

Graduate
.....
Management
.....
Admission
.....
Council®

Creating Access to Graduate Business Education®

C O R P O R A T E

Recruiters Survey

MARCH, 2006

GENERAL DATA REPORT

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION.....	III
OVERALL FINDINGS	1-1
Economic Conditions and Effects on Recruiting Plans	1-1
<i>Year-to-Year Trends</i>	1-1
New Professional Hires	1-2
<i>Number of New Professional Hires</i>	1-2
<i>Hiring Mix</i>	1-3
<i>Characteristics of New Professional Hires</i>	1-4
<i>Companies That Did Not Hire MBA Graduates in 2005</i>	1-5
Availability of Jobs for MBA Graduates.....	1-6
<i>Hiring Data for 2005</i>	1-6
<i>Estimated Starting Annual Salary for New Hires in 2006</i>	1-8
<i>Additional Compensation for New MBA Graduates in 2006</i>	1-10
<i>Estimated Total Annual Compensation Package for New MBA Graduates in 2006</i>	1-11
MBA Selection Criteria	1-11
<i>Skills Recruiters Find Attractive in MBA Graduates</i>	1-11
<i>Skills Recruiters Feel MBA Graduates Need To Strengthen</i>	1-12
<i>Selection and Hiring Criteria of New MBAs</i>	1-13
<i>Recruiter Expectations</i>	1-15
Recruiting Activities.....	1-16
<i>Recruiting Methods</i>	1-16
<i>Number of Schools on Corporate Recruiting Calendar</i>	1-17
<i>On-campus Recruiting Barriers</i>	1-18
<i>Barriers to Recruiting MBA Graduates</i>	1-19
<i>Services Recruiters Would Like to Receive from MBA Career Service Offices</i>	1-20
<i>Sponsorship/Reimbursement Programs</i>	1-21
METHODOLOGY	2-1
Sample Selection	2-1
Questionnaire Development and Administration	2-2
Data Analysis.....	2-2
Note on Statistical Significance.....	2-3
Sample Characteristics	2-3

Introduction

The Graduate Management Admission Council® (GMAC®)—a not-for-profit education association dedicated to creating access to graduate management education worldwide—has tabulated the results of its fifth annual survey of MBA employers, the Corporate Recruiters Survey 2006. This survey generated findings that can be used by—

- Graduate business school professionals, MBA students, and prospective students to gauge the job market and better understand MBA employers' expectations;
- MBA employers in developing their recruiting and hiring plans; and
- Business school professionals and employers to benchmark their MBA recruiting practices against comprehensive data.

Seventy-six graduate business schools facilitated the administration of this survey by submitting contact information for companies with whom they have recruiting relationships. The survey includes the responses of 1,270 recruiters representing 737 companies that employ MBA graduates. In return for their cooperation, each of the 76 schools and 1,270 respondents received—

- An executive report, summarizing the overall significant findings and implications, including year-to-year trends; and
- A comprehensive statistical report of all findings, including year-to-year trends, and comparisons across world regions, industry groups, and company size categories.

Participating schools also received an individualized report detailing the data from recruiters their school identified, which allows the school to benchmark against the overall survey sample.

Overall Findings

This section of the report presents an overall view of the survey data. The objective of this section is to present the general views of participating corporate recruiters on recruiting and evaluating MBA graduates and professionals.

Economic Conditions and Effects on Recruiting Plans

Overall, a majority (63%) of respondents indicate that current economic conditions are not weak. Among those respondents who do feel the current economic conditions are weak, the majority (63%) believes that the weakness in the economy is not constraining their recruiting plans. The remaining 37% of respondents who identify the economy as weak—14% of all respondents—do feel that the economic conditions are constraining their recruiting plans.

Assessment of Current Economic Conditions and Recruiting Plans (2006)		
Question	Response	(n = 1,270)
Economic conditions and their effects	Economy weak, constraining recruiting plans	14%
	Economy weak, not constraining recruiting plans	23%
	Economy not weak	63%
	Total	100%
		(n = 1,270)
Economic conditions (Economy weak combined)	Economy weak	37%
	Economy not weak	63%
	Total	100%
		(n = 464)
Effects of weak economy (Economy not weak excluded)	Constraining recruiting plans	37%
	Not constraining recruiting plans	63%
	Total	100%

Year-to-Year Trends

Since the inception of the Corporate Recruiter Survey in the 2001-2002 recruiting season, the state of the economy has steadily improved, as gauged by respondent viewpoints on the economy. For the first time since the survey's inception, the majority of respondents indicate that the economy is not weak. Furthermore, the percentage of respondents who state that a weak economy is constraining their recruiting plans is significantly lower in 2005 and 2006 compared to 2002 and 2003.

Corporate Recruiters Survey 2006 General Data Report

Assessment of Current Economic Conditions and Recruiting Plans—Year-to-Year Comparison						
Question	Response	Time Period				
		2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
		(n = 550)	(n = 940)	(n = 1,300)	(n = 1,691)	(n = 1,270)
Economic conditions and their effects*	Economy weak, constraining recruiting plans	68%	55%	41%	17%	14%
	Economy weak, not constraining recruiting plans	31%	41%	41%	38%	23%
	Economy not weak	1%	4%	18%	45%	63%
	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
		(n = 550)	(n = 940)	(n = 1,300)	(n = 1,691)	(n = 1,270)
Economic conditions (Economy weak combined)*	Economy weak	99%	96%	82%	55%	37%
	Economy not weak	1%	4%	18%	45%	63%
	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
		(n = 544)	(n = 902)	(n = 1,065)	(n = 928)	(n = 464)
Effects of weak economy (Economy not weak excluded)*	Constraining recruiting plans	69%	57%	50%	30%	37%
	Not constraining recruiting plans	31%	43%	50%	70%	63%
	Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

*p ≤ 0.05; Items in bold in the contingency table significantly affect the overall X² statistic of the table

New Professional Hires

Number of New Professional Hires

Respondents report the number of individuals hired in 2005 for each of the four sources of new professional hires, as well as estimates for the number of new professional hires expected in 2006. Additionally, the respondents indicate the level of their company for which they are reporting their information.

The 2006 estimates and the 2005 actual number of new hires from all sources at the department level do not show any changes from year to year. At the local office level, there are no dramatic changes in the number of new hires for each of the sources—the estimated number of other graduate hires decreased by one compared to the actual number of hires in 2005, whereas the estimate for undergraduates increased by one compared to the actual new hires in 2005.

At the regional level, there are increases in the estimated number of new hires for 2006 compared to the actual number of hires in 2005 for direct-from-industry and MBA graduate hires. However, there are plans for fewer hires in 2006 compared to 2005 for other graduates and undergraduates. At the national level, 2006 appears to be a better year for hiring direct-from-industry, other graduates, and undergraduates. The demand for MBA graduate hires remains the same as in 2005.

Corporate Recruiters Survey 2006 General Data Report

At offices worldwide, there is an expected increase in the number of new direct-from-industry, MBA graduates and other graduate hires compared to 2005. The number of new undergraduate hires is expected to decline slightly.

Number of New Hires (Mean*), by Company Level									
Company Level	Time Frame	Type of Hire							
		Direct-from-industry		MBA Graduates		Other Graduates		Undergraduates	
		Mean	Max	Mean	Max	Mean	Max	Mean	Max
Department	2005 Actual	6	50	4	15	2	10	6	59
	2006 Estimate	6	50	4	15	2	10	6	65
Local Office	2005 Actual	17	107	4	20	6	75	9	72
	2006 Estimate	17	135	4	20	5	45	10	80
Regional Office	2005 Actual	18	120	6	25	6	30	38	300
	2006 Estimate	23	150	9	40	5	30	35	250
National Office	2005 Actual	51	500	16	100	14	105	40	250
	2006 Estimate	63	600	16	100	18	130	67	500
Offices Worldwide	2005 Actual	74	819	21	150	9	50	56	500
	2006 Estimate	105	900	24	150	14	80	47	530

*A 95% trimmed mean is calculated to control for the effects of sampling fluctuation and extreme numbers.

Hiring Mix

The following tables present the hiring mix for each of the company levels in 2005 and 2006¹. There are no statistically significant differences between the actual hiring mix of 2005 and the estimated hiring mix in 2006 for each of the company levels, based on a paired-comparison t-test computed to test for differences.

Hiring Mix (Actual 2005), by Company Level					
New Hire	Company Level				
	Department	Local Office	Regional Office	National Office	Offices Worldwide
Direct-from-industry	36%	42%	36%	41%	43%
MBA graduate	30%	17%	27%	19%	12%
Other graduate	8%	14%	7%	15%	16%
Undergraduate	26%	27%	29%	25%	29%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

¹ In order to calculate the hiring mix for each company, the number of hires was summed across the four sources for each respondent providing complete data at a particular level. Then the percentage contribution of each source was calculated for each respondent. These percentages were averaged across respondents to determine the overall hiring mix. This process has the effect of equally weighting mix data from companies that are of different sizes.

