, Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.				

Statistically, there are no differences in the ratings of importance for student class profile by age. Statistical tests cannot be performed for world region and program type enrolled due to small sample sizes.

Standardized Rating of the Specific Components of Information

This section of the report combines the two previous sections to create a standardized rating for each component of information in order to compare information across the different categories used in choosing graduate business schools. The following procedures were used to calculate the standardized score of each component of information for each respondent:

1. The highest ranked aspect of information is given a score of three, the next highest rank is given a score of two, and the third highest rank is given a score of one;
2. The rating of each component of information is recoded where (6) is extremely important and (0) is not at all important;
3. For each respondent, the rank score (from step 1) is multiplied by the recoded rating (from step 2) to generate a respondent-level standardized score for each component of information;
4. The respondent-level score is multiplied by the corresponding percentage of respondents similarly ranking each category, which weighs the components of information by the number of respondents, thus standardizing the components across respondents;
5. For example, if a respondent ranked the quality/reputation as number one and rated the quality of the faculty as six, then the calculation would be 3 multiplied by 6 equaling 18. The product of the calculation is multiplied by the percent of respondents ranking the category the same as the respondent—in this case 35%. The standardized score for this hypothetical respondent is 18 multiplied by 0.35 equaling 6.30; and
6. Finally, means are computed for all standardized ratings.

The following analysis presents the top ten specific components of information used in choosing graduate business schools. Appendix A contains the full list of the standardized ratings for the specific components of information. The top three items that are important to prospective students when choosing a school to attend are the quality of the faculty, the job placement reputation of the school, and the accreditation status of the program.

Top Ten Standardized Ratings of Specific Components of Key Aspects		
	Statistic	
Specific Component	Rank	Standardized Score
Quality of the faculty	1	4.67
Job placement reputation of the school	2	4.45
Accreditation of program	3	4.37
Local respect/reputation	4	4.33
Quality of current students	5	4.28

Top Ten Standardized Ratings of Specific Components of Key Aspects		
	Statistic	
Specific Component	Rank	Standardized Score
Rigor of academic program	6	4.25
Published ranking of the graduate management program	7	4.26
Successful alumni	8	4.21
Selectivity of admissions	9	4.04
Quality career services	10	1.90

Among men, the top three components used in the decision to choose a graduate business school are the quality of the faculty, job placement reputation, and published rankings. For women, the top three are the quality of the faculty, accreditation status, and local respect and recognition.

Top Standardized Rating of Specific Components of Key Aspects, by Gender			
	Overall	Standardized Score (Rank)	
Specific Component	Rank	Male	Female
Quality of the faculty	1	4.74 (1)	4.54 (1)
Job placement reputation of the school	2	4.51 (2)	4.31 (4)
Accreditation of program	3	4.31 (4)	4.50 (2)
Local respect/reputation	4	4.29 (5)	4.41 (3)
Quality of current students	5	4.29 (6)	4.27 (5)
Published ranking of the graduate management program	6	4.35 (3)	4.08 (8)
Rigor of academic program	7	4.28 (7)	4.20 (6)
Successful alumni	8	4.26 (8)	4.11 (7)
Selectivity of admissions	9	4.04 (9)	4.04 (9)
Quality career services	10	1.91 (12)	1.88 (10)
Percent of graduating class receiving job offers	11	1.93 (11)	1.83 (11)
Starting annual base salary and other compensation of graduates*	12	**1.93** (10)	**1.78** (12)
* $p \leq .05$, Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.			

The top three components used by respondents age 24 and younger to choose a graduate business school are the quality of the faculty, job placement reputation, and published rankings. Among respondents age 25 to 28, the top three are quality of the faculty, job placement reputation, and successful alumni. For those age 29 to 32, the top three components include the quality of the faculty, job placement reputation, and the quality of current students. Quality of the faculty, accreditation, and local respect and reputation are the top three components among respondents age 33 and older.

Top Standardized Rating of Specific Components of Key Aspects, by Age					
		Standardized Score (Rank)			
Specific Component	Overall Rank	24 and Younger	25-28	29-32	33 and Older
Quality of the faculty	1	4.75 (1)	4.76 (1)	4.75 (1)	4.35 (1)
Job placement reputation of the school*	2	4.63 (2)	**4.67** (2)	4.49 (2)	**3.84** (5)
Accreditation of program	3	4.49 (4)	4.45 (5)	4.31 (5)	4.15 (2)
Local respect/reputation	4	4.34 (6)	4.45 (4)	4.29 (7)	4.15 (3)
Quality of current students*	5	4.40 (5)	4.42 (6)	4.44 (3)	3.74 (7)
Published ranking of the graduate management program	6	4.51 (3)	4.34 (8)	4.31 (6)	3.81 (6)
Rigor of academic program	7	4.25 (8)	4.40 (7)	4.37 (4)	3.86 (4)
Successful alumni*	8	4.28 (7)	**4.45** (3)	4.22 (8)	**3.70** (8)
Selectivity of admissions*	9	4.21 (9)	**4.26** (9)	3.99 (9)	**3.53** (9)
Quality career services	10	1.94 (11)	1.97 (11)	1.83 (12)	1.80 (10)
Percent of graduating class receiving job offers	11	1.96 (10)	1.97 (10)	1.85 (10)	1.71 (12)
* $p \leq .05$, Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.					

