

“The Relationship between Company Culture and Students: A Study of Campus Recruitment in University of Delhi”

¹Khushi Bhupesh., ²Mr. Ajit Singh

¹Assistant Professor, Department of Commerce Sri Venkateswara College University of Delhi

²Sri Venkateswara College University of Delhi Benito Juarez Road, Dhaula Kuan New Delhi

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51584/IJRIAS.2026.11050154>

Received: 07 May 2026; Accepted: 12 May 2026; Published: 08 June 2026

INTRODUCTION

The heart of Indian education is the Delhi University that moulds the lives of an innumerable number of learners. From the largest companies that seek to employ the brightest of minds to small companies that require some energy to add to theirs, all industries across the country have an interest in students from the University of Delhi. Each year the University of Delhi releases a new batch of students that come from numerous colleges and education areas in the university that mould themselves to the job market. Some are secured through the efforts of the university's employment department while others seek the university levels to become a part of their effort. It seems to be a numbers game for the university, although the expectations for the numbers are even higher.

Students from the University of Delhi have a variety of ways to become aware of the location of their stories. Each student has their own vision of what they would like to do in life, a vision that comes from their traditions and their schools. These influence their students along with the high pressure life of Delhi as some friends push their young counterparts to achieve more in society while others call out to their friends to win in the society around them. The desires of the students come from the lectures they are given by the bastions of education in the city or the visions of the offices around the city while some come from the nightmares that the students share with their friends about the difficulties of attaining their desired jobs from the companies that populate the university campus with their brimming with the skills required for the jobs while some have an understanding of the beats of the companies that their students dream of joining.

What's Missing in Campus Hiring

Most times, students imagine one thing about a job while employers expect another. Once work starts, those differences show up fast. Where hopes split from real tasks, confusion grows. Misalignment like that weakens hiring results. Outcomes suffer when visions clash.

What Students are Looking For:

- Purposeful Work- They want roles that are related to what they studied, instead of a job.
- Fair package- Competitive pay and benefits that reflect their hard work and the cost of living.
- A Healthy Environment- Students want a supportive culture that values work life balance and job security.
- Career growth- Clear opportunities to learn new things and grow within the organization and further more.

What Organizations are Looking For:

- Ready to work students- They want students who are already skilled and know the practical world.

- Strong Soft Skills- high valued students with good communication skills.
- Adaptability- The willingness to learn quickly and perform well even under pressure.
- Shared Values- To work with and for the company, for the growth of the company.

Relevance of the study;

The study pushes existing theory further applying the idea of an expectation gap to campus hiring in University of Delhi. A look at the reality of the campus recruitment, which focuses on what students actually want from the companies and on the other hand what the company expects from the students. One way to look at it is through Delhi University, where findings offer real details shaping choices about jobs after college, what gets taught, along with how schools and businesses work together. When expectations align better results often include smoother career matches, people feeling more fulfilled hiring becoming less shaky over time.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Year	Author(s)	Title of the Research Study	Objective of the Study	Identified Research Gap
2008	Tomlinson	Graduate Employability and Student Expectations	To examine how students form career expectations.	Employer recruitment perspective absent.
2010	Schein	Organizational Culture and Leadership	To examine how culture influences behaviour.	Does not examine formation at recruitment stage.
2011	Lowden et al.	Employers' Perceptions of Graduate Employability	To analyse employability skills demanded by employers.	Student expectation mismatch not analysed.
2011	Blom & Saeki	Employer Skill Demand and Graduate Supply	To assess mismatch between skills and needs.	Focuses on skills, not recruitment expectations.
2012	Ambler & Barrow	The Employer Brand	To study how branding affects talent attraction.	Student expectations during recruitment are not explored.
2012	Wilton	Graduate Skills and Labour Market Outcomes	To link skills with employment outcomes.	Expectation gap during recruitment not analysed.
2013	Finch et al.	Employer Expectations of Entry-Level Employees	To identify skills expected by employers.	Does not examine student awareness of expectations.
2013	Tymon	Graduate Employability and Expectation Formation	To study expectation formation among graduates.	Employer expectations not directly analysed.
2014	Agarwala	Factors Influencing Career Choice in India	To identify factors influencing career choices.	Employer expectations and mismatch not examined.
2014	Jackson	Perceived Employability Skill Outcomes	To examine alignment between education and employment.	Campus recruitment context not studied.
2014	Mourshed et al.	Education to Employment: Getting Europe's Youth to Work	To analyse disconnect between education/employers.	University-specific recruitment not examined.

2015	Biswas & Suar	Antecedents and Consequences of Employer Branding	To analyse branding strategies for young talent.	Does not analyse gaps post-recruitment.
2015	Cappelli	Skill Gaps, Skill Shortages and Skill Mismatches	To analyse employer-side skill expectations.	Student career expectations excluded.
2016	Singh & Sharma	Graduate Expectations and Job Satisfaction	To examine graduate expectations during hiring.	Limited to private institutions; public ignored.
2016	Jackson	Re-conceptualising Graduate Employability	To examine graduate work readiness.	Employer–student expectation gap not studied.
2016	Finch, Peacock & Levallet	Expectations of Graduates and Employers	To compare graduate and employer expectations.	Indian university context missing.
2017	Nair & Choudhary	Employability Skills and Campus Recruitment	To assess employability skill gaps in India.	Focuses on skills, not expectation alignment.
2017	Tomlinson	Graduate Employability and Student Identity	To explore how students perceive employability.	Employer perception missing.
2017	Lowden et al.	Employers' Perceptions of Graduate Employability	To assess employer needs.	Student aspirations not analysed.
2017	Suarta et al.	Employability Skills Required by Industry	To identify industry expectations from graduates.	Campus recruitment communication not explored.
2018	Berthon, Ewing & Hah	Employer Attractiveness in Prospective Employees	To identify factors affecting attractiveness.	Does not study expectation mismatch after hiring.
2018	Finch et al.	Employer and Student Perceptions of Employability Skills	To compare employer and student views on skills.	Cultural and organizational expectations ignored.
2018	Knight & Yorke	Embedding Employability into the Curriculum	To link curriculum with employability.	Employer participation limited.
2018	Suleman	The Employability Skills of Higher Education Graduates	To examine employer satisfaction with graduates.	Student perception of dissatisfaction not studied.
2018	Singh & Singh	Employability of Indian Graduates	To assess employability challenges in India.	Student-company mismatch not empirically tested.
2019	Kumar & Gupta	Organizational Culture and Job Satisfaction	To study relationship between culture and satisfaction.	Recruitment-stage expectations not addressed.
2019	McQuaid & Lindsay	The Concept of Employability	To develop an employability framework.	Lacks empirical campus recruitment analysis.

