The Employment Dilemma and Pathways for Vocational College Graduates in the AI Era

Yu Siyuan

Wenzhou University，Wenzhou City, Zhejiang Province，325000；

Abstract: We analyze the employment issues that vocational college students face under the wave of artificial intelligence (AI). In March – April 2025, we carried out semi-structured interviews with eight vocational teachers of Xinjiang, Henan and Wenzhou by convenience sampling. What we have learned is contrary to our initial expectations; it is a matrix of complicated factors from politics, economy, society and technology: there are information information gaps in policy making so students do not know what it supports them; large scale changes in the economy appear visibly decreasing large-scale industry jobs, specially from manufacturing lines of majors such as accounting and software; employers begin to seek no only the domain specific knowledge but also the AI common knowledge that graduates can hardly master; institutions themselves lack high quality teachers, equipment and good AI teaching contents. From this we suggested five suggestions: instating AI common knowledge in colleges' teaching contents, adopting the way of project teaching, inspur college in-depth collaborative working with industries to deepen the traditions, dividing grades and majors for career pre-advisory works, conducting AI innovation competition. However, these successful implementation need policies and resources, without that all individual college or college teachers' works alone can hardly work

Keywords:AI;Vocational Colleges Graduates; Employment issues

DOI：10.69979/3041-0843.26.02.006

1 Introductio

The past few years have seen AI advance at a dizzying pace—so fast, in fact, that it has caught many off guard. "Frey and Osborne (2017) threw out a number that stuck: 47% of jobs could be automated in coming decades. That figure has been quoted, challenged, and recycled ever since—in the author's view, perhaps too often, given how little we still know about its real-world validity for Chinese vocational students." Yet in preparing this study, the author noticed that amid all this noise, the predicament of vocational college graduates has received surprisingly little targeted attention. Rosyadi et al. (2023) note that vocational curricula update slowly. The author read this as stating the obvious—any teacher could have said the same—but the implication is harsh: by the time a syllabus finally changes, market demands have already moved on, and graduates are left holding outdated skills. Morandini et al. (2023) describe a squeeze from both ends: automation eats the low-skill jobs vocational graduates used to fill, while the high-skill jobs in programming and data analysis that are growing fastest require credentials they do not have. The author kept thinking of a student trained for three years in factory-floor skills, graduating just as those floors go robotic. Chiang et al. (2022) call for reform—AI in curricula, deeper industry ties. The author nods along until hitting the practical questions: who pays? Who trains the teachers? Who keeps enterprises from signing a cooperation agreement and then vanishing? Where will resources come from? Will enterprises commit beyond signing ceremonial agreements? These questions remain largely unanswered.

In reviewing the literature, the author encountered a puzzling gap: while mountains of ink have been spilled on AI's macroeconomic impact and its effects on white-collar employment, studies zeroing in on vocational graduates are scarce (Windelband, 2023; Kovalchuk et al., 2023). Stranger still, existing work tends to generalize or transplant experiences from developed economies onto the Chinese context, glossing over regional disparities and offering reform pathways with thin empirical grounding. It was this void that pulled the author into the present research—seeking to hear from frontline teachers, to understand what vocational graduates' employment dilemmas actually look like, and to identify where meaningful change might begin.

Research Questions:In light of the dilemmas outlined above, this study seeks to address two core questions. First, what specific employment challenges do vocational college graduates encounter in the AI era when examined through political, economic, social, and technological lenses? Second, what concrete measures can vocational colleges take to respond to these challenges effectively? While these questions may appear straightforward, the author recognizes that answering them adequately requires more than desk-based literature review; it demands listening to the grounded voices of frontline teachers.

2 Literature Review

2.1 AI in Vocational Education: Appealing Yet Distant?

Chiang (2022), Mohamad (2023), and Borgen (2021) each paint a rosy picture—AI boosts motivation, makes training more effective. The author noticed a pattern: the rosier the picture, the more likely the study came from a well-funded lab.The author encountered these claims repeatedly in the literature. Yet what concerns the author more is what follows the "but": equipment costs are staggering, data privacy issues loom large, and teachers' digital literacy simply cannot keep pace. Borgen (2021) discusses augmented reality in aeronautical engineering training, which sounds cutting-edge, but the author cannot help asking: how much does this equipment cost? Can ordinary vocational colleges afford it? Mohamad (2023) mentions similar barriers in his review, yet treats them somewhat lightly. What troubles the author more is that these studies almost exclusively originate from developed-country contexts. Cross-cultural analysis? Hardly any. Whether their conclusions still hold at a resource-strapped vocational college in western China—the author remains skeptical.

