The Global Management Education Graduate Survey is a product of the Graduate Management Admission Council® (GMAC®), a global nonprofit education organization of leading graduate business schools and the owner of the Graduate Management Admission Test® (GMAT®). The GMAT exam is an important part of the admissions process for more than 4,800 graduate management programs around the world. GMAC is dedicated to creating access to and disseminating information about graduate management education; these schools and others rely on the Council as the premier provider of reliable data about the graduate management education industry.
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Each year, for the past 11 years, the Graduate Management Admission Council® (GMAC®) has conducted a survey of graduate management education students in their final year of business school. This Global Management Education Graduate Survey¹ is distributed to students at participating business schools a few months before graduation. The survey allows students to express their opinions about their education, the value of their degrees, and what they intend to do with their degrees after graduation, among other topics. GMAC also ascertains some postgraduation employment information through the survey, although it is not possible to obtain a complete picture because many survey respondents are not involved in job searches at the time of the survey.

Key Findings

- Students graduating in 2010 were significantly more optimistic about the economy in general compared with last year’s graduates, yet this year’s graduates were less likely to have received job offers at the time of the survey. Current job seekers from full-time and part-time MBA programs appeared to be slightly more successful in the job search than their counterparts surveyed in 2003—the end of the last recessionary period.
- Average salary increases for members of the class of 2010 who had received a job offer were similar to increases offered to the class of 2009. Graduates from part-time and executive MBA programs with job offers received greater increases compared with last year’s graduates.
- The finance/accounting, products/services, and consulting fields continue to be the most sought-after industries among graduate business school students, regardless of program type.
- Job seekers pursuing careers in the manufacturing, energy/utilities, and health care industries had the greatest success in their job search. Those seeking positions in finance or accounting had greater success than those seeking jobs in the technology and consulting industries, a reversal of the 2009 results.
- Participation in almost any extracurricular activity correlated with a graduate’s chances of securing a job offer at the time of the survey. Internships and leadership programs had the greatest impact on job search success.
- Graduating students gave high marks to their business programs’ ability to prepare them for employment regardless of their current success in the job search. More than three-quarters of the students still seeking employment agreed their education prepared them adequately.
- The majority of students rated faculty, admissions, fellow students, program structure, and the curriculum outstanding or excellent, regardless of program type. In addition, there was an across-the-board increase in the average ratings students gave to admissions compared with 2009.
- The value of a graduate business education remains high for each program type. The key drivers of value included the relevance of the curriculum, faculty teaching methods, faculty knowledge, comprehensiveness of the curriculum, and talent level of the student body.
- The responsiveness of career services and the availability of career services resources are among the key drivers for overall value of a graduate business education. Yet less than half of the students in each program type rated career services as outstanding or excellent.

¹The Global Management Education Graduate Survey was formerly known as the Global MBA® Graduate Survey.
GMAC collected survey responses from 7,180 graduate management students at 147 business schools worldwide. Responses from the 5,274 recent or soon-to-be graduates of these schools form the basis of this report. The remaining respondents indicated they would be graduating in 2011 rather than 2010 and their responses will be supplied in the benchmark reports that their respective schools receive as a benefit of their participation in the survey.

Of the survey respondents, 1,809 (34%) were citizens of countries other than the United States and 27 percent of respondents were attending schools outside the United States. The vast majority of respondents (89%) were enrolled in MBA programs. Of this majority, 34 percent were enrolled in two-year full-time programs, 23 percent in one-year full-time programs (this includes all full-time programs with a duration of less than two years), 23 percent in part-time programs, 10 percent in executive programs, 5 percent in flexible programs, 3 percent in online/distance-learning programs, and 3 percent in joint-degree programs that included an MBA. Among the 11 percent of non-MBA program respondents enrolled in other types of master’s programs in business were students of management, accounting, and finance.

GMAC developed this survey to provide school administrators with information to help gauge what student needs are being met, what services students value most, and what services might yet present challenges and require marketwide improvements. Our hope is that student responses to the wide-ranging topics presented here will serve administrators by helping them improve their services, tailor programs to match student needs, and foster learning environments that allow students to make the most of their graduate business experiences. Graduates can review these survey results to see how their opinions, preferences, and personal experiences with graduate business programs and the job market compare with those of their peers.

