


Article

# Employment Training at the University: Employment Expectations in Times of Pandemic

Juan-Jesús Torres-Gordillo \* and Paloma Belinda García-Martínez

Department of Educational Research Methods and Diagnostics, Facultad de Ciencias de la Educación, Universidad de Sevilla, 41013 Sevilla, Spain; paloma\_belinda@hotmail.com

\* Correspondence: juanj@us.es; Tel.: +34-955420637

**Abstract:** This study analyses the job expectations found in early childhood education students as well as the main personal and academic aspects that influence their training during the COVID-19 pandemic. A nonexperimental ex post facto study based on a descriptive, correlational and inferential approach is developed. A total of 168 students from the University of Seville (Spain) participated. The results show a moderate to high level of expected employability. However, salary expectations and how the university is perceived regarding employability reveal more negative data. Expectations are higher for men, first-year students and those from a high socioeconomic background. The results suggest the value of offering guidance to students according to their employment preferences, before and during their training, to avoid considering the university as the only educational institution available.

**Keywords:** labour market; higher education; youth employment



**Citation:** Torres-Gordillo, J.-J.; García-Martínez, P.B. Employment Training at the University: Employment Expectations in Times of Pandemic. *Sustainability* **2022**, *14*, 6398. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14116398>

Academic Editor: Rosabel Roig-Vila

Received: 25 April 2022

Accepted: 20 May 2022

Published: 24 May 2022

**Publisher's Note:** MDPI stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.



**Copyright:** © 2022 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

## 1. Introduction

Students' labour market expectations and aspirations play an important role in the decisions they face about their academic future [1]. With high levels of unemployment in Spain [2], economic and social tensions are created that negatively condition these labour market expectations. Higher education is associated with a higher degree of labour market insertion, increasing the number of university students and the competitiveness among them [3]. In this respect, the present research is interested in the general tendency of young people to undertake university studies as a guarantee of becoming employed without considering their job preferences. It is also interested in the impact of the socioeducational and employment crisis caused by COVID-19, which interrupted higher education in many countries, creating uncertainty about the performance of higher education in preparing students for this new phase [4,5].

Due to the popularisation of higher education degrees and the negative view of the labour market [3,6], one of the motives of this research is to analyse the labour expectations presented by university students and to study their conditioning factors. Specifically, it focuses on the degree in Early Childhood Education at the University of Seville due to the novelty of analysing the job expectations of students in this field. In addition, there is a high number of university graduates in Early Childhood Education, which is the field of study with the fourth highest number of graduate students in Spain [7].

One of the reasons for the scarcity of research in this area is the lack of available data on job expectations [8]. Therefore, there is a need to investigate the formation of expectations towards and from the university. The research aims to provide a frame of reference for students who intend to continue their education in the future, providing data that will help to reduce academic failure at university and increase motivation in this area. It will also serve as a reference for universities seeking to understand students' views on university resources and tools for labour market insertion.

### 1.1. Socioeconomic Context

In the European framework, there are periods of economic stagnation, which have created a great disparity in the structure of the labour markets. The situation has worsened in recent decades as a result of the economic crisis that began in 2007–2008 [6,9,10]. Countries such as Germany, Denmark and the Netherlands, which are characterised by early labour market entry with few cases of failure, are taken as a reference. Based on data from the European Union Household Panel (PHOGUE), Spain is in the opposite group, with a considerably slower transition between the educational phase and the labour market [10].

According to Law 2/2015 of 29 December, the economic crisis has had serious repercussions on employment and has led to inequalities in job opportunities in Spain [11]. The low perception of success in employability has contributed to an increase in a generalised malaise among the Spanish population, reducing their real chances of finding employment [12,13]. Particular attention has been given to how this situation affects young people, who have the highest national unemployment figures (see Table 1) [2].

**Table 1.** Unemployment rates (%) by age group and sex in Spain [2].

	16–25 Years	25–54 Years	55–65 Years
Both sexes	32.53	12.91	12.24
Men	30.92	11.05	11.26
Women	34.47	14.99	13.45

Youth labour market integration refers to the transition towards active labour participation and subsequent economic autonomy through the constant adjustment of work expectations [6,14,15]. With precarious employment situations and economic instability and uncertainty, the process of labour market integration becomes more complex [15].

### 1.2. The Role of the University as a Means of Labour Market Integration

There are different training alternatives for students, such as intermediate and higher education, vocational training or higher education, sports and arts. However, young people cling to the idea of university studies as the safest way into the labour market [16]. Job expectations are overestimated, resulting in overeducation among hundreds of highly qualified young graduates every year, leading to an excessive demand for jobs [17,18]. However, the function of the university is not to insert people into the labour market but to enable them to develop in the labour market [16].

As Brunello, Lucifora and Winter-Ebmer [19] comment, “When people make decisions about higher education, they face important choices that depend on expectations based on earnings and employment opportunities” (p.1117). However, the COVID-19 crisis could drive a new educational trend involving new training models, changing this perspective [20].

### 1.3. Job Expectations of University Students and the Factors Influencing Them

There are personal and academic variables that shape the underestimation and overestimation of these job expectations [21]. Aspects such as salary expectations differ according to gender, with higher aspirations on the part of males [22–24]. The socioeconomic status of the student or the self-perception of skills fostered by the university may help to explain these differences [8,25–27]. Additionally, the higher the socioeconomic status of the family is, the higher the salary expectations [28]. Chevalier, Gibbons, Thorpe, Snell et al. [29] speak of the “big fish in a small pond effect”, which creates negative expectations due to the high ability of the reference group.