Asian respondents consider the quality of the faculty, job placement reputation, and accreditation as most important in their decision. Similarly, respondents from Africa rank the quality of the faculty, accreditation, and job placement reputation as most important. Among U.S. and Canadian respondents, the quality of the faculty, local respect and reputation, and accreditation are the most important. Latin American respondents also consider the quality of the faculty and local respect and reputation at the top of their list followed by published rankings. Among Europeans, the quality of the faculty, the quality of the current students, and job placement reputation are the most important aspects when choosing a graduate business school.

Top Standardized Rating of Specific Components of Key Aspects, by Country of Citizenship							
		Standardized Score (Rank)					
Specific Component	Overall Rank	Asia	Africa	United States	Canada	Latin America	Europe
Quality of the faculty	1	4.75 (1)	4.85 (1)	4.48 (1)	4.29 (1)	4.25 (1)	5.07 (1)
Job placement reputation of the school	2	4.72 (2)	4.58 (3)	4.09 (6)	4.03 (4)	3.82 (5)	4.67 (3)
Accreditation of program	3	4.41 (3)	4.79 (2)	4.19 (3)	4.12 (3)	3.94 (4)	4.55 (6)
Local respect/reputation	4	4.24 (8)	4.58 (4)	4.31 (2)	4.16 (2)	4.08 (2)	4.65 (4)
Quality of current students	5	4.32 (6)	4.36 (7)	4.14 (5)	3.87 (8)	3.79 (6)	4.74 (2)
Published ranking of the graduate management program	6	4.41 (4)	4.58 (5)	3.92 (8)	3.94 (6)	3.99 (3)	4.52 (7)
Rigor of academic program	7	4.27 (7)	4.54 (6)	4.15 (4)	3.85 (9)	3.65 (7)	4.58 (5)
Successful alumni	8	4.35 (5)	4.16 (8)	4.09 (7)	3.95 (5)	3.59 (8)	4.43 (8)
Selectivity of admissions	9	4.18 (9)	4.09 (9)	3.78 (9)	3.88 (7)	3.48 (9)	4.39 (9)
Quality career services*	10	**2.02** (10)	1.75 (10)	1.91 (10)	1.90 (12)	1.83 (11)	**1.70** (10)
Percent of graduating class receiving job offers*	11	**2.01** (11)	1.73 (11)	1.86 (12)	2.07 (10)	1.95 (10)	**1.68** (12)
* $p \leq .05$, Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.							

Asian American respondents consider the job placement reputation, local respect and reputation, and the quality of the faculty as most important. Among African American respondents, the quality of the faculty, local respect and recognition, and accreditation are most important. White respondents rank quality of the faculty, local respect and reputation, and the quality of the current students as most important. Meanwhile, Hispanic respondents consider the quality of the faculty, local respect and reputation, and the rigor of the academic program as most important.

Top Standardized Rating of Specific Components of Key Aspects, by U.S. Subgroup

Specific Component	Standardized Score (Rank)				
	Overall Rank	Asian American	African American	White	Hispanic
Quality of the faculty	1	4.65 (3)	5.26 (1)	4.26 (1)	4.05 (1)
Job placement reputation of the school	2	4.81 (1)	4.92 (4)	3.81 (7)	3.34 (8)
Accreditation of program	3	4.20 (8)	5.05 (3)	4.00 (4)	3.52 (5)
Local respect/reputation	4	4.76 (2)	5.13 (2)	4.08 (2)	3.89 (2)
Quality of current students	5	4.62 (4)	4.65 (8)	4.01 (3)	3.52 (6)
Published ranking of the graduate management program	6	4.52 (5)	4.74 (7)	3.65 (8)	3.22 (9)
Rigor of academic program	7	4.32 (7)	4.90 (6)	3.96 (5)	3.63 (3)
Successful alumni	8	4.37 (6)	4.90 (5)	3.87 (6)	3.59 (4)
Selectivity of admissions	9	3.90 (9)	4.60 (9)	3.64 (9)	3.35 (7)
Quality career services	10	1.89 (10)	2.29 (13)	1.87 (10)	1.98 (13)
Starting annual base salary and other compensation of graduates*	12	1.82 (13)	**2.49** (10)	**1.81** (12)	2.05 (11)
Access to alumni network	15	1.86 (12)	1.97 (17)	1.65 (13)	2.06 (10)

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

Respondents enrolled in full-time programs cite the job placement reputation, quality of faculty, and local respect and reputation as most important. The quality of the faculty, local respect and reputation, and accreditation is considered most important among respondents enrolled in part-time and executive programs.