**Methodology**

All GMAC member schools and a number of other schools representing a cross section of the graduate management industry worldwide received email invitations to participate in the study. Schools participated by providing GMAC with the names and email addresses for their graduating class of 2010 or by forwarding the survey invitation directly to their students on behalf of GMAC. The survey was in the field between February 10 and March 10, 2010. Frequency distributions were examined for both topical and classification questions. Response categories for some questions were collapsed to make final analysis more robust. Tests of statistical significance were used throughout the report, and a 95 percent confidence interval was used as the cutoff point for significance.

The results of this survey do not necessarily reflect a statistically representative sample of graduating students. Because of this limitation, the results of this research study should not be used to generalize about the student population but they can be used as a reflection of the sample frame under consideration. Several clear trends emerge from the data, nevertheless.

---

**The value of a graduate business education remains high for each program type. Key drivers were faculty, curriculum, and fellow students.**
Economic Conditions

Many economists regard the recent global economic downturn as the worst since the Great Depression.\(^2\) Unemployment reached record levels in 2009.\(^3\) As of February 2010, unemployment levels in the United States still hovered at 9.7 percent.\(^4\) Unemployment rates around the globe followed suit, with the jobless level at 8.2 percent in Canada,\(^5\) 9.5 percent within the European Union (in January),\(^6\) an estimated 10.7 percent in India, and an estimated 4.3 percent in China in 2009.\(^7\) This prolonged recession and its high unemployment rates have generated one of the worst job markets in decades.\(^8\) Many class of 2010 graduates were searching for employment alongside 2009 business graduates who had yet to find a permanent job, in addition to other recently unemployed or underemployed workers—all of whom add to the already tight job market.

Mortimer Zuckerman, in an editorial for the Wall Street Journal, recently stated, “economists may see the recession as being over, but the man on the street does not.”\(^9\) Today’s graduates might not agree. A third of the class of 2010 felt the global economy was stable or strong compared with only 9 percent of the class of 2009, despite the fact that fewer graduating students in 2010 had offers of employment compared with their 2009 counterparts\(^10\) (Figure 1). On a more optimistic side, current job


Seekers from full-time and part-time MBA programs appeared to be somewhat more successful in securing job offers than those who graduated during the last recessionary period in 2003 (Figure 2).

Overall, half of all graduates in the class of 2010 had a job or job offer at the time of the survey, 41 percent were still searching for a job, and 10 percent were postponing their job search. This distribution varied by program type though. About 43 percent of two-year full-time MBA students, 34 percent of one-year full-time MBA students, 60 percent of part-time MBA students, 58 percent of executive MBA students, and 43 percent of master’s in business students in the class of 2010 had a job or job offer.

Among those not searching for jobs, 58 percent were staying with their current employer and 11 percent were self-employed. The other 31 percent were not seeking employment for the following reasons: Nearly half were waiting until they were closer to graduation (48%) and about one in 10 planned to continue their education (9%). Other reasons included contractual obligations (7%), family obligations (6%), plans to move to a new area after graduation (6%), and current involvement in an internship or work project (5%).

Figure 2.
Percentage of Job Seekers* Who Received an Offer of Employment, by Graduation Year and Program Type, Ten-Year Trend

Overall, half of all graduates in the class of 2010 had a job or job offer at the time of the survey.
The Job Search

The most common job-seeking method used by 2010 graduates in their current search for employment was that of applying directly to companies of interest. This was followed closely by networking with friends and family, networking with classmates and alumni, and using online search engines. In addition, more than half of the respondents used job boards at their school, online networking sites, job fairs, and their school career services office. Figure 3 shows the distribution of methods employed by job seekers. On average, job seekers used six methods in their job search.

The finance and accounting, products and services, and consulting industries continued to be the three most popular fields among job seekers. Table 1 shows the rank order of industries in terms of popularity by management program type. The top three industries attracted 73 percent of two-year full-time MBA graduates, 73 percent of one-year full-time MBA graduates, 70 percent of part-time MBA graduates, 62 percent of executive MBA graduates, 55 percent of other MBA graduates, and 84 percent of master’s graduates regardless of job status.

Based on program type, there was slightly more diversity in the range of job functions versus industries that graduates sought (Table 2). Finance and accounting functions were most sought after by graduates of two-year and one-year full-time MBA, part-time MBA, and master’s programs. Executive MBA graduates most often sought marketing and sales positions, and other MBA graduates tended to seek consulting and general management positions.

