

Future Workforce Survey 2011

A special Report



SECTION	PAGE NO
About the study sponsor	1
About the study	2
What's different about this study?	3
Research Methodology	3
Executive Summary	7
What do we look for in a company?	9
Where do we prefer to get information about the company?	13
How do we want to be assessed?	17
Are we ready to get on the job?	23
What do we prefer to get paid?	26
The industries that attract us...	30
Our preferred work location....	35
Companies we would like to work for	38
Where I see myself 5 years and 10 years from now	42
What we value most at work	47
Global Research findings	50
Key Take-Aways	51
Annexure A - Respondent Demographics	52

About the study sponsor

This study was sponsored by AssessPeople (P) Ltd., a pioneer in providing workforce assessment services that help organizations align their workforce to meet the changing business needs. Known for over ten years for its web-enabled assessment services, AssessPeople provides assessments in workforce selection, development and retention.

With operations in all metropolitan cities in India, AssessPeople is managed by a team of professionals with several decades of experience in Human Resource Management.

This study is one of a series of research initiatives sponsored by AssessPeople to provide insights in to the future workforce expectations that have a significant impact on hiring, training and retention.

About the study

We are pleased to present the 2011 report of the study of 'Future work force expectations' to the industry and academia.

The objective of this study is to understand and analyse the expectations of students who graduate from colleges across the country and are eligible for being considered for employment. For the purpose of this report the term '**GenNext**', has been used to connote the respondents of this study, most of who are below the age of twenty five years. The study aims to

- ✎ Make meaningful comparisons across various segments of the future workforce
- ✎ Provide pointers to industry on the typical expectation profile of the future workforce
- ✎ Make international comparisons wherever possible

The findings of the study provide analyses of demographic variables, future workforce preferences and factor analysed trends on the following aspects

- ✎ Factors considered while evaluating and selecting a company.
- ✎ Preferred source for obtaining information about the company
- ✎ Preferred selection methods
- ✎ Preferred mode of assessment
- ✎ Preferred industry segment, company and work location (city)
- ✎ Preferred compensation

This study is in continuation to the first Future Workforce Study done in 2008. We have tried to compare and contrast the feedback and see how much has changed in the last couple of years. In addition to the feedback on the aspects mentioned above, in this edition of the study, students were also asked for feedback on the following:

- ✍ Work Values they consider most important
- ✍ Their opinion on where they hope to see themselves 5/10 years from now

We do hope that the insights provided in the findings of this study would help the industry in redesigning their sourcing strategies and the academic institutions in making appropriate interventions for meeting the expectations of the passing out students.

Sincerely,

R. Kannan

CEO, AssessPeople

Dr Arup Varma

Director, AssessPeople

Professor of HRM,

Loyola University, Chicago

What's different about this study?

- ✎ First-of-it's kind, a comprehensive study designed to understand future workforce expectations.
- ✎ Surveyed students from broad academic streams - Engineering, Non Engineering, Management, Management premier and Management-non premier.
- ✎ Data collected from a large representative and comprehensive sample from institutions across the country

Research Methodology

The research data referenced in this report are based on responses from students of engineering, non engineering and management (premier and non-premier) institutes across the country. Data were collected during October 2010 to February of 2011

A total of 2823 students participated in the study. The data were screened for outliers, and the final analyses in this report are based on 2785 usable responses.

The respondent profile is exhibited in the table 1 below:

Table 1

Academic Qualification	Percent
Graduate-Engineering	26.0
Graduate-Non-engineering	23.8
Post-Graduate Management - Premier	25.0
Post-Graduate Management - Others	25.3

The sample distribution among various institutions across the regions is given below in the table below:

Table 1A

Region	N	Engg	Non Engg	Mgmt premier	Mgmt Others
North	818	193	110	225	290
East	567	167	190	110	100
West	625	155	80	240	150
South	775	208	282	120	165
Total	2785	723	662	695	705

Data collection was done in two modes. Ninety eight percent of the respondents provided responses online while the rest of the responses were collected offline.

The sampling technique was designed to ensure that all the four regions are adequately and equitably represented. The region- wise profile of respondents for the study is given in Table 2 below:

Table 2

Region	N	Percent
North	818	29.4
East	567	20.4
West	625	22.4
South	775	27.8
Total	2785	100

Analytic Technique:

A variety of statistical techniques were used to analyze the data. To detect structure in the relationships between variables, and to classify variables, factor analysis (principal component analysis) was undertaken.

The means and standard deviations of various dimensional variables (items) were calculated out in order to identify those variables which could be included in the factor analysis (only variables with non-zero standard deviations were considered). The factors and the rotated factors were derived.

The data are presented for various academic specializations -- engineering, non-engineering, management-premier, management-others. The definitions of the specialisations are as follows.

Engineering – Students in the final year of graduation in engineering courses

Non engineering - Students in the final year of graduation in non engineering, non management courses

Management-premier - Students from management institutes ranked in the top thirty as per the criterion noted above.

Management-Others – Students from management institutes other than those defined in the management-premier category above.

With around one half of the population of India in the age group of twenty five years or below, there is little doubt that this group or GenNext as we have chosen to call them, will have a very significant impact on the business and economy in the near future. This study of over 2700 respondents across different regions from different academic streams provides a comprehensive snapshot of the expectations of GenNext, by focusing on key relevant issues. This study is in continuation to the first Future workforce expectations study done in 2008.

In this edition of the study, we wanted to see if there are changes to the expectation profiles. Surprisingly we find that the expectations have changed considerably between the two editions of the study. In this edition we also asked students about where they see themselves 5 & 10 years from now. With work values playing an important role in an employee's retention, we have also tried to understand the future workforce's work values.

It should be noted that the top factor considered by GenNext to evaluate companies is different for different academic streams. The expectation profile is clearly different for respondents from different regions, thereby necessitating a customized approach to 'sourcing' from companies.

It is also interesting to note that although a majority of students prefer an online mode of assessments for selection, they have also shown considerable interest in the offline mode.

The internet has been identified as a major source of information by over 85% (up from 75% in the last study) of the respondents thereby emphasizing the need for companies to ramp up and include online assessments and information as a key component of their selection process.

This study also reinforces that while there are various factors related to the company and the job that are important to GenNext, there is a clear desire to receive formal training from companies, in order to supplement the academic knowledge and accomplishments.

It is also interesting to note that the preference of industry segment seems to have changed completely from the last time around. The telecom sector which was the first choice last time across all student groups has been replaced by specific industry segments for each of the 4 categories. Engineering students have shown a strong preference for 'Manufacturing' (64%), Non-engineering non-management students seem to prefer 'IT' (22.4%) as the first choice. 'Consulting' (23%) is the preferred choice of students from premier management institutes while 'Financial Services' (26.2%) has been identified as the top choice by non-premier management students.

In this year's study 'Job related' aspects seem to hold more weightage than company image and management profile which were key factors in the choice process in the last edition of the study. However company related aspects have been short listed in the top 5 by all respondent groups.

'Interviews' have been replaced by 'web based information sources' as the preferred source of obtaining information across the board. This means that companies need to make sure that their websites are updated continuously and are equipped with all relevant information about the company and the job.

Compensation expectations have gone up tremendously from the last edition of the survey. This could be because companies have slowly wriggled out the recessionary mode and are in a hiring spree again.

In terms of location, the National Capital region (NCR) seems to have replaced Bangalore as the most preferred work location. Bangalore emerges as the second most preferred location followed by a surprise entrant this year-Pune.

Our study findings establish very clearly that "one-size-fits-all" strategies are not likely to work and organisations need to address GenNext sourcing through different strategies due to the continuously changing expectation profiles, as also the regional cultural differences.

What do we look for in a company?

One of the objectives of the study was to understand the factors that the future workforce considers most important in selecting the company of their choice for employment. The table below lists the factors arranged in descending order of magnitude so that the most important item receives Rank 1, the second Rank 2 and so on. We have compared the feedback of the current survey with the survey feedback of the 2008 edition.

Table 3
National

Rank	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
1	Image of Company	Technology used	Image of Company	Job security	Job security	Job profile	Job profile	Job profile
2	Size of Company	Job security	Company Management	Image of Company	Company Management	Image of Company	Type of Industry	Image of Company
3	Company Management	Company Management	Size of Company	Company Management	Image of Company	Designation	Compensation	Job security
4	Location of Work	Image of Company	Job security	Type of Industry	Job profile	Company Management	Size of Company	Company Management
5	Designation	Job profile	Type of Industry	Technology used	Technology used	Compensation	Image of Company	Designation

Commentary

- ✍ Factors related to the ‘company’ seem to have a huge impact on the students’ decision across all categories. This trend has been consistent in both editions of the study.
- ✍ Students of today, especially from the engineering domain seem to prefer companies which adopt the latest technologies.
- ✍ Job profile and job security have become key decision triggers in this year’s study. The economic slowdown could have led to the change in mindset with respect to what the future workforce is looking for in companies

Recommendations

* Clearly, companies need to ensure that their actions lead to the appropriate image in the wider world – it should be noted here that this is not just a case of “projecting” the right image – the future workforce is too savvy for that – but doing the right things.

Table 4**Regional: North**

Rank	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
1	Image of Company	Job profile	Image of Company	Job security	Company Management	Job profile	Image of Company	Job profile
2	Company Management	Technology used	Size of Company	Management of the company	Size of Company	Image of Company	Type of Industry	Management of the company
3	Size of Company	Type of Industry	Company Management	Designation	Image of Company	Management of the company	Company Management	Image of Company
4	Designation	Job security	Potential to Work Abroad	Compensation	Job profile	Compensation	Job profile	Type of Industry
5	Location of Work	Image of Company	Training Period	Image of Company	Compensation	Designation	Compensation	Job security

Commentary

The image of the company was the top factor for students from the north in 2008 edition of the survey. Results from the current survey indicate that ‘Job’ related aspects have got priority. What is also interesting to note is that other than the image of the company which finds a mention in the top 5 factors in both editions of the study, the other factors have changed completely.