Corporate Recruiters Survey 2006 General Data Report

Hiring Mix (Estimated 2006), by Company Level					
New Hire	Company Level				
	Department	Local Office	Regional Office	National Office	Offices Worldwide
Direct-from-industry	32%	43%	40%	40%	51%
MBA graduate	36%	17%	27%	19%	15%
Other graduate	10%	13%	7%	16%	14%
Undergraduate	23%	27%	26%	25%	20%
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Characteristics of New Professional Hires

Respondents were asked to indicate the number of new MBA graduate hires who required a work permit and the number who were interns among their 2005 hires. As shown in the table, there is a slight increase in the percentage of new MBA hires who required a work permit compared to 2004. Additionally, there is a slight decrease in the percentage of new MBA hires who were interns at the company compared to 2004.

Respondents were asked to indicate the number of direct-from-industry hires who had MBA degrees. As shown, there was a slight increase. If we use this data in conjunction with the actual number of new hires in 2005, a more concise picture of the number of MBAs hired in 2005 can be constructed. For instance, at the regional level, companies hired 18 direct-from-industry and 6 new MBA graduates. Considering that 42% of the direct-from-industry hires had MBA degrees (approximately 8 individuals), companies at the regional level hired 14 MBA degree holders.

Characteristics of New Professional Hires		
MBA Graduate Hire	2004	2005
Percentage of MBA graduates requiring a work permit	14%	17%
Percentage of MBA graduates that were interns at your company	31%	27%
Direct-from-Industry Hire		
Percentage of direct-from-industry hires that had MBA degrees	38%	42%

Companies That Did Not Hire MBA Graduates in 2005

In 2005, 18% of the respondents indicated that their company did not hire any new MBA graduates. This is a statistically lower percentage than the percentage of companies that did not hire new MBA graduates in 2003 (23%).

Percentage of Companies that Did Not Hire MBA Graduates, Year-to-Year Comparison			
Response	Year		
	2003	2004	2005
	(n = 724)	(n = 926)	(n = 776)
Hired one or more MBA graduates	77%	79%	82%
Did not hire MBA graduates	23%	21%	18%
Total	100%	100%	100%

Among respondents who indicated the economy is weak and constraining their recruiting plans, 30% did not hire new MBAs in 2005. This is a statistically higher percentage compared with respondents who felt the economy is weak but not constraining recruiting (16%) and those who stated the economy is not weak (16%).

Respondents who did not hire new MBA graduates in 2005 were asked to indicate reasons. The largest percentage of respondents who did not hire new MBAs in 2005 stated that there were no job openings at their company, yet this percentage is not statistically different from previous years. There is increasing concern that MBA entry-level salary demands are too high in 2005 compared to the previous two years. In 2004 and 2005, respondents were less likely than respondents in 2003 to state that their company did not hire new MBA graduates for the following reasons:

- Limited company growth anticipated;
- Hiring freeze in our company; and
- Company in process of reducing headcount.

Corporate Recruiters Survey 2006 General Data Report

Main Reasons Company Did Not Hire New MBA Graduates, Year-to-Year Comparison			
Reason	Year		
	2003	2004	2005
	(n = 143)	(n = 193)	(n = 131)
No job openings at company*	35%	23%	29%
MBA entry-level salary demands are too high*	15%	20%	28%
Available MBA candidates did not match my job requirements	21%	27%	26%
MBA skills/resources are not critical in my company	15%	25%	21%
Recruiting resources were allocated to experienced hires direct-from-industry*	14%	34%	19%
Timing of job openings did not match availability of MBA graduates	13%	16%	15%
Offers made to MBAs were not accepted	4%	7%	11%
Limited company growth anticipated*	22%	13%	9%
Recruiting resources were allocated to new undergraduate hires	14%	9%	9%
Hiring freeze in our company*	18%	7%	6%
Company in process of reducing headcount*	15%	8%	5%
Obtained MBA talent by sponsoring current employees in MBA programs	6%	6%	3%
Other	3%	7%	5%
Don't know	2%	1%	2%

Responses may add to more than 100% due to multiple selections
 *p ≤ 0.05; Items in bold in the contingency table significantly affect the overall X² statistic of the table

Availability of Jobs for MBA Graduates

Hiring Data for 2005

Respondents were asked to indicate the job areas for which they hired MBA graduates in 2005. Recruiters responded that companies hired a significantly larger percentage of MBA graduates for accounting and operations/logistics positions in 2005 and 2003 compared with 2002. About a third (34%) of companies hired consulting positions in 2005, which is significantly greater than the percentage of companies that hired consulting positions in 2002 (18%). In 2003 and 2005, companies hired a greater percentage of MBA graduates in general management positions compared with 2004.

Corporate Recruiters Survey 2006 General Data Report

Job Areas Company Hired New MBA Graduates—Year-to-Year Comparison					
Job Area	Hiring Year				
	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
	(n = 550)	(n = 560)	(n = 623)	(n = 733)	(n = 599)
Accounting*	22%	17%	30%	22%	29%
Consulting*	24%	18%	21%	24%	34%
Business Development	na	na	na	na	32%
Finance*	52%	56%	62%	51%	51%
General Management*	22%	22%	29%	21%	30%
HR/Organization Management*	13%	9%	17%	11%	21%
Information Technology/MIS*	25%	15%	26%	16%	24%
Marketing*	31%	34%	49%	35%	42%
Operations and Logistics*	20%	15%	28%	20%	31%

Responses may add to more than 100% due to multiple selections
 *p ≤ 0.05; Items in bold in the contingency table significantly affect the overall X² statistic of the table
 na: Job area not included in these years.

In the current survey, respondents were asked to indicate the level of the job position for which they hired MBA graduate in 2005. As shown in the table below, among respondents who hired for various job areas, respondents indicated that they were most likely to hire MBA graduates for mid-level positions. Between 4% and 11% of companies hired MBA graduates for senior level positions, and only 2-4% of companies hired MBA graduates for executive level positions.

Job Areas Company Hired New MBA Graduates, by Job Level (2005 Hires)					
Job Area	Job Level				
	Entry-Level	Mid-Level	Senior-Level	Executive-Level	Did Not Hire for Job Area
Accounting	13%	17%	7%	4%	71%
Consulting	13%	19%	9%	3%	67%
Business Development	8%	19%	8%	4%	68%
Finance	21%	30%	11%	4%	50%
General Management	6%	19%	8%	3%	70%
HR/Organization Management	8%	10%	4%	2%	80%
Information Technology/MIS	9%	15%	6%	3%	76%
Marketing	17%	25%	10%	3%	58%
Operations and Logistics	9%	21%	6%	2%	70%

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

Corporate Recruiters Survey 2006 General Data Report

Considering 93% of the respondents to the survey are employed with companies based in the United States, it is not surprising that 92% of companies hired MBA graduates from the United States. Nearly one in twenty (18%) recruited new hires from Asia/Australia/Pacific Rim, 17% recruited from Europe, and 11% from Mexico/Central/South America.

Location Company Hired New MBA Graduates from in 2005	
World Region	(n = 591)
United States	92%
Asia/Australia/Pacific Rim	18%
Europe	17%
Mexico/Central/South America	11%
Canada	9%
Africa/Middle East	6%
Don't know	2%
Responses may add to more than 100% due to multiple selections	

Respondents who hired MBA graduates from the United States were asked to indicate the region of the United States from which they hired. About half (51%) of respondents obtained MBA talent from the Northeast, and 44% obtained talent from the Midwest. About a third of companies obtained talent from the Middle Atlantic States (38%), Southwest (35%), South (33%) and Western states (33%).

U.S. Regions Company Hired New MBA Graduates from in 2005	
U.S. Region	(n = 546)
Northeast (CT, MA, ME, NH, NJ, NY, RI, VT)	51%
Midwest (IA, IL, IN, KS, MI, MN, MO, ND, NE, OH, SD, WI)	44%
Middle Atlantic (DC, DE, MD, PA, VA, WV)	38%
Southwest (AZ, CO, NM, OK, TX)	35%
South (AL, AR, FL, GA, KY, LA, MS, NC, SC, TN)	33%
West (AK, CA, HI, ID, MT, NV, OR, UT, WA, WY)	33%
Don't know	3%
Responses may add to more than 100% due to multiple selections	

Estimated Starting Annual Salary for New Hires in 2006

Respondents were asked to estimate the average starting salary for new hires in 2006. The estimated starting annual salary for new MBA hires in 2006 is \$80,809. For hires from other graduate programs, the average starting salary is \$65,780. In 2006, undergraduates can expect to receive a starting salary of \$46,436, on average.

It appears that companies place a premium on new MBA graduates. Based on the numbers provided, MBA graduates are estimated to command a starting annual salary that is 23% higher compared with the starting salary for hires from other graduate programs. When compared to undergraduate hires, companies plan to provide MBA graduates a starting annual salary that is

Corporate Recruiters Survey 2006 General Data Report

74% higher. (New hires from other graduate programs will see a 42% higher salary than that provided for undergraduate hires.)