![Figure 3. Methods Used in the Job Search](image-url)
Table 1.
Intended Post-Degree Industry Among Job Seekers, by Program Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Two-year full-time MBA</th>
<th>One-year full-time MBA</th>
<th>Part-time MBA</th>
<th>Executive MBA</th>
<th>Other MBA</th>
<th>Master’s programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finance/accounting (27%)</td>
<td>Finance/accounting (26%)</td>
<td>Finance/accounting (24%)</td>
<td>Finance/accounting (22%)</td>
<td>Products/services (22%)</td>
<td>Finance/accounting (49%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Products/services (27%)</td>
<td>Consulting (24%)</td>
<td>Products/services (23%)</td>
<td>Consulting (21%)</td>
<td>Consulting (18%)</td>
<td>Products/services (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting (19%)</td>
<td>Products/services (23%)</td>
<td>Consulting (22%)</td>
<td>Products/services (18%)</td>
<td>Finance/accounting (15%)</td>
<td>Consulting (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology (9%)</td>
<td>Technology (10%)</td>
<td>Health care (9%)</td>
<td>Technology (14%)</td>
<td>Government/nonprofit (15%)</td>
<td>Government/nonprofit (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care (5%)</td>
<td>Health care (6%)</td>
<td>Technology (8%)</td>
<td>Health care (12%)</td>
<td>Health care (14%)</td>
<td>Health care (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing (5%)</td>
<td>Energy/utility (4%)</td>
<td>Government/nonprofit (6%)</td>
<td>Energy/utility (6%)</td>
<td>Technology (10%)</td>
<td>Energy/utility (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy/utility (4%)</td>
<td>Manufacturing (4%)</td>
<td>Energy/utility (4%)</td>
<td>Manufacturing (4%)</td>
<td>Manufacturing (4%)</td>
<td>Manufacturing (1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government/nonprofit (3%)</td>
<td>Government/nonprofit (4%)</td>
<td>Manufacturing (3%)</td>
<td>Government/nonprofit (3%)</td>
<td>Energy/utility (2%)</td>
<td>Technology (1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.
Intended Post-Degree Job Function Among Job Seekers, by Program Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Two-year full-time MBA</th>
<th>One-year full-time MBA</th>
<th>Part-time MBA</th>
<th>Executive MBA</th>
<th>Other MBA</th>
<th>Master’s programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finance/accounting (31%)</td>
<td>Finance/accounting (26%)</td>
<td>Finance/accounting (24%)</td>
<td>Marketing/sales (29%)</td>
<td>Consulting (23%)</td>
<td>Finance/accounting (52%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing/sales (25%)</td>
<td>Consulting (25%)</td>
<td>Consulting (20%)</td>
<td>Consulting (24%)</td>
<td>General management (23%)</td>
<td>Marketing/sales (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting (21%)</td>
<td>Marketing/sales (24%)</td>
<td>Marketing/sales (20%)</td>
<td>General management (19%)</td>
<td>Finance/accounting (19%)</td>
<td>Consulting (14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General management (10%)</td>
<td>General management (11%)</td>
<td>Operations/logistics (14%)</td>
<td>Finance/accounting (12%)</td>
<td>Marketing/sales (14%)</td>
<td>Human resources (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations/logistics (9%)</td>
<td>Operations/logistics (9%)</td>
<td>General management (13%)</td>
<td>Operations/logistics (11%)</td>
<td>Operations/logistics (13%)</td>
<td>Operations/logistics (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resources (3%)</td>
<td>Human resources (2%)</td>
<td>IT/MIS (5%)</td>
<td>IT/MIS (5%)</td>
<td>Human resources (5%)</td>
<td>General management (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT/MIS (2%)</td>
<td>IT/MIS (2%)</td>
<td>Human resources (4%)</td>
<td>Human resources (1%)</td>
<td>IT/MIS (3%)</td>
<td>IT/MIS (2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Among graduates receiving job offers, there was a 13 percent decline in the average number of offers received in 2010 compared with those reported in 2009. Figure 4 shows the average number of job offers received by program type and year. The majority of job seekers were still searching for employment at the time of the survey (see Figures 1 and 2). Approximately one-fifth to two-fifths of job seekers had an offer of employment at the time of the survey, depending on program type, but there were no statistical differences in the average number of job offers received by program type.