Similarly, academic aspects, such as teacher guidance and mentoring, would allow students to develop a critical awareness of the labour supply [30,31]. The lack of this guidance has become one of the main complaints of students, who perceive that career guidance comes too late, creating high and unrealistic expectations at the beginning of their

university studies [6,32–34]. In addition, the university is expected to provide intrinsic motivation towards the desired job [33,35].

On the other hand, students' job expectations differ significantly with the academic year. While new students tend to overestimate their future salary, final-year students face employer requirements that they cannot meet [8,17,18,36,37]. This situation translates into increased pessimism in the job search, considerably reducing expectations of success as the end of the university studies approaches [8,25,34,38].

This phenomenon is of interest because final-year students should feel better equipped to meet job requirements [8]. As a result, there is a loss of confidence in the expected salary and in the perception of job skills developed during the course of study at the university [19,21,25,34]. Here, we consider the possible bias in students' opinions due to their completion of the degree program during the COVID-19 pandemic. The sudden shift to distance education has caused confusion and tension among faculty members, both personally and professionally, as they have navigated a lack of time, inadequate digital content or poor infrastructure [39].

From the perspective of education–employment and in view of the lack of empirical studies, this article collects and analyses data to investigate whether the job expectations of students of the Bachelor's Degree in Early Childhood Education at the University of Seville reflect this negative situation of the labour market or whether these expectations also stem from a demotivation resulting from students' high expectations of the job opportunities provided by graduation from the university.

This study analyses the job expectations found in early childhood education students, as well as the main personal and academic aspects that influence their training, during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Based on the above evidence, the following research question is posed: What job expectations do university students of early childhood education have? Two research objectives derive from this question:

1. To analyse the expectations about the labour market insertion of university students of the degree in Early Childhood Education at the University of Seville.
2. To analyse the main personal and academic factors that influence the employment expectations of these university students.

## 2. Materials and Methods

This section outlines the research design, the participants, the instruments used and the data analysis process.

### 2.1. Research Design

The study is quantitative in nature, using a nonexperimental, ex post facto design based on a descriptive, correlational and inferential study. This type of study in Education usually follows the line of nonexperimental designs, since there is no manipulation of the variables. It is also common in the Social Sciences to assume an ex post facto design, by means of a sample survey, since the aim is to check whether the disparities between the groups generated in the different variables have generated any differences once the academic year has ended [40,41]. The article is completed with a correlational study to test possible relationships between variables, as well as the use of inferential statistics with nonparametric hypothesis tests to find differences between variables. In addition, this research was adhered to the standards of the Social Sciences of the Ethical Committee of Experimentation of the University of Seville (Spain).

### 2.2. Selection of Participants

Due to the social circumstances of isolation caused by the COVID-19 virus, social networks were used to collect information. This new reality made it necessary to carry out convenience sampling, as direct interaction with the study subjects was impossible (see Table 2). The research is aimed at a population of 440 students enrolled in the first

and last years of the Bachelor's Degree in Early Childhood Education at the University of Seville in the 2019–2020 academic year, with a final sample of 168 students, representing a  $\pm 5.7\%$  sampling error. An intergenerational comparison is made between the 82 first-year students and 86 graduating students who returned completed questionnaires.

**Table 2.** Sample of university students pursuing a degree in Early Childhood Education at the University of Seville.

	Sample		Totals
	First-year students	Final-year students	
	82	86	168
Men	5	12	17
Women	77	74	151

By gender, 6.1% of first-year respondents were men, and 93.9% were women. Among the final-year students, 14% were men and 86% were women, reflecting the gender disparity in this university degree, with the number of women being significantly higher at 89.9%.

### 2.3. Data Collection Instruments

A mixed questionnaire was created, consisting of three types of questions—single response, multiple response and Likert-type—with the following response scale: 1 (Strongly disagree), 2 (Disagree), 3 (Neither agree nor disagree), 4 (Agree) and 5 (Strongly agree). Content validity was determined by 12 experts from different fields related to our study: teachers and researchers in social and work psychology, early childhood education, economics and the master's degree in training and guidance for work. The anonymity and informed consent of all participants was guaranteed.

This instrument made it possible to obtain the job expectations and perceptions expressed by the university students. It explores the conceptions these students have of higher education and their employability as well as certain personal and academic factors that influence the formation and evolution of these perspectives: gender, academic year and family socioeconomic environment. The research problem and the dimensions studied are presented in Table 3.

**Table 3.** Problem and research dimensions.

Problem: What Are the Job Expectations of University Students in Their First and Last Year of Early Childhood Education?	
Dimension 1	Labour market insertion expectations
Dimension 2	Personal and academic factors

The dimension Labour market insertion expectations includes the variables expected income in future employment, expected level of employability and expected job opportunities. The items of the questionnaire corresponding to this dimension are p.5 (expected income in future employment), p.13, p.14, p.15 and p.16 (expected level of employability) and p.8, p.11 and p.12 (expected job opportunities).