2.2 Trends and Risks: The Flip Side of Efficiency Gains

Lars (2023), Vasyl I. (2023), and Svitlana (2022) sell a compelling vision: AI makes teaching more efficient, learning more personalized. The author kept waiting for the catch.Yet when reading these accounts, the author senses something missing. Data privacy, algorithmic bias, infrastructure deficits—these risks are not entirely ignored, but the tone tends to be "worth noting" rather than "urgently pressing." The author would argue that AI technology is iterating far faster than educational systems can respond. Svitlana (2022) mentions a "substitution effect" whereby traditional occupations are being eroded by AI, but the author believes this problem proves more acute in vocational education than at other levels: a student trained for three years in computerized accounting skills may graduate only to find her core competencies already covered by financial robots. This "structural mismatch" receives insufficient attention in existing literature.

2.3 Policy Responses: The Gap Between Vision and Implementation

UNESCO's TVET Strategy (2022-2029) opens with a lofty goal: 'developing inclusive economic skills for the AI age.' The author flipped through its pages looking for concrete steps—curriculum reform, teacher training, industry cooperation—and found plenty of verbs, but fewer details on who does what and who pays.Reading this document, the author was moved by its vision on one hand, yet felt a twinge of unease on the other. Alqahtani et al. (2023) confirm this unease: current policies lack sufficient flexibility and foresight, functioning more as "after-the-fact remedies" than "forward-looking arrangements." For a country as regionally diverse as China, can one-size-fits-all policy designs really work? The author heard similar concerns from teachers during interviews.

2.4 Employment Difficulties for Vocational Graduates: Three Entry Points

Skill mismatch. The author generally buys Frey and Osborne's (2017) argument that AI is moving into cognitive and creative territory. Yet Brunello and Wruuck (2019) and Acemoglu and Restrepo (2019) push the author toward a bleaker reading: as AI eliminates low-skill positions while driving up demand for high-skill roles, vocational graduates face a "double squeeze"—entry-level jobs vanish, while advanced positions remain out of reach. UNESCO (2022) warns that curricula lag behind technology. Every teacher the author spoke to confirmed this—not as a statistic, but as a daily frustration.But the author would add: this lag is not merely a matter of timing, but fundamentally one of resource allocation.

Education-market disconnection. Song and Xu (2024) complain that vocational curricula are still chained to old industry needs, barely touching smart manufacturing or IoT. The author wondered: who writes these curricula, and when did they last visit a factory floor?. The author wants to push further: why does this disconnection persist? Shen and Zhang (2024) partly blame corporate apathy. The author's preliminary digging suggests a different story: companies do not refuse to play because they dislike schools, but because no one has figured out how to collaborate fairly, split benefits cleanly, or handle intellectual property without a legal fight. Signing agreements is easy; genuine cooperation is hard.

Non-standard employment growth. Schor et al. (2020) and Graham et al. (2017) on the platform economy draw the author's attention to an increasingly visible trend: AI-driven gig work is pushing more vocational graduates into flexible employment with inadequate social security and volatile incomes. Ellingrud et al. (2023) predict that generative AI may automate 8% of working hours by 2030—behind this figure lies the prospect of countless vocational graduates compelled into "precarious employment." The author heard similar worries in interviews, but would note that existing research pays insufficient attention to the quality of such non-standard employment, as if "having a job" were sufficient.

3 Methods

The author conducted semi-structured online interviews with eight vocational teachers from Xinjiang, Henan, and Wenzhou between March 14 and April 15, 2025. These teachers were reached through the author's existing academic network—a convenience sample, with all limitations openly acknowledged. Interversations explored two things: how AI is changing the jobs graduates land, and what teachers actually do with AI in their classrooms—two questions that turned out to have surprisingly little overlap. All sessions were recorded, transcribed, and analyzed thematically by the author.

4 Results and Discussion

4.1 Employment Challenges

Sifting through the interview transcripts, the author initially struggled to impose a neat framework. Yet patterns gradually emerged across four messy, interwoven dimensions: political—teachers grumbled that policy information rarely reaches students intact; economic—structural shifts are visibly eating away at traditional job slots; social—employers now want "hybrid" skills that graduates simply do not possess; and technological—colleges lack the AI resources to train them anyway.

4.2 Graduate Competency Gaps

Teachers kept returning to a sore point: graduates can usually do one technical thing passably, but put them in a team, ask them to plan, or have them explain their work to a client, and they stumble. As S1 put it bluntly, "Students lack comprehensive qualities—communication, expression, planning, and coordination—which matter more than technical prowess in cross-departmental projects." S3 added that students' innovative thinking remains weak; they learn AI tools yet cannot apply them flexibly at work. " S6's comment stuck with the author longest: to use AI precisely, you need professional terminology and the ability to verify experimentally whether the AI's output is nonsense. Students, S6 said, are 'nearly blank' on both counts..