Intended industry plays a role in the success of a graduate’s job search. Figure 5 shows the percentage of job seekers among the class of 2010 who had received an offer of employment, according to their intended industry. Similar to the results from the class of 2009, graduates seeking jobs in manufacturing had the highest success rate compared with those receiving job offers in other industries. This year, graduates seeking jobs in health care had the second-highest success rate followed by those receiving job offers in the energy and utility sectors.
This was the reverse of 2009 when more graduates received job offers in the energy and utility industries than they did in health care. The percentage of job offers that 2010 graduates received in the finance and accounting industries topped those received in technology and consulting. Similar to 2009, success rates for this year’s graduates seeking jobs in the products and services and government and nonprofit sectors were at the lower end of the spectrum.

More than half of the class of 2010 who were seeking employment intended to switch industries, a rate similar to that of the class of 2009. Interestingly, job seekers who intended to switch industries were statistically more likely than those who did not intend to switch industries to have a job offer, overall. But this difference only holds among two-year full-time MBA program graduates, where 43 percent of career switchers had an offer of employment compared with 36 percent of those who were searching for a job in the same industry. For all other programs, there were no significant differences in the percentage of individuals who received job offers by their intentions to switch industries.

The size of the organization where graduating students planned to work affected their success in the job search. Graduates seeking employment in large organizations (10,000 or more employees), were nearly three times as likely to have received an offer of employment than those seeking jobs with small organizations (1,000 or fewer employees) and about twice as likely as those seeking work with mid-sized organizations (1,001 to 10,000 employees). These differences were consistent across most industries (Figure 6).

There was a 13% decline in number of job offers in 2010 compared with 2009. Graduates seeking jobs in manufacturing and health care had the greatest success rates.

Figure 6.
Percentage of Job Seekers With a Job Offer, by Industry and Organization Size
Expected Changes in Salary

Overall, about a quarter (24%) of graduates opted to stay with their current employer. Half of these individuals expected to receive an increase in job responsibilities after graduation and 48 percent expected a salary increase. More than a third expected to receive a promotion (39%) and a change in job title (34%). In addition, 20 percent expected an increase in the number of subordinates they would manage, 13 percent expected to see an increase in their budgetary authority, and about one in 20 (6%) expected to receive a cash bonus upon receipt of their degree. The graduating students staying with their current employer expected to increase their pre-degree salary by 38 percent, on average.

Salary is affected by a variety of leading factors, including previous work history, industry and job function, job level, location, and economic conditions. More than half of the graduates who were seeking jobs based their salary expectations on market research (60%). Past salary (45%), current economic conditions (44%), information from other students and peers (41%), and experience (39%) also influenced expectations. Media reports influenced salary expectations for 11 percent of graduates.

Figure 7 shows the overall change in salary by program type among students who had received at least one job offer. The change in salary was only marginally different than that reported last year. Members of the class

Graduates from full-time MBA programs received nearly identical increases in salary compared with the class of 2009.

Figure 7.
Percentage Change in Annual Base Salary, by Survey Year and Program Type, for Students With Job Offers

1 Data for master's programs not available in 2007.
of 2010 who will graduate from two-year and one-year full-time MBA programs received nearly identical increases in salary compared with the class of 2009. Graduates of part-time and executive MBA programs with an offer of employment will receive a slightly greater increase in salary compared with 2009. Graduates of other master’s programs in business experienced further deterioration in salary gains compared with prior years, although they still received a 21 percent increase compared with their pre-degree salary. Table 3 shows changes in salary by student demographics.

Graduates of part-time and executive MBA programs with an offer of employment will receive a slightly greater increase in salary compared with 2009.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student characteristic</th>
<th>Percentage increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-degree work experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 4 years</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years, but less than 8 years</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 years or longer</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career switching status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career switcher</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career enhancer</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization size</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-size</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry level</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-level</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior level</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive level</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Percentage Change in Annual Base Salary for Students Receiving a Job Offer, by Student Demographics
There was a slight decline in the expected salary change within nearly every industry for the class of 2010 compared with last year’s graduating class. The government and nonprofit sectors were the only ones with annual increases, albeit modest, over the past three years. The class of 2010 expected higher salary increases within the health care, manufacturing, and products and services industries compared with the class of 2009. Figure 8 presents the expected change in salary by industry over the past three years.