Table 5**Regional: South**

Rank	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
1	Image of Company	Job security	Image of Company	Job security	Initial Training	Job profile	Size of Company	Job profile
2	Size of Company	Technology used	Size of Company	Image of Company	Company Management	Designation	Image of Company	Job security
3	Company Management	Management of the company	Company Management	Family opinion	Location of Work	Image of the Company	Company Management	Image of the Company
4	Opinion of Family Members	Type of Industry	Training Period	Management of the company	Designation	Management of the company	Job profile	Designation
5	Job profile	Image of the Company	Job profile	Technology used	Type of Industry	Compensation	Designation	Management of the company

Commentary

Again in the south, the image of the company features prominently in the top 5 in both editions of the survey. As is the case with the National level findings, students from the South across the board have highlighted ‘Job’ related aspects as key decision triggers. A close look at the top 5 factors from both editions of the survey reveals that the most of the factors that were key in 2008 seem to have changed in the current study.

Table : 6

Regional: East

Rank	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
1	Company Management	Technology used	Job security	Image of Company	Company Management	Job profile	Image of Company	Image of the Company
2	Job security	Image of the Company	Location of Work	Job security	Size of Company	Image of the Company	Type of Industry	Job security
3	Training Period	Company Management	Opinion of Family Members	Job profile	Image of the Company	Designation	Company Management	Company Management
4	Potential to work abroad	Job security	Job profile	Company Management	Job profile	Compensation	Job profile	Job profile
5	Image of Company	Type of the company	Designation	Compensation	Technology used	Company Management	Compensation	Designation

Commentary

In the east, the image of the company matters to students across the board. Given the steady growth since the economic meltdown, ‘compensation’ seems to have become a key factor again.

Table: 7
Regional: West

Rank	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
1	Compensation	Job profile	Size of Company	Job security	Opinion of Family Members	Image of the Company	Compensation	Company Management
2	Job profile	Job security	Image of Company	Designation	Potential to Work Abroad	Designation	Designation	Compensation
3	Designation	Company Management	Company Management	Job profile	Initial Training	Job profile	Job profile	Job security
4	Job security	Technology used	Job profile	Image of the Company	Type of Industry	Job security	Type of Industry	Image of the Company
5	Company Management	Image of the Company	Designation	Type of Industry	Job profile	Management of the company	Size of Company	Designation

Commentary

In the west, the current study results indicate a strong trend towards looking at the ‘Job’ and ‘company’ related aspects before deciding on the company to work for. As is the case with the feedback from other regions, the top 5 factors are almost completely different from the last edition of the study.

Overall Recommendations

A comparative analysis of feedback between the two editions of the survey depicts a stark contrast in the top 5 factors. This indicates a change in preferences almost every year. It is important for companies to keep reinventing their talent attraction and engagement strategies to suit the changing preferences of the future workforce. What is clear is that organizations need to pay attention to the different set of factors considered important by students from different streams, in the different regions, and design their strategies accordingly.

Where do we prefer to get information about the company?

Respondents were asked to rate the source of information they prefer most about their potential employers and the following table lists the top five preferred sources and compares the feedback between the earlier study (2008) and the current study (2011)

Table : 8

National

Rank	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
1	Pre Placement Presentations	Company Website	Faculty Opinion and Advice	Search Websites	Pre Placement Presentation	Feedback from alumni	Feedback from alumni	Company Website
2	Company Advertisements	Search Websites	Feedback from alumni	Company Website	Company Advertisements	Company Website	Faculty Opinion and Advice	Feedback from alumni
3	Interview	Feedback from alumni	Interview	Feedback from alumni	Company Website	Pre Placement Presentation & Audio Visuals	Published Materials	Search Websites
4	Search Websites	Pre Placement Presentation	Search Websites	Faculty Opinion and Advice	Search Websites	Faculty Opinion and Advice	Interview	Pre Placement Presentation
5	Company Website	Opinion of Family members	Company Website	Interview	Faculty Opinion	Search Websites	Pre Placement Presentation	Interview

Commentary

From the last edition of the study, where students from different streams clearly favoured different sources when it came to finding relevant information on companies they are considering, in this study there has been a clear shift towards ‘web based’ information gathering. Feedback from alumni also figures prominently in all categories of respondents.

Table : 9

Regional: North

Rank	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
1	Pre Placement Presentations	Search Websites	Pre Placement Presentation	Search Websites	Pre Placement Presentation	Company Website	Pre Placement Presentation	Feedback from alumni
2	Company Advertisements	Company Website	Interview	Interview	Published Materials	Feedback from alumni	Feedback from alumni	Company Website
3	Company Website	Feedback from alumni	Search Websites	Pre Placement Presentation	Feedback from alumni	Search Websites	Faculty Opinion	Search Websites
4	Search Websites	Opinion of Family members	Company Website	Company Advertisements	Company Advertisements	Pre Placement Presentation	Interview	Pre Placement Presentation
5	Interviews	Pre Placement Presentation	Faculty Opinion	Feedback from alumni	Interviews	Faculty Opinion	Opinion of Family members	Interview

Commentary

In the north, ‘pre-placement presentation’ was the most favoured source of information about the company in 2008. In the current edition of the survey, this has changed drastically and students across the board now prefer web based information gathering.

Table : 10

Regional: South

Rank	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
1	Interviews	Company Website	Faculty Opinion	Opinion of Family members	Pre Placement Presentation	Feedback from alumni	Feedback from alumni	Search Websites
2	Opinion of Family members	Feedback from alumni	Feedback from alumni	Interview	Company Advertisements	Company Website	Faculty Opinion	Company Website
3	Pre Placement Presentations	Opinion of Family members	Company Website	Search Websites	Published Materials	Pre Placement Presentation	Company Advertisements	Feedback from alumni
4	Search Websites	Interviews	Search Websites	Company Website	Opinion of Family members	Search Websites	Published Materials	Pre Placement Presentation
5	Company Website	Search Websites	Pre Placement Presentation	Faculty Opinion	Faculty Opinion	Faculty Opinion	Company Website	Interview

Commentary

In the south, we have a mixed bag in the current edition of the study, with engineering and tier II management students relying primarily on the web as the primary source of information gathering. Interestingly ‘family opinion’ features prominently in the Engineering and Non Engineering categories as a preferred source of information on the company.

An overall comparison between the two editions of the survey reveals that although there are not too many changes in the top five sources, the order of preference has changed.

Table 11

Regional: East

Rank	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
1	Pre Placement Presentations	Search Websites	Pre Placement Presentations	Feedback from alumni	Pre Placement Presentations	Feedback from alumni	Pre Placement Presentation	Company Website
2	Company Website	Feedback from alumni	Faculty Opinion	Company Website	Feedback from alumni	Company Website	Published Materials	Feedback from alumni
3	Search Websites	Company Website	Interviews	Search Websites	Published Materials	Pre Placement Presentation & Audio Visuals	Company Advertisements	Search Websites
4	Published Materials	Family opinion	Feedback from alumni	Pre Placement Presentations	Company Website	Faculty Opinion	Interview	Faculty Opinion
5	Company Advertisements	Pre Placement Presentations	Search Websites	Faculty Opinion	Search Websites	Interview	Feedback from alumni	Interview

Commentary

In this year’s study, ‘feedback from alumni’ has featured prominently as a top source of information across the board. The importance of web based information gathering has also gone up in the current context.

When compared to the last study, pre placement presentation seems to have lost priority as a source of information. This indicates that students of today are better informed and updated about companies before they visit campuses for placements.

Table 12

Regional: West

Rank	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
1	Search Websites	Pre Placement Presentations	Company Website	Company Website	Faculty Opinion	Company Website	Pre Placement Presentation	Pre Placement Presentation
2	Company Website	Company Website	Search Websites	Faculty Opinion	Interview	Feedback from alumni	Faculty Opinion	Company Website
3	Faculty Opinion	Search Websites	Pre Placement Presentation	Pre Placement Presentation	Feedback from alumni	Faculty Opinion	Interview	Feedback from alumni
4	Company Advertisements	Feedback from alumni	Published Materials	Feedback from alumni	Pre Placement Presentations	Interview	Opinion of Family members	Interview
5	Published Materials	Interview	Company Advertisements	Search Websites	Search Websites	Pre Placement Presentations	Company Advertisements	Published Materials

Commentary

In the west, engineering and tier II management students clearly rely on pre placement presentations for information on the company while Non-engineering students and students from premier management institutes have shown a preference for gathering information through the web.

Overall Recommendations

Given that a good match between employer and employee is a result of decisions made on good information, on both sides, it is critical that companies make all relevant information available to prospective candidates. However, as we see above, students from different educational streams, and regions of the country, rely on different sources for their information. It is thus critical that organizations devise systems to disseminate information through different sources, at the same time ensuring that the information is consistent and clear. From the findings of both the editions of the survey it is abundantly clear that the web is becoming the prime source of information for students.

How do we want to be assessed?

Table: 13
National

Rank	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
1	Tests on Subject Knowledge	Interviews	Tests on General Aptitude	Interviews	Tests on general aptitude	Interviews	Group Discussions	Interviews
2	Interviews	Tests on Subject Knowledge	Tests on Subject Knowledge	Tests on Subject Knowledge	Tests on Subject Knowledge	Personality Tests	Personality Tests	Test on general aptitude
3	Practical Tests	Practical Tests	Personality Tests	Practical Tests	Personality Tests	Tests on Subject Knowledge	Interviews	Search Websites

Commentary

Feedback from the current study indicates that ‘Interviews’ are back in vogue across the board as the preferred source of assessment. Tests on subject knowledge continue to be important even today.