Estimated Average Starting Annual Salary for 2006 Hires²			
New Hire	U.S. Dollars		
	Minimum	Mean	Maximum
From MBA program	\$26,000	\$80,809	\$165,000
From other graduate program	\$35,000	\$65,780	\$150,000
From undergraduate program	\$17,500	\$46,436	\$95,000

The minimum and maximum salaries in the above table are supplied by individual respondents, and they do not represent a range of average salaries. To get this range, it is necessary to incorporate the margin of error that is the national result of the sampling process. For instance, what would the range of average salaries have been if all recruiters in the population had been contacted, instead of just a sample? This question is answered in the following table.

95% Confidence Interval		
New Hire	U.S. Dollars	
	Lower 95% Confidence Interval	Upper 95% Confidence Interval
From MBA program	\$78,959	\$82,660
From other graduate program	\$63,347	\$68,214
From undergraduate program	\$45,344	\$47,528

The starting annual salary for MBA graduates has steadily increased over the years. Statistically, companies are paying MBA graduates significantly more in 2006 and 2005 compared to 2003 and 2002. Additionally, MBA hires in 2004 received higher starting salaries compared to MBA hires in 2002.

There has been a steady increase in salaries for other graduates over the years, aside from a slight decline in 2005, and companies plan to pay other graduates significantly more in 2006 compared to 2002 and 2003. Additionally, companies paid other graduates significantly more in 2004 and 2005 compared to 2002.

Undergraduate starting annual salary has also been steadily increasing over the years as well. Statistically, companies are paying undergraduates significantly more in 2006 and 2005

² Note that respondents reported average salary. Recruiters say that salary offers depend on a number of factors, such as geographic region of the branch for which they are hiring; the strength of the candidate (years of work experience, proven ability to perform, interview performance); other organizations aggressively competing for the same MBA candidates (women, specific background experience, minorities, etc); and so on.

Corporate Recruiters Survey 2006 General Data Report

compared to 2003 and 2002. Additionally, undergraduate hires in 2004 received higher starting salaries compared to MBA hires in 2002.

Estimated Starting Annual Salary for New Hires					
Year-to-Year Comparison					
New Hire	U.S. Dollars (Mean)				
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
From MBA program*	\$72,021	\$73,859	\$77,066	\$78,040	\$80,809
From other graduate program*	\$52,322	\$56,518	\$62,371	\$60,865	\$65,780
From undergraduate program*	\$41,381	\$42,936	\$45,029	\$45,652	\$46,436

*p ≤ 0.05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.

Additional Compensation for New MBA Graduates in 2006

The majority of companies plan to offer new MBA hires a benefits package (81%), a moving allowance (55%), and performance-based bonuses (54%). More than a third of companies estimate that signing bonuses (45%) and year-end bonuses (40%) will comprise a portion of the total MBA compensation package. Other compensation employers plan to provide MBA graduates include tuition reimbursement (31%), profit-sharing (25%), and a stock purchase plan (23%).

On average, the total additional compensation package for new MBA hires is \$18,928.

Estimated Additional Compensation for New MBA Hires in 2006	
Compensation/Benefit	(n = 529)
Benefits package	81%
Moving allowance	55%
Performance-based bonus	54%
Signing bonus	45%
Year-end bonus	40%
Tuition reimbursement	31%
Profit sharing	25%
Stock purchase plan	23%
Stock options	17%
Starting bonus	16%
Housing allowance or reimbursements	13%
First-year bonus	10%
Commission	9%
Car or car allowance	5%
Other compensation	8%
No additional compensation	2%

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

Estimated Total Annual Compensation Package for New MBA Graduates in 2006

Respondents were asked to estimate the total annual compensation package for new MBA graduate hires in 2006. Total compensation includes annual base salary and all other compensation previously mentioned. Overall, companies plan to pay new MBA graduate hires \$99,737—slightly higher than the \$96,657 average reported by respondents in 2005.

Estimated Total Annual Compensation for 2006 New MBA Graduate Hires	
Statistic	U.S. Dollars
Lower 95% Confidence Interval	\$96,713
Mean	\$99,737
Upper 95% Confidence Interval	\$102,761

Respondents who feel that the economy is not weak will pay a new MBA graduate hire \$103,164 on average, which is significantly higher than respondents who feel the economy is weak but not constraining their recruiting plan (\$91,277).

Estimated Total Annual Compensation for 2006 New MBA Graduate Hires, by Economic Conditions			
Statistic	Economy Weak, Constraining Recruitment	Economy Weak, Not Constraining Recruitment	Economy Not Weak
Lower 95% Confidence Interval	\$85,189	\$85,750	\$99,363
Mean*	\$94,000	\$91,277	\$103,164
Upper 95% Confidence Interval	\$102,811	\$96,805	\$106,965

*p ≤ 0.05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.

MBA Selection Criteria

Skills Recruiters Find Attractive in MBA Graduates

Respondents were asked to indicate the skills and abilities they find attractive in MBA graduates. The ability to think analytically (78%) and the ability to think strategically (71%) top the list of skills and abilities respondents find attractive in MBA graduates. More than half of respondents find the following skills and abilities attractive: quantitative skills (58%); leadership skills (56%); oral communication skills (53%); creative problem-solving skills (52%); the ability to integrate information (51%); and project management/implementation skills (51%).

Corporate Recruiters Survey 2006 General Data Report

Skills/Abilities Recruiters Find Attractive in MBA Graduates	
Skills/Abilities	(n = 1,173)
Ability to think analytically	78%
Ability to think strategically	71%
Quantitative skills	58%
Leadership skills	56%
Oral communication skills	53%
Creative problem-solving skills	52%
Ability to integrate information	51%
Project management/implementation skills	51%
Interpersonal skills	48%
Written communication skills	48%
Ability to adapt/change to new situations	45%
Work ethic	38%
Ability to make decisions with imperfect information	35%
Initiative/risk-taking ability	33%
Technological skills	28%
People management skills	27%
Cultural sensitivity and awareness	22%
Skills in corporate ethical conduct	20%
Other	3%
None of the above	3%
Responses may add to more than 100% due to multiple selections	

Skills Recruiters Feel MBA Graduates Need To Strengthen

Respondents were asked to indicate the skills and abilities they feel MBA graduates need to strengthen. The responses indicate there is little consensus in the skills and abilities respondents feel that MBA graduates need to strengthen, as none of the skills/abilities were identified by a majority of the respondents. The top two skills and abilities respondents feel MBA graduates need to strengthen are listed among “soft” skills—people management skills (35%) and leadership skills (30%). About a quarter of the respondents feel that MBA graduates could strengthen their interpersonal skills (26%) and their ability to make decisions with imperfect information (26%). Other skills that need strengthening include written communication skills (23%), the ability to adapt/change to new situations (22%), and oral communication skills (22%).

Corporate Recruiters Survey 2006 General Data Report

Skills/Abilities Recruiters Feel MBA Graduates Need To Strengthen	
Skills/Abilities	(n = 1,168)
People management skills	35%
Leadership skills	30%
Ability to make decisions with imperfect information	26%
Interpersonal skills	26%
Written communication skills	23%
Ability to adapt/change to new situations	22%
Oral communication skills	22%
Ability to think strategically	19%
Cultural sensitivity and awareness	19%
Project management/implementation skills	18%
Initiative/risk-taking ability	16%
Creative problem-solving skills	16%
Work ethic	14%
Ability to integrate information	13%
Ability to think analytically	13%
Quantitative skills	13%
Skills in corporate ethical conduct	13%
Technological skills	11%
Other	4%
None of the above	16%
Responses may add to more than 100% due to multiple selections	

Selection and Hiring Criteria of New MBAs

Respondents were asked to indicate the importance of various selection and hiring criteria used in evaluating MBA graduates. The top four criteria that respondents evaluate when hiring new MBA graduates include cultural fit with the company, proven ability to perform, strong soft skills (e.g. communication and interpersonal skills), and strong “hard” skills (e.g. technical and analytical skills and conducting cost/benefit and financial analysis). Additionally, 21% of the respondents feel a specific type of background (e.g., engineering, science, liberal arts) is extremely important, 19% feel that the MBA functional area/concentration of study is extremely important, and evidence of adaptability and strong management skills (e.g. leadership, managing staff, and managing change) are extremely important to 18%.