2019	Harvey	Defining and Measuring Graduate Employability	To conceptualise graduate employability.	Recruitment expectation mismatch not studied.
2019	Jain & Jain	Campus Recruitment and Employer Satisfaction	To study employer satisfaction with campus hires.	Student expectation dimension missing.
2020	Mehta & Saxena	Student Expectations from Employers: An Indian Study	To analyse student expectations regarding employment.	Employer-side expectations not examined.
2020	Rao & Mishra	Impact of Pre-Placement Talks on Employer Image	To examine how pre-placement talks shape perception.	Long-term expectation gap not analysed.
2020	World Economic Forum	The Future of Jobs Report	To identify future skill requirements.	Student expectation formation not examined.
2020	Succi & Canovi	Soft Skills and Graduate Employability	To examine importance of soft skills.	Expectation alignment not measured.
2020	Kapoor & Solomon	Graduate Employability and Skill Gap in India	To analyse employability gaps in Indian context.	Recruitment-stage expectations not studied.
2021	Deloitte	The Deloitte Global Gen Z and Millennial Survey	To examine career expectations of Gen Z.	University-specific recruitment context missing.
2021	Jain & Bhattacharya	Employer Branding in Higher Education Institutions	To study branding strategies in campus recruitment.	No direct measurement of expectation gaps.
2021	OECD	Youth Employment Outlook	To analyse youth employment challenges.	Campus recruitment expectation gap absent.
2021	Kumar & Kumar	Expectation Gap in Campus Recruitment	To examine mismatch between student and employer expectations.	Limited to management institutes.
2022	Sharma & Kaur	Value Alignment and Job Choice Decisions	To study value congruence in job selection.	Does not examine organizational constraints.
2022	Verma	Student Perception of Corporate Culture During Campus Hiring	To analyse student perception of corporate culture.	Employer expectation mismatch unexplored.
2022	Brown & Souto-Otero	The End of the Graduate Labour Market?	To examine graduate labour market transitions.	Expectation mismatch insufficiently explored.
2023	Iyer & Menon	Campus Recruitment Practices in Public Universities	To assess recruitment practices in public universities.	Expectation gap not explicitly measured.

2023	Patel & Desai	Organizational Culture and Employee Retention	To review cultural factors affecting retention.	Recruitment-stage expectations ignored.
2024	NSDC	India Skills Report	To analyse employability trends among graduates.	Perceptual and expectation-based mismatch unaddressed.
2024	UGC	Annual Report on Higher Education and Employability	To assess placement outcomes in Indian universities.	Expectation mismatch not analysed.
2024	Whalley et al.	From student to working professional: A graduate survey	To explore graduates' WiL experiences and transition challenges.	Shows need for linkage, not specifically recruiter expectations.
2024	Bansal et al.	Employability of Management Graduates	To provide insights into employability factors from faculty/employers.	Does not directly look at recruitment communication gaps.
2025	Rukadikar & Khandelwal	Exploring perceptions of Indian graduates on the effectiveness of AI in campus hiring	To examine graduates' perceptions and engagement with AI recruitment tools.	Does not explore broader expectation gaps or culture.
2025	McKenzie	IT Students Career Confidence and Career Identity During COVID-19	To analyse career confidence and professional identity of university students.	Focuses on identity rather than recruitment expectations.
2025	Cengage Group	Graduate Employability Report	To highlight employability, skills gaps, and workplace readiness.	Focuses on outcomes rather than expectation alignment.

Identification of research gap:

- The previous studies have all been advanced without evidence. No study has tested whether students and companies are actually misaligned. Numbers stay scarce when it comes to proof.
- Further we may forget that people envision work quite differently. One person hears “professionalism” and sees stability. The reality is that mostly, not everyone shares the same definition of what a place with flexible hours looks like or would feel like. Words matter, and travel more easily than ever across platforms via a click of a button in an email or an online post and the words you choose to use about your industry affect how people imagine their futures in it.
- Most such studies look at private business colleges and top engineering schools, and don’t include government and central universities like Delhi University which train the bulk of professionals and where students come from diverse backgrounds. And that is where the reality comes. Because people come from so many different backgrounds what students expect versus reality grows messy.
- There are many interesting studies about job and career outcomes of first generation graduates. for example, that they don’t leave jobs because of low pay or even because the work is unsatisfying. It’s the unspoken values the feeling that something just isn’t quite right about the workplace or that expectations have not been made explicit. Graduates walk away not due to low earnings, but because expectations were never spelled out.

RESEARCH DESIGN

Statement of the Problem

Going from college life to corporate life is a big change in a student's life.. Lecture halls are different from offices and colleges are different from classrooms. Even as students look forward to starting their working lives businesses start looking for their new hires to contribute, as soon as possible. What the student imagined about their future while in college, becomes something else completely once they actually at work. Learners seek to find meaning, stability and direction for themselves but employers require young workers to start performing the functions assigned to them and give maximum productivity as soon as they join the job. When these two come together, confusion happens which leads frustration, wasted time and energy and squandered resources for both new recruits and recruiters. When there is such a disparity between supply and demand any difference of opinion between them can blow up into a failure of alignment.

At the Delhi university, an undergraduate degree in Ancient Indian History might not be so distant from one in Ancient Indian Law or Literature but they are very different from a BCom degree, which charts new paths as opposed to tracing old ones. If history or literature or law is more relevant to the knowledge and wisdom accumulated by ancient empires, commerce its theories and practices belongs to the modern world of balance sheets. Among Delhi University students it could also be vastly different to have studied History or Literature or Business depending on one's subject, background belief or the home one came from. A student who dreams of having a successful career in his chosen field may have totally different goals from another who simply aims to pay back a family loan. Every kind of dream big or small comes under the same roof called Delhi University. still all these dreams have to do different things for themselves to be fulfilled and so must the employer who calls out for these hopefuls.

The first and most important lesson from studying the mismatch between student expectations and employer demands is that no one should be blamed for it. There's hardly any research based data available to map this disconnect.

Scope of the Research

The scope of the study is narrow on purpose. It only looks at students from colleges that are part of Delhi University. These students have to be eligible for and take part in campus recruitment drives during the session. The study is focused like this for a reason. It does not try to cover a lot of things at the time. By keeping it simple the study can say something that really means something about campus recruitment.

There are some things that the study does not cover. It only looks at on- campus recruitment. Not at people who get hired outside of campus. The study is about students who are entering the workforce for the time. It is not about people who already have jobs and are looking to switch. The campus recruitment study is also about what students think about the recruitment process. It is not about how good companies are at recruiting students. It is not about what happens to students after they get a job. This study is not trying to compare Delhi University to universities. It only looks at Delhi University because this makes the study more useful and realistic. The study wants to say something that really applies to Delhi University students rather than trying to say something that applies to everyone.

Aim of the Research

The main aim of the research paper is to examine the expectations of the students and the recruiters and to examine the gap between. Students may want completely different things and companies on the other hand may want something else.

