



Munich Personal RePEc Archive

The satisfaction of university students: differences by field of study

Juan Carlos, Campaña and J. Ignacio, Giménez-Nadal and
Jose Alberto, Molina

University of Zaragoza, University of Zaragoza and CTUR,
University of Zaragoza and IZA

1 June 2015

Online at <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/64727/>
MPRA Paper No. 64727, posted 02 Jun 2015 04:35 UTC

Introduction

This paper examines the factors that may influence the level of satisfaction of students at the University of Zaragoza (Spain). Many theories of college retention recognize the significance of student satisfaction as a positive factor in student persistence (see Suhre et al. (2007) for a review), and the analysis of the satisfaction of university students can provide information to identify inequalities, trends, and public needs within and across college populations (Campbell, 1976). Moreover, prior research has found that observed heterogeneity of students can explain part of the variation in satisfaction at school or university. Huebner et al. (2000) found that women are more satisfied with their experience at school, compared to men, and Caucasian students are more satisfied than others with their friends and life environment. Zullig et al. (2009) found that race influenced the results, since Caucasian students are more satisfied with school, compared with ethnic minorities. Lykken and Tellegen (1996) argue that individual characteristics can explain up to 80% of satisfaction. Hence, the analysis of what factors are related to the level of satisfaction of university students proves important for teachers, students, and policy-makers. This paper contributes to the literature in confirming the importance of student heterogeneity, together with motivations and the field of study, in influencing the level of satisfaction of undergraduate students.

We use data from the survey “Los universitarios aragoneses y su altruismo” for the academic year 2011/2012, conducted at the University of Zaragoza (Spain), among undergraduate students from different fields of study¹. The survey provides information on the socio-demographic characteristics of students from four disciplines: *Economics and Business, Health Sciences, Arts and Philosophy, and Engineering Sciences*. In this academic

¹ See Giménez-Nadal and Ortega (2015) for a detailed explanation of the survey. Recent evidence on altruistic *versus* non-altruistic behaviors appear in Molina (2013 and 2014).

year, the University of Zaragoza ranks among the top 20 universities in Spain, in terms of the number of undergraduate students, which is relevant for the validity of the sample. The survey gathers information on how students assess their level of satisfaction at the University, which is analyzed in relation to the socio-demographic characteristics and expectations of students. We estimate linear OLS models on the level on satisfaction, controlling for factors such as the field of study, gender, risky behaviors, and expectations.

Our main results show that students of *Engineering Sciences* are less satisfied with their university life, relative to students in other fields. In particular, we find that undergraduate students from *Health Sciences*, *Art and Philosophy*, and *Economics and Business* report satisfaction scores of 0.213, 0.233 and 0.061 higher, compared to students from *Engineering Sciences*, which represent differences of 23%, 25% and 6% of one standard deviation in satisfaction. These differences are obtained when socio-demographic characteristics, motivations, and expectations are considered in the analysis, which points towards net differences in satisfaction levels. However, in this analysis, we cannot take into account the unobserved heterogeneity of individuals that may condition the interpretation individuals may make of the valuation scale and the selection of the field of study. Within this framework, variations by field of study may be observed because different individuals select in different fields, and not because that particular area increases the satisfaction of students. Hence, we cannot establish a causal link between student satisfaction and field of study, and thus our analysis represents only a first step in understanding differences in student satisfaction, and more research on this issue is needed.

We find that alcohol and tobacco consumption is positively related to student satisfaction. At the country level, it is interesting to analyze possible reasons at the root of these relationships. Spain has the recent phenomenon of “botellon”, where young people meet in public open places to consume alcohol and tobacco, usually during the night, on weekends,

and this practice is commonly seen as a way to socialize with peers. Thus, alcohol consumption in young people is associated with greater socialization with their peers (Duarte et al., 2007 and 2011), which likely influences the size of personal networks. Thus, we hypothesize that higher satisfaction of students and alcohol consumption may reflect the effect of greater socialization among students (Murphy et al., 2005), especially given the positive relationship between satisfaction and health status reported by these students, and the detrimental effect of alcohol consumption on health and human development that can lead to lower academic efficiency (Gil and Molina, 2007). We leave this question open to future research.

Finally, we find the feeling that having a university degree will be enough to obtain a job in the future is positively related to the level of satisfaction. Thus, students who believe the degree will be a passport to a job report a higher level of satisfaction, indicating the importance of expectations in influencing the satisfaction of students. This is especially relevant in our context, given the high rates of unemployment in Spain at the time of the survey (INE, 2014), and where the under-30 generation is especially affected.

We contribute to the literature by analyzing what factors affect the satisfaction undergraduates report at University. Knowing these factors is particularly important, as a body of research reports that around 20–30% of students do not return to their initial institution for the second year (Rausch and Hamilton, 2006). Other research claims that satisfaction at university affects student performance (Bean and Bradley, 1986; Pike, 1991), is a predictor of student persistence at university (Aitken, 1982; Tinto, 1993), or helps a university to be more competitive and attract more students (Lee et al., 2000).