Corporate Recruiters Survey 2006 General Data Report

Selection and Hiring Criteria of New MBAs						
Selection/Hiring Criteria	(n = 572)					Total
	Extremely Important	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Not Very Important	Not At All Important	
Cultural fit with company	47%	39%	10%	3%	1%	100%
Proven ability to perform	43%	44%	12%	1%	<1%	100%
Strong “soft” skills	38%	50%	11%	1%	0%	100%
Strong “hard” skills	33%	51%	13%	2%	<1%	100%
A specific type of background	21%	31%	34%	11%	3%	100%
MBA functional area/ concentration of study	19%	41%	29%	10%	2%	100%
Evidence of adaptability	18%	46%	29%	6%	1%	100%
Strong management skills	18%	47%	26%	8%	1%	100%
Prior internship/work experience directly related to job requirements	15%	34%	34%	12%	5%	100%
A specific number of years of professional work experience	14%	38%	38%	9%	2%	100%
Strong academic achievement	13%	35%	36%	12%	5%	100%
History of increased job responsibility	11%	42%	36%	10%	1%	100%
Reputation of MBA school	10%	37%	39%	10%	3%	100%
History of leading teams	10%	33%	38%	15%	3%	100%
Prior internship/work experience in my industry	10%	28%	35%	20%	8%	100%
Relevant language, country, and/or cultural expertise	10%	22%	34%	24%	10%	100%
Type of program	7%	20%	34%	27%	13%	100%
History of managing people in a formal reporting role	4%	18%	44%	28%	6%	100%
Prior internship/work experience in my company	4%	13%	23%	35%	24%	100%

Recruiter Expectations

Respondents were asked to rate the performance of the MBA graduates they hired in 2005. About one in five (21%) rated the MBA hires as exceeding expectations. More than three-quarters (76%) felt that the MBA hires in 2005 met expectations. Only 4% felt that the MBA hires did not meet expectations.

MBAs Hired in 2005	
Would you say that the new MBAs your organization hired in 2005...	(n = 572)
Exceeded expectations	21%
Met expectations	76%
Did not meet expectations	4%
Total	100%

Reasons MBA Hires Exceeded Expectations

Respondents who stated the MBA hires in 2005 exceed expectations were asked to indicate in what ways the MBA hire exceeded expectations. The most common reason why MBA hires in 2005 exceeded expectations was their ability to adapt quickly, “to hit the ground running” as one recruiter stated. This reason is followed by rave reviews about the productivity and quality of the work produced and the high level of technical skills exhibited. Additionally, respondents who stated that the MBA hires exceeded expectations said the MBA hires displayed a high level of initiative and leadership skills. Other comments by respondents include exhibited professionalism, work ethic, and flexibility.

Reasons MBA Hires Did Not Meet Expectations

The relatively few respondents (4%) who stated that the MBAs they hired in 2005 did not meet expectations were asked to indicate in what ways the MBA hires did not meet expectations. Some of their comments include lack of initiative, expectations too high, poor work ethic, and a lack of commitment to the organization.

Recruiting Activities

Recruiting Methods

Respondents were asked to indicate the methods they use to obtain MBA talent. Overall, 45% of the respondents say they recruit experienced direct-from-industry hires who have MBAs. More than a third of the respondents sustain formal/centralized MBA recruiting programs (39%) and recruit MBAs on an as-needed basis (39%). About a third of the respondents recruit new MBAs on an informal/decentralized basis (32%) and obtain MBA talent through an MBA intern pool (32%). One in five (20%) respondents state that they consider MBAs, but do not actively recruit them.

Recruiting Methods	
Response	(n = 1,270)
Recruit experienced direct-from-industry hires who have MBAs	45%
Sustain formal/centralized MBA recruiting program	39%
Recruit new MBA graduates on an as-needed basis	39%
Recruit new MBA graduates on an informal/decentralized basis	32%
Obtain MBA talent through MBA intern pool	32%
Recruit new MBA graduates on a planned periodic basis	30%
Develop MBA talent by sponsoring current employees to attend MBA programs	27%
Consider MBAs, but do not actively recruit them	20%
Responses may add to more than 100% due to multiple selections	

The percentage of respondents who say they obtain talent by recruiting experienced direct-from-industry hires who have MBAs has risen dramatically since 2004, when only 26% indicated this method of recruitment.

Corporate Recruiters Survey 2006 General Data Report

Number of Schools on Corporate Recruiting Calendar

Based on responses from recruiters who knew of company plans, 83% of companies visited campuses in 2005 and 87% plan to visit campuses in 2006. As shown in the table, 37% of companies recruited at seven or more schools in 2005 and in 2006, 45% plan to visit seven or more schools. Overall, companies visited eight campuses on average in 2005 and plan to visit nine campuses in 2006—a statistically significant increase in the number of campuses companies plan to visit.

Number of Schools in Which Company Recruits MBAs		
Number of Schools	Actual 2005	Estimated 2006
	(n = 816)	(n = 772)
None	17%	13%
3 or less	23%	20%
4, but less than 7	23%	22%
7 or more	37%	45%
Total	100%	100%
Mean*	8	9
*p ≤ 0.05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.		

About three-quarters (73%) of the respondents visited campuses in 2005 and 78% plan to visit campuses in 2006. Overall, respondents visited 2.7 campuses on average in 2005 and plan to visit 3.4 campuses in 2006—a statistically significant increase.

Number of Schools in Which Respondent Personally Recruits MBAs		
Number of Schools	Actual 2005	Estimated 2006
	(n = 1,140)	(n = 993)
None	27%	22%
3 or less	49%	48%
4, but less than 7	15%	17%
7 or more	9%	12%
Total	100%	100%
Mean*	2.7	3.4
*p ≤ 0.05; Items in bold represent significant differences based on Bonferroni comparison in an ANOVA.		

Corporate Recruiters Survey 2006 General Data Report

On-campus Recruiting Barriers

Overall, one in ten (10%) respondents does not feel there are any barriers to recruiting MBAs on campus. The most common barrier to recruiting on campus is limited time and staff resources, which was cited by 42% of the respondents. More than a quarter of the respondents state inconsistent quality of students (28%), restricted recruiting budgets (27%), and insufficient number of qualified resumes (26%) as additional barriers faced when recruiting on campus. The following table compares respondent perceptions of barriers to on-campus recruiting in 2004 to those in 2006. Respondents in 2006 were more likely to cite the existence of barriers to on-campus recruiting.

Barriers to On-Campus Recruiting		
Response	2004 (n = 1,300)	2006 (n = 1,270)
Limited time and staff resources for campus recruiting	35%	42%
Inconsistent quality of students within a school	20%	28%
Restricted recruiting budget	na	27%
Insufficient number of qualifying resumes to justify campus schedule	15%	26%
Availability of candidates does not match my timing needs for hires	16%	23%
Difficulty in finding and identifying applicants	10%	21%
High cost of recruiting on campus	12%	16%
Lack of customer service from Career Services staff	10%	12%
Selection process through campus is slow and cumbersome	7%	10%
Unfamiliarity with graduate business schools' interview processes	5%	10%
Difficulty in identifying schools at which to recruit	6%	8%
Other	3%	6%
Don't know	10%	7%
None of the above—Do not feel there are any barriers	25%	10%

Corporate Recruiters Survey 2006 General Data Report

Barriers to Recruiting MBA Graduates

About two in five respondents (43%) feel that MBA graduates have unrealistic salary expectations. Unrealistic job role/level is cited by 39% of the respondents as a barrier to recruiting MBA graduates. About a third of the respondents indicate that a limited supply of MBAs with relevant industry-specific experience (36%), a limited supply of candidates with functional experience (34%), and the competition from other organizations trying to recruit MBAs (33%) as barriers to recruiting MBA graduates. Additionally, a quarter (25%) state that MBA candidates have an unrealistic view of advancement opportunities. The following table compares respondent perceptions of barriers to recruiting MBA graduates in 2004 to those in 2006. Respondents in 2006 were more likely to cite the relevant background of the candidate and less likely to indicate unrealistic expectations.

Barriers to Recruiting MBA Graduates		
Response	2004	2006
	(n = 1,300)	(n = 1,270)
Unrealistic salary expectations of MBA candidates	45%	43%
Unrealistic job role/level expectations of MBA candidates	44%	39%
Limited supply of MBA candidates with relevant industry-specific experience	22%	36%
Limited supply of MBA candidates with relevant functional experience	18%	34%
Other organizations aggressively competing for the same MBA candidates	26%	33%
Unrealistic view of advancement opportunities of MBA candidates	30%	25%
Limited recruitment staff and/or budget at your company	29%	23%
Limited supply of minorities in MBA candidate pool	16%	19%
Poor interviewing preparation and/or performance of MBA candidates	21%	17%
Difficulty in finding and identifying MBA candidates	8%	15%
Other		3%
Don't know		6%
None of the above—Do not feel there are any barriers		7%

Corporate Recruiters Survey 2006 General Data Report

Services Recruiters Would Like to Receive from MBA Career Service Offices

Respondents were asked to indicate the types of services they would like to receive from career service offices. Nearly three-quarters (73%) of the respondents would like online services, which include resume searches, job postings, and online interview scheduling. About two-thirds of the respondents would like the ability to pre-select candidates for interview schedules (68%) and to have access to seasoned MBA alumni seeking new employment (65%). Additionally, a majority of the respondents would like one point of contact in the career service office (59%), career service staff who are knowledgeable about recruiting from a company perspective (55%), and a responsive staff for fast turnaround times and special requests (55%). The following table compares the services of MBA career service offices that were important to respondents in 2004 compared to those in 2006. Respondents in 2006 were more likely to cite online services and access to seasoned MBA alumni seeking new employment.