The Personal and academic factors dimension includes the following variables: gender, academic year, perception of the role of the university in employability and family socioeconomic environment. The items of the questionnaire that correspond to this dimension are p.1 (gender), p.2 (academic year), p.6, p.7, p.9 and p.10 (perception of the role of the university in employability), and p.3 and p.4 (family socioeconomic environment).

The variables mentioned were selected for their relevance in previous research [12,16,19,25,26,29,36].

#### 2.4. Data Analysis

A descriptive analysis was initially carried out to determine the mean and standard deviation of the items, which were grouped into four factors: expected income in future employment, expected employment opportunities, perception of the role of the university in employability and expected level of employability.

A correlational study was also carried out to check the existence of significant relationships ( $p < 0.05$ ) between variables. The contingency coefficient was used to establish relationships between nominal variables. Correlations between ordinal variables were tested using Spearman's coefficient.

Finally, this study uses inferential statistics. Nonparametric tests, specifically the Mann–Whitney U test and the Kruskal–Wallis H test, were used to analyse possible differences between variables. Cohen's d test was calculated to estimate the magnitude of the effect of the differences.

### 3. Results

First, the descriptive results are presented (see Appendix A, Table A1). The expected income in future employment ( $M = 2.41$ ;  $SD = 0.84$ ) presented a medium–low level in terms of salary expectations among the answers given by the students. With regard to the job opportunities considered, the most highly valued option (87.5%) was to take a competitive examination to obtain a job in a public company (Item 8.2,  $N = 147$ ), followed by continuing studies in education (Item 8.4,  $N = 98$ ), with 58.3%. On the other hand, options such as starting a company (Item 8.3,  $N = 26$ ) or continuing education in other studies (Item 8.5,  $N = 24$ ) had the lowest response levels, with 15.5% and 14.3%, respectively.

Finding employment in a job related to what they are studying was given the highest priority (Item 11,  $M = 4.61$ ;  $SD = 0.76$ ). However, obtaining any type of job, even if it is not related to their studies (Item 12,  $M = 3.18$ ;  $SD = 1.20$ ), presented an intermediate–high level of valuation, representing fairly high priority.

Regarding the perception of the role of the university in employability, the majority of the students expressed an intermediate–high level in terms of feeling prepared to apply their knowledge in a job after university (Item 10,  $M = 3.19$ ;  $SD = 1.02$ ). Lower levels were recorded regarding the students' sense that they received useful job training in university subjects (Item 9,  $M = 3.01$ ;  $SD = 0.91$ ). The data found within this dimension confirm one of the lowest ratings of all variables of interest. With regard to the meaning given to having a university degree, the respondents reported that a degree is necessary to be able to work professionally (Item 7.1,  $N = 139$ ), obtaining a percentage of 82.7%. Its usefulness for personal training in a field of study (Item 7.6,  $N = 121$ ) ranked second, with a value of 72%. In addition, students perceive, to a large extent, that the university degree will help them to earn potentially higher income (Item 7.2,  $N = 77$ ), with 45.8%, and that it will be useful as a competitive advantage in a job selection process (Item 7.3,  $N = 73$ ), with 43.5% of responses. Despite these data, a number of students reported that obtaining a university degree is an obligation (Item 7.7,  $N = 7$ ) or that they pursued a degree to satisfy their parents (Item 7.5,  $N = 14$ ), accounting for 4.2% and 8.3% of the total number of responses obtained, respectively.

As far as the expected level of employability is concerned, the most positive assessment focuses on the fact that the training acquired in the degree course will enable students to find a job related to their studies (Item 13,  $M = 3.83$ ;  $SD = 0.83$ ), reflecting a high level of expected employability in the educational field. Conversely, finding any kind of job is the option least valued by students (Item 12,  $M = 2.88$ ;  $SD = 0.97$ ).

Regarding correlations, there are significant relationships ( $p < 0.05$ ) according to academic year, gender and average monthly family income level of the student. With a low level of relationship ( $CC = 0.275$ ) (see Appendix A, Table A2), first-year students more positively value the role of university subjects in their future employability (Item 9;  $p = 0.08$ ), while students closer to graduation are more negative, indicating a drop in the results over the course of study. With regard to employability in the field of study itself due

to the training acquired in the degree course (Item 13;  $p = 0.003$ ), there is a low relationship ( $CC = 0.296$ ), in which first-year students rate this training more positively, while final-year students rate it less positively. Likewise, with a low relationship ( $CC = 0.238$ ), first-year students show more positive expectations about employability in their field of study (Item 15;  $p = 0.38$ ), while final-year students show more negative expectations.

In relation to gender (see Appendix A, Table A3), significant relationships were found (Item 6;  $p = 0.01$ ), with women giving greater importance to intrinsic motives, placing greater value on options such as personal vocation or personal worth ( $CC = 270$ ). Men, on the other hand, opt more for a combination of intrinsic and extrinsic motives, thus giving greater importance to having a high social status or being financially independent. In terms of the assessment of the level of employability of having a university degree (Item 14;  $p = 0.005$ ), a low relationship is found ( $CC = 285$ ), with a slight increase in women, while men establish less of a relationship between having a university degree and greater employability. On the other hand, with regard to the expected employability in their field of work (Item 15;  $p = 0.015$ ), women report a greater confidence in obtaining a job related to their studies, while men have lower expectations ( $CC = 261$ ).