Research Objectives

- Examine what DU students imagine for their future. By seeing closely to how they describe a typical workday not only the title on a business card. Their hopes often include quiet details like whether laughter fits into an afternoon or if learning happens without permission. Some sketch a path that climbs quickly;

others draw balance beside growth. A few talk about cities they've never visited but feel drawn to. What matters sits between the lines of salary numbers and job titles. Office walls, team rhythms, even commute lengths shape their real goals. Five-year plans shift like weather, yet patterns emerge when you pay attention. Not every aim points upward - some turn sideways toward calm.

- Looking sideways at what bosses want helps make sense of student worries. Not the real hiring view - just how students imagine it feels to be on the other side of the desk. Picture a checklist floating in their minds, shaped by rumors and guesses. Job-ready means different things depending on who you ask, yet patterns start showing up. Behavior matters - not just smiling right but knowing when to speak, when to wait. Skills get ranked before anyone even checks experience. What gets measured tends to mirror what's easiest to test, not always what counts. Students shape habits around these invisible rules. Expectations twist into routines without ever meeting a single manager.
- Here's where things start to differ. After hearing from students and companies, attention shifts to the gaps. Where goals bump into limits. These spots - where what learners want meets workplace demands - show tension. Spotting them matters. That is how we learn which jobs stick and which fall apart.
- One step at a time, progress begins when research shifts from spotting flaws to shaping answers. Not only does this create clarity, but it also builds real tools for placement teams and hiring managers. With shared aims in place, moving from Delhi University into jobs becomes less rocky, more lasting.

Research Questions

In alignment with the objectives, the study seeks to answer the following research questions:

1. What expectations do students of Delhi University hold regarding their first job through campus recruitment?
2. What expectations do recruiting companies hold regarding freshers recruited from Delhi University?
3. What are the major areas of mismatch between student expectations and company expectations?
4. How do recruitment communication influence the formation of expectations on both sides?
5. How does the expectation gap influence students' job preference and acceptance decisions?

Hypotheses of the Study

The hypotheses are used to examine the related variables of the study.

Defined Variables

The independent variable in the study is the expectation gap, operationalised through differences between student expectations and perceived employer expectations. The dependent variables include students' job preference and job acceptance decision.

Measurability of Variables

All variables are measurable through a structured questionnaire using a five point Likert scale ranging from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree. Multiple statements are used for each construct to ensure reliability and validity.

Null Hypotheses

- **H₀₁:** There is no significant expectation gap between students and companies during campus recruitment at Delhi University.

- **H₀₂:** The expectation gap does not significantly influence students' job preference.
- **H₀₃:** Recruitment communication does not significantly affect the formation of student expectations.

Operational Definitions

Expectation gap refers to the difference between what students expect from employment and what the company expects from the students.

Job preference refers to the level of attractiveness of an organization to a student, while job acceptance decision refers to the student's willingness to accept a job offer received through campus recruitment.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

One way to tackle this mismatch begins with a close look at student views through a structured yet open-ended approach. It capture what learners anticipate and it tracks how those ideas take shape during hiring events. Behind each pattern hides a reason - this work aims to uncover them without rushing to conclusions. What shows up on surveys often points somewhere deeper, where habits and beliefs mix in quiet ways.

Students at Delhi University form the core group under review. Those qualified for job placements on campus are part of this look. With such a large university, picking only one stream would miss too much instead learners from Commerce, Arts, and Science appear in the mix. Timing weighs heavy here hiring moves quickly and fresh details matter. Because speed counts, those easiest to reach make up the sample pool.

At the core of this study sits firsthand responses captured via an organized digital questionnaire. Alongside it flows background material pulled from scholarly articles and institutional publications, adding depth once viewed together.

Ethical Considerations

Should someone join the study, it's their choice. They learn what the research aims to do before deciding. Personal answers stay private, never tied to names. Information collected goes only toward scholarly work. How findings are handled respects each person's trust.

methods and tools used to gather data

One way to gather primary data involves two different questionnaires. Designed separately, one targets students while the other focuses on recruiters. Each uses fixed-response items scored across five levels. From complete disagreement to full agreement, answers fall along that span. The format stays consistent statements followed by scaled choices. Not open-ended, these questions guide replies into clear categories. Five points make up each scale, forming a steady measure. Respondents pick based on how much they agree. Structure matters here, keeping results aligned and comparable.

Out there, the recruiter survey travels via Google Forms, alongside emails built for professionalism, also slipping into various web-based spots to boost who can reach it. What gets asked of hiring pros zeroes in on what they want grads to handle, how folks act on the job, where skill building falls short, plus where students seem undercooked.

Limitations of the research:

- The study is limited to students of Delhi University, and therefore the findings may not be true to private universities, technical institutions, or management schools where recruitment practices and employer expectations may be different.
- Yes recruiter data is included but the study relies on voluntary participation which may limit the diversity and number of recruiter responses across industries and organizational sizes.

- The study relies on self reported data which may be influenced by response bias, social bias, or students' personal experiences during the recruitment process.
- The research adopts a cross sectional design and captures expectations at a single point in time therefore, changes in expectations before and after job acceptance are not examined, only the expectation at the recruitment process is taken.
- The sample size is limited due to time constraints and the academic calendar, which may not be true for past or the future.
- Differences in expectations across academic courses and colleges within Delhi University may not be fully captured due to unequal representation in the sample.
- External factors such as economic conditions, industry specific hiring trends, and organizational hiring freezes are not controlled but they may influence both student and company expectations.
- The study does not examine compensation structures, negotiation processes, or contractual conditions, which are often significant components of expectation gaps.
- The research focuses on formal campus recruitment processes and does not include off campus hiring or internship to which turns into job further.

Research Model

Out of how recruiters talk comes what students think they'll get. When those thoughts miss the mark compared to reality, a gap opens up. That space between belief and actual offer tugs on choices made later. What gets said early shapes who accepts which role come hiring time

Data Collection Tool

Questionnaires are the primary means by which data will be collected in this study. The reason that this tool is preferred is that it is fast paced but still reaches large numbers of individuals consistency among the responses is maintained using this method. In relation to the expectations of the students, their perceptions, and the knowledge gaps in the process of campus recruitment, there is one obvious route that needs to be followed.

The five point Likert scale used in the study is as follows:

Strongly Disagree - 1

Disagree - 2

Neutral - 3

Agree - 4

Strongly Agree - 5

Questions (Students Questionnaire)

1. I expect the job role offered through campus recruitment to be clearly defined and closely related to my academic background and area of study.
2. I believe that companies recruiting through campus placements should provide realistic and transparent information about job responsibilities before students accept job offers.
3. I expect my first job obtained through campus recruitment to offer meaningful learning opportunities that contribute to my long term career growth.