Services of MBA Career Service Offices That Are Important To Your Company		
Response	2004	2006
	(n = 1,300)	(n = 980)
Online services	50%	73%
Ability to pre-select candidates for interview schedule	55%	68%
Access to seasoned MBA alumni seeking new employment	35%	65%
Staff that is knowledgeable about recruiting from a company's perspective	45%	60%
One point of contact at the office	44%	59%
Staff that is knowledgeable about my company's and industry's requirements	47%	55%
Responsive staff for fast turnaround times and special requests	40%	55%
Quality interview-day services	39%	49%
Staff assisted services	40%	44%
Opportunities for relationship-building activities	29%	44%
Access to faculty willing to identify qualified students	41%	43%
Ability to interview throughout the year	30%	40%
Access to part-time or EMBA graduates seeking new employment	15%	22%
Assistance with arranging off-campus interviews	18%	22%
Opportunities to discuss business and research with the faculty and/or dean	15%	18%
Video conferencing and other technological substitutes to face-to-face interviewing	11%	11%
Assistance in networking with other companies recruiting MBAs	7%	11%
Other	1%	1%
Don't know	6%	2%

Sponsorship/Reimbursement Programs

Respondents were asked to indicate whether their company sponsors or reimburses their employees for various MBA programs. Those who did sponsor/reimburse employees were asked the number of employees on average per year they sponsor/reimburse and the average amount spent per employee per year. Overall, 59% of the respondents state that their companies sponsor/reimburse employees who attend full-time MBA programs, 66% sponsor/reimburse for part-time MBA programs, and 62% sponsor/reimburse for executive MBA programs. On average, companies sponsor/reimburse 9 employees for full-time programs, 10 employees for part-time programs, and 4 employees for executive programs. The average amount spent per employee is \$27,750 for full-time programs, \$21,327 for part-time programs, and \$27,098 for executive programs.

Corporate Reimbursement and Sponsorship Programs			
Statistic	Full-Time MBA	Part-Time MBA	Executive MBA
Percentage sponsored/reimbursed	59%	66%	62%
Average number of employees	9	10	4
Average cost per employee per year	\$27,750	\$21,327	\$27,098

Methodology

Sample Selection

In order to develop the sample for the survey, all GMAC[®] member schools and a number of non-member schools were invited to participate by providing the names and e-mail addresses of active recruiters for their MBA graduates over the past recruiting year. To encourage schools to participate, each was offered an individualized report to allow the school to benchmark its corporate recruiters against the overall survey sample. To encourage recruiters to participate, each participating recruiter was also offered an overall report to allow them to benchmark against other recruiters in the sample. In addition, recruiters were offered copies of the Global MBA[®] Graduate Survey results and the MBA Alumni Perspectives Survey results.

Seventy-six schools responded to the invitation to participate and provided the requested data on recruiters (company name, recruiter name, and e-mail address). This represents a response rate of 23% among schools, as shown in the following table.

Corporate Recruiter Survey Response Rates: Schools			
Time Period	Sample Size	Number Responded	Response Rate
2002	147	73	50%
2003	740	95	13%
2004	209	79	38%
2005	290	84	29%
2006	330	76	23%

The survey was launched on January 11, 2006, with an e-mail invitation that provided more details on survey objectives and a link to the survey site. As an incentive to participate, recruiters who completed the survey were offered the chance to win one of four US\$500 AMEX gift checks. Follow-up e-mails messages were sent to non-respondents on January 25, 2006.

When the survey closed on February 3, 2006, 1,270 recruiters had logged in and completed the questionnaire. This is a response rate of 9.8%, based on 12,992 e-mail addresses ultimately determined to be valid, as shown in the following table.

Corporate Recruiter Survey Response Rates: Individuals			
Time Period	Sample Size	Number Responded	Response Rate
2002	5,452	550	10.1%
2003	9,745	940	9.6%
2004	11,463	1,300	11.3%
2005	15,329	1,691	11.0%
2006	12,992	1,270	9.8%

Corporate Recruiters Survey 2006 General Data Report

A company-based analysis of respondents shows a response rate of 13.8% among companies, as shown in the following table.

Corporate Recruiter Survey Response Rates: Companies			
Time Period	Sample Size	Number Responded	Response Rate
2002	4,216	421	10.0%
2003	5,176	683	13.2%
2004	4,718	1,004	21.3%
2005	5,187	1,019	19.6%
2006	5,356	737	13.8%

Questionnaire Development and Administration

Administration of the questionnaire online offered several advantages over a paper-and-pencil administration. First, responses automatically went into a database that was available for analysis at all times. This allowed for monitoring of survey progress and eliminated the time and cost of data entry. Second, the site was programmed to check for the accurate completion of each question before the respondent was allowed to proceed to the next question. This eliminated the typical problems associated with item non-response. Third, for questions likely to be affected by order bias (i.e., a respondent's tendency to select earlier items in a multiple-response question rather than later items), response categories were randomized before the questionnaire was displayed on the respondent's monitor. Fourth, skip patterns allowed respondents to move quickly and appropriately through the questionnaire because they never saw inappropriate questions.

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, version 12). Two weeks before the cessation of data collection, a preliminary analysis of the data was conducted. Frequency distributions were examined for both topical and classification questions. Based on this examination, response categories for some questions were collapsed in order to make the final analysis more robust.

In the final analysis, variations in responses to topical questions were analyzed using the following collapsed classification categories: world region (company location), number of employees (company size), and type of industry. For topical questions scaled at nominal and ordinal levels, a chi-square analysis was used to evaluate statistical significance in cross-classification tables ($p \leq .05$). That is, a relationship between a topical item and a classification item was considered statistically significant only when it could have been produced by chance less than or equal to 5% of the time. Whenever an interval level of measurement could be assumed, means were computed and analysis of variance was used to assess significance (also with $p \leq .05$).

Post hoc Bonferroni tests were used in conjunction with analysis-of-variance for comparisons involving more than two subgroups (classification items or time). In addition, exact tests were used in conjunction with chi-square analyses whenever chi-square assumptions could not be met.

Note on Statistical Significance

Tests of statistical significance are used throughout this report to evaluate whether a difference in an average or a percentage is likely to have resulted purely from chance (the sampling process) or whether it indicates a real difference in the given population. As discussed above, a .05 criterion is used throughout, meaning that in order for a difference to be statistically significant, there must be a 5% or lower chance that the difference resulted from the sampling process. When a percentage difference meets the standard for statistical significance, we conclude that there must be a real difference in the population represented by the data at hand.

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

A difference that is statistically significant may or may not be managerially significant—it is open for consideration. Occasionally in the report, findings are discussed even when they are not statistically significant because of a consistency in the responses that may deserve managerial attention.

Sample Characteristics

Respondents provided information about their primary job responsibility. The majority (55%) of respondents are executive or line managers with hiring authority. Experienced-hire recruiters with some campus recruitment represent 18% of the respondents, and human resource executives and managers represent 15%. Eleven percent of the respondents are full-time campus recruiters, managers, or staff.

Primary Job Responsibility of Respondent	
Response	(n = 1,270)
Executive or line manager with hiring authority	55%
Experienced-hire recruiter, with some campus recruitment	18%
Human resources executive or manager	15%
Full-time campus recruiter, manager, or staff	11%
Other	1%
Total	100%

Corporate Recruiters Survey 2006 General Data Report

The following is a detailed account of the industry categories used in the main body of the report. As shown, the largest industry category is finance/accounting (25%), followed by products and services (21%), consulting (18%), high technology (10%), and manufacturing (10%). Within the finance and accounting industry, the largest subcategories are investment banking or management, and banking. The single largest category among products and services is consumer goods. In the consulting category, the largest subcategories are consulting services, management consulting, and information technology consulting. The largest subcategories in high technology are information technology and services, and telecommunications.