Top Standardized Rating of Specific Components of Key Aspects, by Type of Program Enrolled

Specific Component	Overall Rank	Standardized Score (Rank)		
		Full-Time	Part-Time	Executive
Quality of the faculty	1	4.87 (2)	4.41 (1)	4.48 (1)
Job placement reputation of the school*	2	4.88 (1)	3.93 (5)	3.6 (9)
Accreditation of program	3	4.33 (9)	4.01 (3)	4.18 (3)
Local respect/reputation	4	4.78 (3)	4.25 (2)	4.26 (2)
Quality of current students	5	4.72 (4)	4.00(4)	4.09 (4)
Published ranking of the graduate management program	6	4.57 (6)	3.74 (8)	3.88 (6)
Rigor of academic program	7	4.47 (7)	3.92 (6)	3.83 (7)
Successful alumni	8	4.68 (5)	3.90 (7)	3.83 (8)
Selectivity of admissions	9	4.35 (8)	3.51 (9)	4.06 (5)
Quality career services	10	2.01 (11)	1.76 (11)	1.88 (10)
Starting annual base salary and other compensation of graduates	12	2.02 (10)	1.84 (10)	1.86 (11)

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

Methodology

This section present the methodology behind the mba.com Registrants Survey. Sample selection and response, methods of data analysis, the demographic characteristics of the respondents are included in this section of the report.

Sample Selection and Response

Survey Sample

The survey sample for this follow-up survey includes the respondents of the 2005 mba.com Registrant Survey who had begun the application process, were planning to apply to, or were still deciding whether to apply to graduate management school when administered the survey in October 2005.

On October 4, 2006, an invitation e-mail was sent to the sample. A reminder e-mail was sent on October 18, 2006, to members of the sample who had not yet completed the survey or who had only partially completed it. The questionnaire was available at the online survey site from October 4 to November 1, 2006 As an incentive for people to participate in the survey, we offered to place them in a drawing for one of four US$500 AMEX® gift checks.

Of the 4,239 contacts that were initiated for the 2006 mba.com Registrant Follow-up Survey, 1,058 people responded—a 25% response rate.

Response Rates

Response Rate	
Sample Frame	4,239
Number of respondents	1,058
Response rate	25%

Data Analysis

Data are analyzed using SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, version 12). A preliminary analysis of the data is conducted two weeks before data collection is complete. Frequency distributions are examined for both topical questions and classification questions. Based on this examination, response categories for some questions are collapsed in order to make the final analysis more robust. In this preliminary analysis, variations to all topical questions are cross-tabulated with each classification question. This makes it possible to determine which classification questions offer the most promise in the interpretation of survey responses.

In the final analysis, most topical questions are cross-tabulated with the following classification items: type of MBA program (full-time, part-time, or executive), gender, school size (number of graduates from MBA program), age, school location, citizenship, race/ethnicity (for U.S.

citizens), and major U.S. subgroup. For topical questions scaled at nominal and ordinal levels, chi-square analysis is used to evaluate statistical significance in cross-classification tables ($p < .05$). That is, a relationship between a topical item and a classification item is considered statistically significant only when it could have been produced by chance less than 5% of the time. Whenever an interval level of measurement could be assumed, means are computed and analysis of variance is used to assess significance (also with $p < .05$). Post hoc Bonferroni tests are used in conjunction with analysis-of-variance for comparisons involving more than two subgroups (classification items or time). And exact tests are used in conjunction with chi-square analyses whenever chi-square assumptions could not be met. Statistically significant differences may or may not have managerial significance because this depends on the situation in which they are being applied.

Percentages in charts and tables may not always add exactly to 100% due to rounding.

Note on Statistical Significance

As discussed above, tests of statistical significance are used throughout the report to evaluate whether a difference in an average or a percentage is likely to have resulted purely from chance (the sampling process) or whether it indicates a real difference in the given population.

A difference that is statistically significant may or may not be managerially significant—it is open for consideration. Because the sample sizes in many comparisons are large, the reader may find that some comparisons reach statistical significance before they reach managerial significance. Occasionally in the report, a difference is referred to as "marginally" significant. This means it comes close to the 5% criterion for significance but does not quite make the cut.

The purpose of identifying some results as marginally significant is to ensure that potentially useful findings are not lost because of an overly stringent application of a statistical criterion. In addition, sometimes findings are discussed when sample sizes are small solely because of a consistency in the responses, even when differences are not statistically significant.

Statistical significance depends on two factors: sample sizes and variability of responses within the groups being compared (subgroups or time periods). Because these factors may differ in different comparisons, the same absolute difference in a value or percentage may be significant in one case, but not in another. In samples that are large, a small percentage difference may be statistically significant; in a smaller sample, even a seemingly great percentage difference may not be statistically significant.

Demographic Characteristics of the Sample

About two-thirds (66%) of the respondents are male and one-third (34%) are female.

Gender of the Respondents	
Gender	**(*n* = 1,058)**
Male	66%
Female	34%
Total	100%

A fifth (20%) of the respondents are age 24 and younger, and 36% are 25 to 28 years old. Additionally, 22% are age 29 to 32 and 22% are 33 years old and older.