Finally, there is a moderate relationship ( $CC = 0.517$ ) according to the student's average monthly family income level (Item 5;  $p = 0.000$ ) (see Appendix A, Table A4). When the average monthly family income level is lower, the expected salary score is also lower.

Regarding the Likert scale questions, statistically significant relationships ( $p < 0.05$ ) were found between the dimensions of perception of the role of the university in employability and expected level of employability (see Table 4). With a moderate relationship at 99% confidence ( $CC = 0.549$ ), as the perceived usefulness of university subjects (Item 9) increases, there is an increase in the perceived personal preparation for a job (Item 10). Similarly, the likelihood of finding any kind of job in the labour market also increases (Item 16).

**Table 4.** Correlation of Likert scale questions.

Items		9.	10.	11.	13.	15.	16.
Spearman's Rho	9.	1.000	0.549 **	0.026	0.189 *	0.122	0.306 **
			0.000	0.739	0.014	0.116	0.000
	13.	0.189 *	0.210 **	0.222 **	1.000	0.444 **	0.149
		0.014	0.006	0.004		0.000	0.054

Note: \*  $p < 0.05$  \*\*  $p < 0.01$ .

With a moderate relationship ( $CC = 0.444$ ), it is perceived that the greater the training acquired in the degree is valued in order to find a job related to the studies (Item 13), the higher the probability of finding a job related to the studies (Item 15).

According to the results of the Mann–Whitney U test and the Kruskal–Wallis H test, differences in job expectations according to the academic year, gender and socioeconomic background of the student were obtained. With a confidence level of 95%, it is affirmed that first-year students show higher job expectations and greater satisfaction with the role of the university in their employability than final-year students (see Table 5). According to the magnitude of the effect size, the differences are moderate in all comparisons ( $d$  is between 0.4 and 0.5 points), except for job readiness after university (Item 10), where the difference is low ( $d$  is approximately 0.3 points).

Concerning gender (see Table 6), there are significant differences (95% confidence) in relation to expected salary (Item 5). The analysis of the magnitude of the effect reveals high differences in favour of men, who obtain a higher average rank and therefore a higher salary expectation. Intrinsic motives are also identified more highly in women (Item 6). On the other hand, men rank higher in extrinsic motives and in the combination of both. Similarly, being a woman is identified with a high level of expected employability in relation to having a university degree (Item 14). The magnitude of the effect size shows moderate–high differences in all comparisons ( $d$  is approximately 0.6 and 0.8 points).

**Table 5.** Differences in job expectations by academic year (Mann–Whitney U).

Items	Year	N	Average Range	Mann–Whitney U	Sig.	d
9.	1°	82	96.41	2549.000	0.001	0.524
	4°	86	73.14			
10.	1°	82	92.10	2902.500	0.038	0.291
	4°	86	77.25			
13.	1°	82	94.46	2709.500	0.006	0.473
	4°	86	75.01			
15.	1°	82	92.88	2838.500	0.020	0.426
	4°	86	76.51			

**Table 6.** Differences in job expectations by gender (Mann–Whitney U).

Items	Gender	N	Average Range	Mann–Whitney U	Sig.	d
5.	Male	17	110.41	843.000	0.011	0.551
	Female	151	81.58			
6.	Male	17	111.91	817.500	0.001	0.807
	Female	151	81.41			
14.	Male	17	59.47	858.000	0.020	0.695
	Female	151	87.32			

According to the average level of monthly family income (see Table 7), significant differences (95% confidence) are found in the expected remuneration in future employment (Item 5), revealing that students with a higher monthly family income expect a higher salary. On the other hand, students with parents with lower monthly income have a lower expected salary. In this case, the magnitude of the effect establishes moderate differences (d approximately 0.5 points).

**Table 7.** Differences in job expectations by the average level of monthly household income (Kruskal–Wallis K).

Items	Average Level of Monthly Household Income	N	Average Range	Kruskal–Wallis K	Sig.	d
5.	949.99€ or less	21	56.57	37.020	0.000	0.456
	950–1899.9€	84	75.26			
	1900–2849.99€	32	89.22			
	2850–3799.99€	22	120.32			
	More than 3800€	9	131.67			

#### 4. Discussion and Conclusions

Although labour market insertion under fair conditions is an issue of concern for young people in training, the results of this study reflect a moderate–high level of expected employability on the part of university students of the Bachelor’s Degree in Early Childhood at the University of Seville ( $M = 3.45$ ). Generally, positive expectations are confirmed when linking university training with an increase in the possibility of finding employment [6,36]. In contrast, students’ salary expectations present a more pessimistic view, reflecting the current economic crisis, with an expected intermediate–low level of income ( $M = 2.41$ ). The results reveal clear differences between genders, coinciding with Alonso-Borrego and Romero-Medina [25], who found a higher salary for men. This explains why women show a greater effort and confidence that their studies will help them to achieve a better salary despite the undisputed wage gap [21,25].

This situation directly affects the demand for employment, with civil service examinations being the most secure and sought-after employment route despite high levels of

unemployment [3]. The widespread interest in working in a public company or pursuing advanced studies highlights the need for higher levels of training to opt for quality employment [36]. This reality forces young people to act according to competitive criteria, leading to problems of access and frustration in the training process [3,16,25]. Effective guidance is needed to help students achieve their employment goals, rejecting higher education as the only avenue for effective training [24].