Primary Industry/Business		
Category	Industry/Business	(n = 1,140)
Consulting (18%)	Consulting Services	7%
	Human Resource Services	1%
	Healthcare Consulting	1%
	Information Technology Consulting	2%
	Management Consulting	4%
	Other Consulting	1%
Energy/Utilities (4%)	Energy and Utilities	2%
	Mining	<1%
	Utilities	1%
	Other Energy and Utilities	1%
Finance/Accounting (25%)	Accounting	3%
	Banking	6%
	Finance and Insurance	3%
	Insurance	1%
	Investment Banking or Management	6%
	Venture Capital	1%
	Other Finance	3%
Healthcare/Pharmaceutical (7%)	Biotechnology	1%
	Healthcare	1%
	Health Insurance	1%
	Health Managed Care (provider)	<1%
	Pharmaceutical	2%
	Science and Research	<1%
	Other Healthcare or Pharmaceutical	1%
High Technology (10%)	Engineering	1%
	Information Technology or Services	3%
	Internet and/or E-commerce	1%
	Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services	<1%
	Science and Research	<1%
	Telecommunications	2%
	Other Technology	1%
Manufacturing (10%)	Aerospace and Defense	1%
	Automotive	3%
	Other Manufacturing	5%

Corporate Recruiters Survey 2006 General Data Report

Primary Industry/Business		
Category	Industry/Business	(n = 1,140)
Nonprofit or Government (5%)	Education or Educational Services	1%
	Government (non-military)	2%
	Military	<1%
	Nonprofit/not-for-profit	1%
Products and Services (21%)	Advertising	1%
	Architecture	0%
	Arts and Entertainment	1%
	Aviation and Airlines	1%
	Construction and Installation	1%
	Consumer Goods	4%
	Customer Services	<1%
	Engineering	<1%
	Food, Beverage, and Tobacco	2%
	Hotel, Gaming, Leisure, and Travel	1%
	Marketing Services	1%
	Real Estate and Rental and/or Leasing	1%
	Restaurant and Food Services	1%
	Retail/Wholesale	2%
	Sports and Recreation	<1%
Other Products and Services	3%	
Other (1%)	Other industry	1%
Total (100%)	Total	100%

The majority of companies that participated in the survey (60%) are publicly held corporations. Slightly more than a fifth (22%) are privately held corporations.

The majority of companies (68%) represent the parent company and 21% represent a division or subsidiary.

Corporate Recruiters Survey 2006 General Data Report

The majority of companies (68%) have a global scope, followed by national (20%), regional (8%), and local (5%).

Company Characteristics	
Form of Legal Organization	(n = 1,138)
Publicly held corporation	60%
Privately held corporation	22%
Partnership	9%
Sole proprietorship	1%
Nonprofit/not-for-profit	3%
Local/State/Federal Government (nonmilitary)	3%
Military	<1%
Other	3%
Total	100%
Parent/Division or subsidiary	(n = 1,138)
Parent company	68%
Division or subsidiary	32%
Total	100%
Scope of Company	(n = 1,138)
Global	68%
National	20%
Regional	8%
Local	5%
Total	100%

Corporate Recruiters Survey 2006 General Data Report

Respondents were asked the number of employees that work for their company. The median number of employees that work for a parent company is between 5,000 and 9,999. The median number of employees that work for a division or subsidiary is between 1,000 and 2,499. When combined, the median number of employees is between 2,500 and 4,999. For the purpose of analysis in the report, a relatively equal distribution was calculated, whereby a small company is classified as having less than 500 employees (30%), a mid-sized company has between 500 and 9,999 employees (30%), and a large company has 10,000 or more employees (40%).

Company Size				
Number of Employees	Parent Company	Division or Subsidiary	Combined	Group
	(n = 770)	(n = 368)	(n = 1,138)	(n = 1,119)
9 or less	6%	1%	4%	Small (< 500) 30%
10-24	5%	3%	4%	
25-49	4%	3%	4%	
50-99	5%	5%	5%	
100-249	6%	10%	7%	
250-499	4%	9%	6%	
500-999	4%	10%	6%	Mid-Sized (500-9,999) 30%
1,000-2,499	6%	13%	8%	
2,500-4,999	6%	12%	8%	
5,000-9,999	6%	10%	8%	Large (10,000+) 40%
10,000-24,999	13%	11%	12%	
Over 25,000	36%	11%	28%	
Don't know	1%	2%	2%	-
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%

The vast majority (93%) of companies are located in the United States. Three percent of companies are located in Europe, 2% in Canada, and 2% in Asia/Australia/Pacific Rim.

Of the companies located in the United States, 23% are in the Northeast, 21% are in the Southwest, 19% in the Midwest, 15% in the Middle Atlantic, 12% in the West, and 10% in the South.

Corporate Recruiters Survey 2006 General Data Report

Company Location	
World Region	(n = 1,138)
United States	93%
Europe	3%
Asia/Australia/Pacific Rim	2%
Africa/Middle East	<1%
Canada	1%
Mexico/Central/South America	1%
Total	100%
U.S. Region	(n = 1,057)
Northeast	23%
Middle Atlantic	15%
Midwest	19%
South	10%
Southwest	21%
West	12%
Total	100%

Participating Schools

American University
Australian Graduate School of Management
Baruch College, City University of New York
Baylor University
Bentley College
Carnegie Mellon University
Claremont Graduate University
Clarkson University
Cornell University
Emory University
Florida International University
Florida State University
Fordham University
George Washington University
Georgetown University
Georgia Institute of Technology
Georgia State University
HEC School of Management
Hong Kong University of Science and Technology
IAE
Illinois Institute of Technology
Indiana University
Lehigh University
London Business School
Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge
Michigan State University
Monterey Institute of International Studies
Nanyang Technological University
New York University
North Carolina State University
Northeastern University
Ohio State University
Old Dominion University
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
Rice University
Simmons College
Southern Methodist University
Stanford University
Syracuse University
Temple University
Texas Christian University
Texas Tech University
Thunderbird, The Garvin School of International Management
University of Arizona
University of Arkansas, Fayetteville
University of California, Davis
University of California, Riverside
University of Cincinnati
University of Connecticut
University of Denver
University of Florida
University of Kansas
University of Kentucky
University of Maryland
University of Melbourne
University of Minnesota
University of Missouri-St. Louis
University of Notre Dame
University of Oklahoma
University of Pittsburgh
University of Rochester
University of South Carolina
University of South Florida
University of Southern California
University of Texas at Dallas
University of Texas at San Antonio
University of the Pacific
University of Toronto
University of Tulsa
University of Virginia
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Washington University
West Virginia University
Willamette University
Wits Business School (Witwatersrand)
Xavier University of Ohio

Participating Companies

20th Century Fox
3M Company (Minnesota Mining And
Manufacturing Co.)
A C Nielsen
A. G. Edwards & Sons, Inc
A.T. Kearney, Inc.
Abacus Financial Group, LLC
Abbott Capital Management
Abbott Laboratories
ABF Freight System, Inc
ABN Amro Bank
Accenture Inc.
Access Business Group International, L.L.C
Accountemps
ACS, Inc.
Acterna
ADC
Adjoined Consulting, Inc.
Adobe Systems Incorporated
Advent Software, Inc.
Advisory Board Company, The
AEGON Group, The
Aerotek Engineering
Agilent Technologies, Inc.
Air Products & Chemicals, Inc.
Airtime-Manager
Ajilon Finance
Alcan Inc.
Alcoa Inc.
Alcon Laboratories, Inc.
ALICO, Inc.
Alliant Techsystems
Allianz Group
Allied Domecq
Allstate Insurance Company
Altima Web Systems, Ltd.
Ambrose Employer Group, LLC
Amdocs, Inc.
America Online, Inc. (AOL)
American Airlines
American Airlines Federal Credit Union
American Eagle Outfitters
American Express
American Profit Recovery
American Standard, Inc.
American Water Works Company Inc.
Ameriprise (fka American Express)
Ameritrade
Amstar Group, LLC
Analysis Group, Inc.
Angott Search Group
Anheuser-Busch Companies Inc.
Anklesaria Group
Anton Collins Mitchell LLP
ANZ Bank
AOL Time Warner
AP Technoglass
Archstone Consulting LLC
Arrow Electronics, Inc.
ARTEL, Inc.
Ascent Media Group, Inc.
Ashton Woods Homes
Aspen Publishers
AT&T
Atkins China Ltd
Atlantic Consulting Associates
Atlantis Limited (Iceland)
August Max
Aurarian Capital
Aurora Loan Services
Automatic Data Processing
Avail Medical Products
Avendra, LLC
Axes Technology
Bacardi USA., Inc.
Bank of America
Bank Of Hawaii
Bank of New York
Bankworld Inc.
Barclays Capital
Barrier Advisors, LP
Bausch & Lomb Incorporated
Bayer Corporation
BDO Seidman, LLP

