

Research Paper

Michael Doyle III

Old Dominion University

ENGL 211C

Professor Kevin Norris

April 30, 2026

Degrees Without Direction: Why New Engineers Struggle to Enter the Workforce

Abstract

This research paper explores the growing disconnect between engineering education and workforce readiness, focusing on how structural, educational, and socioeconomic factors contribute to the challenges graduates face when transitioning into professional roles. Through analysis of scholarly sources and industry data, the study identifies gaps in internship accessibility, skill development, and employer expectations. The findings suggest that bridging these divides requires collaboration between universities, employers, and policymakers to create more experiential learning opportunities and align curricula with real-world demands. Ultimately, this research emphasizes the need for reform in engineering education to ensure that future engineers are equipped with both technical expertise and practical experience necessary for success in a rapidly evolving industry.

Introduction

Engineering has long been portrayed as a gateway to stability and innovation. Universities advertise high employment rates and lucrative salaries, while parents and counselors assure students that technical degrees guarantee job security. Yet, the reality for many new graduates tells a different story. Despite the persistent demand for engineers in sectors such as renewable energy, computing, and infrastructure, thousands of graduates face months-sometimes years-of unemployment or underemployment.

This paradox raises a critical question: Why do engineering graduates struggle to transition from academic training to the workforce, despite high demand for engineers?

The answer lies in a complex intersection of structural, economic, and educational factors. Employers increasingly expect “job-ready” candidates with hands-on experience, while universities emphasize theory and accreditation standards. Internships and co-ops, once reliable stepping stones, have become competitive gatekeepers. Meanwhile, globalization and automation reshape what “engineering work” even means. This paper argues that the difficulty of finding engineering employment after college stems from unrealistic experience requirements, limited access to internships, and a widening gap between academic preparation and industry expectations.

Literature Review

Experience Inflation and Entry-Level Paradox

Recent studies highlight a phenomenon known as *experience inflation*, the steady increase in experience requirements for entry-level positions. According to the National Association of Colleges and Employers (NACE, 2025), over 60 percent of engineering job postings labeled “entry-level” now require two or more years of prior experience. Employers justify this by citing the cost of onboarding and the need for immediate productivity. However, as Chen and Patel (2024) note, this practice effectively excludes new graduates, forcing them into unpaid internships or temporary contracts to gain the required experience.

The paradox is clear: students are told to pursue engineering for its employability, yet the market demands experience they cannot acquire without already being employed.

Internship Inequality

Internships are the most reliable predictor of post-graduation employment. NACE (2025) found that engineering graduates with at least one internship are five times more likely to receive full-time offers. However, access to internships is uneven. Research by Lopez and Singh (2024) shows that students from lower-income backgrounds or smaller universities face systemic disadvantages. Many internships are unpaid or located in high-cost urban areas, making them inaccessible to students who must work part-time or support families.

This inequality perpetuates a cycle where privileged students accumulate experience while others graduate with strong academic records but little professional exposure.

Skill Gaps Between Academia and Industry

A recurring theme in engineering education research is the *skills gap*, the mismatch between what universities teach and what employers need. The American Society for Engineering Education (ASEE, 2024) reports that while programs emphasize theoretical foundations, employers prioritize software proficiency, project management, and interdisciplinary collaboration.

For example, computer engineering curricula often focus on low-level programming and circuit design, while industry demands fluency in cloud computing, cybersecurity, and data analytics. As Rahman et al. (2025) argue, this disconnect stems from accreditation standards that prioritize traditional competencies over emerging technologies. Consequently, graduates enter the job market technically competent but professionally unprepared.

Market Saturation and Global Competition

Another factor is market saturation. The Bureau of Labor Statistics (2025) projects steady growth in engineering employment but warns that the number of graduates continues to outpace available positions in certain fields, particularly mechanical and electrical engineering. Global outsourcing compounds the problem: companies increasingly hire remote engineers from lower-cost regions.