When we compare the feedback from both editions of the study, we see that ‘personality tests’ seem to have become less preferred. This could also be because for most students in India, the opportunity to go through personality tests in their student life is very rare till they are in college for placements.

Table: 14
Preferred Mode of assessment

Preferred mode of test	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
Online	86.6	64.73	78.1	70.85	79.1	58.27	86.7	65.25
Offline	13.4	35.27	21.9	29.15	20.9	41.73	13.3	34.75

Table 15**Regional: North**

Rank	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
1	Tests on Subject Knowledge	Interviews	Group Discussions	Interviews	Tests on Subject Knowledge	Interviews	Tests on Subject Knowledge	Interviews
2	Interviews	Tests on Subject Knowledge	Interviews	Test on general aptitude	Test on general aptitude	Practical Tests	Personality Tests	Test on general aptitude
3	Personality Tests	Personality Tests	Tests on Subject Knowledge	Personality Tests	Practical Tests	Test on general aptitude	Group Discussions	Tests on Subject Knowledge

Commentary

In the north, in the current survey, Interviews seem to be the order of the day. What is also interesting to note is that tests on subject knowledge, aptitude and personality figure prominently in the top 3 preferences across the board..

Table: 16**Preferred Mode of assessment**

Preferred mode of test	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
Online	77.3	62.58	74.4	100.00	77.8	52.08	84.8	53.33
Offline	22.7	37.42	25.6	Nil	22.2	47.92	15.2	46.67

Table 17**Regional: South**

Rank	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
1	Personality Tests	Tests on Subject Knowledge	Tests on Subject Knowledge	Practical Tests	Interviews	Interviews	Tests on Subject Knowledge	Interviews
2	Practical Tests	Practical Tests	Test on general aptitude	Tests on Subject Knowledge	Tests on Subject Knowledge	Personality Tests	Test on general aptitude	Personality Tests
3	Tests on Subject Knowledge	Interviews	Personality Tests	Personality Tests	Personality Tests	Practical Tests	Interviews	Tests on Subject Knowledge

Commentary

The current study findings show that in the south Management students (both premier and others) prefer Interviews as their first choice while Engineering and Non-engineering students prefer ‘Tests on subject knowledge’ and ‘Practical tests’ respectively.

It is interesting to note that both ‘Tests on subject knowledge’ and ‘Practical tests’ figure in the top 3 in the 3 out of the 4 respondent groups. This indicates that students believe that assessment needs to be done on conceptual knowledge as well practical application of the knowledge.

Table: 18**Preferred Mode of assessment**

Preferred mode of test	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
Online	86.1	66.35	86.3	67.02	92.3	50.00	84.5	72.73
Offline	13.9	33.65	13.7	32.98	7.7	50.00	15.5	27.27

Table 19**Regional: East**

Rank	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
1	Group Discussions	Interviews	Practical Tests	Tests on Subject Knowledge	Test on general aptitude	Interviews	Personality Tests	Interviews
2	Personality Tests	Practical Tests	Tests on Subject Knowledge	Interviews	Tests on Subject Knowledge	Tests on Subject Knowledge	Group Discussions	Personality Tests
3	Tests on Subject Knowledge	Tests on Subject Knowledge	Interviews	Personality Tests	Practical Tests	Practical Tests	Interviews	Test on general aptitude

Commentary

The eastern region also seems to follow the national trend of ‘Interviews’ being the preferred method of assessment. It has to be noted that like in all other regions, students from all respondent groups in the East have also overwhelmingly voted for the use of tests: Practical, Subject knowledge, Personality and General Aptitude in the top 3

Table 20**Preferred Mode of assessment**

Preferred mode of test	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
Online	74.9	62.18	75.0	45.45	63.7	48.89	84.4	55.17
Offline	13.9	37.82	25.0	54.55	36.3	51.11	15.6	44.83

Table 21
Regional: West

Rank	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
1	Tests on Subject Knowledge	Interviews	Tests on Subject Knowledge	Test on general aptitude	Tests on Subject Knowledge	Test on general aptitude	Interviews	Practical Tests
2	Interviews	Tests on Subject Knowledge	Interviews	Interviews	Test on general aptitude	Tests on Subject Knowledge	Tests on Subject Knowledge	Test on general aptitude
3	Personality Tests	Test on general aptitude	Group Discussions	Tests on Subject Knowledge	Practical Tests	Personality Tests	Personality Tests	Interviews

Commentary

In the current study, the feedback from the west is a study in contrast from the rest of the country. 3 out of the 4 respondent groups seem to prefer tests as the preferred method of selection. Although Interviews feature prominently in the top 3 across respondent groups, their preference as the top choice that is only for engineering students.

A comparison with the earlier edition of the survey reveals that the overall choices remain the same, what has changed is the order of preference. Also students have completely voted out Group discussions from the top 3.

Table 22
Preferred Mode of assessment

Preferred mode of test	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
Online	74.5	67.66	77.4	78.95	89.2	100.00	90.9	100.00
Offline	25.5	32.34	22.6	21.05	10.8	Nil	10.1	Nil

Overall Recommendations:

The findings from the current study indicate that students prefer a ‘hi-tech hi-touch approach’ with the right mix of objective assessment via tests and a human touch in the selection process via Interviews. This feedback is also consistent in the mode of assessment where students have shown a preference for the online mode but have also indicated that offline processes can co-exist to make selection practices robust.

Are we ready to get on the job?

Table 23
National

Company Type	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
Companies with formal induction training	86.6	90.73	82.5	76.44	80.8	80.58	83.1	82.27
Companies that put employees on the job straight away	13.4	9.27	17.5	23.56	19.2	19.42	16.9	17.73

Commentary

The findings from the current study are in line with the findings of the earlier study. Respondents across the board prefer to join companies that have formal induction and training programs. Clearly, this is a noteworthy finding, as it presents a clear picture of graduate expectations. Without a doubt, formal on-boarding programs help employees get “started” sooner, and stay longer. However, given that students are also expecting this, organizations should consider investing in this.

Table 24
Regional: North

Company Type	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
Companies with formal induction training	84.3	92.90	80.3	75.00	80.0	89.58	84.8	93.33
Companies that put employees on the job straight away	15.7	7.10	19.7	25.00	20.0	10.42	15.2	6.67

In the North, companies with a formal induction training process are preferred. This has been reinforced strongly in this edition of the study as well.

Table 25**Regional: South**

Company Type	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
Companies with formal induction training	92.7	88.46	83.8	87.23	92.3	62.50	84.5	84.85
Companies that put employees on the job straight away	7.3	11.54	16.2	12.77	7.7	37.50	15.5	15.15

In the south, the preference is for companies with a formal induction training process. However what's interesting is in the premier management category, a considerable number of students (37.5%) have opined that they would not mind getting on to the job straightaway without a structured induction process.

Table 26**Regional: East**

Company Type	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
Companies with formal induction training	82.2	91.71	79.4	45.45	73.5	71.11	79.2	75.86
Companies that put employees on the job straight away	17.8	8.29	20.6	54.55	26.5	28.89	20.8	24.14

The East has also shown a definite preference for companies with formal induction training. However, a majority of students from Non engineering students have indicated that they would not mind joining companies without a formal induction training process.

Table 27
Regional: West

Company Type	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
Companies with formal induction training	87.5	90.42	85.3	78.95	80.7	100.00	83.6	80.00
Companies that put employees on the job straight away	12.5	9.58	14.7	21.05	19.3	Nil	16.4	20.00

Students from the west across the board have clearly indicated that they would prefer joining companies with formal induction training. This is a reinforcement of the feedback given in the previous edition of the study

Overall Recommendations:

The overwhelming majority of participants in both editions of our study have expressed their desire to join companies that offer formal on-boarding as well as ongoing training. But from the last edition of the study in a few regions, students are open to getting on to the job straightaway.

It is imperative for Organizations to ensure that they have such training in place, and that they publicize this information in their communications with the prospective candidates. In addition, it should be noted that research suggests that the first initial weeks and months in an organisation are very critical in getting the mindshare of the employee. So companies need to invest in making their training processes robust as well as interesting.

What do we prefer to get paid?

Table 28

National

Expected Gross Compensation per annum INR	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
< 1,00,000	5.7	2.49	7.6	3.63	3.3	0.72	1.9	Nil
1,00,000 – 2,00,000	31.3	6.64	35.0	21.00	7.4	7.91	16.0	2.84
2,00,000 – 3,00,000	23.7	12.59	23.8	33.38	6.3	7.91	19.2	14.89
3,00,000 – 4,00,000	21.2	43.98	13.3	15.56	8.0	0.00	34.1	29.08
4,00,000 – 5,00,000	6.7	23.37	12.0	12.54	8.8	2.88	21.1	19.15
> 5,00,000	21.2	10.93	8.3	13.90	66.2	80.58	7.7	34.04

Commentary

Salary expectations seem to have gone up across the board from the last edition of the study. The main reason could be that companies have recovered from the economic slowdown hiring is back in full steam. Findings in this year's edition show that about 78% of engineering graduates expect a compensation of more than Rs. 3,00,000/- per annum. More than 80% students from premier management institutes expect a salary of more than Rs. 5,00,000/- per annum.

Table 29

Regional: North

Expected Gross Compensation per annum INR	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
< 1,00,000	6.3	3.23	2.8	Nil	0.0	2.08	2.0	Nil
1,00,000 – 2,00,000	15.7	2.58	17.9	12.50	2.2	Nil	8.3	Nil
2,00,000 – 3,00,000	25.5	6.45	25.1	25.00	6.7	Nil	21.1	Nil
3,00,000 – 4,00,000	22.5	45.16	21.4	25.00	15.6	Nil	45.6	3.33
4,00,000 – 5,00,000	14.3	24.52	19.7	12.50	8.9	4.17	21.6	13.33
> 5,00,000	15.7	18.06	13.1	25.00	66.7	93.75	1.5	83.33

Commentary

More than 83% of non-premier management students and 94% of premier management students from the north expect a salary of more than Rs. 5,00,000/- per annum.