Corporate Recruiters Survey 2006 General Data Report

Beach, Fleischman, & CO, P.C.	CalSTRS
Bear Creek Corporation	Calvert Group, Ltd.
Bear Stearns & Co., Inc.	Cambria Consulting
Bearingpoint, Inc.	Cambridge Associates LLP
Beekman Advisors	Cambridge Search, LLC
Bell Helicopter Textron Inc.	Campbell Soup Company
Bell National	Capital City Bank
Belo Corporation	Capital One
Berbee Information Networks	Cargill, Incorporated
Bernstein, Conklin & Balcombe	Carlson Companies, Inc.
Best Buy Co., Inc.	Carreker
Bevington Consulting	Carrier Distributions
Big Bend Hospice	Carter Burgess
Billy Casper Golf	Castle Rock Development Company
BJC HealthCare	Cendant Corporation
BlackRock	Center for Autism & Related Disorders
Blattner Brunner	Centex Home Equity
Blue Cross Blue Shield	Centex Homes
Blue Sage Consulting	Central Hudson Gas & Electric Corporation
Blue Shield of California	Centre People
Blue Slate Solutions	Centura Health
BNSF	Channel Capital Group / HedgeFund.net
BNU Corporation	Chartwell Investment Partners
BNY Securities Group	Chatham Financial Corporation
Boa Construction	Chemical Lime
BOC Gases	ChevronTexaco Corporation
Boehringer Laboratories	Children's Hospital
Booz Allen Hamilton	CIBER, Inc.
Boral	Cigna Corporation
Bose Corporation	CIGNA Financial Services
Boston Consulting Group (BCG)	Cim Group, Inc
Boston Scientific Corporation	Cintas Corporation
Boston South Financial Group / MetLife	Cisco Systems Inc.
Brand Sense Marketing	Citibank/Citigroup
Brandoutlook	Citicard
Brazos Capital Management	Citigroup
Bridge Worldwide	Citigroup, Salomon Smith Barney/Citibank
Briggs and Stratton AG	Citizens Capital, Inc.
Brinker International	Citizens, Inc.
Bristol-Myers Squibb Company	City of Fort Worth
Brunswick Boat Group	Clark Realty
Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railway Company	Clean Earth Technologies
ByAllAccounts	Clorox Company
BzzAgent	Cm Solutions
Cadbury Schweppes	CoAMS, Inc.
Cairo Corporation	Colgate-Palmolive Company

Corporate Recruiters Survey 2006 General Data Report

Colorado Credit Union Center
Columbia Sportswear Company
Commonwealth of Massachusetts, All Divisions
Compensation Technologies
Component Builders LLC
Computer Science Corporation
Conagra Foods Group
Conerstone Trading LLC
Congressional Budget Office (CBO)
Connelly Billiard Manufacturing, Inc.
ConocoPhillips
Constellation Brands, Inc.
Constellation Energy Group
Coors Brewing Company
Copeland Corporation
CORNERSTONE R.E. Advisers, Inc.
Corporate Executive Board (CEB)
Corporate Express, Inc
Cowan Financial Group
CPRi
Credit Suisse First Boston
CSC Consulting
CSX Corporation
Cummins, Inc.
Customer Value Partners, Inc. (CVP)
Cyber Coders
Cymfony, Inc.
Daimler Chrysler Corporation
Dalby, Wendland & Co., P.C. (DWC)
Dana Farber Cancer Institute
Datacard Group
Dawson Marketing Group
Daymon
DecisionOne
Degussa Corporation
Del Monte Foods
Dell Computer Corporation
Deloitte & Touche
Delphi Corporation
Delta Air Lines Inc.
Deutsche Bank
Deutsche Post World Net (DPWN) Business Consulting
Development Alternatives, Inc. (DAI)
Devon Energy Corporation
DFW International Airport
Direct Energy
Discover Financial Services
Discovery Communications, Inc. (DCI)
Dorney Park & Wildwater Kingdom
Dow Chemical Company, The
Dow Jones & Company
DRAPER AND ASSOCIATES
Dresdner Kleinwort Wasserstein Securities Llc
DTE Energy
Duff & Phelps Corp. Consulting
Dynegy, Inc.
E&J Gallo Winery
Eastman Chemical Company
East-West Gateway Council of Governments
Eaton Corporation
eBay, Inc.
ECG Management Consultants, Inc.
EchoStar Communications Corporation
Ecolab Inc.
EDS
Education Pioneers
EFW, Inc.
EG&G Technical Services, Inc. (a division of URS Corp.)
Ehrhardt Keefe Steiner & Hottman
EIDETICS
Eisner LLP
Eli Lilly & Company
Empower IT
Encana Oil & Gas USA, Inc.
Enterprise Management Associates
Ericsson Inc.
Ernst & Young
Europraxis Consulting
Everbank
Everest Group
Evolution Benefits
Exactech
Exclusive Resorts, LLC
Experian Information Solutions
Express Scripts, Inc.
Extraco Bank
Exxon Mobil Corporation
Fannie Mae
Farmers Insurance & Financial Services
Farmers Insurance Group

Corporate Recruiters Survey 2006 General Data Report

Fastenal	Grace Construction Products
Federal Bureau Of Investigation	Graham Packaging Co.
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission	Grant Thornton LLP
Federal Express Corporation	Greater Dallas Chamber
Federal Reserve Bank of New York	Gross Mendelsohn & Associates
Federal Reserve Board	Grosvenor Funds, The
Fidelity Investments	GTRonix
Fifth Third Bank	Guidant Corporation
Filimon Partners	Gulf Stream Asset Management
FIND/SVP Global Business Advisory Services	Haendler & Natermann
Finnerty Economic	Halliburton Company
First Data Corporation	HarbourVest Partners, LLC
First Investors Corporation	Harrah's Entertainment, Inc
First Niagara Financial Group	Harris Corporation
First Western Trust Bank	Harris Interactive Inc.
Fisher Scientific International	Harris Nesbitt
Florida Department of Management Services	Hartford Financial Services Group
Florida State Board of Administration	Harvard Pilgrim Healthcare
FMC Technologies	Harvard University
FMI Corporation	Hawkeye Systems
FOCUS	HCA
Ford Motor Company	Healthsmart Preferred Care
Forest Laboratories, Inc.	Heidrick & Struggles
Foster Farms	Heinfeld & Meech, P.C.
Franklin Electric Co., Inc.	Heinz USA
Freddie Mac	Hennion & Walsh
Frost & Sullivan	Hermes Management Consulting S.A.
FTI Consulting Inc.	Hewlett Packard Company
G. X. Clarke & Co.	Highland Capital
Galliard Capital	Highland Community College
Gallup Organization, The	Hi-Line, Inc.
Garden State Philharmonic	Hitachi Consulting
Gartner Consulting	Hogan Group, The
GE Financial Services	Honeywell Inc.
GE Global Sponsor Finance	Hormel Foods Corporation
GEAE	Household Insurance
GEICO	HSBC
Gene Logic	Hughes Network Systems
General Electric	Hunt Oil Company
General Motors Corporation	IBM
GlaxoSmithKline	IBM Business Consulting Services
Goldman Sachs & Co.	IBM Strategy & Change Organization
Goodrich Corporation	ICDDR,B: Centre for Health & Population Research
Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company	IDS Scheer
Gordon Asset Management LLC	IEC Electronics Corp.
Gordon, Hughes & Banks, LLP	Iese Universidad De Navarra

Corporate Recruiters Survey 2006 General Data Report

Independence Investments Llc
Industrial Economics, Incorporated
IngeniCore
InPhonic, Inc.
Institute for International Research
Intel Corporation
Intelsat
Intermagnetics General Corp.
International Biometric Group
International Finance Corporation
International Marketing Group
International Monetary Fund
International Paper Company
Intuit Inc.
Invesco
Investors Bank & Trust Company
Isaacson Miller
J.B. Hunt Transport Services, Inc.
J.C. Penney
J.P. Morgan & Co. Incorporated
Jabil Circuit
Jeffrey, Phillips, Mosley & Scott, P.A.
John Hancock Financial Services, Inc.
Johnson & Johnson
Jrw Technologies
Kaiser Associates
Kaiser Permanente
Kb Home
Kelly Services
Kennametal, Inc.
Kerr-McGee Corporation
KeyCorp (KeyBank)
Kimberly-Clark Corporation
Kimmel & Associates
King Pharmaceuticals, Inc
Kmart
Kohler Company
KPMG
Kraft Foods
Kroger Company
KS&R Research
Lafarge North America
Lehman Brothers
Level 3 Communications
Lextranet
Liberty Mutual
Lifescan (a J&J Company)
Lifestyles HotSpring Spas
LILLY France
Limited Brands Inc.
LISC New York City
Local Development Corporation of East New York
Lockheed Martin Aeronautics Company
Lockton Benefit Group
Lowe's Companies, Inc.
Lutron Electronics Co., Inc.
Lyons Mortgage Services, Inc.
M Squared Strategies, Inc
M&T Bank
Mainsheet Consulting
Management Recruiters Tampa North
Management Resource Consulting
Management Simulations Inc.
Mansanto US Staffing
Masco Corporation
Mass Mutual
Masterfoods
Matdan Corp.
Mattel, Inc.
Mattress Firm, Inc.
Mazerov Miller Research & Marketing Strategy LLC
McCann World Group
McGraw-Hill Companies
McKinney Real Estate
McLean, Koehler, Sparks & Hammond
Mcnail & Johnson Ltd
MediaEdge:cia - Ohal Marketing Response
Consultants
Medrad, Inc.
Medtronic, Inc.
Meek's Building Centers
Mercer Human Resource Consulting
Mercer Management Consulting Ltd
Merck & Co., Inc.
Meridian Iq A Yellow Company
Merril Lynch
Metris Companies Inc.
Metropolitan West Capital Management, LLC
Mettler-Toledo International, Inc.
Michelinnorth America
Michigan Department of Management & Budget
Microsoft Corporation