It is important to avoid passive transmission of curricular knowledge [42]. The present research, however, shows a moderate satisfaction of students with their university education, reflecting a progressive improvement between theory and practice and in student–institution communication. According to Alonso-Borrego and Romero-Medina [25] and Jerrim [8], as students move up the university ladder, they develop a more negative view of the labour market. The results of the present study corroborate lower levels of expected employability than at the beginning of the academic career as well as a more negative assessment of the subjects and job preparation offered by the university. Approaching graduation and subsequent labour market insertion influence the evolution of students' expectations, who are becoming more aware of the job requirements. This perspective could reduce their effort, encouraging rejection of the curricular contents [27].

Today, moreover, the COVID-19 virus has conditioned a new reality in which online learning is taking centre stage [43]. Professionals, students and institutions must develop responsible roles and effective communication, promoting the effectiveness of group teaching as a more independent and autonomous type of work [44]. This new educational format is aimed at the sustainability of system, with responsibility, and it will ensure that students learn to defend themselves in the world of work and do not find themselves insecure about the educational content taught at the end of their training. Moreover, the growing undervaluation and demoralisation of members of the teaching profession must be socially considered to avoid the demotivation of professionals.

Assuming the above evidence, it can be concluded from the first objective that students consider having a university degree to be a requirement for a job, which also provides greater employability and economic security. Furthermore, the academic year and gender influence the formation and evolution of these expectations. According to Bonnard, Giret and Lambert [26] and Sullivan [28], students' expected earnings are proportionally higher when their parents have a higher average monthly income. In a family environment where education is seen as an investment, the university–employability relationship becomes important for students [26], giving rise to reasons such as higher social status or greater economic independence as motives for choosing a university degree.

Among the main contributions of the present study, the social analysis of gender and the labour market stands out, highlighting the long road that remains to be travelled in terms of gender equality. Similarly, the students' perception of the usefulness of university education should be taken into consideration by universities, encouraging communication between teaching staff and students. In addition, an important aim is to avoid the negative bias associated with choosing other educational options, in line with students' aspirations. These contributions are a clear sign of the sustainability of system.

As a limitation of the study, the questionnaire used may reflect a bias regarding social desirability, although the social aspects of the questionnaire are necessary for the achievement of the research objectives. In addition, the personal and academic factors influencing student career expectations could be complemented with other research techniques.

Finally, to augment this analysis of job expectations among university students, a study should be carried out with graduate students to check the degree to which their expectations are justified based on real data on labour market insertion. It is necessary to offer effective solutions to the dissatisfaction found between students and institutions [45]. Specifically, in light of the growing concern about the coronavirus pandemic crisis and the resulting academic stress, it is essential to develop pathways to help students improve their mental well-being and job security [46,47]. This requires the creation of a training plan for universities to improve students' motivation and security with regard to their future career



based on career guidance, transparency and an official policy guideline that positively values students' efforts to find employment in their field. This perspective will lead to a model of higher education that engages students in society, enhancing empowerment, self-confidence and belief in social change [48,49].

**Author Contributions:** J.-J.T.-G. and P.B.G.-M. conceived the research idea and designed the research framework. Conceptualisation, J.-J.T.-G. and P.B.G.-M.; methodology, J.-J.T.-G. and P.B.G.-M.; software, J.-J.T.-G. and P.B.G.-M.; validation, J.-J.T.-G.; formal analysis, J.-J.T.-G. and P.B.G.-M.; resources, J.-J.T.-G. and P.B.G.-M.; writing—original draft preparation, J.-J.T.-G. and P.B.G.-M.; writing—review and editing, J.-J.T.-G. and P.B.G.-M.; supervision, J.-J.T.-G.; project administration, J.-J.T.-G.; funding acquisition, J.-J.T.-G. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

**Funding:** The APC was funded by MIDO Research Group, SEJ-567, University of Seville.

**Institutional Review Board Statement:** This research was adhered to the standards of the Social Sciences of the Ethical Committee of Experimentation of the University of Seville (Spain).

**Informed Consent Statement:** Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study.

**Conflicts of Interest:** The authors declare no conflict of interest.

## Appendix A

This appendix contains different tables with statistical results.

**Table A1.** Description of the items.

Factors	Items	N Valid	N Missing	Percentage of Cases (%)	Mean (M)	Standard Error	Standard Dev. (SD)
Expected income in future employment	5.	168	0	-	2.41	0.065	0.843
	8.1	38	130	22.6%	-	-	-
Expected employment opportunities	8.2	147	21	87.5%	-	-	-
	8.3	26	142	15.5%	-	-	-
	8.4	98	70	58.3%	-	-	-
	8.5	24	144	14.3%	-	-	-
	11.	168	0	-	4.61	0.058	0.758
	12.	168	0	-	3.18	0.093	1.202
Perception of the role of the university in employability	6.	168	0	-	1.47	0.064	0.833
	7.1	139	29	30.8%	-	-	-
	7.2	77	91	45.8%	-	-	-
	7.3	21	147	12.5%	-	-	-
	7.4	73	95	43.5%	-	-	-
	7.5	14	154	8.3%	-	-	-
	7.6	121	47	72.0%	-	-	-
	7.7	7	161	4.2%	-	-	-
	9.	168	0	-	3.01	0.070	0.906
	10.	168	0	-	3.19	0.079	1.020
Expected level of employability	13.	168	0	-	3.83	0.064	0.833
	14.	168	0	-	3.40	0.084	1.090
	15.	168	0	-	3.69	0.072	0.935
	16.	168	0	-	2.88	0.075	0.972

