

'One MBA'? How context impacts the development of post-MBA career outcomes

Article

Accepted Version

Creative Commons: Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 4.0

Houldsworth, E., McBain, R. and Brewster, C. ORCID:
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5314-1518> (2019) 'One MBA'?
How context impacts the development of post-MBA career
outcomes. *European Management Journal*, 37 (4). pp. 432-
441. ISSN 0263-2373 doi:
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2019.01.001> Available at
<https://centaur.reading.ac.uk/81629/>

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work. See [Guidance on citing](#).

To link to this article DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2019.01.001>

Publisher: Elsevier

All outputs in CentAUR are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including copyright law. Copyright and IPR is retained by the creators or other copyright holders. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the [End User Agreement](#).

www.reading.ac.uk/centaur

CentAUR

Central Archive at the University of Reading

Reading's research outputs online

TABLES

Table 1: Sample characteristics (percentages in parentheses)

Variable	Coordinated market economies	Social democratic economies	Liberal market economies	Total
Number	84 (19.5)	113 (14.5)	383 (66.0)	580 (100)
Male	68 (81.0)	81 (71.7)	303 (79.1)	452 (77.9)
Female	16 (19.0)	32 (28.3)	80 (20.9)	128 (22.1)
Mean age	46.1	46.5	48.3	47.6
Mean years since graduation	8.8	7.8	10.0	9.4
Mode of Study				
Flexible	67 (79.8)	99 (87.6)	273 (71.3)	439 (75.7)
Executive	17 (20.2)	14 (12.4)	105 (27.4)	136 (23.4)
Corporate	0 (0)	0 (0)	5 (1.3)	5 (0.9)
Organisation sector on joining MBA				
Private	67 (79.8)	93 (82.3)	301 (78.6)	461 (79.5)
Public	6 (7.1)	6 (5.3)	48 (12.5)	60 (10.3)
Mean number of promotions post- MBA	1.94	1.62	1.68	1.71
Same employer post-MBA	30 (35.7)	32 (29.9)	130 (34.5)	192 (33.8)
In same job post- MBA	8 (9.5)	15 (13.3)	54 (14.2)	77 (13.3)
In same country post-MBA	57 (67.9)	92 (81.4)	309 (80.7)	458 (79.0)
In Senior Management	49 (43.4)	63 (75.0)	252 (71.4)	364 (62.8)

Note: Percentages in parentheses.

Table 2: Subjective career outcomes ('Career Capital', 'Career Satisfaction' & 'Perceived Organisation Support') mean scores (and standard deviations)

Variable	Coordinated market economies	Social democratic economies	Liberal market economies	Total
Knowing Why	34.2(7.8)	35.3(8.2)	33.1(8.4)	33.6(8.4)
Knowing How	31.2(8.5)	32.7(9.3)	30.2(9.0)	30.8(9.0)
Knowing Whom	29.84(11.1))	31.56(11.0)	28.71(11.0))	29.43(10.9)
Career Satisfaction	23.1(4.4)	23.7(4.5)	22.5(5.5)	22.8(5.3)
Perceived Organisation Support	21.8(6.1)	24.5(6.8)	23.2(7.0)	23.2(6.8)

N=576 for Career Capital variables and Career Satisfaction and N=527 for Perceived organisation Support

Table 3a: ANCOVA summary 'knowing why'

Source	Sum of squares	df	Mean sq.	F	P	Partial eta squared
VoC	388.73	2	194.37	2.87	0.06	0.01
Age	126.81	1	126.81	1.87	0.17	0.00
Gender	353.92	1	353.92	5.22	0.02	0.01
Years since graduation	52.04	1	52.04	0.77	0.38	0.00
Error	38249.58	564				

Notes: no organisational sector or size dummy variables were significant ($p < 0.05$) and pairwise comparisons indicated no significant differences ($p < 0.05$) between the 3 varieties of capitalism

Table 3b: ANCOVA summary 'knowing how'

Source	Sum of squares	df	Mean sq.	F	P	Partial eta squared
VoC	490.93	2	245.46	3.07	0.05	0.01
Age	503.95	1	503.95	6.30	0.01	0.01
Gender	378.86	1	378.86	4.73	0.03	0.01
Years since graduation	400.58	1	400.58	5.00	0.03	0.01
Error	45153.35	564				

Notes: no organisational sector or size dummy variables were significant ($p < 0.05$) and pairwise comparisons indicated a significant difference ($p = 0.05$) between SDE and LME's in terms of 'knowing how' but not between SDE's and CME's or between CME's and LME's

Table 3c: ANCOVA summary ‘knowing whom’

Source	Sum of squares	df	Mean sq.	F	P	Partial eta squared
VoC	633.99	2	316.97	2.64	0.07	0.01
Age	169.87	1	169.87	1.42	0.24	0.00
Gender	75.17	1	75.14	0.63	0.43	0.00
Years since graduation	140.96	1	140.96	1.18	0.28	0.00
Sector (dummy public)	485.85	1	485.85	4.05	0.05	0.01
Error	67659.28	564				

Notes: no organisational size dummy variable was significant ($p < 0.05$) and pairwise comparisons indicated no significant differences ($p < 0.05$) between the 3 varieties of capitalism

Table 4: ANCOVA summary ‘number of promotions’

Source	Sum of squares	df	Mean sq.	F	P	Partial eta squared
VoC	4.86	2	2.43	1.06	0.35	0.00
Age	30.49	1	30.49	13.26	0.00	0.02
Gender	0.26	1	0.26	0.11	0.74	0.00
Yrs since graduation	180.73	1	180.73	78.58	0.00	0.13
Size (dummy 1001-10000)	16.20	1	16.20	7.05	0.01	0.01
Size (dummy 10001+)	20.56	1	20.56	9.00	0.00	0.02
Error	1251.06	544				