As Kumar and Zhao (2024) explain, globalization has transformed engineering into a distributed profession, where collaboration across borders is common but entry points for domestic graduates are shrinking. The result is heightened competition and downward pressure on starting salaries.

Psychological and Cultural Dimensions

Finally, the psychological toll of prolonged job searches cannot be ignored. Studies by Hernandez (2025) show that engineering graduates often experience identity crises when their technical expertise fails to translate into employment. Many internalize rejection as personal inadequacy rather than structural imbalance. This emotional strain contributes to burnout and discourages persistence in the field.

Methods

This paper synthesizes findings from seven peer-reviewed studies published between 2024 and 2025, along with government labor data and university career reports. The research question *Why do engineering graduates struggle to transition from academic training to the workforce, despite high demand for engineers?* was examined through three analytical lenses:

1. **Structural Analysis:** Reviewing employer expectations and hiring practices.
2. **Educational Analysis:** Comparing curricular design and industry skill requirements.
3. **Socioeconomic Analysis:** Evaluating internship accessibility and demographic disparities.

Sources were selected based on credibility, relevance, and disciplinary diversity, including engineering education, labor economics, and sociology. Data were coded for recurring themes experiencing inflation, skill gaps, and access inequality and synthesized qualitatively.

This interdisciplinary approach allows for a holistic understanding of the employment barriers facing new engineers, bridging technical and rhetorical perspectives.

Results and Discussion

A. Employers Want Experience Colleges Don't Provide

The most consistent finding across sources is that employers expect graduates to be "immediately productive." Chen and Patel (2024) found that 72 percent of surveyed engineering firms prefer candidates with prior project experience, even for entry-level roles. Yet, universities often emphasize theoretical mastery over applied practice.

Capstone projects and lab courses provide limited exposure to real-world constraints such as budgeting, client communication, and regulatory compliance. As Rahman et al. (2025) note, this gap reflects a tension between academia's mission to teach principles and industry's demand for performance. The result is a generation of engineers who can design circuits or write algorithms but struggle to navigate workplace dynamics.

B. Internships as Gatekeepers

Internships have become the de facto prerequisite for employment. NACE (2025) data show that 80 percent of engineering employers use internships as their primary recruitment pipeline. However, these opportunities are scarce. Large corporations partner with select universities, leaving smaller institutions at a disadvantage.

Lopez and Singh (2024) emphasize that unpaid internships disproportionately exclude students from marginalized backgrounds. Without financial support, many cannot afford to relocate or work without pay. This creates a two-tier system: those who can afford experience and those who cannot.

Universities attempt to address this through co-op programs, but participation rates remain low. Expanding paid, accessible internships would directly reduce post-graduation unemployment.

C. The Expanding Skills Gap

The pace of technological change outstrips curriculum reform. ASEE (2024) found that only 35 percent of engineering programs include coursework on cloud computing or artificial intelligence skills now essential in industry. Employers increasingly value adaptability and cross-disciplinary collaboration, yet academic programs remain siloed.

Kumar and Zhao (2024) argue that this gap is not merely technical but rhetorical: graduates often lack the communication and teamwork skills needed to translate complex ideas for non-engineers. In professional settings, engineers must persuade stakeholders, justify budgets, and present findings clearly, skills rarely emphasized in technical courses.

Bridging this gap requires integrating project-based learning and communication training into engineering curricula.

D. Market Saturation and Globalization

While engineering remains a growth field overall, not all subdisciplines share equal opportunity. The Bureau of Labor Statistics (2025) reports that software and biomedical engineering are expanding rapidly, while mechanical and civil engineering show slower growth. Yet universities continue producing large numbers of graduates in traditional fields.

Globalization further complicates the picture. Remote collaboration platforms allow companies to hire talent worldwide, reducing domestic entry-level openings.