**Table A2.** Level of the significant contingency coefficient by academic year.

Items	Response	Academic Year		Value Contingency Coefficient (CC)	Sig.				
		1°	4°						
9.	SD	Count	2	8	0.275	0.008			
		Expected count	4.9	5.1					
	D	Count	14	19					
		Expected count	16.1	16.9					
	NA/ND	Count	32	44					
		Expected count	37.1	38.9					
	A	Count	30	14					
		Expected count	21.5	22.5					
	SA	Count	4	1					
		Expected count	2.4	2.6					
	13.	SD	Count	0			1	0.296	0.003
			Expected count	0.5			0.5		
D		Count	1	6					
		Expected count	3.4	3.6					
NA/ND		Count	23	25					
		Expected count	23.4	24.6					
A		Count	31	45					
		Expected count	37.1	38.9					
SA		Count	27	9					
		Expected count	17.6	18.4					
15.		SD	Count	0	5	0.238	0.039		
			Expected count	2.4	2.6				
	D	Count	3	7					
		Expected count	4.9	5.1					
	NA/ND	Count	23	24					
		Expected count	22.9	24.1					
	A	Count	36	40					
		Expected count	37.1	38.9					
	SA	Count	20	10					
		Expected count	14.6	15.4					

**Table A3.** Level of significant contingency coefficient by gender.

Items	Response	Gender		Value Contingency Coefficient (CC)	Sig.				
		Male	Female						
6.	Intrinsic motives	Count	7	119	0.270	0.001			
		Expected count	12.8	113.3					
	Extrinsic motives	Count	2	3					
		Expected count	0.5	4.5					
	Both motives	Count	8	29					
		Expected count	3.7	33.3					
14.	SD	Count	1	7	0.285	0.005			
		Expected count	0.8	7.2					
	D	Count	8	18					
		Expected count	2.6	23.4					
	NA/ND	Count	3	51					
		Expected count	5.5	48.5					
	A	Count	3	48					
		Expected count	5.2	45.8					
	SA	Count	2	27					
		Expected count	2.9	26.1					
	15.	SD	Count	1			4	0.261	0.015
			Expected count	0.5			4.5		
D		Count	4	6					
		Expected count	1.0	9.0					
NA/ND		Count	5	42					
		Expected count	4.8	42.2					
A		Count	6	70					
		Expected count	7.7	68.3					
SA		Count	1	29					
		Expected count	3.0	27.0					

**Table A4.** Contingency coefficient by median monthly family income level.

Items	Response	Median Monthly Household Income Level					Value CC	Sig.	
		949 € or less	950–1899	1900–2849	2850–3799	More than 3800 €			
5.	949€ or less	Count	4	8	2	1	0	0.517	0.0
		Expected count	1.9	7.5	2.9	2.0	0.8		
	950–1424	Count	15	53	17	3	1		
		Expected count	11.1	44.5	17.0	11.7	4.8		
	1425–1899	Count	2	19	8	13	5		
		Expected count	5.9	23.5	9.0	6.2	2.5		
	1900–2324	Count	0	3	5	5	2		
		Expected count	1.9	7.5	2.9	2.0	0.8		
	2325–2799	Count	0	0	0	0	1		
		Expected count	0.1	0.5	0.2	0.1	0.1		
	Más de 2800€	Count	0	1	0	0	0		
		Expected count	0.1	0.5	0.2	0.1	0.1		