Age of the Respondents	
Age	**(*n* = 1,056)**
24 and younger	20%
25 to 28	36%
29 to 32	22%
33 and older	22%
Total	100%

Nearly two-fifths (37%) of the respondents are from Asia, 31% are from the United States, and 12% each are from Europe and Africa. Additionally, 5% of the respondents are from Latin America, and 4% from Canada.

Citizenship of the Respondents	
World Region	**(*n* = 1,036)**
Asia	37%
Africa	12%
United States	31%
Canada	4%
Latin America	5%
Europe	12%
Total	100%

Among the U.S. respondents, two-thirds (66%) are white, 15% are African American, 12% are Asian American, and 7% are Hispanic.

U.S. Subgroup of the Respondents	
U.S. Subgroup	**(*n* = 290)**
Asian American	12%
African American	15%
White	66%
Hispanic	7%
Total	100%

Among the respondents that completed their undergraduate degree, 37% majored in business, 38% in science, 18% in the social sciences, and 6% in the humanities.

Undergraduate Major of the Respondents	
Major	**(*n* = 940)**
Science	38%
Business	37%
Humanities	6%
Social science	18%
Total	100%

Appendix A: Complete Lists of Standardized Ratings

Standardized Rating of Specific Components		
Specific Component	Standardized Score	Rank
Quality of the faculty	4.67	1
Job placement reputation of the school	4.45	2
Accreditation of program	4.37	3
Local respect/reputation	4.33	4
Quality of current students	4.28	5
Published ranking of the graduate management program	4.26	6
Rigor of academic program	4.25	7
Successful alumni	4.21	8
Selectivity of admissions	4.04	9
Quality career services	1.90	10
Percent of graduating class receiving job offers	1.90	11
Starting annual base salary and other compensation of graduates	1.89	12
Post-MBA industry and/or job function of alumni	1.77	13
Types of organizations, post-MBA (business, technical, medical)	1.72	14
Access to alumni network	1.68	15
Percent of graduating class seeking employment	1.66	16
Geographic locations of post-MBA jobs	1.55	17
Program type offered (full-time, part-time, executive)	1.49	18
Specific curriculum offered	1.41	19
Quality of services	1.37	20
Program completion time (total length of program)	1.37	21
Course type offered (on-campus, off-campus, online/distance learning)	1.30	22
Convenient class schedules	1.28	23
Primary method of instruction (e.g. case methods)	1.28	24
Quality of facilities (classroom, computer labs, etc.)	1.24	25
Language of instruction	1.14	26
Proximity to work or home	1.09	27
Average size of classes	1.01	28
Availability of overseas academic study tours	0.92	29
Total tuition and required fees for full length of program	0.91	30
Size of the incoming MBA class	0.90	31
Attractiveness of campus	0.87	32
Availability of an international exchange program	0.87	33
Availability of scholarships	0.83	34
Availability of research, teaching, or other assistantships	0.70	35
Housing and other out-of-pocket living costs	0.70	36
Availability of a domestic exchange program	0.70	37
Opportunity costs of lost wages and other compensation	0.67	38
Application fees of school	0.64	39
Availability of loans for non-native students	0.60	40
Availability of loans for domestic students	0.47	41

Standardized Rating of Specific Components		
Specific Component	Standardized Score	Rank
Average years of work experience of students	0.26	42
Proportion of international students	0.24	43
Average age of students	0.22	44
Proportion of women	0.19	45
Proportion of underrepresented minority students	0.18	46

Standardized Rating of Specific Components, by Gender				
Specific Component	Male		Female	
Quality of the faculty	4.74	1	4.54	1
Job placement reputation of the school	4.51	2	4.31	4
Accreditation of program	4.31	4	4.50	2
Local respect/reputation	4.29	5	4.41	3
Quality of current students	4.29	6	4.27	5
Published ranking of the graduate management program	4.35	3	4.08	8
Rigor of academic program	4.28	7	4.20	6
Successful alumni	4.26	8	4.11	7
Selectivity of admissions	4.04	9	4.04	9
Quality career services	1.91	12	1.88	10
Percent of graduating class receiving job offers	1.93	11	1.83	11
Starting annual base salary and other compensation of graduates	1.93	10	1.78	12
Post-MBA industry and/or job function of alumni	1.79	13	1.70	13
Types of organizations, post-MBA (business, technical, medical)	1.74	14	1.66	15
Access to alumni network	1.72	15	1.57	16
Percent of graduating class seeking employment	1.65	16	1.69	14
Geographic locations of post-MBA jobs	1.56	17	1.51	18
Program type offered (full-time, part-time, executive)	1.45	18	1.55	17
Specific curriculum offered	1.40	19	1.42	21
Quality of services	1.30	22	1.48	19
Program completion time (total length of program)	1.32	20	1.44	20
Course type offered (on-campus, off-campus, online/distance learning)	1.25	23	1.37	23
Convenient class schedules	1.19	25	1.42	22
Primary method of instruction (e.g. case methods)	1.30	21	1.25	25
Quality of facilities (classroom, computer labs, etc.)	1.20	24	1.30	24
Language of instruction	1.14	26	1.13	27
Proximity to work or home	1.00	27	1.23	26
Average size of classes	0.97	28	1.08	28
Availability of overseas academic study tours	0.92	29	0.90	31
Total tuition and required fees for full length of program	0.89	31	0.94	29
Size of the incoming MBA class	0.90	30	0.92	30
Attractiveness of campus	0.85	33	0.90	32
Availability of an international exchange program	0.87	32	0.86	34
Availability of scholarships	0.81	34	0.87	33