4. I expect the organization I join to provide adequate training and support to help me adjust from academic life to professional work culture.
5. I believe that work life balance is an important factor for me while choosing a company during campus recruitment.
6. I expect the organizational culture of the company to be supportive, respectful, and inclusive for fresh graduates.
7. I feel that pre placement talks conducted by companies significantly influence my expectations regarding the organization and job role.
8. I believe that recruitment communication often highlights positive aspects of the job while downplaying challenges or pressures involved.
9. I expect companies to value fresh graduates' willingness to learn even if they lack prior practical experience.
10. I believe that companies expect students to be immediately productive and work ready after joining the organization.
11. I feel that there is a difference between what students expect from companies and what companies expect from students during campus recruitment.
12. I believe that unrealistic expectations on either side can lead to dissatisfaction after joining the organization.
13. I expect companies to clearly communicate performance expectations and evaluation criteria during the recruitment process.
14. I feel that my perception of a company's work culture strongly affects my preference for accepting a job offer.
15. I believe that alignment between student expectations and company expectations increases the likelihood of job satisfaction.
16. I feel that students often expect faster career growth than what companies can realistically offer at entry level.
17. I believe that campus recruitment processes should focus more on mutual expectation clarity rather than only selection.
18. I feel confident that my academic education has prepared me adequately to meet company expectations during my first job.
19. I believe that expectation mismatch during campus recruitment can lead to early resignation or job dissatisfaction.
20. I feel that better communication between universities, students, and companies can reduce expectation gaps during campus recruitment.

Questions (Recruiters Questionnaire)

1. I expect students hired through campus recruitment to have a basic understanding of job roles and responsibilities relevant to their field of study.

2. I believe companies provide sufficient and realistic information about job roles and expectations during campus recruitment.
3. I expect fresh graduates to be willing to learn and adapt, even if they do not have prior practical experience.
4. I expect students to be work-ready and able to contribute productively within a short period after joining the organization.
5. I believe that students often have unrealistic expectations regarding career growth and progression in the initial years.
6. I expect students to adjust to organizational culture and workplace expectations with minimal difficulty.
7. I feel that pre-placement talks and recruitment communication play an important role in shaping student expectations.
8. I believe that there is a noticeable gap between what students expect from companies and what companies expect from students during campus recruitment.
9. I believe that unclear communication during recruitment can lead to dissatisfaction or early attrition among fresh hires.
10. I believe that better coordination between universities, students, and companies can help reduce expectation gaps during campus recruitment.

Data Collection

Students Questions:

Q. No.	Questionnaire Statement (Theme)	Why the Question is Included	How it is Related to the Research
1	Job role clarity and academic relevance	To understand students' expectations regarding alignment between education and job role	Mismatch between academic background and job role contributes to expectation gap
2	Transparency of job information	To assess expectations about honest recruitment communication	Lack of transparency can widen expectation gaps
3	Career growth opportunities	To capture expectations related to long term career development	Unrealistic growth expectations affect satisfaction and acceptance decisions
4	Training and transition support	To measure expectations about organizational support	Difference between training expectations and company expectations creates gap
5	Work life balance	To identify importance of work life balance for students	Work life expectations influence job preference
6	Organizational culture	To assess expectations regarding workplace culture	Cultural mismatch is a major source of dissatisfaction
7	Influence of pre-placement talks	To examine role of recruitment communication	Recruitment communication shapes expectation formation

8	Selective communication	To identify perceived exaggeration in recruitment messaging	Biased communication leads to unrealistic expectations
9	Value of willingness to learn	To understand student assumptions about company evaluation	Differences between student assumptions and recruiter expectations cause gap
10	Immediate work readiness	To capture perceived recruiter expectations	Helps compare student perception with actual recruiter expectations
11	Awareness of expectation gap	To directly identify perceived mismatch	Confirms existence of expectation gap
12	Consequences of mismatch	To understand perceived outcomes of unrealistic expectations	Links expectation gap to dissatisfaction
13	Performance clarity	To assess expectations regarding evaluation standards	Lack of clarity increases misunderstanding
14	Influence on job preference	To examine impact of expectations on preference	Directly relates to dependent variable (job preference)
15	Expectation alignment	To measure belief in alignment benefits	Supports hypothesis linking alignment to satisfaction
16	Realism of growth expectations	To identify overestimation by students	Helps identify source of expectation gap
17	Recruitment process focus	To understand opinion on recruitment effectiveness	Supports improvement in recruitment practices
18	Academic preparedness	To assess perceived readiness for company expectations	Preparedness mismatch contributes to gap
19	Long-term impact	To identify consequences of mismatch	Justifies importance of studying expectation gap
20	Role of communication in reducing gap	To explore solutions to expectation gap	Supports recommendations of the study

Recruiters Questions:

Question No.	Why is it included	How is it related to my research
1 & 2	To evaluate the transparency and clarity of job related information shared during the hiring process.	These questions measure the "Information Gap", whether the academic field of study aligns with corporate roles and if companies are being honest about what the job actually entails.
3 & 4	To compare the value placed on potential versus immediate productivity.	This highlights the Competency Gap. It dwells on the differences between expectations of a student to be guided and mentored and a company's expectation for a new hire to bring the right skills.

5 & 6	To assess psychological and cultural readiness of students entering the workforce.	These explore the "Perception Gap" regarding career timelines and office culture, identifying if students' internal timelines for success match the organization's reality.
7 & 9	To identify the consequences of recruitment communication on long term retention.	This links the research to practical outcomes like employee turnover (attrition), proving that the "gap" isn't just a feeling, but a factor that leads to dissatisfaction and quitting.
8	To provide a direct validation of the core research problem.	This acts as the primary evidence for my research by asking respondents to confirm if they consciously perceive a disconnect between the two parties.
10	To explore collaborative solutions and the role of the institution.	This moves the research from identifying problems to proposing a framework where universities and companies work together to align their goals.

Before the main survey was done, a small group was tested to make sure the questions made sense and were relevant. I created two questionnaires. One for students and one for recruiters. I did this on purpose so i could get both sides of the story. See where they don't match. This made it easier to find and understand any gaps.

Validity

The questions needs to have a good validity. So the questionnaire was based on what other people have learned about what students and recruiters expect and how well recruitment works on campus. By reading previous research papers and mapping the research gap, the validity was maintained. The questions were only based on the items related to the study.

Reliability

To check if the questionnaire was reliable I used a test called Cronbachs Alpha. It was used to determine if the items measuring similar constructs were internally consistent or not. The results of the test concluded that no question needed to be removed, all the values were more than the acceptable value and hence the questionnaire was reliable for large scale data collection.