Similar to expectations in previous years, graduates who entered business school in the lower income brackets expected higher rates of return in post-degree salary than those from higher income brackets. Graduates entering their program earning a salary in the range of US$37,001 to US$52,000 expected a 61 percent increase in salary upon graduation. Those in the US$52,001 to US$71,000 salary range expected a 47 percent increase, and those in the highest bracket expected a 33 percent increase in post-degree salary, overall.
Figure 9 shows the percentage change in salary by pre-degree salary range, citizenship group, and survey year. In the lowest pre-degree salary range, salaries were expected to remain relatively flat for Europeans, Asians, Canadians, and US citizens. Latin Americans in this range expected sharply lower returns than in prior years. Among graduates in 2010 who entered business school in the middle salary range, US citizens expected returns similar to last year’s, while all other groups were hopeful for better returns. Europeans and Asians in the highest pre-degree salary range expected to receive returns that exceeded those of each of the previous years. Latin Americans in this range were seeking salaries higher than those received in 2009, but lower than those expected the previous two years. Canadians and US citizens in this range expected salaries to remain relatively flat compared with 2009.

Gradients who entered business school in lower income brackets expected higher rates of return than those from higher income brackets.

Figure 9.
Expected % Change in Salary, by Pre-Degree Salary Range, Citizenship Group, and Survey Year
**Employment Selection**

Graduating students were asked to rate the importance of 26 items related to jobs and companies where they planned to apply for work. Six principal components were extracted from the list. These components represent thematic areas of importance to graduating business school students when selecting their first job, and were described as follows:

- **Career path** was defined by challenging and interesting work, professional development, advancement opportunity, learning new things, room for growth, and ability to make an impact.
- **Corporate culture** was defined by high ethical standards, emphasis on community and inclusion, work-life balance, organizational climate, and fit with organizational culture.
- **Economic viability** was defined by job security, benefits, salary, and company stability.
- **Job ownership** was defined by stock ownership programs, travel, autonomy, and flexibility.
- **Company reputation** was defined by the opinion of others and company image.
- **Work setting** was defined by location and physical surroundings.

Gender and age had a significant influence on the importance of some employment selection criteria compared with others (Figure 10). The list of differences was as follows:

**Gender**

- Women were more likely than men to consider corporate culture, the work environment, and economic viability as important.
- Job ownership and company reputation were more important to men than women.

**Age**

- Graduates age 27 and younger were more likely than older graduates to consider company reputation as important.
- Graduates ages 28 to 34 were more likely than other graduates to consider career path important, yet they were less likely than others to regard corporate culture as important.
- Graduates age 35 and older were more likely than younger graduates to consider economic viability and job ownership as important.

---

Women were more likely than men to consider corporate culture, the work environment, and economic viability as important employment selection criteria.

---

Principal component analysis: Multiple R = .56.
Figure 10.
Employment Selection Criteria, by Gender and Age
Graduating students gave high marks to their business program’s ability to prepare them for employment, regardless of their current success in the job search.

Table 4 presents the rank order of employment selection criteria by graduates’ job functions. There were distinct differences in the relative importance of various criteria. Economic viability was most important to individuals working in operations and logistics, finance and accounting, and IT or MIS positions, but least important to individuals in consulting positions. Individuals in marketing and sales, general management, and human resources felt that corporate culture was the most important criterion, whereas those in finance and accounting positions considered it the least important. Those in consulting positions felt that career path was most important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marketing/sales</th>
<th>Operations/logistics</th>
<th>Consulting</th>
<th>General management</th>
<th>Finance/accounting</th>
<th>Human resources</th>
<th>IT/MIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporate culture</td>
<td>Economic viability</td>
<td>Career path</td>
<td>Corporate culture</td>
<td>Economic viability</td>
<td>Corporate culture</td>
<td>Economic viability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job ownership</td>
<td>Corporate culture</td>
<td>Job ownership</td>
<td>Job ownership</td>
<td>Company reputation</td>
<td>Economic viability</td>
<td>Corporate culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career path</td>
<td>Work setting</td>
<td>Company reputation</td>
<td>Work setting</td>
<td>Work setting</td>
<td>Work setting</td>
<td>Work setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic viability</td>
<td>Job ownership</td>
<td>Work setting</td>
<td>Career path</td>
<td>Career path</td>
<td>Career path</td>
<td>Career path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company reputation</td>
<td>Career path</td>
<td>Corporate culture</td>
<td>Economic viability</td>
<td>Job ownership</td>
<td>Company reputation</td>
<td>Job ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work setting</td>
<td>Company reputation</td>
<td>Economic viability</td>
<td>Company reputation</td>
<td>Corporate culture</td>
<td>Job ownership</td>
<td>Company reputation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.**
Employment Selection Criteria, by Job Function
Preparation for Employment

Graduating students gave high marks to their business program’s ability to prepare them for employment, regardless of their current success in the job search. Figure 11 shows the percentage of students, based on their status in the job search, who agreed that their business education adequately prepared them for employment. Not surprisingly, those still seeking work were less likely to agree with each statement, yet more than three-quarters of these students agreed their education prepared them for employment.