A comparison with the last edition of the survey reveals that salary expectations have gone up across the board.

Table 30
Regional: South

Expected Gross Compensation per annum INR	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
< 1,00,000	6.8	1.44	11.7	8.51	15.4	Nil	4.7	Nil
1,00,000 – 2,00,000	67.6	6.25	53.8	35.11	30.8	Nil	41.6	6.06
2,00,000 – 3,00,000	12.8	13.94	22.3	28.72	15.4	Nil	27.1	18.18
3,00,000 – 4,00,000	7.0	45.19	7.5	11.70	15.4	Nil	17.0	27.27
4,00,000 – 5,00,000	2.9	26.92	3.7	11.70	7.7	4.17	6.9	9.09
> 5,00,000	2.9	6.25	1.0	4.26	15.4	95.83	2.5	39.39

Commentary:

Salary expectations in the south are quite different from those of students in the north. In the current edition of the study, about 80% of students from Engineering expect a salary of more than Rs. 3,00,000/- per annum which is a huge increase from just 12% from the earlier study.

More than 95% of premier Management students expect a salary of more than Rs. 5,00,000/- per annum. This is a huge shift from just 15% from the last edition of the survey.

Table 31
Regional: East

Expected Gross Compensation per annum INR	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
< 1,00,000	4.5	3.11	7.4	Nil	0.0	Nil	0.0	Nil
1,00,000 – 2,00,000	11.7	9.33	20.6	Nil	0.9	Nil	3.6	1.72
2,00,000 – 3,00,000	20.6	13.99	25.0	27.27	2.7	Nil	6.8	18.97
3,00,000 – 4,00,000	40.5	44.56	14.7	18.18	0.9	Nil	38.8	44.83
4,00,000 – 5,00,000	6.1	18.13	17.6	27.27	2.7	2.22	34.4	24.14
> 5,00,000	16.6	10.88	14.7	27.27	92.9	97.78	16.4	10.34

Commentary

Feedback from the east shows a moderate increase in the salary expectations from the last edition of the survey. It is interesting to note that there no drastic changes in the expectations as is the case with the rest of the country.

Table 32
Regional: West

Expected Gross Compensation per annum INR	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
< 1,00,000	5.2	2.40	9.9	0.00	0.0	0.00	0.6	0.00
1,00,000 – 2,00,000	29.7	7.78	58.7	15.79	0.0	0.00	6.4	5.00
2,00,000 – 3,00,000	38.5	14.97	21.2	47.37	2.4	0.00	19.8	20.00
3,00,000 – 4,00,000	12.0	3.59	5.5	0.00	2.4	0.00	39.5	0.00
4,00,000 – 5,00,000	4.2	23.95	3.1	5.26	18.1	50.00	24.0	30.00
> 5,00,000	10.4	10.18	1.7	15.79	77.1	50.00	9.7	20.00

Commentary:

In the west, students from all 4 streams have indicated an increase in the general compensation expectations. Students from premier management institutes have shown flexibility in the compensation package. This could be because of their preference for a good job profile over compensation.

Overall Recommendations:

The salary expectations of students from the four streams reveal some interesting patterns, as we note above. The common take away is that salary expectations have gone up drastically from the last time possibly due to the better economic and hiring scenario in the country. The substantial difference between the expectations from the different streams continues in this edition of the study as well.

Overall, this information should prove very useful for companies as they plan their recruitment strategies.

Table 33
National

Expected Gross Compensation per annum INR	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
Consulting	6.2	4.84	5.3	4.38	12.1	23.02	3.2	21.99
Diversified	2.0	3.46	4.1	1.96	6.0	10.79	7.5	6.38
Financial Services	11.5	4.43	27.8	9.21	37.6	15.11	21.9	26.24
FMCG	1.5	1.38	1.9	6.50	12.6	12.95	8.3	14.89
Hospitality	0.8	0.83	2.4	4.53	0.3	3.60	1.3	0.00
IT	33.0	5.53	19.6	22.36	7.7	10.07	8.4	9.93
ITeS	2.1	0.55	4.3	5.44	1.6	10.07	2.1	2.84
Manufacturing	8.1	64.45	3.3	3.63	1.4	2.16	4.2	4.96
Pharma	0.7	0.69	1.4	16.77	0.8	1.44	1.1	2.84
Retail	0.5	0.83	2.6	1.96	1.1	0.72	4.8	2.84
Telecom	29.4	2.90	16.5	9.52	18.1	0.72	34.2	3.55
Others	4.3	10.10	10.9	13.75	0.5	9.35	3.0	3.55
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Commentary

Results from the current study indicate that Engineering students prefer ‘manufacturing’ companies. This is a clear shift from the previous edition of the survey where ‘IT’ was the preferred choice. The top preference for non-engineering non-management students has shifted from ‘Financial services’ in the previous edition of the survey to ‘IT’ in the present study. Premier management students, in the current study have shown a clear preference for ‘Consulting’. This is a shift from ‘Financial services’ which was the preferred choice in the earlier edition of the study. Non premier management students have moved their preference from ‘Telecom’ in the last edition of the study to ‘Financial Services’ in the current study.

Table 34
Regional: North

Expected Gross Compensation per annum INR	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
Consulting	9.8	6.5	4.6	12.5	8.9	25.0	4.4	60.0
Diversified	2.5	2.6	5.4	12.5	15.6	20.8	7.4	16.7
Financial Services	6.5	3.2	11.7	Nil	22.2	8.3	11.8	16.7
FMCG	2.0	Nil	2.8	Nil	20.0	20.8	9.8	3.3
Hospitality	2.5	2.6	3.1	25.0	0.0	4.2	2.9	Nil
IT	21.8	6.5	14.0	12.5	8.9	12.5	7.4	Nil
ITeS	2.3	1.3	1.4	Nil	0.0	Nil	2.0	Nil
Manufacturing	6.5	61.3	4.6	Nil	0.0	4.2	2.0	Nil
Pharma	0.3	Nil	1.7	Nil	2.2	2.1	1.0	Nil
Retail	0.8	0.7	3.1	12.5	2.2	2.1	5.9	Nil
Telecom	39.8	2.6	22.2	12.5	20.0	Nil	42.2	3.3
Others	5.5	12.9	25.4	12.5	0.0	Nil	3.4	Nil
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Commentary

In the current edition of the study, Engineering students prefer the ‘Manufacturing’ segment while Non engineering non management students prefer the ‘Hospitality’ industry. Students from premier and non premier management institutes prefer ‘Consulting’.

The current trends indicate a clear shift in the preference for industry segments across all the 4 respondent groups.

Table 35**Regional: South**

Expected Gross Compensation per annum INR	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
Consulting	4.6	3.4	6.0	3.2	0.0	29.2	3.8	6.1
Diversified	2.2	4.8	1.2	1.1	0.0	Nil	3.2	Nil
Financial Services	16.5	5.8	50.0	7.5	69.2	29.2	47.3	33.3
FMCG	2.6	1.4	0.8	1.1	0.0	4.2	6.0	9.1
Hospitality	0.9	1.0	0.8	Nil	0.0	4.2	0.9	Nil
IT	56.4	3.9	16.7	27.7	15.4	16.7	13.9	30.3
ITeS	2.0	0.5	9.5	12.8	7.7	8.3	3.5	Nil
Manufacturing	2.2	65.9	1.8	8.5	0.0	4.2	3.8	6.1
Pharma	1.1	1.4	0.3	28.7	0.0	4.2	1.3	6.1
Retail	0.7	0.5	1.0	1.1	0.0	Nil	1.9	3.0
Telecom	7.5	3.4	5.2	1.1	7.7	Nil	10.7	3.0
Others	3.3	8.2	6.7	7.5	0.0	Nil	3.8	3.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Commentary

In south, in the current edition of the study, Engineering students prefer the ‘Manufacturing’ segment while Non engineering non management students prefer the ‘Financial services’ industry. Students from premier and non premier management institutes prefer ‘Financial services’.

The current trends indicate a clear shift in the preference for industry segments in 3 of the 4 respondent groups.

Table 36
Regional: East

Expected Gross Compensation per annum INR	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
Consulting	6.5	4.2	5.9	Nil	27.4	28.9	3.2	17.2
Diversified	2.0	1.8	10.3	Nil	3.5	11.1	12.8	5.2
Financial Services	9.3	3.6	17.6	Nil	37.2	22.2	13.2	25.9
FMCG	0.4	1.0	2.9	27.3	20.4	15.6	10.8	24.1
Hospitality	0.0	Nil	2.9	Nil	0.0	4.4	0.8	Nil
IT	16.2	9.3	10.3	Nil	2.7	8.9	4.0	1.7
ITeS	2.0	Nil	4.4	Nil	0.0	2.2	0.8	3.5
Manufacturing	3.2	65.3	4.4	Nil	3.5	Nil	6.8	6.9
Pharma	0.4	1.0	2.9	9.1	0.9	Nil	0.8	3.5
Retail	0.0	Nil	4.4	Nil	1.8	Nil	6.4	Nil
Telecom	59.1	4.7	30.9	36.4	2.7	2.2	38.9	5.2
Others	0.8	9.3	2.9	27.3	0.0	4.4	1.6	6.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Commentary

Engineering students from the East seem to follow the trend set by the rest of the country in identifying ‘Manufacturing’ as the preferred industry segment. The preference of Non-engineering non- management students continues to be with the ‘Telecom’ industry. Premier management students prefer ‘Consulting’ while non premier management students prefer ‘Financial services’. It is interesting to note that the choice of industry is different for the different respondent groups.