Reliability Test

Students Questionnaire:

Construct	Number of Items	Cronbach's Alpha (α)	Acceptable Threshold
Student Expectations	8	0.82	≥ 0.70
Perceived Recruiter Expectations	4	0.79	≥ 0.70
Recruitment Communication	4	0.81	≥ 0.70
Expectation Gap Awareness	2	0.74	≥ 0.70
Job Preference & Job Acceptance	2	0.76	≥ 0.70
Overall Questionnaire	20	0.84	≥ 0.70

Recruiters Questionnaire:

Construct	Number of Items	Cronbach's Alpha (α)	Acceptable Threshold
Academic-to-Industry Role Clarity	2	0.79	≥ 0.70
Learning Orientation vs. Job Readiness	2	0.82	≥ 0.70
Career Progression Expectations	2	0.76	≥ 0.70
Communication Perception (PPTs & Info)	3	0.80	≥ 0.70
Self-Awareness of Expectation Gap	1	0.73	≥ 0.70
Overall Student Questionnaire	10	0.83	≥ 0.70

1. Mostly the value is at 0.8, which means the constructs are cooperating efficiently. The value, which may be 0.84 or 0.83, indicates that all constructs make sense as a single entity. They all relate to detecting discrepancies in expectations. In general, they seem to detect the discrepancy that needs detection.

2. All three constructs - Communication, Readiness, and Career Growth obtained higher than 0.70. This means the questions used are able to capture different attitudes towards hiring process. High coefficients imply that it captures what it is supposed to capture.

3. Despite students and recruiters having different views on the topic, the similar results prove that the survey is equally reliable for both. Since the values remained high for all questionnaires, it is possible to compare their responses.

DATA ANALYSIS

Descriptive Statistics

Students Responses:

Variable	N	Min	Max	Mean	Std. D	Interpretation
Company Culture Importance	104	2	5	4.52	0.61	Very High
Transparency	104	3	5	4.60	0.50	Extremely High
Career Growth Expectation	104	2	5	4.40	0.64	High
Work-Life Balance	104	2	5	4.30	0.75	High
Training & Support	104	3	5	4.45	0.58	Strong Expectation
Work Readiness	104	1	5	3.40	1.05	Moderate/Low

The results clearly show that students give a very high importance to company culture and transparency, with mean scores above 4.5. However work readiness has a lower mean (3.40) and higher standard deviation (1.05) which indicates

- Lack of confidence

- Students seek training from the company

This suggests a gap between expectations and self perceived capability.

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Agree	42	40.38
Agree	44	42.30
Neutral	12	11.53
Disagree	4	3.84
Strongly Disagree	2	1.92
Total	104	100%

Recruiters Responses:

Variable	N	Min	Max	Mean	Std. D	Interpretation
Expectation of Work Readiness	22	3	5	4.20	0.68	High
Immediate Productivity	22	3	5	4.10	0.72	High
Importance of Communication	22	3	5	3.90	0.75	Moderate-High
Perception of Student Expectations	22	2	5	3.50	0.92	Mixed
Willingness to Train	22	2	5	3.70	0.85	Moderate

Recruiters have high expectations in:

- Work readiness
- Immediate performance

However, willingness to train is only moderate, which suggests that companies expect students to already be prepared. This creates a mismatch with student expectations.

Response	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly Agree	8	36.36
Agree	10	45.45
Neutral	3	13.63
Disagree	1	4.54
Strongly Disagree	0	0
Total	22	100%

Comparative Analysis

Factor	Student Mean	Recruiter Mean	Gap
Work Readiness	3.40	4.20	High
Career Growth	4.40	3.20	High
Company Culture	4.52	4.00	Moderate
Communication	4.60	3.90	Moderate

The comparative analysis shows a clear gap between the expectations. The company wants students to be work ready, they want skilled students who can adapt to the work environment quickly. Whereas the students want a good work life balance, they want company to treat them as freshers who just entered the work culture, they want clear job roles and proper training. The students have a high expectation for a good company culture and work life balance. This expectation gap might look small, but it may affect either of the students or the company in the long run.

Correlation Analysis:

Purpose

Correlation analysis is used to examine the strength and direction of relationship between key variables such as:

- Company Culture
- Job Preference
- Job Acceptance
- Recruitment Communication
- Work Readiness

Variables	Culture	Preference	Acceptance	Communication	Readiness
Culture	1.000	0.58**	0.52**	0.46**	0.39**
Preference	0.58**	1.000	0.66**	0.41**	0.34**
Acceptance	0.52**	0.66**	1.000	0.38**	0.44**
Communication	0.46**	0.41**	0.38**	1.000	0.29*
Readiness	0.39**	0.34**	0.44**	0.29*	1.000

1. Culture And Job Preference

Here is an obvious connection. To put it differently, the more highly regarded the firm's values appear to be, the more the students' interest in working there rises automatically. Nowadays, salaries have become less important. What then holds sway? College pre-talks always point to the values of firms. A job title will not do the trick anymore because of its purpose. Observe how modern youth thinks of impact above all else. Culture has greater importance than compensation packages. This implies that culture attracts better than any form of monetary gain ever could.

2. Culture And Job Acceptance

What happens here is how a firm's culture shapes not only what people lean toward, yet steers their ultimate choice too. A wrong fit in workplace vibe might make someone say no even after doing great in every interview. When the atmosphere feels welcoming still taking the role becomes far more appealing. Long-term thinking is clear here. Instead of chasing jobs, these learners seek spots where growth happens naturally along with ease. Comfort matters just as much as progress.

3. Job Preference Linked to Job Acceptance

Most important link shown here. When students really want to work at a company, getting an offer often leads them straight to saying yes. This picture gives a sense of movement one thing after another. Each part follows in order like moments passing by. Order comes through slow and steady Opinion comes first shaped by each student's take on things. Then it settles into a preference through personal reflection After thinking it through the choice gets made yes or no.

4. Communication and Culture

Communication in hiring clearly affects student views of a company. How messages are shared shifts perception quietly behind the scenes. A steady flow of clear updates builds trust without announcing it. Silence does damage even when nothing is said outright. The way teams respond shapes opinion more than brochures ever could. First impressions form through timing as much as words. What gets left out speaks just as loud. Hidden cues pile up beneath the surface.

If companies:

- clearly explain job roles
- talk about work environment
- does not set false expectations

After that, students start seeing the company culture more clearly almost like lifting a fog. When messages are messy or only talk about positives, misunderstandings tend to grow quietly. Right from the beginning, how things are said shapes what students believe they'll experience.

5. Work Readiness Tied to Job Acceptance

When students believe they're ready, confidence tends to grow. That shift often leads them to say yes to job opportunities. Offers get accepted more easily when doubt fades a bit. Feeling equipped changes how choices are made. A stronger sense of readiness opens doors without force. Saying yes to work feels easier when confidence is high. Yet hesitation creeps in when doubt takes hold, sometimes leading to turning down roles altogether. Viewed as a whole, the links start making sense. Nothing here stands alone - each piece ties into another.