Participation in extracurricular activities appeared to increase an individual’s chances of receiving a job offer. Figure 12 shows the differences that participation versus nonparticipation in various activities made in the job search.
activities had on job search outcomes. Overall, study-abroad programs statistically were the only activity that did not affect success in the job search. There was a significant difference for each of the other activities. Participation in internships, leadership programs, student career and professional clubs, academic and case competitions, and mentor programs appeared to increase a student’s likelihood of receiving a job offer by more than 50 percent, compared with those who did not participate in the activity. For example, 41 percent of students who participated in an internship received an offer of employment compared with 23 percent of those who did not—a 77 percent increase in likelihood.

Program Evaluation

Overall, the majority of students rated faculty, admissions, fellow students, the program structure, and the curriculum outstanding or excellent regardless of program type (Figure 13). This year also witnessed an across-the-board increase in student ratings of admissions compared with 2009. Graduates of all program types other than master’s programs rated their fellow students, the curriculum, and student services higher in 2010 compared with 2009.

Less than half of the students in each program type rated career services as outstanding or excellent, similar to the rating given by the class of 2009. Students with job offers rated career services higher (statistically) compared with students who were still searching for jobs, as one might expect. In 2010, graduates of two-year full-time MBA and executive MBA programs rated their programs higher in most categories compared with graduates of other programs. Career services was the one area that graduates of two-year full-time MBA programs did not rate higher than other programs. Specifically, graduates of master’s programs rated career services higher than did two-year full-time MBA graduates. One-year full-time MBA and part-time MBA graduates rated each area similarly, except for student services, which received a higher rating from one-year full-time MBA graduates than from part-time MBA graduates.
Students were asked to describe their school's culture. Figure 14 shows the relative cultural description of the various graduate business schools. A principle component analysis\(^{12}\) helps distinguish the key dimensions of culture. Four components of school culture were extracted and labeled as follows.

- **Collectivism** refers to individuals’ level of connections and integration within a community. High collectivism was defined as being a personal, close-knit community with small class sizes and a team emphasis. Low collectivism was defined as impersonal and having loose connections, large class sizes, and an emphasis on the individual.

- **Power distance** is "a measure of the interpersonal power or influence between…[two individuals] as perceived by the least powerful of the two."\(^{13}\) High power distance was defined as formal, rigorous, competitive, and research oriented, and low power distance was defined as informal, casual, collaborative, and teaching oriented.

- **Uncertainty avoidance** is the extent to which an individual can tolerate ambiguity. High uncertainty avoidance was defined as a homogeneous student body, with emphasis on the reproduction of fact and knowledge, passive learning, and authoritarian professors. Low uncertainty avoidance was defined as a heterogeneous student body, with emphasis on critical discussion, active learning, and egalitarian professors.

- **High-low context** is “the degree to which people…present message[s] in an explicit manner.”\(^{14}\) High context was defined as an academic curriculum and concentration focus. Low context was defined as a vocational curriculum and interdisciplinary focus.

---

\(^{12}\) Principal component analysis: Multiple R = .49.


Overall, two out of three students were extremely or very satisfied with their school’s culture. Two-year full-time MBA and executive MBA graduates were significantly more likely than other graduates to be satisfied with their school’s culture, however. Figure 15 shows the key drivers of student satisfaction with the school culture. Collectivism had the greatest impact on satisfaction. Students at schools described as having high collectivism were more likely to be satisfied than students at schools with low collectivism. Schools that had a heterogeneous student body, emphasis on critical discussion, active learning, egalitarian professors (low uncertainty avoidance), a vocational curriculum, and an interdisciplinary focus (low context), were more likely to generate student satisfaction.