Corporate Recruiters Survey 2006 General Data Report

MicroVest
Middendorf Meats
Midwest Manufacturing Solutions (MMS)
Milender White Construction Co.
Miller Brewing Company
Milliman Usa, Inc.
Monigle Associates, Inc.
Monitor Group
Moody's Investor Service
Morgan Stanley
Mortgage Line Financial Corp.
Motorola, Inc.
Mta New York City Transit
MTG Management Consultants LLC
Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency (MIGA)
MVP Marketing + Design, Inc.
Nat'l Foundation for Teaching Entre
National City Corporation
National Grid
National Rural Electric Cooperative Association
Navigant Consulting
NCR Corporation
Nestle
Neutrogena Corporation
New Providence Company
New York Life Insurance Co.
New York Software Industry Association (NYSIA)
Nissan
Nokia, Inc.
Norfolk Southern
Nortel Networks
NorthMarq Capital, Inc.
Northrop Grumman
NorthStar Exchange Corp.
Northwest Airlines, Inc.
Northwestern Mutual
Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corporation
Nuvell Financial Services
NVR / Ryan Homes, Inc.
NYC Department of Small Business Services
Oakwood Homes LLC
O'Connor, O'Conner, Lordi, Ltd.
Oddo & Cie
Omni American Federal Credit Union
Opera Solutions
Oppenheimer Funds, Inc
Oracle Corporation
Orbital Research
Overbreak
Overseas Private Investment Corporation
Panda Restaurant Gp.
Pangea Capital Advisors, LLC
Parature Inc.
Parenting Cottage
Pass & Seymour
Paymentech, Inc
PayStream Advisors, Inc.
Peace Corps
PEPPERIDGE FARM
Perot Systems Corporation
Pfizer Inc
PharmaOne Search, LLC
Pier 1 Imports, Inc.
Pinnacle Hills Mortgage Co.
Plantronics, Inc.
Playtex Products, Inc.
Pls Financial
PNC Financial Services Group
Point B Solutions Group LLP
Polaris Industries
Popular Financial Holdings
Population Services International (PSI)
PriceWaterhouse Coopers
Primedia Workplace Learning
PrimeStaff International
Principal Financial Group
Procter & Gamble
PROGRESS ENERGY
Progressive Insurance Co.
PRTM
Pulte Homes
PWC Logistics
Qualitrol Corporation
Radioshack Corp
Raiffeisen Bank (RZB Group)
Rancho Sahuarita
Randall & Dewey
Raymond James & Associates
Raytheon
Recruiter
Red Horse Realty
Red Oxygen

Corporate Recruiters Survey 2006 General Data Report

Reebok International Ltd.	Siemens Management Consulting
Regan Campbell Ward-Division Of Mccann-Erickson Advertising	Signature Theatre Company
Regions Financial Corporation	Silverwood Partners
Regions/ Union Planters Bank	Simat, Helliesen & Eichner, Inc. (SH&E)
Remington Hotels	Six Sigma Systems, Inc.
ResolvIT Resources	Sky Tv, Llc
Resources Global Professionals	Smith Barney
Revolution Communications	Societe Generale
Ricoh Corporation	Softrax
RLG Associates, LLC	SourceMedia
Robert Baird & Co.	Sourcing Value
Robert Half International Inc.	Southwestern Medical Cemter
Roche	Sovereign Bank
Rock Bottom Restaurants, Inc.	Sovereign Homes of Colorado
Rockwell Automation	SpaceAge
Rocky Mountain Health Plans	Spectrum Brands
Rohm & Haas	Sprint Corporation
Rosemount Analytical	SSA Consultants
Rothschild Inc.	St. Bernard Financial Services
Rp Options	Standard & Poors
RPH on the Go	Standard New York Securities, Inc.
RPOptions Management Consultants	Stanley Vidmar Storage Technologies
RSG Media Systems, LLC.	Stanton Chase International
RSMI	Staples, Inc.
RubinBrown, LLP	Starbucks Coffee Company
Rudder Capital	State Street
Ruder Finn, Inc.	Staubach & Co.
Russell Investment Company	Steak 'n Shake Inc.
Ryder TMC	Stirling Properties
Sabre Holdings	Stracienta
Safelite AutoGlass	STRACIENTA S.A.
Sara Lee Food	Strategic Workforce Solutions
SBC	Strategies for Wealth
Schindler Elevator Company	Stroud Consulting Inc.
Schreiber Foods Inc.	Summit Resources, Llc
SCORE! Learning, Inc.	Sungard Securities Processing
Seattle Northwest	Swiss Re
Seedco	Syllogis Teks
Select Comfort Corporation	Synaptic Source, LLC
Sense Corp	Syntroleum
Sensis Corporation	T Mobile
ServiceMagic, Inc.	Target Corporation
SF&Co	Tarpley & Underwood, P.C.
Shinsei Bank	TD Securities
Siemens	Teacher Retirement System of Texas
	Tech Data Corporation

Corporate Recruiters Survey 2006 General Data Report

Tennessee Valley Authority
Texas Commission On Environmental Quality
Texas Instruments Incorporated
texturemedia
The Adkins Group, Inc.
The Bank of Fayetteville
The Boston Consulting Group, Inc.
The Campus Special, LLC
The City of New York, Office of Management and Budget
The Clorox Company
The Dial Corporation
The Entrepreneur Authority
The Environmental League of Massachusetts
The Globecon Group LLC
The Growth Partnership
The Hartford Financial Services Group
The McGraw-Hill Companies
The Mills Corporation
The Pinnacle Group
The Ritz Carlton Hotels of New York
The Sloan Consortium
The Solae Company
The TJX Companies, Inc.
The Walt Disney Company
The Ward Group
Thomson Corporation/Thomson West
Thrivent Financial
Tiara Medical Systems, Inc.
Timberland Company
Tivis Ventures
Toyota Financial Services
Toyota Motor Corporation
Toyota Motor Sales
Tracylocke
Trade Center Management Associates
Trader Publishing Company
Transocean Inc.
TransUnion ITC
Triton Info Tech, Inc.
TriZetto Group
Tt&T Public Company Limited
TTI, INC
TXU Corporation
Tyson Foods, Inc.
Ubisoft
UBS
Union Planters National Bank
Unisys Corporation
United Bancshares, Inc.
United Methodist Publishing House
United Parcel Service
United Stationers Supply Co.
United Technologies Corp.
UnitedHealth Group
Universal Compression Holdings, Inc.
University of Phoenix
Univision
UNT Health Sci. Ctr.
US Air Force
US Air Force Civilian Personnel Center
US Airways
US Bancorp
US Department of Homeland Security
US Department of Labor
US Department of State
US General Accounting Office
US Oncology
US Postal Inspection Service
USA Today
USAA
USApple
Valtech
Vanguard Group, The
Ventana Medical Systems
Veritas Elite GMAT Preparation
Vistakon
VonLehman & Company
Wachovia
Walgreens
Washington Mutual
Washingtonpost.Newsweek Interactive
Wellington Management
Wellinx
Wells Fargo & Company
Western & Southern Financial Group
Weta Tv 26/ 90.9 Fm
Wexford Health Sources
White Rogers
Wild Oats
Williams-Sonoma, Inc.
Wilmington Finance

Corporate Recruiters Survey 2006 General Data Report

Workplace Essentials, Inc.
World Bank
World Trade Center Institute
World Wide Technologies
Wrigley Company (The)
Wyeth Consumer Healthcare
Xaviro Biosciences
Xcel Energy

Xerox Corporation
XM Satellite Radio
Xomox Corporation
Yankee Group, The
Yellow
Zimmer, Inc.
ZS Associates

Contact Information

For questions or comments regarding study findings, methodology or data, please contact the GMAC[®] Research and Development department at research@gmac.com.

Authorship

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

Gregg Schoenfeld, Manager, Applied Research, GMAC[®].

Acknowledgements

Larry Rudner, Vice President, Research and Development, GMAC[®], manuscript review; Rachel Edgington, Director, Market Research and Analysis, GMAC[®], manuscript review, survey questionnaire development and analysis; Grady Bruce, Contractor/Professor Emeritus, California State University, Fullerton, survey questionnaire development and analysis; Veronica Garcia, Research Writer/Editor, GMAC[®], writing and editorial services.

© 2006 Graduate Management Admission Council® (GMAC®). All rights reserved.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, distributed or transmitted in any form by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior written permission of GMAC®. For permission contact the GMAC® legal department at legal@gmac.com.

Creating Access to Graduate Business Education®, Global MBA®, GMAC®, and Graduate Management Admission Council® are registered trademarks of the Graduate Management Admission Council® (GMAC®).