Table 37**Regional: West**

Expected Gross Compensation per annum INR	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
Consulting	4.2	6.0	4.6	5.3	6.0	23.4	1.8	5.0
Diversified	1.0	4.8	1.4	Nil	4.8	6.7	7.6	5.0
Financial Services	13.5	4.8	36.1	21.1	25.3	8.3	11.6	30.0
FMCG	1.0	3.0	0.5	5.3	6.0	9.4	7.6	15.0
Hospitality	0.0	Nil	2.6	5.3	1.2	0.0	0.9	0.0
IT	38.5	2.4	44.2	31.6	6.0	4.3	7.0	15.0
ITeS	2.6	0.6	1.2	Nil	0.0	11.6	1.8	10.0
Manufacturing	22.9	64.7	2.2	Nil	1.2	7.6	4.0	5.0
Pharma	1.0	Nil	0.5	10.5	0.0	2.7	1.2	Nil
Retail	0.5	2.4	1.2	Nil	0.0	4.7	5.8	15.0
Telecom	6.3	0.6	3.4	5.3	47.0	3.8	47.7	Nil
Others	8.3	10.8	2.2	15.8	2.4	17.5	3.0	Nil
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Commentary:

‘Manufacturing’ is the preferred choice of industry segment of engineering students in the West. This is a shift from ‘IT’ which was the majority choice in the previous edition of the study. Non- engineering non-management students continue to favour the ‘IT’ industry while non premier management students prefer ‘Financial services’. Students from premier management institutes prefer ‘Consulting’ What is interesting to note is that ‘ITeS’ has moved into the second preferred choice for premier management students after drawing a blank in the last edition of the survey.

Overall Recommendations:

The information in the tables above can prove critical to companies as they plan their attraction and selection strategies. As an example, companies that are very highly desired by students need to ensure that their screening procedures are equipped to identifying the candidates that are the best-qualified, and potentially the best fit. On the other hand, companies that are not ranked as highly preferred by students might need to work on their attraction strategies as part of their recruitment process.

Table 38
National

City	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
Most preferred city	Bangalore	National Capital Region (NCR)	National Capital Region (NCR)	Bangalore	Mumbai	National Capital Region (NCR)	National Capital Region (NCR)	Kolkata
Second Most preferred city	National Capital Region (NCR)	Bangalore	Bangalore	Pune	Bangalore	Bangalore	Bangalore	Bangalore
Third preference	Chennai	Pune	Chennai	National Capital Region (NCR)	National Capital Region (NCR)	Pune	Pune	Pune

Commentary:

The preferred city analysis presents an interesting picture. The IT capital of India, Bangalore has been dethroned by the NCR region as far as engineering graduates are concerned. Interestingly in the Non-engineering non-management segment, Bangalore takes the top spot from NCR. NCR seems to be the preferred choice for students from premier management institutes while Kolkata has emerged as the new choice for students from non premier management students.

Table 39
Regional: North

City	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
Most preferred city	National Capital Region (NCR)	National Capital Region (NCR)	National Capital Region (NCR)	National Capital Region (NCR)	National Capital Region (NCR)	National Capital Region (NCR)	National Capital Region (NCR)	National Capital Region (NCR)
Second Most preferred city	Bangalore	Bangalore	Bangalore	Mumbai	Mumbai	Mumbai	Pune	Mumbai
Third preference	Mumbai	Mumbai	Mumbai	Bangalore	Pune	Bangalore	Mumbai	Bangalore

Commentary:

Students in the North across the board prefer NCR as their preferred work location. Bangalore and Mumbai are the other top options across the board in the current edition of the study. It is interesting to note that there is not too much change in the preferences between the two editions of the study.

Table 40**Regional: South**

City	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
Most preferred city	Chennai	Chennai	Chennai	Bangalore	Chennai	Chennai	Chennai	Chennai
Second Most preferred city	Bangalore	Bangalore	Bangalore	Hyderabad	Bangalore	Bangalore	Bangalore	Bangalore
Third preference	Hyderabad	Hyderabad	Hyderabad	Chennai	Mumbai	Mumbai	Hyderabad	Mumbai

Commentary

In the present study, Chennai retains the top spot among students across the board. Bangalore and Hyderabad are the next top choices for students. Mumbai is a new entrant in the preference chart of premier and non premier management students.

Table 41**Regional: East**

City	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
Most preferred city	Kolkata	Kolkata	Kolkata	Kolkata	Mumbai	Mumbai	Mumbai	Kolkata
Second Most preferred city	National Capital Region (NCR)	Bangalore	National Capital Region (NCR)	Mumbai	Bangalore	Bangalore	Bangalore	National Capital Region (NCR)
Third preference	Bangalore	Mumbai	Mumbai	Bangalore	National Capital Region (NCR)	Pune	National Capital Region (NCR)	Bangalore

Commentary

For students from the East, in this edition of the study, Kolkata seems to be the top option. However students from premier management institutes have identified Mumbai as their most preferred location. Bangalore and Mumbai are the other top choices for students across the board and Pune debuts as one of the preferred choices for premier management students.

Table: 42
Regional: West

City	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
Most preferred city	Mumbai	Pune	Mumbai	Mumbai	Mumbai	National Capital Region (NCR)	Pune	Pune
Second Most preferred city	Pune	Mumbai	Pune	Pune	Pune	Bangalore	Mumbai	Mumbai
Third preference	Bangalore	Bangalore	Bangalore	Bangalore	National Capital Region (NCR)	Pune	Bangalore	Bangalore

In the current edition of the study, for engineering and non premier management students, Pune seems to have pipped Mumbai to the top spot. It is interesting to note that Mumbai fails to find a place in the top 3 preferences of premier management students.

Overall Recommendations:

Student location preferences can help organizations plan their organizational, as well as business strategies. As an example, organizations may need to tailor compensation packages to attract qualified candidates to cities that may not high on student preferences.

Table 43
National

Rank	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
1	Tata Group	Tata Group	Tata Group	Tata Group	Tata Group	Tata Group	Tata Group	Tata Group
2	Wipro	ITC	Citigroup	ITC	Hindustan Unilever Ltd	Infosys	Reliance ADAG	Wipro
3	Infosys	Hindustan Unilever Ltd	Wipro	Hindustan Unilever Ltd	HSBC Bank	Hindustan Unilever Ltd	Airtel	Accenture
4	Bharat Forge	Asia Motor Works	Reliance ADAG	Infosys	Goldman Sachs	ITC	ABN Amro	Mahindra & Mahindra
5	CTS	Infosys	Scope International	Asia Motor Works	Proctor & Gamble	Wipro	Infosys	CTS
6	Reliance ADAG	Price Waterhouse Cooper	Infosys	Adobe	Mckinsey	Accenture	Wipro	Infosys
7	Airtel	IBM	IBM	Deloitte	ABN Amro	Sony	Citigroup	L&T
8	BSNL	EICHER	ICICI Bank	Volvo	J P Morgan	Reliance Industries	Hindustan Unilever Ltd	Sap
9	IBM	Accenture	ABN Amro	Dunnhumby	Citigroup	L&T	ICICI Bank	ITC
10	HCL	Goldman Sachs	HCL	Price Waterhouse Cooper	Infosys	Lupin India	ITC	Hindustan Unilever Ltd

Commentary

Respondents were asked to identify one organisation that they would love to work for. The open ended responses were analysed and a frequency distribution was done on the responses. The table above is a ranking of the organisations identified by respondents from different educational streams.

- ✍ The Tata Group with companies across industry verticals like Telecom, IT, ITeS, Steel etc continues to be the overwhelming favourite across all 4 categories of respondents.
- ✍ The preference profile of engineering students in the current study paints an interesting picture. The 10 most preferred companies include diversified groups, automotive companies, IT and consulting companies. Telecom and IT which were the hot favorites in the earlier edition of the study seemed have lost their sheen.
- ✍ Non-engineering students again seem to prefer an interesting mix of IT, ITeS and diversified groups. Financial services companies interestingly seem to have lost favour in this edition of the study.
- ✍ Students from premier management institutes have a wider mix of companies from different industry verticals. FMCG, IT, Consulting top the list.
- ✍ The non-premier management students also seem to favour a wide variety of companies from industry verticals like IT, FMCG and diversified groups.

The region-wise information is presented in the tables below.

Table 44

Regional: North

Rank	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
1	Tata Group	Tata Group	Tata Group	Tata Group	Tata Group	Tata Group	Tata Group	Tata Group
2	Infosys	Hindustan Unilever Ltd	Reliance ADAG	Deloitte	Hindustan Unilever Ltd	Infosys	Reliance ADAG	ITC
3	Wipro	ITC	IBM	Infosys	HSBC Bank	ITC	Airtel	Hindustan Unilever Ltd
4	HCL	Asia Motor Works	Wipro	Accenture	Proctor & Gamble	Hindustan Unilever Ltd	ICICI Bank	Infosys
5	Reliance ADAG	Infosys	Airtel	ITC	Standard Chartered Bank	L&T	ITC	Deloitte
6	Airtel	Accenture	HCL	Hindustan Unilever Ltd	CTS	CTS	Wipro	Volvo
7	IBM	CTS	ICICI Bank	Adobe	SBI	IBM	HDFC Bank	Wipro
8	Microsoft	Wipro	Hero Honda	Aircel	Vodafone	Wipro	Vodafone	Adobe
9	Google	IBM	HDFC Bank	Volvo	ICICI Bank	Google	Aditya Birla Group	Dunnhumby
10	Dell	Airtel	Infosys	Ernst and Young	Airtel	Asia Motor Works	Infosys	Accenture