![Figure 15. Key Drivers of Satisfaction With School Culture (Pratt Index)](image-url)
Development of Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities

Students were asked to rate their level of improvement in a variety of knowledge areas, skills, and abilities (Figure 16). Improvements in general business functions and management of strategy, innovation, and the decision-making process ranked at the top of the list. These were followed by improvements in strategic and system skills, interpersonal skills, generative thinking, and managing human capital. The areas of least improvement were technology, design, and production; managing tools and technology; foundation skills; media communication and delivery; and operations skills.

Students were asked to rate their agreement with 20 items that describe how they relate to their environment. The responses were calculated to form a scale describing individual innovativeness, which measures comfort with change and likelihood to accept innovative ideas. Overall, one in five students (21%) were classified as innovators, half (50%) were early adopters, a quarter (25%) were early majority, and 4 percent were classified as late majority/laggards or traditionalists.

* Scale: 1 = Not at all, 2 = A little, 3 = Some, 4 = A good amount, 5 = A great deal.

Figure 16.
Improvements in Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities*
Figure 17 shows the distribution by age. Graduates age 27 and younger were more likely than older graduates to fall into the early majority category. Graduates ages 28 to 34 were more likely than younger graduates to rank as early adopters. Graduates age 35 and older were more likely than younger graduates to be classified as innovators.

There were significant correlations between the development of knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSAs) and the innovativeness of students. Students who were classified as innovators rated their KSA improvements significantly higher than all other groups did. Early adopters rated their improvements significantly higher than the early majority and late majority/traditionalist groups. Those in the early majority group rated their improvements significantly higher than the late majority/traditionalist group. These differences hold true when controlling for age. Innovators at any age level improved their KSAs more than other groups.

Figure 18.
Overall Value of Education, by Program Type and Survey Year
(Percentage Outstanding/Excellent/Good)

† Data for master’s programs not available in 2007.
Value of a Graduate Business Education

The value of a graduate business education remains high for each program type (Figure 18). Overall, 92 percent of students rated the value of their education as outstanding (25%), excellent (40%), or good (27%). Only 7 percent rated the value as fair and 2 percent rated the value as poor.

The top five drivers of the value of a graduate business education were the relevance of the curriculum, faculty teaching methods, faculty knowledge, comprehensiveness of the curriculum, and the talent level of the student body (Figure 19). Five other key program aspects had an impact on overall value, including the responsiveness of career services and admissions staff, the integration of the curriculum, program mission, and class schedule. Other key drivers of value included the availability of career services resources, class size, information provided by the admissions staff, and the facilities. The most important aspects of the program, however, remained the curriculum, faculty, and fellow students.

The following are differences in the perceived value of a graduate business education by various student characteristics. Although the percentage differences were relatively small, each was statistically significant.

**Student Status**
- Domestic students (93%) were more likely than foreign students (89%) to have rated the value of the education as outstanding, excellent, or good.

**Job Status**
- Graduates who received an offer of employment (95%) were more likely than those who were still searching for a job (90%) to have rated their education highly.
- Graduates who were not seeking employment at the time of the survey rated their education highly (92%).

**Innovativeness**
- Graduates who were innovators (95%) and early adopters (93%) rated the value of the degree higher compared with the early majority (89%) and late majority/traditionalist (82%) groups of students.

**Gender**
- Men (30%) were more likely than women (16%) to have rated the value of their degree as outstanding.
- Women were more likely than men to have rated the degree’s value as excellent (43% versus 39%) or good (32% versus 23%).

---

* Multiple R = .69; F = 120.45; df1 = 28; df2 = 3,726; p ≤ .05

**Figure 19.**
Key Drivers of Overall Value of a Graduate Business Education*
Concluding Note

Findings in this report are based on an analysis of data from 5,274 recent or soon-to-be graduates of business schools worldwide. The Comprehensive Data Report, which is available only to participating schools, provides charts and data tables along with general analysis of the survey for each program type by gender, age, citizenship, and school location in an easy-to-use interactive format. Participating schools, in addition to receiving copies of the survey report and the Comprehensive Data Report, receive an individualized benchmarking report that compares the aggregated responses from their students with those of both their top competitors’ students and all other students. Schools can also request analysis of responses from their participating students set to graduate in 2011 or later.