Data and empirical strategy

The data used in the analysis is obtained from the survey “Los universitarios aragoneses y su altruismo” (The University Students in Aragon and their Altruism) corresponding to the academic year 2011/2012, conducted by the research group “Industrial and Family Economics” of the University of Zaragoza (Spain). The data comprise a representative sample of students in four fields of study, providing information on socio-demographic variables and student expectations/motivations. The University of Zaragoza ranks 13th out of 74 Spanish Universities in terms of the number of students. At the time of the survey, 31,548 were officially enrolled in degree courses at the University, of which 82.17% were born in the same Autonomous Community (Aragon), 14.88% of students were born in other Autonomous Communities, and 2.95% of students came from abroad. For consider Spain is organized into 17 Autonomous Communities (Andalucia, Aragon, Madrid, Catalonia, etc.) and 2 autonomous cities (Ceuta and Melilla).

The sample of students comprise the following faculties: *Economics and Business*, including Economics and Business Administration; *Health Sciences*, including Medicine, Nursing, and Physiotherapy; *Arts and Philosophy*, including Information and Documentation, Philosophy, Journalism, English Studies, History, Geography, Art History, Classical Studies, and Hispanic Studies, and *Engineering Sciences*, including Geology, Optometry, Biotechnology, Physics, Chemistry, Mathematics, Engineering, Industrial Design, Architecture, Mechanical Engineering, Chemical Engineering, Industrial Technology, Telecommunication Engineering, Computer Engineering, and Electrical Engineering.

Table 1 shows the distribution of the sample across the different fields of study. In the year of the survey, 7,789 students were enrolled in the faculties surveyed, distributed as follows: 19.28% of students were enrolled in *Economics and Business*, 22.48% were enrolled in

Health Sciences; 16.96% were enrolled in *Arts and Philosophy*, and 41.28% were enrolled in *Engineering Sciences*. The total number of students surveyed is 2,212, representing 28.39% of the total student body, divided as follows: 50.66% are students of *Economics and Business*, 22.48% are students of *Health Sciences*, 16.96% are students of *Arts and Philosophy*, and 15.19% are students of *Engineering Sciences*. Given that we have different percentages of students in each field of the population and in the sample, weights are used to give the sample the same proportion of students in the different fields of study in comparison with the total population: 0.38 for *Economics and Business*, 1.06 for *Health Sciences*, 1.31 for *Arts and Philosophy*, and 2.72 for *Science and Engineering*.

[Table 1 here]

For the dependent variable, we focus on the answer to the following question: What is the current level of your satisfaction with university life? Possible responses are on a scale from 1 to 5, with the value “1” referring to “very dissatisfied”, and the value 5 referring to “very satisfied”. Looking at overall values of the responses to this question, we observe an overall value of 3.624 and a standard deviation of 0.899. Students from *Health Sciences* show the largest value in response to the question (3.688) followed by students from *Arts and Philosophy* (3.659) and *Economics and Business* (3.606), while students in *Engineering Sciences* report the lowest level of satisfaction (3.564). We find that the difference in overall satisfaction between students in *Health Sciences* and *Engineering Sciences* is statistically significant at standard levels ($p=0.07$). Thus, we observe that students’ levels of satisfaction may differ according to the field of knowledge, and we include this as an explanatory factor.

Table 2 shows summary statistics of the socio-demographic variables and expectations for undergraduates in our sample. Column 1 shows summary statistics for all surveyed students, and Columns 2 to 5 show summary statistics for students in each field of study. The average

age of our sample is 20.45 years, with the youngest group being students of *Economics and Business* (19.81 years of age, on average). The largest proportion of students are in the first year of their degree course (31%), more females than males were surveyed (53.5% of the total), although the fields of *Economics and Business* and *Engineering Sciences* have more male respondents. Slightly more than half of the students (58%) live at home, with 9.2% of the students having divorced parents. The level of education of the bread-winner in the household is secondary education for 43.9% of students, while university-educated bread-winners correspond to 43.4% of the students. There are dependent adults at home in 12.6% of cases, while 80.7% of the students have siblings. The proportion of students who had any type of surgery in the previous year is 5.9% of the sample, while a high proportion of students report having a good (43.1%) or a very good (47.6%) health status. Regarding risky behaviors, 45.9% of the students indicated they are not involved in any risky behavior, while 43.6% and 9.8% reported drinking alcohol and smoking on a regular (weekly) basis, respectively. Furthermore, 3.9% of students admitted to consuming some type of illegal substance, 5.7% reported practicing extreme sports, and 3.4% reported taking other risks (students were able to choose more than one risky behavior, as appropriate).