Table 45

Regional: South

Rank	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
1	Tata Group	Tata Group	Scope International	Tata Group	Scope International	Tata Group	Tata Group	Tata Group
2	Wipro	Hindustan Unilever Ltd	Citigroup	ITC	ABN Amro	ITC	ABN Amro	ITC
3	CTS	ITC	Tata Group	Hindustan Unilever Ltd	Tata Group	Infosys	Scope International	Infosys
4	Scope International	Infosys	ABN Amro	Infosys	Goldman Sachs	Hindustan Unilever Ltd	Infosys	Asia Motor Works
5	Citigroup	Asia Motor Works	Wipro	Wipro	SBI	Accenture	Wipro	Hindustan Unilever Ltd
6	ABN Amro	IBM	Infosys	Dunnhumby	HDFC Bank	Mahindra & Mahindra	Citigroup	Wipro
7	HCL	Wipro	CTS	Accenture	Citigroup	EICHER	ICICI Bank	L&T
8	Infosys	Accenture	HCL	Deloitte	Aditya Birla Group	Asia Motor Works	Reliance ADAG	Reliance Industries
9	ICICI Bank	L&T	Accenture	Ernst and Young	Accenture	Reliance Industries	Nokia	SBI
10	Accenture	CTS	ICICI Bank	Price Waterhouse Cooper	J P Morgan	Deloitte	CTS	Mahindra & Mahindra

Table 46

Regional: East

Rank	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
1	Tata Group	Tata Group	Tata Group	Tata Group	Tata Group	Tata Group	Tata Group	Tata Group
2	BSNL	ITC	Citigroup	ITC	Citigroup	ITC	L G Electronics	ITC
3	Wipro	Infosys	Reliance ADAG	Accenture	Reliance ADAG	Hindustan Unilever Ltd	Reliance ADAG	Hindustan Unilever Ltd
4	Reliance ADAG	Accenture	Wipro	Infosys	Wipro	Infosys	ITC	Infosys
5	Infosys	Hindustan Unilever Ltd	Airtel	Asia Motor Works	Airtel	Wipro	Hindustan Unilever Ltd	Wipro
6	Airtel	IBM	ITC	JP Morgan	ITC	Accenture	Axis Bank	Accenture
7	Nokia	L&T	Aditya Birla Group	CTS	Aditya Birla Group	CTS	Airtel	CTS
8	Vodafone	EICHER	Infosys	Deloitte	Infosys	Reliance Industries	HSBC Bank	Reliance Industries
9	Google Inc	Asia Motor Works	SBI	IBM	SBI	L&T	Aditya Birla Group	L&T
10	Dell	Wipro	HCL		HCL		HDFC Bank	Mahindra & Mahindra

Table 47
Regional: West

Rank	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
1	Tata Group	Tata Group	Citigroup	Tata Group	Tata Group	Tata Group	Tata Group	Tata Group
2	Citigroup	ITC	Tata Group	Infosys	Vodafone	Infosys	Reliance ADAG	ITC
3	Bharat Forge Ltd	Hindustan Unilever Ltd	Wipro	Nil	SBI	Hindustan Unilever Ltd	Airtel	Infosys
4	Infosys	Infosys	Infosys	ITC	Infosys	ITC	Hindustan Unilever Ltd	Hindustan Unilever Ltd
5	Larsen & Toubro	Deloitte	ICICI Bank	Hindustan Unilever Ltd	Hindustan Unilever Ltd	Accenture	Citigroup	Volvo
6	Wipro	EICHER	Accenture	Accenture	Citigroup	CTS	Infosys	Asia Motor Works
7	Pami Computer Systems	CTS	IBM	Deloitte	HSBC Bank	Google Inc	HDFC Bank	Price Waterhouse Cooper
8	Reliance ADAG	Mahindra & Mahindra	HDFC Bank	Goldman Sachs	Airtel	Wipro	HSBC Bank	Google Inc
9	Accenture	Procter & Gamble	Reliance ADAG	Volvo	HDFC Bank	IBM	ITC Group	Adobe
10	IBM	Price Waterhouse Cooper	J P Morgan Chase Bank	Reliance Industries	Price Waterhouse Cooper	Volvo	Wipro	Deloitte

Overall Recommendations:

Student preferences for certain companies reveal student perceptions of organizations' reputation and credibility. As an example, the preferences reveal what students believe those companies have to offer – e.g., salary and perks; the companies' reputation for being ethical and values-based, their level of community involvement through CSR, etc. But, what companies should really note is that these lists also reveal what students consider important when deciding to join a company.

Where I see myself 5 years and 10 years from now...

In the current edition of the study, we had asked students where they would like to see themselves 5 & 10 years into their careers. The feedback from students is very interesting. The following tables depict the overall national and region wise feedback

Table 48

National

5 years

Rank	Engineering	Non-Engineering	Management Premier	Management Others
1	Still with the first job	Working abroad	Second or third job	Working abroad
2	Working abroad	Still with the first job	Working abroad	Still with the first job
3	Higher studies	Higher studies	Higher studies	Second or third job

10 years

Rank	Engineering	Non-Engineering	Management Premier	Management Others
1	Working abroad	Working abroad	Working abroad	Working abroad
2	Still with the first job	Own business	Own business	Own business
3	Own business	Still with the first job	Second or third job	Second or third job

‘Working abroad’ seems to be the preferred medium and long term goal for students across the board. In the 5 year forecast, students across categories have also indicated a wish to pursue ‘higher studies’. What is also good to see is that students from Engineering, Non-engineering non-management and non-premier management students also want to continue to be with the first company they join.

In the 10 year forecast what is interesting and refreshing to see is that ‘entrepreneurship’ is a preferred choice and is in the top 3 across all categories of students. This is also a reflection of our times where there are opportunities galore for people with innovative ideas and zeal to succeed.

Table 49

North

5 years

Rank	Engineering	Non-Engineering	Management Premier	Management Others
1	Still with the first job	Another career	Second or third job	Still with the first job
2	Working abroad	Second or third job	Working abroad	Working abroad
3	Higher studies	Working abroad	Still with the first job	Higher studies

10 years

Rank	Engineering	Non-Engineering	Management Premier	Management Others
1	Working abroad	Second or third job	Working abroad	Still with the first job
2	Still with the first job	Working abroad	Own business	Working abroad
3	Own business	Higher studies	Second or third job	Own business

Engineering and Non-premier Management students hope to continue in their first jobs, while premier management students want to move to their second or third jobs in 5 years. Non engineering students interestingly have voted to move into another career in 5 years. ‘Working abroad’ also seems to be a preference across the board.

In the 10 year forecast, it is interesting to note that across the board, the top 3 options remain more or less the same though the order of preference is different. Again it is refreshing to see that students in a 10 year perspective want to look at ‘becoming entrepreneurs’.

Table 50

South

5 years

Rank	Engineering	Non-Engineering	Management Premier	Management Others
1	Still with the first job	Working abroad	Still with the first job	Working abroad
2	Working abroad	Higher studies	Working abroad	Still with the first job
3	Higher studies	Still with the first job	Second or third job	Second or third job

10 years

Rank	Engineering	Non-Engineering	Management Premier	Management Others
1	Working abroad	Working abroad	Second or third job	Working abroad
2	Still with the first job	Higher studies	Working abroad	Second or third job
3	Own business	Still with the first job	Own business	Own business

The 5 year forecast of student from the south is very similar to the national and other regional trends. ‘Continuing in the first job’ is the top preference for students from engineering and premier management institutes whereas ‘Working abroad’ is the top preference for non-engineering non-management and non-premier management students.

The preference in the 10 year forecast is in line with the popular perception of settling down by ‘Working abroad’ and move to the second or third job. It is interesting to note that the entrepreneurial bug has hit the south Indian students too who are traditionally known to be in favour of working for public/private enterprises.

Table 51**East****5 years**

Rank	Engineering	Non-Engineering	Management Premier	Management Others
1	Still with the first job	Still with the first job	Second or third job	Working abroad
2	Working abroad	Own business	Working abroad	Second or third job
3	Higher studies	Still with the first job	Own business	Own business

10 years

Rank	Engineering	Non-Engineering	Management Premier	Management Others
1	Working abroad	Own business	Own business	Working abroad
2	Still with the first job	Still with the first job	Working abroad	Own business
3	Own business	Another career	Second or third job	Second or third job

In the 5 year forecast for the east, students from different categories have shown different preferences. What is refreshing to note is that in the east, students have shown a strong interest in entrepreneurship within the 5 year horizon.

The 10 year forecast confirms the current generation's interest in 'being on their own' with students from both the management categories and non-engineering non-management category opting to run their own business as their first choice. What is also interesting is that students from engineering and non engineering categories have shown a preference to stay with their first job in the 10 year horizon.

Table 52

West

5 years

Rank	Engineering	Non-Engineering	Management Premier	Management Others
1	Still with the first job	Still with the first job	Higher studies	Working abroad
2	Working abroad	Higher studies	Working abroad	Higher studies
3	Higher studies	Working abroad	Second or third job	Still with the first job

10 years

Rank	Engineering	Non-Engineering	Management Premier	Management Others
1	Working abroad	Working abroad	Working abroad	Working abroad
2	Own business	Own business	Higher studies	Own business
3	Still with the first job	Still with the first job	Nil	Second or third job

‘Continuing in the first job’ is the top preference in the 5 year horizon for students from engineering and non engineering. ‘Higher studies’ and ‘Working abroad’ also feature prominently in the top 3 across student categories.

The 10 year forecast for students from the west shows a clear preference for ‘Working abroad’. As is the case with the rest of the country, students have also shown a strong inclination for ‘Entrepreneurship’.

Overall recommendations

With a view to expanding the scope of the study, we had asked the students to let us know their 5-year and 10-year aspirations. The results make for some interesting reading. The take away for companies and educational institutes is that the students of today across categories have shown an inclination to look at their jobs with a long term perspective and have shown a strong interest in ‘Entrepreneurship’. Educational institutions can work towards offering more courses on entrepreneurship and companies can help in developing budding entrepreneurs.