4.3 Strategic Pathways

When asked what might actually help, teachers did not offer grand theories but pointed to concrete experiments already underway. On curriculum, S8's institution is pushing "AI General Knowledge and Ethics" across all programs and piloting "AI + Financial Analysis" hybrids. S4 described Henan University of Technology's three-tier approach—general courses, interdisciplinary pilots, and project-based learning—which seems to move the needle on AI literacy, though the author wonders how transferable this is to less-resourced colleges.

Teaching methods are also shifting. S7 at Wenzhou Institute of Technology has students build smart home systems using Arduino and machine learning—"they break things, fix them, and learn more from the fixing," S7 noted. S6 at Shaoxing Vocational College uses AI-assisted programming tools not to replace student thinking but to let them compare outputs and debug together.

Industry ties matter too, yet S4 admitted Henan Polytechnic University's "industry college" model works partly because a few enterprise partners are deeply committed. "Dual mentorship sounds good on paper," S4 said, "but finding industry mentors who actually show up is the real headache."

Career guidance, often an afterthought, is getting sharper. S4's college now feeds AI trend updates to juniors while steering seniors toward niche roles like algorithm engineers—positions students rarely knew existed. Resume and interview prep using AI tools is also being tested, though S4 confessed results are "mixed at best."

Finally, S7 pushes students into AI innovation competitions. "They complain about the workload," S7 laughed, "but the problem-solving grit they gain is unmistakable."

5 Conclusions

Looking back at what eight teachers shared, the author is struck by how messy their concerns are—policy gaps, shrinking traditional jobs, hybrid skill demands, and resource shortages reinforce one another rather than sitting neatly in separate boxes. Rather than offering a rigid framework, this study sketches five directions worth exploring: curriculum tweaks, project-based learning, deeper industry ties, tiered career guidance, and innovation competitions. Whether these take root depends heavily on policy backing and funding—without which, even the best-designed reforms risk falling flat. The author remains cautiously optimistic but insists that larger, more representative studies are needed before drawing firm conclusions.

Acknowledgments

The eight teachers who gave their time and candid opinions made this paper possible. Several colleagues also nudged the author in useful directions—thanks to them for not letting the author get too lost in the data.

References

[1]Acemoglu, D., & Restrepo, P. (2019). Automation and new tasks: How technology displaces and reinstates labor. Journal of Economic Perspectives, 33(2), 3-30.
[2]Alqahtani, A., et al. (2023). AI in vocational education: Challenges and opportunities. Journal of Vocational Education & Training.
[3]Borgen, K. B., et al. (2021). Assessment of augmented reality technology's impact on learning speed in aeronautical engineering. International Journal of Aerospace Psychology, 31(3), 219-229.
[4]Brunello, G., & Wruuck, P. (2019). Skill shortages and skill mismatch in Europe. SSRN Electronic Journal.
[5]Chiang, F. K., et al. (2022). Augmented reality in vocational training: A systematic review. Computers in Human Behavior, 129, 107125.
[6]Ellingrud, K., et al. (2023). Generative AI and the future of work. McKinsey Global Institute.
[7]Frey, C. B., & Osborne, M. A. (2017). The future of employment: How susceptible are jobs to computerisation? Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 114, 254-280.
[8]Graham, M., et al. (2017). Digital labour and development. Transfer, 23(2), 135-162.
[9]Kovalchuk, V. I., et al. (2023). Digitalization of vocational education under crisis conditions. Educational Technology Quarterly, 2023(1), 1-17.
[10]Lars, K. (2023). AI and assistance systems for technical vocational education. Springer.
[11]Mohamad, A. M. (2023). The role of AI in vocational education: A systematic literature review. Journal of Vocational Education Studies, 6(2), 244-263.
[12]Morandini, S., et al. (2023). The impact of artificial intelligence on workers' skills. Informing Science, 26, 39-68.
[13]Rosyadi, M. I., et al. (2023). The role of AI in vocational education. Journal of Vocational Education Studies, 6(2), 244-263.
[14]Schor, J. B., et al. (2020). Dependence and precarity in the platform economy. Theory and Society, 49(5-6), 833-861.
[15]Shen, Y., & Zhang, X. (2024). The impact of artificial intelligence on employment. Humanities and Social Sciences Communications, 11(1), 122.
[16]Svitlana, I. (2022). Artificial intelligence in modern educational space. International Journal of Computer Science & Network Security, 22(6), 25-32.

[17]UNESCO. (2022). Strategy for the transformation of technical and vocational education and training (TVET) 2022-2029.
[18]Vasyl, I. (2023). Digital transformation of vocational education under crisis conditions. Educational Technology Quarterly.
[19]Windelband, L. (2023). Artificial intelligence and assistance systems for TVET. Springer.