Table 5: Logistic regression summary ‘senior management role’

Variable	Beta (standard error)	Significance (p)	Exp (B) (odds ratio)
SDE	-0.28(0.23)	0.22	0.76
CME	-0.17(0.26)	0.51	0.84
Age	0.03 (0.02)	0.06	1.03
Gender	0.27 (0.21)	0.20	1.31
Years since graduation	0.01(0.02)	0.51	1.01
Dummy (mixed sector)	-0.82(0.36)	0.02	0.44

Chi-squared (11) = 24.38, $p = 0.00$, Cox & Snell = 0.04, Nagelkerke = 0.06, $n = 576$

Note: only significant organisational size and sector dummy variables shown

Table 6a: Logistic regression summary ‘same job’

Variable	Beta (standard error)	Significance (p)	Exp (B) (odds ratio)
SDE	-0.30(0.34)	0.38	0.74
CME	-0.39(0.43)	0.37	0.68
Age	0.05 (0.02)	0.02	1.10
Gender	0.77 (0.37)	0.04	2.16
Years since graduation	-0.15(0.03)	0.00	0.86
Dummy (1001-10000)	-0.71(0.33)	0.03	0.49
Dummy (10001+)	-1.74(0.41)	0.00	0.18
Dummy (mixed sector)	1.01(0.43)	0.02	2.76

Chi-squared (11) = 69.19, p=0.00, Cox & Snell = 0.11, Nagelkerke = 0.23, n=576
Note: only significant organisational size and sector dummy variables shown

Table 6b: Logistic regression summary ‘same organisation’

Variable	Beta (standard error)	Significance (p)	Exp (B) (odds ratio)
SDE	-0.53(0.25)	0.04	0.59
CME	-0.10(0.27)	0.72	0.91
Age	0.01 (0.02)	0.43	1.01
Gender	0.30 (0.23)	0.19	1.35
Years since graduation	-0.11(0.02)	0.00	0.90
Dummy (250-1000)	-0.67(0.32)	0.04	0.51

Chi-squared (11) = 54.82, p=0.00, Cox & Snell = 0.09, Nagelkerke = 0.13, n=565
Note: only significant organisational size and sector dummy variables shown

Table 6c: Logistic regression summary ‘same country’

Variable	Beta (standard error)	Significance (p)	Exp (B) (odds ratio)
SDE	-0.05(0.28)	0.87	0.95
CME	-0.72(0.28)	0.01	0.49
Age	0.02 (0.02)	0.25	1.02
Gender	-0.12 (0.27)	0.66	0.89
Years since graduation	-0.03(0.02)	0.17	0.97
Dummy (Mixed sector)	1.58(0.74)	0.03	4.87

Chi-squared (11) = 18.94 p=0.00, Cox & Snell = 0.03, Nagelkerke = 0.05, n=576
Note: only significant organisational size and sector dummy variables shown

Table 7: ANCOVA summary ‘career satisfaction’

Source	Sum of squares	df	Mean sq.	F	p	Partial eta squared
VoC	165.64	2	82.82	3.02	0.05	0.01
Age	15.22	1	15.22	0.55	0.46	0.00
Gender	146.45	1	146.45	5.34	0.02	0.01
Yrs since graduation	52.81	1	52.81	1.90	0.17	0.01
Error	15462.17	564				

Notes: no organisational sector or size dummy variables were significant ($p < 0.05$) and pairwise comparisons indicated that SDE alumni reported higher levels of ‘career satisfaction’ than those from LME economies with bootstrap estimate of $p = 0.02$), but there were no significant differences between alumni from SDE and CME or between CME and LME economies ($p > 0.05$).

Table 8: ANCOVA summary ‘perceived organisation support’

Source	Sum of squares	df	Mean sq.	F	P	Partial eta squared
VoC	280.74	2	141.37	3.014	0.05	0.01
Age	17.94	1	17.94	0.38	0.54	0.00
Gender	6.14	1	6.14	0.13	0.77	0.00
Years since graduation	37.84	1	37.84	0.81	0.37	0.00
Error	23914.54	513				

Notes: no organisational sector or size dummy variables were significant $p < 0.05$ and pairwise comparisons indicated that SDE’s had significantly higher levels of perceived organisational support post-MBA than CMEs ($p = 0.05$), but not LMEs, and there were no significant differences between LMEs and CME’s but CMEs had the lowest levels of perceived organisational support.

Table 9: SUMMARY MBA career outcomes by comparative capitalisms

Variety of capitalism & countries in this study	Literature suggests	Findings from this study
Coordinated market economy countries (Belgium, France, Germany and the Netherlands)	Secure jobs, industry-specific training, and low staff turnover, as described by Whitley's (1999) high interdependency theory. Less movement between firms.	MBA graduates as likely as those from other regions to change or stay within their organization. More likely to change country than LME. Despite security, not satisfied and do not perceive that are supported by organisation.
Social democratic economy countries (Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden)	High job protection, emphasis on general training. High investment in training (self- or employer-funded). Likely to feel more secure about future.	Learning outcomes (knowing how) recognized and valued. Freedom to change employer or country. High level of satisfaction with careers post-MBA and highest perceived organisational support
Liberal market economy countries (UK, Ireland, Australia and New Zealand)	Relatively weak job protection, high turnover, move roles to gain seniority. Individuals invest in themselves with less company support.	Despite more open labour market, similar promotion and progression, less likely to change country and less satisfied than other economies represented here.