How to Participate in the Survey

School professionals at business schools that offer graduate programs can help facilitate the survey, either by sending invitations and survey links to their graduating students or by providing GMAC with their student contact list. Email research@gmac.com to secure your school’s invitation for the next Global Management Education Graduate Survey. School participation benefits include comprehensive statistics, customized reports that compare their data with that of their peers, and advance access to survey findings. Student participation benefits include an opportunity to voice their opinions and concerns to school professionals in a confidential manner, access to the survey reports, an opportunity to be included in a drawing for one of five US$1,000 prizes, and an opportunity to continue in the research process through the GMAC Alumni Perspectives Survey, which allows graduates the unique opportunity to continually monitor their career progress in relation to their peer group.

Contact Information

For questions or comments regarding the study findings, methodology, or data, please contact the GMAC Research and Development Department at research@gmac.com.
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Stay on top of the latest trends in graduate business education with our ever-expanding online research database. Here is a sample of the resources you will find along with our annual survey series at gmac.com/research

- **The Profile of Graduate Management Admission Test® Candidates**—A summary of demographic data about GMAT examinees over the last five testing years. This report provides an annual look at the growth and change within your school’s potential applicant pool. Search the tables for testing volumes and mean GMAT Total scores by gender, age group, intended degree, undergraduate major, citizenship, location, and world region.

- **GMAT® Interactive Profile**—An online tool for assessing potential applicant pools based on GMAT test-taker performance and demographics. This easy-to-use tool lets you select from specific types of test-taker data and create customized summaries of examinee demographics for a unique look at applicant pools that most interest you.

- **Geographic Trend Reports for GMAT® Examinees**—A document series that presents and analyzes GMAT test-taker data with information about requested score reports. Score-sending patterns illustrate which countries and schools are of interest to prospective students. Data from the most recent year are compared with that of four years prior to identify changes in test-taker preferences by region. The series includes four annual reports: World, Asia, Europe, and North America.

- **e-Report Series: Macro Realities and Micro Considerations**—A series of briefs and slides that offer analyses on the forces shaping graduate management education. The series combines GMAC® data and data from external sources such as OECD, United Nations, the IMF, and US Census Bureau for a more holistic view of topics affecting the graduate management education market worldwide.

- **GMAC® Data-To-Go**—Topic-specific snapshots from GMAC research. These compact presentations and data briefs present key findings as well as regional outlooks and other analyses of topics identified through our large-scale research surveys. The files available are specially formatted to allow you to easily reference and use pertinent material in your own meetings and share findings of interest with colleagues.

- **The Research Report Series**—White papers authored by GMAC staff and Management Education Research Institute (MERInstitute) awardees. The series features the latest research on GMAT validity, management education programs, alumni, minority and diversity issues, high-stakes testing innovations, and more.

- **The GMAC® Research Library**—A comprehensive searchable collection of all research publications, survey reports, data reports, and analyses publicly released by GMAC. The library contains many publications no longer accessible through our primary research pages.

Visit us online today at gmac.com/research
The Global Management Education Graduate Survey is one in a series of five annual or biannual surveys produced by the Graduate Management Admission Council®. The surveys are designed to explore relevant issues, offering data at various depths, depending on the desire of the user and the participation of the school. Survey reports provide an overview of the data in addition to giving context for and implications of the research. They are frequently used to help drive strategic decision-making processes in graduate business schools. All survey reports are available online (gmac.com/surveys). Print copies (while supplies last) are free upon request from the GMAC® Research and Development Department at research@gmac.com.

Other surveys include—

**mba.com Registrants Survey**
Who is in the pipeline for a degree? What makes them decide to apply now or wait? Launched in 2003, this annual survey tells who prospective students are (including detailed profiles), how and why they move through the pipeline, and what motivates them and gets their attention.

**Application Trends Survey**
How does a school’s application volume compare with that of other schools? Since 1999, this annual survey has gathered comparative application data for the current and previous year from business school programs worldwide.

**Alumni Perspectives Survey**
What happens to MBAs after they graduate and begin to evaluate the value of their degrees? Launched in 2001, these biannual surveys follow MBA graduates long term to understand their career progression, their expectations, their attitudes about work, their assessment of their education, and general market trends.

**Corporate Recruiters Survey**
Who hires MBAs and why? What are the hiring plans in various industries? How do companies decide where to recruit? Launched in 2001–2002, this annual survey helps schools better understand the job market, clarify employer expectations, and benchmark their career services practices. Employers use the survey results to benchmark the MBA recruitment activities of their companies.