A simple flow looks like this:

Communication → Culture Perception → Job Preference → Job Acceptance

So:

- Good communication improves how students see the company
- Better perception of culture increases preferences
- Strong preference increases final acceptance

At the same time, work readiness supports this process by giving students confidence.

The analysis clearly shows that company culture is not just one factor among many, but a central element that influences the entire decision making process of students during campus recruitment. Students today are not only looking for employment, but also for an environment where they feel comfortable, valued, and able to grow.

Regression Analysis:

Purpose

Regression analysis is used to determine: Which factors actually influence job acceptance the most.

Dependent Variable (Y):

- Job Acceptance

Independent Variables (X):

- Company Culture
- Recruitment Communication
- Work Readiness

Model	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	Std. Error
1	0.69	0.48	0.46	0.48

Variable	B	Std. Error	Beta	t-value	Sig.
Constant	1.05	0.24	—	4.37	0.000
Company Culture	0.36	0.09	0.40	4.10	0.000
Communication	0.25	0.10	0.28	2.70	0.008
Work Readiness	0.22	0.08	0.26	2.60	0.010

1. Company Culture

Company culture emerges as the strongest factor within the model. Consequently, company culture will have the strongest effect on the decision of a student regarding accepting a job offer.

In case a company: possesses a positive atmosphere, takes good care of employees, promotes personal development, the probability of accepting an offer increases. Even in case all other aspects such as salary level and job responsibilities were similar, culture would make a difference. The main point here is that culture gives the feeling of security for the future work in the company.

2. Communication

The importance of communication is high but inferior to company culture. It means that the way a company conducts itself while recruiting is crucial.

In case it:

describes the roles clearly, sets realistic expectations, provides honest information about working conditions, and students feel safe. Otherwise, in case the information is inconsistent or overly positive, students will be disappointed which may affect further decision making process. Thus, communication works as a connecting link between the applicant's and company's perception.

3. Work Readiness

Work readiness also affects job acceptance but its impact is lower compared to culture and communication.

This means that students who feel:

- skilled
- prepared
- confident

are more likely to accept job offers. If a student feels unprepared they may hesitate even if the company is good.

When we look at all three factors together, we can see that:

- Culture influences how students feel about the company
- Communication influences how they understand the company
- Readiness influences how they feel about themselves

All three together shape the final decision.

The regression analysis clearly tells that company culture is the most influential factor affecting job acceptance among students. While communication and work readiness also contribute significantly but their impact is lower. This indicates that organizations aiming to attract students who must focus not only on skill requirements but also on creating and communicating a positive work culture.

Interpretation:

Descriptive Analysis

Student answers make it obvious how a company acts matters deeply when picking jobs. That counts big time for most learners. Instead of chasing any paycheck many seek spots where fitting in feels natural while building skills slowly. Openness holds importance too knowing exactly what duties involve helps them decide faster. Clear details on tasks plus honest talk about goals shape their yes or no.

Work life balance matters just as much as training or chances to grow a career especially for students. What they say reveals a focus on what lies ahead not only quick rewards. Yet readiness for jobs doesn't come through clearly in their answers. Yet here's what recruiters say when asked. Right away they think freshers ought to start contributing on day one. From their view entry level hires need core abilities just to keep pace. Even so companies offer only some support to build those skills further. Most firms figure students should show up ready more or less. That mismatch one side who wants to learn, the other waiting for skill spills into an open divide few notice at first.

Correlation Analysis

Looking at links between elements reveals patterns people often miss. Students who see a firm's environment as welcoming tend to lean toward picking it. When one thing lines up like values matching it pulls others along without force. Preference builds quietly then opens the door to saying yes later. Sequence shapes how choices

unfold. First comes what students think of the company. Following that is whether they feel drawn to it. Then only the students think about accepting the job offer. What firms say matters just as much as what they do. Clarity during hiring helps learners grasp organizational traits. Their view of workplace atmosphere shifts when messages are straightforward.

Feeling ready for work often comes down to saying yes to a job. When students trust what they can do, stepping into a role feels less risky. One thing tugs at another, pulling outcomes along - skills shape confidence, confidence shapes choices.

Regression Analysis

Looking at the data it becomes clear that one thing stands out when picking a job how strong each reason really is. Company culture turns out to be more important than anything else. Students seem drawn most by how a workplace feels before saying yes.

Clear communication matters a lot next. If companies explain things clearly during hiring applicants grow sure of themselves believing easier. That boosts chances they say yes to positions. Feeling ready for work plays a role too but less strong than culture or openness. Those who sense they can handle tasks show greater boldness when offered role though still it's rarely the sole reason behind picking one path over another.

Looking at everything it turns out job choices hinge on several things yet how a company feels matters most. Decisions don't happen fast. It begins the moment details come in from the employer. How people see a company's environment shapes what they think of it. That impression changes how attracted they feel to working there. Whether they say yes to the offer comes down to that attraction. Their personal self assurance plays a role too quietly guiding the choice. One thing leads to another culture views emotions, inner certainty all work together. It isn't any single detail that decides it rather a chain of linked pieces shaping the outcome.

Conclusion of Analysis

Most findings point straight to one thing how a company acts matters big time when hiring from colleges. Young people now pay attention looking for places where they fit in get treated well, stay safe, and keep learning. What learners expect often misses what firms are looking for. When schools talk more openly, and businesses explain their needs clearly, mismatches fade. In truth, workplace atmosphere doesn't sit on the edge - it shapes how students choose jobs when hiring happens on campus.

Hypothesis Analysis

Hypothesis	Statement	Result	Reason
H ₀₁	There is no expectation gap between students and recruiters	Rejected	Mean differences and responses clearly show mismatch
H ₀₂	Expectation gap does not affect job preference	Rejected	Strong negative correlation (-0.61) found
H ₀₃	Recruitment communication does not affect expectations	Rejected	Communication shows significant relationship with gap

Hypothesis 1

H₀ (Null Hypothesis): There is no relationship between company culture and job preference.
H₁ (Alternative Hypothesis): There is a relationship between company culture and job preference.

Based on the correlation analysis a positive relationship was found between company culture and job preference. This means that when students perceive the culture of a company as positive they are more likely to prefer that

company. Since the relationship is clearly visible and meaningful the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted.

Hypothesis 2

H₀ (Null Hypothesis): Company culture does not influence job acceptance.

H₁ (Alternative Hypothesis): Company culture influences job acceptance.

The regression analysis shows that company culture has a strong impact on job acceptance and is the most important factor among all variables. This means that students are more likely to accept jobs in companies where they feel the culture is good. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted.

Hypothesis 3

H₀ (Null Hypothesis): Recruitment communication has no effect on students' perception of company culture.

H₁ (Alternative Hypothesis): Recruitment communication affects students' perception of company culture.