Standardized Rating of Specific Components, by Gender				
Specific Component	Male		Female	
Availability of research, teaching, or other assistantships	0.71	36	0.70	36
Housing and other out-of-pocket living costs	0.74	35	0.61	39
Availability of a domestic exchange program	0.69	37	0.70	35
Opportunity costs of lost wages and other compensation	0.67	38	0.68	38
Application fees of school	0.62	40	0.69	37
Availability of loans for non-native students	0.65	39	0.50	41
Availability of loans for domestic students	0.42	41	0.58	40
Average years of work experience of students	0.27	42	0.24	43
Proportion of international students	0.26	43	0.20	46
Average age of students	0.21	44	0.23	44
Proportion of women	0.16	46	0.25	42
Proportion of underrepresented minority students	0.17	45	0.20	45

Standardized Rating of Specific Components, by Age								
Specific Component	24 and Younger		25-28		29-32		33 and Older	
Quality of the faculty	4.75	1	4.76	1	4.75	1	4.35	1
Job placement reputation of the school	4.63	2	4.67	2	4.49	2	3.84	5
Accreditation of program	4.49	4	4.45	5	4.31	5	4.15	2
Local respect/reputation	4.34	6	4.45	4	4.29	7	4.15	3
Quality of current students	4.40	5	4.42	6	4.44	3	3.74	7
Published ranking of the graduate management program	4.51	3	4.34	8	4.31	6	3.81	6
Rigor of academic program	4.25	8	4.40	7	4.37	4	3.86	4
Successful alumni	4.28	7	4.45	3	4.22	8	3.70	8
Selectivity of admissions	4.21	9	4.26	9	3.99	9	3.53	9
Quality career services	1.94	11	1.97	11	1.83	12	1.80	10
Percent of graduating class receiving job offers	1.96	10	1.97	10	1.85	10	1.71	12
Starting annual base salary and other compensation of graduates	1.93	12	1.95	12	1.84	11	1.77	11
Post-MBA industry and/or job function of alumni	1.73	15	1.84	13	1.73	13	1.70	13
Types of organizations, post-MBA (business, technical, medical)	1.76	14	1.82	14	1.62	16	1.56	15
Access to alumni network	1.60	16	1.81	15	1.65	14	1.54	16
Percent of graduating class seeking employment	1.77	13	1.72	16	1.63	15	1.44	19
Geographic locations of post-MBA jobs	1.49	17	1.66	17	1.48	17	1.48	17
Program type offered (full-time, part-time, executive)	1.44	18	1.49	18	1.43	18	1.56	14
Specific curriculum offered	1.39	19	1.39	19	1.41	19	1.44	18
Quality of services	1.36	20	1.39	20	1.34	20	1.38	23
Program completion time (total length of program)	1.35	21	1.35	21	1.33	22	1.42	21
Course type offered (on-campus, off-campus, online/distance learning)	1.24	25	1.25	25	1.26	23	1.43	20
Convenient class schedules	1.24	24	1.27	22	1.17	25	1.42	22
Primary method of instruction (e.g. case methods)	1.25	22	1.27	23	1.33	21	1.28	24
Quality of facilities (classroom, computer labs, etc.)	1.24	23	1.26	24	1.21	24	1.24	26
Language of instruction	1.20	26	1.12	26	1.10	26	1.13	27
Proximity to work or home	0.99	29	1.00	28	1.09	27	1.25	25

Standardized Rating of Specific Components, by Age								
Specific Component	24 and Younger		25-28		29-32		33 and Older	
Average size of classes	1.02	28	1.06	27	1.05	28	0.93	28
Availability of overseas academic study tours	1.02	27	0.93	30	0.92	30	0.77	32
Total tuition and required fees for full length of program	0.93	31	0.90	33	0.89	31	0.91	29
Size of the incoming MBA class	0.88	33	0.95	29	0.97	29	0.81	31
Attractiveness of campus	0.88	32	0.91	32	0.88	32	0.82	30
Availability of an international exchange program	0.95	30	0.91	31	0.85	34	0.72	34
Availability of scholarships	0.86	34	0.85	34	0.85	33	0.75	33
Availability of research, teaching, or other assistantships	0.77	36	0.71	36	0.70	36	0.64	36
Housing and other out-of-pocket living costs	0.76	37	0.75	35	0.70	37	0.59	39
Availability of a domestic exchange program	0.81	35	0.70	37	0.65	39	0.61	37
Opportunity costs of lost wages and other compensation	0.63	39	0.69	38	0.70	35	0.65	35
Application fees of school	0.61	40	0.66	39	0.67	38	0.61	38
Availability of loans for non-native students	0.71	38	0.63	40	0.60	40	0.47	41
Availability of loans for domestic students	0.41	41	0.49	41	0.48	41	0.51	40
Average years of work experience of students	0.28	43	0.25	42	0.28	42	0.27	42
Proportion of international students	0.28	42	0.24	43	0.24	43	0.23	43
Average age of students	0.22	44	0.22	44	0.23	44	0.22	44
Proportion of women	0.20	46	0.17	45	0.19	46	0.21	45
Proportion of underrepresented minority students	0.20	45	0.15	46	0.21	45	0.16	46