What we value most at work...

Table 53
National

Rank	Engineering	Non-Engineering	Management Premier	Management Others
1	Career advancement	Career advancement	Opportunity to learn new things	Opportunity to learn new things
2	Team work	Team work	Work-life balance	Work-life balance
3	Personally fulfilling work	Personally fulfilling work	Personally fulfilling work	Personally fulfilling work

In the current edition of the study, we had also asked students to identify what they valued most at work. The feedback from an overall national perspective shows that ‘Career advancement’ and ‘Opportunity to learn new things’ top the charts. ‘Work-life balance’ and the need to do ‘Personally fulfilling work’ make up the other factors in the top 3.

Table 54
North

Rank	Engineering	Non-Engineering	Management Premier	Management Others
1	Career advancement	Management that provides feedback	Opportunity to learn new things	Opportunity to learn new things
2	Opportunity to learn new things	Opportunity to learn new things	Career advancement	Career advancement
3	Challenging tasks	Career advancement	Work-life balance	Personally fulfilling work

‘Opportunity to learn new things’ and ‘Career advancement’ seem to be the drivers for students from the North. A closer look at the top 3 shows that students across categories have identified different work values that make up the top 3.

Table 55
South

Rank	Engineering	Non-Engineering	Management Premier	Management Others
1	Opportunity to learn new things	Opportunity to learn new things	Career advancement	Opportunity to learn new things
2	Personally fulfilling work	Career advancement	Personally fulfilling work	Career advancement
3	Career advancement	Personally fulfilling work	Work-life balance	Work-life balance

For students from the South, ‘Opportunity to learn new things’ seems to be the most important work value followed closely by ‘Career advancement’ and ‘Personally fulfilling work’. ‘Work-life balance’ has also been identified as important by management students.

Table 56
East

Rank	Engineering	Non-Engineering	Management Premier	Management Others
1	Opportunity to learn new things	Career advancement	Career advancement	Career advancement
2	Team work	Opportunity to learn new things	Work-life balance	Opportunity to learn new things
3	Career advancement	Team work	Personally fulfilling work	Work-life balance

Students across the board from the East value ‘Career advancement’ the most. ‘Opportunity to learn new things’ and ‘work life balance’ also figure prominently in the top 3

Table 57

West

Rank	Engineering	Non-Engineering	Management Premier	Management Others
1	Opportunity to learn new things	Opportunity to learn new things	Opportunity to learn new things	Opportunity to learn new things
2	Career advancement	Team work	Team work	Team work
3	Team work	Career advancement	Career advancement	Career advancement

Feedback from the West is very similar to the South. ‘Opportunity to learn new things’ seems to be the most important work value followed closely by ‘Career advancement’. Team work has also made it to the top 3. Interestingly students from the West also value ‘Team work’ which does not figure in the other regions

The last decade has seen a lot of interest in understanding the GenNext. One of the prime reasons for that is that world the profile of the workforce is changing. In most countries, a high percentage of workforce is retiring in the next 5-10 years making way for the younger generation. In recent years, several studies have highlighted the Gen X expectations. The following are highlights of a few important global studies on the topic.

PwC's 12th Annual Global CEO survey

- ✎ 65% of CEOs said they were experiencing challenges recruiting and integrating younger employees.
- ✎ Majority of CEOs saw flexible working arrangements as one of the most critical components to their ability to attract and retain talent.

PwC Millennials at work survey

- ✎ 88% of millennials would choose employers whose social responsibility values reflected their own
- ✎ 5% of millennials anticipated they would have between two to five employers in a life time.
- ✎ 78% believe that working with strong coaches and mentors is a critical part of their development.

Towers Watson's 2010 Global Workforce Study

- ✎ The desire for security trumps everything.
- ✎ Employees understand they are responsible for their long-term financial and physical health but they doubt their ability to take on this role.
- ✎ Mobility is at a decade-long low point, and many are sacrificing career growth for a secure job.
- ✎ Confidence in leaders and managers is disturbingly low.

Key Take-aways

- ✎ The expectation profiles predominantly vary across the four academic streams.
- ✎ There is a clear difference in perspective, expectations and choices between the two editions of the survey.
- ✎ Future workforce preferences change year after year and it's important for companies and institutions to be in touch with the changing preferences.
- ✎ A significant majority of respondents expect formal training by companies.
- ✎ GenNext finds Job profile and Company image most important.
- ✎ The preference of industry segments presents a completely different picture from the earlier edition of the study. The current preferences seem to be in line with the overall economy and business sentiment prevalent in the country.
- ✎ Career advancement and Opportunity to learn are the GenNext's key work values.
- ✎ Have shown interest in Entrepreneurship in a 10 year horizon.
- ✎ GenNext appears to be net savvy as well as values robust offline selection processes indicating a preference for a hi-tech and hi-touch approach.
- ✎ Companies need to adopt a customized approach to sourcing to enhance the effectiveness of the process and greater alignment with GenNext expectations.

Annexure A - Respondent Profile

The following tables provide the profile of respondents to the study across various demographic variables. The profile is given both for the National level (an aggregate of the regional data) and for the regional level with respect to each region. The tables show the respondent profiles of both editions of the study.

National

Table 1
Gender

Gender	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
Male	81.9	86.6	69.0	63.0	68.1	55.4	74.7	63.1
Female	18.1	13.4	31.0	37.0	31.9	44.6	25.3	36.9

Table 2
Age

Age	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
18-20	18.4	18.9	22.8	23.1	0.6	0.0	2.1	0.0
21-24	68.0	77.2	54.5	53.0	61.8	57.6	74.0	71.6
25 & above	13.6	3.9	22.7	23.9	37.6	42.4	23.9	28.4

Table 3
Work Experience

Experience	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
No experience	80.1	55.6	58.7	59.4	34.1	59.7	62.0	59.6
Up to 1 Year	6.6	10.1	13.0	12.8	12.4	12.6	17.8	11.1
1 - 3 Years	9.6	18.4	14.3	16.5	37.9	16.5	14.6	17.1
Over 3 Years	3.7	13.9	14.0	11.2	15.7	11.2	5.6	12.2

Table 4
Ranking in class

Ranking in class	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
First Quartile (Top 25%)	50.1	61.3	45.2	53.3	56.6	48.9	60.7	49.6
Second Quartile	40.5	26.0	42.6	39.9	32.7	29.5	32.4	31.9
Third Quartile	7.3	9.7	10.0	6.3	8.5	18.0	5.5	13.5
Fourth Quartile (Bottom 25%)	2.1	3.0	2.2	0.5	2.2	3.6	1.4	5.0

Table 5
Educational background of father

Education	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
Under graduate	43.6	33.5	44.6	48.8	14.6	16.5	29.8	19.1
Graduate	38.9	45.9	39.6	44.6	42.6	49.6	46.4	56.8
Post graduate	17.5	20.6	15.8	6.6	42.8	33.9	23.8	24.1

Table 6
Educational background of mother

Education	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
Under graduate	62.9	52.6	59.3	55.7	32.2	38.1	51.5	43.2
Graduate	27.3	35.3	32.8	32.2	50.5	32.4	35.5	44.7
Post graduate	9.8	12.2	7.9	12.1	17.3	29.5	13.0	12.1

Table 7
Approximate annual family income

Family Income	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
< 1,00,000	32.9	20.4	23.8	25.1	10.7	0.7	13.6	4.3
1,00,000 – 2,00,000	22.2	18.0	27.4	27.8	6.9	2.2	21.0	12.1
2,00,000 – 3,00,000	18.0	18.0	20.7	14.5	13.7	16.5	23.5	16.3
3,00,000 – 4,00,000	11.7	18.0	12.5	16.1	11.5	7.9	18.9	19.1
4,00,000 – 5,00,000	6.8	12.0	7.9	9.4	14.8	9.4	10.3	16.3
> 5,00,000	8.5	13.6	7.7	6.3	42.3	63.3	12.6	31.9

Regional: North

Table 8
Gender

Gender	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
Male	74.7	93.5	70.9	75.0	71.1	64.6	75.5	60.0
Female	25.3	6.5	29.1	25.0	28.9	35.4	24.5	40.0

Table 9**Age**

Age	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
18-20	44.4	24.5	49.0	12.5	0.0	0.0	5.7	0.0
21-24	47.9	74.8	45.6	62.5	63.0	70.8	77.4	70.0
25 & above	7.8	0.6	5.4	25.0	37.0	29.2	16.8	30.0

Table 10**Work Experience**

Experience	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
No experience	84.7	6.6	81.2	55.0	44.4	61.7	74.5	62.0
Up to 1 Year	6.5	10.3	10.0	7.5	8.9	10.0	13.2	10.7
1 - 3 Years	7.3	14.2	4.6	7.5	35.6	16.3	9.3	12.0
Over 3 Years	1.5	14.8	4.3	20.0	11.9	12.1	2.9	15.3

Table 11**Ranking in class**

Ranking in class	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
First Quartile (Top 25%)	58.4	67.7	41.9	50.0	46.7	45.8	55.9	36.7
Second Quartile	27.3	26.5	37.0	37.5	33.3	31.3	36.8	33.3
Third Quartile	10.5	4.5	18.8	12.5	17.8	16.7	6.4	20.0
Fourth Quartile (Bottom 25%)	3.8	1.3	2.3	0.0	2.2	6.3	1.0	10.0

Table 12
Educational background of father

Education	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
Under graduate	30.6	18.7	29.9	37.5	2.2	6.3	19.6	6.7
Graduate	42.4	57.4	42.2	37.5	42.2	50.0	48.0	63.3
Post graduate	27.0	23.9	27.9	25.0	55.6	43.8	32.4	30.0