The correlation results indicate a positive relationship between communication and perception of company culture. When companies communicate clearly and honestly, students develop a better understanding and impression of the organization. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted.

Scope For Future Research

The study looks into how work culture shapes choices students make when companies visit campuses at the University of Delhi. Useful patterns emerged yet plenty remains unexamined here. Expanding later studies to involve more schools around India could open new patterns and gaps. Getting responses from various institutions might show if regional differences shift student thinking. Broader reach means findings may fit more situations beyond just one university.

Looking closer at things like salary, position, how well known the company is or where it sits geographically might shape choices too. While this research zeroed in on workplace vibe dialogue flow and preparedness for tasks actual decision making mixes several ingredients at once. Taking a fresh look at those same students after they enter the workforce would provide insights. If reality does match expectations for those individuals could become evident. Such an observation would typically show how much satisfaction is maintained, as well as who remains with their jobs. Moving forward, more advanced methods of study may help. The use of statistics software to conduct analyses would increase validity.

CONCLUSION

The main purpose of this study was to understand the impact of corporate culture on student preferences during the campus hiring process. It should be noted that having analyzed responses of students and employers, one can understand that company culture is of critical importance when choosing a company for employment. Nowadays, students are not interested only in finding a job but in understanding whether teamwork is effective, whether the atmosphere in the office allows for personal development and learning and what an average work day looks like in this company. Positive company culture that fosters employees' productivity contributes to accepting an employment offer.

The research findings reveal that there are gaps between the expectations of the students and the recruiters. Wanting support, growth, and a balanced approach, recruiters may assume that new employees need to perform excellently from the very first day on the job. Such assumptions may lead to conflicts at the initial stage of employment. Another factor that influences the process of finding a job is how companies communicate with students during recruitment. It is necessary to admit that the success of finding a job is not dependent on a single variable. The most significant role is played by company culture, communication skills, and preparation of candidates. However, it is crucial to stress that company culture plays the dominant role among other factors.

Creating a favorable atmosphere and communicating openly helps to change the situation. Additionally, students' development and education facilitate closing the gap between expectations and actual performance.

Another thing that makes an impression on companies as far as campus recruitment sessions are concerned is their presentation. The culture of a company does matter in terms of selection. The students need to learn about the company culture. What impact the culture has on growth. It is all about company culture, which means everything for students. It is what makes one company different from others. As long as the company manages to create company culture, the students prefer to join them.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my research supervisor, Mr. Ajit Singh, for his continuous guidance, patient supervision, and valuable insights throughout the course of this research. His academic support, constructive criticism, and encouragement were instrumental in shaping the direction and quality of this study.

I am deeply thankful to Dr. Arpita Kaul and Dr. Yogesh Malhotra, members of the research advisory committee, for their thoughtful suggestions, scholarly feedback, and constant support. Their expertise and guidance significantly contributed to strengthening the conceptual framework of my study.

I would also like to acknowledge Sri Venkateswara College, University of Delhi, for providing a supportive academic environment, necessary resources, and institutional facilities that enabled the successful completion of this research work.

I extend my appreciation to all the respondents who participated in the study and shared their valuable time and perspectives. I am also grateful to my teachers, peers, and family members for their encouragement, cooperation, and moral support throughout this academic journey.

Lastly, I thank everyone who contributed directly or indirectly to the completion of this research.

REFERENCES

1. Agarwala, T. (2014). Factors influencing career choice of management students in India. Career Development International.
2. Ambler, T., & Barrow, S. (1996). The employer brand. *Journal of Brand Management*, 4(3), 185–206. <https://doi.org/10.1057/bm.1996.42>
3. Bansal, A., et al. (2024). Employability of management graduates: Emerging perspective of employers and faculty members. *Chitkara University Journal*.
4. Berthon, P., Ewing, M., & Hah, L. L. (2005). Captivating company: Dimensions of attractiveness in employer branding. *International Journal of Advertising*, 24(2), 151–172. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02650487.2005.11072912>
5. Biswas, M. K., & Suar, D. (2016). Antecedents and consequences of employer branding. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 136(1), 57–72. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-014-2502-3>
6. Blom, A., & Saeki, H. (2011). Employer skill demand and graduate supply. World Bank.
7. Brown, P., & Souto-Otero, M. (2022). The end of the graduate labour market? *Oxford Review of Education*, 48(3), 287–303.
8. Cappelli, P. (2015). Skill gaps, skill shortages and skill mismatches: Evidence and arguments for the United States. *ILR Review*, 68(2), 251–290.
9. [Cengage Group](#). (2025). Graduate employability report.
10. [Deloitte](#). (2021). The Deloitte global Gen Z and millennial survey.
11. Finch, D. J., Hamilton, L. K., Baldwin, R., & Zehner, M. (2013). An exploratory study of factors affecting undergraduate employability. *Education + Training*, 55(7), 681–704.
12. Finch, D. J., Peacock, M., & Levallet, N. (2016). Expectations of graduates and employers. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 38(1), 10–21.
13. Finch, D. J., et al. (2018). Employer and student perceptions of employability skills. *Higher Education, Skills and Work-Based Learning*, 8(2), 123–139.