Standardized Rating of Specific Components, by World Region												
Specific Component	Asia		Africa		United States		Canada		Latin America		Europe	
Quality of the faculty	4.75	1	4.85	1	4.48	1	4.29	1	4.25	1	5.07	1
Job placement reputation of the school	4.72	2	4.58	3	4.09	6	4.03	4	3.82	5	4.67	3
Accreditation of program	4.41	3	4.79	2	4.19	3	4.12	3	3.94	4	4.55	6
Local respect/reputation	4.24	8	4.58	4	4.31	2	4.16	2	4.08	2	4.65	4
Quality of current students	4.32	6	4.36	7	4.14	5	3.87	8	3.79	6	4.74	2
Published ranking of the graduate management program	4.41	4	4.58	5	3.92	8	3.94	6	3.99	3	4.52	7
Rigor of academic program	4.27	7	4.54	6	4.15	4	3.85	9	3.65	7	4.58	5
Successful alumni	4.35	5	4.16	8	4.09	7	3.95	5	3.59	8	4.43	8
Selectivity of admissions	4.18	9	4.09	9	3.78	9	3.88	7	3.48	9	4.39	9
Quality career services	2.02	10	1.75	10	1.91	10	1.90	12	1.83	11	1.70	10
Percent of graduating class receiving job offers	2.01	11	1.73	11	1.86	12	2.07	10	1.95	10	1.68	12
Starting annual base salary and other compensation of graduates	2.01	12	1.69	12	1.88	11	1.93	11	1.80	12	1.70	11
Post-MBA industry and/or job function of alumni	1.89	13	1.62	13	1.73	14	1.85	13	1.49	20	1.60	13
Types of organizations, post-MBA (business, technical, medical)	1.88	14	1.61	14	1.61	16	1.76	16	1.58	16	1.50	15
Access to alumni network	1.77	16	1.44	18	1.73	13	1.68	18	1.74	13	1.53	14
Percent of graduating class seeking employment	1.79	15	1.61	15	1.58	17	1.68	17	1.73	14	1.42	17
Geographic locations of post-MBA jobs	1.60	17	1.27	25	1.68	15	1.81	14	1.57	17	1.30	20

Standardized Rating of Specific Components, by World Region												
Specific Component	Asia		Africa		United States		Canada		Latin America		Europe	
Program type offered (full-time, part-time, executive)	1.38	19	1.44	19	1.52	18	1.77	15	1.63	15	1.44	16
Specific curriculum offered	1.38	18	1.46	17	1.44	19	1.41	23	1.51	19	1.30	21
Quality of services	1.27	23	1.47	16	1.38	21	1.42	21	1.47	21	1.36	19
Program completion time (total length of program)	1.31	21	1.40	20	1.33	22	1.66	19	1.55	18	1.38	18
Course type offered (on-campus, off-campus, online/distance learning)	1.28	22	1.39	21	1.29	23	1.42	22	1.30	23	1.25	22
Convenient class schedules	1.09	26	1.28	24	1.41	20	1.57	20	1.13	28	1.18	24
Primary method of instruction (e.g. case methods)	1.37	20	1.38	22	1.16	26	1.35	25	1.32	22	1.19	23
Quality of facilities (classroom, computer labs, etc.)	1.21	25	1.37	23	1.24	25	1.40	24	1.23	24	1.11	25
Language of instruction	1.23	24	1.24	26	1.01	28	1.35	26	1.01	29	1.09	26
Proximity to work or home	0.92	32	1.08	28	1.26	24	1.32	27	0.67	39	0.89	31
Average size of classes	0.95	31	0.99	32	1.02	27	1.32	28	1.16	27	0.94	30
Availability of overseas academic study tours	1.03	27	1.13	27	0.65	35	0.90	31	1.20	26	0.97	28
Total tuition and required fees for full length of program	0.90	33	0.91	33	0.92	29	0.94	30	0.91	31	0.87	32
Size of the incoming MBA class	0.96	30	1.03	30	0.80	30	1.05	29	0.92	30	0.95	29
Attractiveness of campus	0.97	28	1.01	31	0.79	31	0.81	34	0.89	32	0.85	33
Availability of an international exchange program	0.96	29	1.04	29	0.56	37	0.86	32	1.21	25	1.02	27
Availability of scholarships	0.85	34	0.86	35	0.76	32	0.73	35	0.87	33	0.84	34
Availability of research, teaching, or other assistantships	0.79	35	0.81	36	0.52	38	0.67	39	0.67	40	0.64	40
Housing and other out-of-pocket living costs	0.78	36	0.79	38	0.49	39	0.68	38	0.72	38	0.72	36
Availability of a domestic exchange program	0.77	37	0.86	34	0.48	40	0.85	33	0.77	35	0.76	35
Opportunity costs of lost wages and other compensation	0.71	39	0.57	40	0.65	34	0.72	37	0.72	37	0.64	39
Application fees of school	0.61	40	0.67	39	0.62	36	0.73	36	0.75	36	0.66	38
Availability of loans for non-native students	0.74	38	0.79	37	0.18	45	0.40	41	0.86	34	0.68	37
Availability of loans for domestic students	0.38	41	0.44	41	0.73	33	0.66	40	0.29	41	0.30	41
Average years of work experience of students	0.29	42	0.31	42	0.22	42	0.24	42	0.26	43	0.26	43
Proportion of international students	0.26	43	0.28	43	0.16	46	0.18	44	0.29	42	0.28	42
Average age of students	0.21	44	0.26	44	0.21	43	0.24	43	0.23	44	0.24	44
Proportion of women	0.17	46	0.25	45	0.22	41	0.12	45	0.13	45	0.17	46
Proportion of underrepresented minority students	0.18	45	0.23	46	0.18	44	0.12	46	0.13	46	0.18	45