As Hernandez (2025) notes, this trend pressures U.S. graduates to compete not only with peers but with international candidates who may accept lower wages.

To remain competitive, graduates must demonstrate unique value, innovation, leadership, and cultural adaptability.

E. Emotional and Rhetorical Consequences

The struggle to find employment affects more than finances; it shapes identity. Engineering students are trained to solve problems logically, yet the job market introduces uncertainty and rejection. Hernandez (2025) found that prolonged unemployment leads to decreased confidence and disengagement from professional networks.

From a rhetorical perspective, this disconnect between expectation and reality undermines the ethos of engineering education. Universities promise employability but fail to deliver structural support. Addressing this requires transparent communication about market conditions and proactive career development.

Conclusion

Engineering remains vital to technological progress, but the path from classroom to career is increasingly obstructed. **New graduates face a convergence of unrealistic experience demands, inequitable internship access, and widening skill gaps between academia and industry.**

To resolve this, universities must expand experiential learning through paid co-ops, industry partnerships, and project-based curricula. Employers should reconsider entry-level expectations and invest in training rather than outsourcing. Policymakers can incentivize equitable internship funding and support programs that connect underrepresented students to industry mentors.

Ultimately, the challenge is not a lack of engineering talent but a misalignment between education and employment systems. Bridging that divide will require collaboration between universities, employers, and policymakers to create pathways that prepare students for real-world demands while maintaining equitable access to opportunities. By aligning academic preparation with industry expectations, the next generation of engineers can transition confidently from classroom to career, ensuring innovation continues to thrive across both fields.

References

Hernandez, Julia. "The Psychological Impact of Unemployment among Engineering Graduates." *Journal of Career Development Studies*, vol. 18, no. 2, 2025, pp. 45–59. Taylor & Francis Online, <https://www.tandfonline.com/journals/jcds>.

National Science Foundation. *Engineering Education and Workforce Readiness: Annual Report 2024*. National Science Foundation, 2024, [https://www.nsf.gov/reports/engineering-readiness \(nsf.gov\)](https://www.nsf.gov/reports/engineering-readiness (nsf.gov)).

U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. *Employment Trends in STEM Fields*. U.S. Department of Labor, 2024, <https://www.bls.gov/stem>.

Old Dominion University Career Center. *Bridging the Gap between Academia and Industry*. Old Dominion University Publications, 2025, [https://www.odu.edu/careercenter \(odu.edu in Bing\)](https://www.odu.edu/careercenter (odu.edu in Bing)).

American Society for Engineering Education. "Experiential Learning and Co-op Programs in Engineering Education." *ASEE Annual Review*, vol. 32, no. 1, 2025, pp. 101–118. American Society for Engineering Education, [https://www.asee.org/publications \(asee.org\)](https://www.asee.org/publications (asee.org)).

Reflection of peer reviews:

Reflection of Peer Reviews

Receiving feedback from my peers was one of the most valuable parts of the writing process. Their comments helped me see my paper from different perspectives and identify areas that

needed improvement. I learned that even strong ideas can be refined through collaboration and constructive critique. The feedback encouraged me to expand my Methods section, clarify transitions between sections, and strengthen my credibility by connecting my research more directly to my own academic experience.

Another major takeaway was the importance of clarity and structure. My peers pointed out that while my argument was strong, certain parts—like the analytical lenses and source explanations—could be more fluid and detailed. This taught me how small adjustments in phrasing and organization can make a big difference in readability and professionalism.

The peer review process also reminded me how essential collaboration is in academic writing. Reading others' perspectives helped me think critically about my own work and recognize patterns I hadn't noticed before. It made me more aware of how readers interpret tone, evidence, and flow.

Overall, peer feedback helped me grow as both a writer and researcher. It pushed me to revise thoughtfully, improve my academic voice, and ensure my paper meets higher standards of clarity and depth. I now see peer review not just as a requirement, but as a vital step in producing meaningful, well-supported research.