14. Harvey, L. (2001). Defining and measuring employability. *Quality in Higher Education*, 7(2), 97–109.
15. Iyer, R., & Menon, S. (2023). Campus recruitment practices in public universities. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 58(4), 611–624.
16. Jackson, D. (2014). Testing a model of undergraduate competence in employability skills and perceived employability. *Studies in Higher Education*, 39(9), 1623–1640.
17. Jackson, D. (2016). Re-conceptualising graduate employability: The importance of pre-professional identity. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 35(5), 925–939.
18. Jain, R., & Bhattacharya, S. (2021). Employer branding in higher education institutions. *Journal of Marketing for Higher Education*, 31(2), 210–227.
19. Jain, S., & Jain, R. (2019). Campus recruitment and employer satisfaction. *Management and Labour Studies*, 44(3), 245–260.
20. Kapoor, R., & Solomon, S. (2020). Graduate employability and skill gap in India. *Journal of Contemporary Issues in Business and Government*, 26(2), 345–352.
21. Knight, P. T., & Yorke, M. (2018). Embedding employability into the curriculum. *Higher Education Academy*.
22. Kumar, A., & Gupta, S. (2019). Organizational culture and job satisfaction. *Journal of Management Research*, 19(4), 201–214.
23. Kumar, P., & Kumar, S. (2021). Expectation gap in campus recruitment. *Indian Journal of Commerce*, 74(1), 88–97.
24. Lowden, K., Hall, S., Elliot, D., & Lewin, J. (2011). Employers' perceptions of the employability skills of new graduates. *Edge Foundation*.
25. Lowden, K., et al. (2017). Employers' perceptions of graduate employability [Industry analysis].
26. McKenzie, J. (2025). IT students career confidence and career identity during COVID-19. *arXiv preprint*.
27. McQuaid, R. W., & Lindsay, C. (2005). The concept of employability. *Urban Studies*, 42(2), 197–219.
28. Mehta, P., & Saxena, K. (2020). Student expectations from employers: An Indian study. *Journal of Applied Management*, 18(3), 44–58.
29. Mourshed, M., Farrell, D., & Barton, D. (2014). Education to employment: Getting Europe's youth into work. *McKinsey & Company*.
30. Nair, R., & Choudhary, N. (2017). Employability skills and campus recruitment. *Journal of Human Resource Management*, 5(1), 12–19.
31. [National Skill Development Corporation \(NSDC\)](#). (2024). India skills report 2024.
32. OECD. (2021). Youth employment outlook. *OECD Publishing*.
33. Patel, S., & Desai, M. (2023). Organizational culture and employee retention. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 18(1), 55–68.
34. Rao, S., & Mishra, P. (2020). Impact of pre-placement talks on employer image. *IIMB Management Review*, 32(4), 356–367.
35. Rukadikar, A., & Khandelwal, S. (2025). Exploring perceptions of Indian graduates on the effectiveness of artificial intelligence in higher education campus hiring. *Springer*.
36. Schein, E. H. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership* (4th ed.). John Wiley & Sons.
37. Sharma, M., & Kaur, R. (2022). Value alignment and job choice decisions. *Vision: The Journal of Business Perspective*, 26(1), 67–79.
38. Singh, A., & Sharma, P. (2016). Graduate expectations and job satisfaction. *Management Review*, 28(2), 140–152.
39. Singh, V., & Singh, S. (2018). Employability of Indian graduates. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 53(4), 610–622.
40. Suarta, I. M., et al. (2017). Employability skills required by industry. *Journal of Vocational Education*, 6(1), 35–45.
41. Succi, C., & Canovi, M. (2020). Soft skills to enhance graduate employability: Comparing students and employers' perceptions. *Studies in Higher Education*, 45(9), 1834–1847.
42. Suleman, F. (2018). The employability skills of higher education graduates: Insights into conceptual frameworks and methodological options. *Journal of Education and Work*, 31(3), 263–278.
43. Tomlinson, M. (2007). Graduate employability and student attitudes and orientations to the labour market. *Journal of Education and Work*, 20(4), 285–304. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13639080701650164>

44. Tomlinson, M. (2008). The degree is not enough: Students' perceptions of the role of higher education credentials for graduate work and employability. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 29(1), 49–61. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01425690701737457>
45. Tomlinson, M. (2017). Graduate employability and student identity. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 38(3), 337–350.
46. Tymon, A. (2013). The student perspective on employability. *Studies in Higher Education*, 38(6), 841–856.
47. [University Grants Commission \(UGC\)](#). (2024). Annual report on higher education and employability.
48. Verma, R. (2022). Student perception of corporate culture during campus hiring. *Global Business Review*, 23(5), 1120–1134.
49. Whalley, J., et al. (2024). From student to working professional: A graduate survey. arXiv preprint.
50. Wilton, N. (2012). The impact of work placements on skills development and employability of business and management graduates. *Studies in Higher Education*, 37(5), 603–620.
51. World Economic Forum. (2020). The future of jobs report 2020. World Economic Forum.

Certificate of Originality

This is to certify that the Dissertation work titled **“The relationship between company culture and students:A study of campus recruitment in University of Delhi”** was conducted in the Department of Commerce, Sri Venkateswara College, University of Delhi. The work embodied in this project is original and has not been submitted in part or in full, to this or any other University for any other degree or diploma. To the best of my knowledge and belief, it does not contain any published or written material from other sources, except cited work references.

No generative artificial intelligence technologies were used for the report writing/ only the authorized aids were used, which included suggestions from the supervisor regarding language and content. Generative artificial intelligence technologies if used were solely done in consultation with the supervisor. All sources have been properly acknowledged, including any ideas, extracts, or information taken from other sources. The work is free from plagiarism and no copyright laws have been violated to the best of my belief and knowledge.

Supervisor's Name: Mr. Ajit Singh

Designation: Assistant Professor, Sri Venkateswara College, University Of Delhi

Signature:



Page 2 of 46 - AI Writing Overview

Submission ID trnoid::1:3562732331

*% detected as AI

AI detection includes the possibility of false positives. Although some text in this submission is likely AI generated, scores below the 20% threshold are not surfaced because they have a higher likelihood of false positives.

Caution: Review required.

It is essential to understand the limitations of AI detection before making decisions about a student's work. We encourage you to learn more about Turnitin's AI detection capabilities before using the tool.

Disclaimer

Our AI writing assessment is designed to help educators identify text that might be prepared by a generative AI tool. Our AI writing assessment may not always be accurate (i.e., our AI models may produce either false positive results or false negative results), so it should not be used as the sole basis for adverse actions against a student. It takes further scrutiny and human judgment in conjunction with an organization's application of its specific academic policies to determine whether any academic misconduct has occurred.

ORIGINALITY REPORT

4%
SIMILARITY INDEX

3%
INTERNET SOURCES

1%
PUBLICATIONS

2%
STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1	socialscisearch.org Internet Source	<1 %
2	dspace.stir.ac.uk Internet Source	<1 %
3	Submitted to Trine University Student Paper	<1 %
4	Submitted to Women's University Student Paper	<1 %
5	www.spuvvn.edu Internet Source	<1 %
6	ssrpublisher.com Internet Source	<1 %
7	Submitted to SP Jain School of Global Management Student Paper	<1 %
8	www.msit.in Internet Source	<1 %
9	Submitted to American University in the Emirates Student Paper	<1 %
10	admin.ijbarr.com Internet Source	<1 %
11	www.mdpi.com Internet Source	<1 %

<1 %

12	Adams, Kaweeda Phae Greene. "The Relationship Between Ethical Leadership Characteristics and the Ethical Actions of Superintendents in New York State.", Sage Graduate School Publication	<1 %
13	slidelegend.com Internet Source	<1 %
14	ijip.in Internet Source	<1 %
15	wiredspace.wits.ac.za Internet Source	<1 %
16	Submitted to Chartered Institute of Personnel Management CIPM Student Paper	<1 %
17	Tang Wee Teo, Aik-Ling Tan, Paul Teng. "STEM Education from Asia - Trends and Perspectives", Routledge, 2021 Publication	<1 %
18	jetmase.com Internet Source	<1 %
19	oapub.org Internet Source	<1 %
20	pingpdf.com Internet Source	<1 %
21	repository.uinsaizu.ac.id Internet Source	<1 %
	scholar.ufs.ac.za	

22	Internet Source	<1 %
----	-----------------	------

Exclude quotes
Exclude bibliography

Off
Off

Exclude matches

Off