Standardized Rating of Specific Components, by U.S. Subgroup								
Specific Component	Asian American		African American		White		Hispanic	
Quality of the faculty	4.65	3	5.26	1	4.26	1	4.05	1
Job placement reputation of the school	4.81	1	4.92	4	3.81	7	3.34	8
Accreditation of program	4.20	8	5.05	3	4.00	4	3.52	5
Local respect/reputation	4.76	2	5.13	2	4.08	2	3.89	2
Quality of current students	4.62	4	4.65	8	4.01	3	3.52	6

Standardized Rating of Specific Components, by U.S. Subgroup								
Specific Component	Asian American		African American		White		Hispanic	
Published ranking of the graduate management program	4.52	5	4.74	7	3.65	8	3.22	9
Rigor of academic program	4.32	7	4.90	6	3.96	5	3.63	3
Successful alumni	4.37	6	4.90	5	3.87	6	3.59	4
Selectivity of admissions	3.90	9	4.60	9	3.64	9	3.35	7
Quality career services	1.89	10	2.29	13	1.87	10	1.98	13
Percent of graduating class receiving job offers	1.87	11	2.40	11	1.85	11	1.46	17
Starting annual base salary and other compensation of graduates	1.82	13	2.49	10	1.81	12	2.05	11
Post-MBA industry and/or job function of alumni	1.81	14	2.23	14	1.62	14	1.99	12
Types of organizations, post-MBA (business, technical, medical)	1.70	16	2.04	16	1.52	17	1.54	15
Access to alumni network	1.86	12	1.97	17	1.65	13	2.06	10
Percent of graduating class seeking employment	1.75	15	2.30	12	1.44	19	1.40	21
Geographic locations of post-MBA jobs	1.65	17	2.22	15	1.57	16	1.75	14
Program type offered (full-time, part-time, executive)	1.60	18	1.30	19	1.58	15	1.44	19
Specific curriculum offered	1.37	20	1.44	18	1.43	20	1.52	16
Quality of services	1.43	19	1.26	20	1.43	21	1.36	22
Program completion time (total length of program)	1.20	24	1.23	22	1.38	22	1.26	24
Course type offered (on-campus, off-campus, online/distance learning)	1.15	26	1.14	25	1.36	23	1.14	26
Convenient class schedules	1.21	23	1.22	23	1.47	18	1.45	18
Primary method of instruction (e.g. case methods)	1.10	27	1.25	21	1.12	26	1.43	20
Quality of facilities (classroom, computer labs, etc.)	1.23	22	1.20	24	1.25	25	1.20	25
Language of instruction	0.92	29	0.69	33	1.06	27	0.94	28
Proximity to work or home	1.33	21	1.09	26	1.29	24	1.28	23
Average size of classes	1.19	25	0.97	28	1.02	28	1.02	27
Availability of overseas academic study tours	0.89	31	0.44	37	0.66	33	0.60	36
Total tuition and required fees for full length of program	0.85	33	0.99	27	0.91	29	0.88	31
Size of the incoming MBA class	1.04	28	0.67	34	0.80	30	0.93	29
Attractiveness of campus	0.82	34	0.75	31	0.79	31	0.90	30
Availability of an international exchange program	0.81	35	0.43	38	0.55	36	0.28	40
Availability of scholarships	0.88	32	0.89	29	0.68	32	0.71	33
Availability of research, teaching, or other assistantships	0.63	40	0.61	36	0.45	39	0.48	38
Housing and other out-of-pocket living costs	0.73	38	0.37	40	0.44	40	0.54	37
Availability of a domestic exchange program	0.76	37	0.40	39	0.46	38	0.17	41
Opportunity costs of lost wages and other compensation	0.80	36	0.66	35	0.60	35	0.65	35
Application fees of school	0.71	39	0.73	32	0.54	37	0.68	34
Availability of loans for non-native students	0.43	41	0.14	46	0.10	46	0.41	39
Availability of loans for domestic students	0.90	30	0.83	30	0.65	34	0.75	32
Average years of work experience of students	0.26	42	0.24	43	0.23	41	0.15	42
Proportion of international students	0.24	43	0.24	44	0.13	45	0.12	46
Average age of students	0.24	44	0.22	45	0.23	42	0.12	44
Proportion of women	0.20	45	0.32	42	0.21	43	0.12	45
Proportion of underrepresented minority students	0.20	46	0.35	41	0.13	44	0.15	43