## References

1. Hughes, D.; Smith, G. *Youth Transitions: Creating Pathways to Success*; Education Development Trust: Berkshire, UK, 2020; pp. 1–55. Available online: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED607277.pdf> (accessed on 2 April 2022).
2. Tasas de Paro por Distintos Grupos de Edad, Sexo y Comunidad Autónoma. Año 2019. Madrid [Internet]. INE. 2019. Available online: <https://www.ine.es/jaxiT3/Tabla.htm?t=4247> (accessed on 1 April 2022).
3. Gómez-Acuñas, M.; Pérez-Vacas, C.; Sánchez-Herrera, S. Percepción del mercado laboral de jóvenes estudiantes universitarios: Una aproximación cualitativa. *Int. J. Dev. Educ. Psychol.* **2009**, *4*, 221–230. Available online: <https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/3498/349832323025.pdf> (accessed on 1 April 2022).
4. Beal, K.; Sommo, C.; Ratledge, A. Forging Ahead with SUCCESS. Providing Remote Support Services to College Students. MDRC 2020. Available online: [https://www.mdrc.org/sites/default/files/SUCCESS-COVID-19\\_REVISIED.pdf](https://www.mdrc.org/sites/default/files/SUCCESS-COVID-19_REVISIED.pdf) (accessed on 2 April 2022).
5. Uluöz, E. Opinions of the faculty of sport sciences students on the changes in education system during COVID-19 pandemic: A qualitative research. *Afr. Educ. Res. J.* **2020**, *8*, 481–490. [CrossRef]
6. García-Moreno, J.M.; Feliciano-Pérez, L. ¿Siguen vigentes los modelos teóricos clásicos de la inserción laboral juvenil? *Anduli* **2018**, *18*, 49–72. [CrossRef]
7. Encuesta de Inserción Laboral de Titulados Universitarios 2014, Cifras Absolutas. Madrid [Internet]. INE. 2014. Available online: <https://www.ine.es/jaxi/Datos.htm?path=/t13/p100/2014/p01/&file=01001.px#!tabs-tabla> (accessed on 1 April 2022).
8. Jerrim, J. Do UK Higher Education students overestimate their starting salary? *Fisc. Stud.* **2011**, *32*, 483–509. [CrossRef]
9. Capraro, S.; Panico, C.; Perrotini, I.; Purificato, F. Economía política de la crisis de deuda en Europa. *Investig. Econ.* **2013**, *72*, 35–64. [CrossRef]
10. Granell-Trias, F. El sistema económico internacional en 2019. *Bol. Econ. ICE* **2020**, *3119*, 13–30. [CrossRef]
11. Ley No. 2/2015. Ley de Medidas Urgentes para Favorecer la Inserción Laboral, la Estabilidad en el Empleo, el Retorno del Talento y el Fomento del Trabajo Autónomo. España: Boletín Oficial de la Junta de Andalucía. 2016. Available online: <https://www.juntadeandalucia.es/boja/2016/6/1> (accessed on 2 April 2022).
12. Izquierdo, T.; Fariás, A.J. Empleabilidad y expectativa de logro en la inserción laboral de los estudiantes universitarios. *Rev. Esp. Orientac. Psicopedag.* **2018**, *29*, 29–40. [CrossRef]
13. Rego-Agraso, L.; Rial-Sánchez, A. ¿Por qué elegir formación profesional? Satisfacción, motivaciones y expectativas del alumnado sobre el empleo y formación. *Rev. Esp. Orientac. Psicopedag.* **2017**, *28*, 43–62. [CrossRef]
14. García-Blanco, J.M.; Gutiérrez, R. Inserción laboral y desigualdad en el mercado de trabajo: Cuestiones teóricas. *Rev. Esp. Investig. Sociol.* **1996**, 269–293. [CrossRef]
15. Verdier, É.; Vultur, M. La inserción laboral de los jóvenes: Un concepto histórico, ambiguo y societal. *Cuest. Sociol.* **2018**, *19*, e067. [CrossRef]
16. Pineda-Serna, L.; Rojas, M.; Linares, J. La formación de calidad y el optimismo por el futuro laboral de los jóvenes en la universidad. *Investig. Desarro.* **2011**, *19*, 298–319. Available online: <https://rcientificas.uninorte.edu.co/index.php/investigacion/article/view/1806> (accessed on 2 April 2022).
17. Webbink, D.; Hartog, J. *Can Students Predict Their Starting Salary? Yes!* University of Amsterdam: Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 2000; pp. 1–11. Available online: <https://hdl.handle.net/11245/1.428537> (accessed on 2 April 2022).
18. Wolter, S.C.; Zbinden, A. Labour market expectations of Swiss university students. *Int. J. Manpow.* **2002**, *23*, 458–470. [CrossRef]
19. Brunello, G.; Lucifora, C.; Winter-Ebmer, R. The Wage Expectations of European Business and Economics Students. *J. Hum. Resour.* **2004**, *39*, 1116–1142. [CrossRef]
20. McCully, G. Is This the End of Higher Education? A Historian’s Perspective [Intertet]. New England Board of Higher Education. 2020. Available online: <https://nebhe.org/journal/is-this-the-end-of-higher-education-a-historians-perspective> (accessed on 2 April 2022).
21. Carvajal, M.J.; Bendana, D.; Bozorgmanesh, A.; Castillo, M.A.; Pourmasiha, K.; Rao, P.; Torres, J.A. Inter-gender differentials between college students’ earnings expectations and the experience of recent graduates. *Econ. Educ. Rev.* **2000**, *19*, 229–243. [CrossRef]
22. Botelho, A.; Pinto, L. Students’ expectations of the economic returns to college education: Results of a controlled experiment. *Econ. Educ. Rev.* **2004**, *23*, 645–653. [CrossRef]
23. Chevalier, A. Education, Occupation and Career Expectations: Determinants of the Gender Pay Gap for UK Graduates. *Oxf. Bull. Econ. Stat.* **2007**, *69*, 819–842. [CrossRef]
24. Menon, M.E. The economic benefits of higher education in Cyprus: The expectations of prospective students. *Int. J. Educ. Dev.* **2008**, *28*, 259–267. [CrossRef]
25. Alonso-Borrego, C.; Romero-Medina, A. Wage Expectations for Higher Education Students in Spain. *J. Labor Econ.* **2016**, *30*, 1–17. [CrossRef]
26. Bonnard, C.; Giret, J.F.; Lambert-Le Mener, M. Educational intentions, cognitive skills and earnings expectations of French undergraduates. *Appl. Econ. Lett.* **2014**, *21*, 1293–1296. [CrossRef]
27. Chadi, A.; Pinto, M.; Schultze, G. Young, gifted and lazy? The role of ability and labor market prospects in student effort decisions. *Econ. Educ. Rev.* **2019**, *72*, 66–79. [CrossRef]