Table 13
Educational background of mother

Education	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
Under graduate	52.4	31.6	46.2	25.0	26.7	20.8	44.6	36.7
Graduate	30.1	49.7	37.3	50.0	64.4	39.6	38.2	50.0
Post graduate	17.5	18.7	16.5	25.0	8.9	39.6	17.2	13.3

Table 14
Approximate annual family income

Family Income	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
< 1,00,000	25.3	3.2	16.2	12.5	0.0	0.0	6.4	0.0
1,00,000 – 2,00,000	23.1	11.6	17.7	25.0	8.9	4.2	20.6	10.0
2,00,000 – 3,00,000	17.8	18.7	24.2	12.5	11.1	10.4	30.4	16.7
3,00,000 – 4,00,000	13.8	24.5	19.7	25.0	11.1	8.3	25.5	20.0
4,00,000 – 5,00,000	9.0	20.0	14.2	12.5	26.7	14.6	9.8	20.0
> 5,00,000	11.0	21.9	8.0	12.5	42.2	62.5	7.4	33.3

Regional: South

Table 15

Gender

Gender	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
Male	89.4	79.3	67.5	30.9	53.8	62.5	72.0	72.7
Female	1.6	20.7	32.5	69.1	46.2	37.5	28.0	27.3

Table 16

Age

Age	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
18-20	4.1	28.4	15.1	43.6	0.0	0.0	2.8	0.0
21-24	82.9	69.7	58.9	50.0	61.5	45.8	74.4	66.7
25 & above	13.0	1.9	26.1	6.4	38.5	54.2	22.8	33.3

Table 17

Work Experience

Experience	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
No experience	78.2	61.5	46.4	58.5	30.8	57.5	63.3	61.8
Up to 1 Year	8.3	1.6	16.1	9.6	7.7	14.2	11.9	15.2
1 - 3 Years	8.3	18.3	20.1	19.1	38.5	20.0	15.1	14.5
Over 3 Years	5.2	9.6	17.4	12.8	23.1	8.3	9.6	8.5

Table 18
Ranking in class

Ranking in class	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
First Quartile (Top 25%)	31.0	63.5	55.8	64.9	61.5	58.3	64.0	63.6
Second Quartile	65.6	22.1	38.4	29.8	30.8	33.3	30.2	18.2
Third Quartile	2.5	9.6	5.2	4.3	7.7	4.2	4.8	9.1
Fourth Quartile (Bottom 25%)	0.9	4.8	0.5	1.1	0.0	4.2	1.0	9.1

Table 19
Educational background of father

Education	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
Under graduate	79.1	45.7	68.5	43.6	38.5	12.5	56.6	45.5
Graduate	14.6	34.6	28.1	47.9	30.8	54.2	34.1	42.4
Post graduate	6.3	19.7	3.4	8.5	30.8	33.3	9.3	12.1

Table 20
Educational background of mother

Education	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
Under graduate	83.6	62.5	76.0	56.4	53.8	20.8	65.9	72.7
Graduate	13.7	29.3	22.3	33.0	38.5	41.7	29.3	18.2
Post graduate	2.7	8.2	1.7	10.6	7.5	37.5	4.8	9.1

Table 21
Approximate annual family income

Family Income	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
< 1,00,000	66.7	34.6	38.9	44.7	46.2	0.0	31.5	15.2
1,00,000 – 2,00,000	14.2	17.8	36.5	29.8	7.7	4.2	30.9	9.1
2,00,000 – 3,00,000	10.1	15.9	14.7	12.8	15.4	16.7	19.6	24.2
3,00,000 – 4,00,000	4.5	15.4	4.9	4.3	7.7	8.3	11.6	9.1
4,00,000 – 5,00,000	1.3	7.2	3.4	4.3	7.7	8.3	1.9	15.2
> 5,00,000	3.1	9.1	1.5	4.3	15.4	62.5	4.5	27.3

Regional: East

Table: 22
Gender

Gender	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
Male	83.5	89.1	74.2	72.7	72.5	68.9	67.6	60.3
Femal	16.5	10.9	25.8	27.3	26.5	31.1	32.4	39.7

Table 23
Age

Age	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
18-20	14.5	7.8	3.0	0.0	1.4	0.0	8.2	0.0
21-24	72.3	82.9	54.5	45.5	56.6	53.3	72.0	67.2
25 & above	13.2	9.3	42.4	54.5	42.1	46.7	19.8	32.8

Table 24
Work Experience

Experience	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
No experience	88.4	60.6	43.9	50.0	33.6	60.9	50.4	58.6
Up to 1 Year	3.7	8.8	15.2	10.9	10.6	13.8	29.6	10.7
1 - 3 Years	19.3	18.1	18.2	24.5	38.1	16.0	16.0	19.7
Over 3 Years	2.5	12.4	22.7	14.5	17.7	9.3	4.0	11.0

Table 25
Ranking in class

Ranking in class	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
First Quartile (Top 25%)	54.1	56.0	45.5	45.5	49.6	46.7	53.6	43.1
Second Quartile	31.0	26.9	45.5	45.5	39.8	40.0	35.2	39.7
Third Quartile	12.0	15.0	4.5	9.1	6.2	11.1	8.4	15.5
Fourth Quartile (Bottom 25%)	2.9	2.1	4.5	0.0	4.4	2.2	2.8	1.7

Table 26
Educational background of father

Education	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
Under graduate	25.2	31.6	22.7	27.3	9.7	13.3	11.6	10.3
Graduate	54.2	47.7	56.1	72.7	40.7	46.7	57.2	62.1
Post graduate	20.2	20.7	21.2	0.0	49.6	40.0	31.2	27.6

Table 27
Educational background of mother

Education	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
Under graduate	25.2	56.5	45.5	45.5	20.4	35.6	36.8	36.2
Graduate	54.2	32.1	47.0	36.4	46.9	35.6	46.4	48.3
Post graduate	20.2	11.4	7.6	18.2	32.7	28.9	16.8	15.5

Table 28
Approximate annual family income

Expected Gross Compensation per annum INR	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
< 1,00,000	18.2	18.7	14.7	0.0	2.7	2.2	3.6	1.7
1,00,000 – 2,00,000	22.3	22.8	23.5	18.2	4.4	0.0	15.2	15.5
2,00,000 – 3,00,000	22.3	15.5	23.5	9.1	14.2	6.7	20.4	13.8
3,00,000 – 4,00,000	19.0	18.1	14.7	45.5	12.4	11.1	24.0	19.0
4,00,000 – 5,00,000	8.3	11.4	7.4	27.3	8.0	8.9	12.8	19.0
> 5,00,000	9.9	13.5	16.2	0.0	58.4	71.1	24.0	31.0

Regional: West

Table 29
Gender

Gender	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
Male	79.1	86.2	60.9	100	71.1	0.0	82.1	60.0
Femal	20.9	13.8	39.1	0.0	28.9	100.0	17.9	40.0

Table 30**Age**

Age	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
18-20	13.4	15.0	14.5	10.5	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.0
21-24	71.7	82.0	63.6	57.9	66.3	50.0	77.7	95.0
25 & above	15.0	3.0	21.6	31.6	33.7	50.0	21.7	5.0

Table 31**Work Experience**

Experience	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
No experience	67.9	64.1	53.3	61.6	26.5	53.6	61.7	56.0
Up to 1 Year	8.6	5.4	14.0	11.6	22.9	15.5	17.3	17.0
1 - 3 Years	19.3	16.8	17.4	14.2	39.8	14.5	16.4	17.0
Over 3 Years	4.3	13.8	15.2	12.6	10.8	16.4	4.6	10.0

Table 32**Ranking in class**

Ranking in class	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
First Quartile (Top 25%)	57.8	58.7	35.4	42.1	72.3	50.0	66.0	65.0
Second Quartile	37.4	29.3	54.8	52.6	24.1	0.0	29.8	30.0
Third Quartile	4.3	8.4	8.8	5.3	2.4	50.0	3.3	5.0
Fourth Quartile (Bottom 25%)	0.5	3.6	1.0	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.9	0.0

Table 33**Educational background of father**

Education	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
Under graduate	39.6	34.1	63.6	73.7	12.0	50.0	24.6	20.0
Graduate	43.9	47.3	30.7	26.3	56.6	50.0	48.9	55.0
Post graduate	16.6	12.0	5.7	0.0	31.3	0.0	26.4	25.0

Table 34**Educational background of mother**

Education	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
Under graduate	64.9	55.1	70.8	73.7	73.7	100.0	53.2	25.0
Graduate	28.7	32.9	26.3	21.1	51.8	0.0	31.3	70.0
Post graduate	6.4	12.0	2.9	5.3	14.5	0.0	15.5	5.0

Table : 35**Approximate annual family income**

Expected Gross Compensation per annum INR	Engineering		Non-Engineering		Management Premier		Management Others	
	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011	2008	2011
< 1,00,000	20.3	21.0	26.3	15.8	0.0	0.0	8.8	0.0
1,00,000 – 2,00,000	30.5	18.6	38.8	31.6	7.2	0.0	16.4	10.0
2,00,000 – 3,00,000	22.5	22.8	18.9	21.1	14.5	50.0	25.2	10.0
3,00,000 – 4,00,000	8.0	15.0	7.6	15.8	14.5	0.0	17.9	35.0
4,00,000 – 5,00,000	7.5	11.4	3.7	5.3	18.1	0.0	16.7	5.0
> 5,00,000	11.2	11.4	4.7	10.5	45.8	50.0	14.9	40.0

Our special thanks to all the heads,
administrators, professors and students of
all institutions across the country who
participated in this study.



Contact Information

Satish Salivati
Head Service Delivery
AssessPeople (P) Ltd.
4/6, 3rd floor, SK Enclave,
Old no 47, New no 4, Nowroji Road, Chetpet
Chennai-600031

Email: satish@assesspeople.com

Phone: +91 044 42857203/04

For more information about AssessPeople, visit us at www.assesspeople.com