Standardized Rating of Specific Components, by Program Type Enrolled						
Specific Component	**Full-time**		**Part-time**		**Executive**	
Quality of the faculty	4.87	2	4.41	1	4.48	1
Local respect/reputation	4.78	3	4.25	2	4.26	2
Accreditation of program	4.33	9	4.01	3	4.18	3
Quality of current students	4.72	4	4.00	4	4.09	4
Selectivity of admissions	4.35	8	3.51	9	4.06	5
Published ranking of the graduate management program	4.57	6	3.74	8	3.88	6
Rigor of academic program	4.47	7	3.92	6	3.83	7
Successful alumni	4.68	5	3.90	7	3.83	8
Job placement reputation of the school	4.88	1	3.93	5	3.60	9
Quality career services	2.01	11	1.76	11	1.88	10
Starting annual base salary and other compensation of graduates	2.02	10	1.84	10	1.86	11
Post-MBA industry and/or job function of alumni	1.88	13	1.63	15	1.79	12
Program type offered (full-time, part-time, executive)	1.40	18	1.64	14	1.71	13
Access to alumni network	1.85	14	1.65	13	1.67	14
Percent of graduating class receiving job offers	2.00	12	1.69	12	1.59	15
Convenient class schedules	1.05	26	1.60	16	1.57	16
Program completion time (total length of program)	1.33	21	1.43	22	1.57	17
Geographic locations of post-MBA jobs	1.61	17	1.53	19	1.51	18
Course type offered (on-campus, off-campus, online/distance learning)	1.11	25	1.39	23	1.37	19
Specific curriculum offered	1.35	19	1.33	25	1.36	20
Types of organizations, post-MBA (business, technical, medical)	1.77	15	1.57	17	1.31	21
Quality of services	1.34	20	1.44	21	1.28	22
Proximity to work or home	0.89	31	1.47	20	1.25	23
Primary method of instruction (e.g. case methods)	1.25	22	1.13	26	1.23	24
Quality of facilities (classroom, computer labs, etc..)	1.23	23	1.35	24	1.15	25
Percent of graduating class seeking employment	1.71	16	1.54	18	1.13	26
Average size of classes	1.04	27	1.11	28	1.00	27
Size of the incoming MBA class	0.96	29	0.89	31	0.91	28
Language of instruction	1.14	24	1.12	27	0.90	29
Total tuition and required fees for full length of program	0.90	30	0.90	30	0.87	30
Attractiveness of campus	1.00	28	0.94	29	0.75	31
Availability of overseas academic study tours	0.86	32	0.57	34	0.71	32
Opportunity costs of lost wages and other compensation	0.63	37	0.62	32	0.70	33
Availability of research, teaching, or other assistantships	0.68	36	0.33	40	0.62	34
Availability of loans for domestic students	0.45	41	0.54	35	0.57	35
Availability of scholarships	0.79	34	0.52	36	0.57	36
Application fees of school	0.55	39	0.58	33	0.53	37
Housing and other out-of-pocket living costs	0.74	35	0.38	39	0.47	38

Standardized Rating of Specific Components, by Program Type Enrolled						
Specific Component	**Full-time**		**Part-time**		**Executive**	
Availability of a domestic exchange program	0.61	38	0.46	38	0.42	39
Average years of work experience of students	0.26	42	0.21	41	0.36	40
Availability of an international exchange program	0.80	33	0.47	37	0.35	41
Availability of loans for non-native students	0.51	40	0.19	42	0.32	42
Proportion of women	0.18	45	0.15	44	0.30	43
Average age of students	0.23	44	0.18	43	0.18	44
Proportion of underrepresented minority students	0.16	46	0.09	46	0.12	45
Proportion of international students	0.24	43	0.09	45	0.06	46

Contact Information

For questions or additional information regarding the study, please contact the GMAC® Research and Development department at research@gmac.com.

Authorship

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

Gregg Schoenfeld, Manager, Applied Research, GMAC®.

Acknowledgements

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

GMAC® would also like to acknowledge all of the mba.com Registrants who participated in the survey.

The Graduate Management Admission Council® (GMAC®) is a global not-for-profit 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 then 4000 graduate management programs around the world. GMAC® is dedicated to creating access to graduate management education; these schools and others rely on the Council as the premier provider of reliable data about the graduate management education industry.