28. Sullivan, A. Students as rational decision-makers: The question of beliefs and attitudes. *Lond. Rev. Educ.* **2006**, *4*, 271–290. [CrossRef]
29. Chevalier, A.; Gibbons, S.; Thorpe, A.; Snell, M.; Hoskins, S. Students' academic self-perception. *Econ. Educ. Rev.* **2009**, *28*, 716–727. Available online: <https://EconPapers.repec.org/RePEc:eee:ecoedu:v:28:y:2009:i:6:p:716-727> (accessed on 2 April 2022). [CrossRef]
30. Monta, R. Expectativas y Demandas Laborales. Ph.D. Thesis, Pontificia Universidad Católica del Ecuador, Santo Domingo, Ecuador, 2016. Available online: [https://issuu.com/pucesd/docs/tesis\\_final\\_ramiro\\_monta](https://issuu.com/pucesd/docs/tesis_final_ramiro_monta) (accessed on 10 January 2022).
31. Oliver, C.; Kettley, N. Gatekeepers or facilitators: The influence of teacher habitus on students' applications to elite universities. *Br. J. Sociol. Educ.* **2010**, *31*, 737–753. [CrossRef]
32. Rasheed, H.S.; Rasheed, B.Y. Developing entrepreneurial characteristics in minority youth: The effects of education and enterprise experience. In *Ethnic Entrepreneurship: Structure and Process*; Stiles, C.H., Galbraith, C.S., Eds.; Emerald Group Publishing Limited: Bingley, UK, 2003; pp. 261–277. [CrossRef]
33. Rowley, G.; Purcell, K. Up to the Job? Graduates' perceptions of the UK Higher Education careers service. *High. Educ. Q.* **2001**, *55*, 416–435. [CrossRef]
34. Smith, H.L.; Powell, B. Great expectations: Variations in income expectations among college seniors. *Sociol. Educ.* **1990**, *63*, 194–207. [CrossRef]
35. Kvammen, S.; Sorte, A.; Isaksson, K.; Aase, M. Medical students' attitudes and expectations for future working conditions. *Tidsskr. Nor. Laegeforen.* **2019**, *139*, 1–9. [CrossRef]
36. Damián, J. Las expectativas de búsqueda del primer empleo de universitarios con formación híbrida. El caso de una universidad pública mexicana. *Cuad. Investig. Educ.* **2015**, *6*, 33–49. [CrossRef]
37. Šafránková, J.M.; Šikýř, M. Work expectations and potential employability of millennials and post-millennials on the Czech labor market. *Oecon. Copernic.* **2017**, *8*, 585–599. [CrossRef]
38. Appianing, J.; Van Eck, R.N. Development and validation of the Value-Expectancy STEM Assessment Scale for students in higher education. *Int. J. STEM Educ.* **2018**, *5*, 24. [CrossRef]
39. Lassoued, Z.; Alhendawi, M.; Bashitialshaaer, R. An Exploratory Study of the Obstacles for Achieving Quality in Distance Learning during the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Educ. Sci.* **2020**, *10*, 232. [CrossRef]
40. McMillan, J.H.; Schumacher, S. *Research in Education. A Conceptual Introduction*, 5th ed.; Pearson Education: New York, NY, USA, 2001.
41. Corbetta, P. *Metodología y Técnicas de Investigación Social*; McGrawHill: Madrid, Spain, 2003.
42. Vasco, C.E. Siete retos de la educación colombiana para el periodo 2006–2019. *Pedagog. Saberes* **2006**, *24*, 33–41. [CrossRef]
43. Adnan, M.; Anwar, K. Online learning amid the COVID-19 pandemic: Students' perspectives. *J. Pedagog. Soc. Psychol.* **2020**, *2*, 45–51. [CrossRef]
44. Basilaia, G.; Kvavadze, D. Transition to Online Education in Schools during a SARS-CoV-2 Coronavirus (COVID-19) Pandemic in Georgia. *Pedagog. Res.* **2020**, *5*, em0060. [CrossRef]
45. Melero-Aguilar, N.; Torres-Gordillo, J.J.; García-Jiménez, J. Retos del profesorado universitario en el proceso de enseñanza-aprendizaje: Aportaciones del método ECO (Explorar, Crear y Ofrecer). *Form. Univ.* **2020**, *13*, 157–168. [CrossRef]
46. Capone, V.; Caso, D.; Donizzetti, A.R.; Procentese, F. University Student Mental Well-Being during COVID-19 Outbreak: What Are the Relationships between Information Seeking, Perceived Risk and Personal Resources Related to the Academic Context? *Nat. Sustain.* **2020**, *12*, 7039. [CrossRef]
47. Toquero, C.M. Challenges and opportunities for Higher Education amid the COVID-19 pandemic: The philippine context. *Pedagog. Res.* **2020**, *5*, em0063. [CrossRef]
48. López, L.A.; Ruiz, C. Social innovation Hub. Developing a model on social innovation and entrepreneurship. In Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Education and New Learning Technologies EduLearn18, Palma de Mallorca, Spain, 2–4 July 2018. [CrossRef]
49. Torres-Gordillo, J.J.; Melero-Aguilar, N.; García-Jiménez, J. Improving the university teaching-learning process with ECO methodology: Teachers' perceptions. *PLoS ONE* **2020**, *15*, e0237712. [CrossRef]