[Table 2 here]

We also use the information obtained from two additional questions included in the survey. The first question is: “Do you think your degree will be enough to obtain a job?” with students answering yes (1) or no (0) to this question. The second question is: “What two characteristics of your future work will you value the most”, selecting from the following options: salary, autonomy, social recognition, flexibility, safety, work environment, and others. The responses to these questions allow us to obtain the variables related to the motivations and expectations of students, as prior research has shown that decision-making in regard to tertiary education is multi-faceted (Sojkin et al., 2012).

Table 2 shows that 65.7% of the students report believing that their degree will be enough to obtain a job in the future. However, there are differences in this rate by field of knowledge. The higher rates correspond to *Health Sciences* (75.2%) and *Engineering Sciences* (75.1%), while the lowest rate corresponds to *Arts and Philosophy* (37.5%). Thus, students may see their degree as helpful to a career in some cases, and not in others, which may indicate that certain students choose their degrees in order to increase their employability, while others choose their degrees for other reasons (e.g., personal interest, vocation).

Table 2 shows that, among the options available, “salary” is chosen as an important characteristic in 62.9% of the cases. By field of study, the highest percentage of students choosing “salary” as one of their preferred options is shown in *Economic and Business* (76.6%). The lowest percentage of students choosing this option appears in *Health Sciences* (52.5%). These differences indicate that motives to choose the degree and field of study may differ among students. The second most valued characteristic of the future job is “work environment”, with students choosing this option in 32.8% of the cases, which may indicate that students will consider this work characteristic important if they are confronted with several job offers at the same time.

For the econometric analysis, we estimate OLS regressions on the level of satisfaction of undergraduate students, although, given that we have a categorical variable, other models, such as the ordered probit model, may be preferred to OLS models. However, Ferrer-i-Carbonell and Frijters (2004) show that assuming ordinality or cardinality of happiness/satisfaction scores makes little difference, whilst allowing for fixed-effects does change results substantially. Given that we rely on cross-sectional data, we use OLS models, although we have alternatively estimated ordered probit models, and our qualitative conclusions are the same (results available upon request).

We estimate the following equation:

$$S_i = \alpha + \beta X_i + \varepsilon_i \quad (1)$$

where S_i represents the satisfaction level of undergraduate student “i”, and vector X_i includes individual and household characteristics, including field of study, age and its square, academic course, gender (ref.: male), living at parents’ home, whether parents are divorced/separated, or not, the educational level of the head of the household, whether there are dependent relatives at home, number of siblings, if the respondent had a surgery last year, health status, risky behaviors, whether the respondent believes the degree will be enough to obtain a job, and the two characteristics of the job the respondent considers as most important. We correct our estimates with the use of robust standard errors.

Results

Table 3 shows the results of estimating OLS models on our dependent variable. Column (1) shows the results of including the field of study only (ref.: *Engineering Sciences*), Column (2) shows the results of including the field of study and socio-demographic variables, and Column (3) shows the results of including the previous factors and the characteristics that the students value most for their future work, and whether the students consider that the degree will be sufficient to obtain a job. Column (1) shows that, with respect to students in the field of *Engineering Sciences*, students in the fields of *Health Sciences* ($p < 0.05$) and *Art and Philosophy* ($p < 0.10$) report a higher level of satisfaction with university life, as the indicators of being in those disciplines are positive and highly significant. Furthermore, those who are the most satisfied are students of *Health Sciences*. These results allow us to conclude that students in *Engineering Sciences* are slightly less satisfied compared to students in other fields of study.

[Table 3 here]

These results are maintained when we include the socio-demographic characteristics of the students (Column (2)). We observe that students of *Health Sciences* ($p < 0.05$) and *Arts and Philosophy* ($p < 0.05$) are more satisfied, relative to students in *Engineering Sciences*, with students in *Health Sciences* being those who report higher levels of satisfaction. Furthermore, students in *Economics and Business* appear to be equally satisfied, relative to students in *Engineering Sciences*. Thus, differences in satisfaction across fields of study remain after the observed heterogeneity of individuals has been controlled for. Considering the remaining variables, we observe that academic year ($p < 0.1$), living in the family home ($p < 0.05$) and doing extreme sports ($p < 0.10$) all have negative relationships to the level of satisfaction, while having fair ($p < 0.01$), good ($p < 0.01$) and very good ($p < 0.01$) health, drinking alcohol ($p < 0.10$) and smoking ($p < 0.05$) are all positively related to student satisfaction. In the case of age, we observe a u-shaped relationship with the satisfaction of students.

The relationship to age can be explained because the majority of respondents (between 18 and 25) are in the period of “emerging adulthood” (Arnett, 2001, 2004). According to that author, students at this age can experience some degree of instability, since their selected studies may no longer be interesting, or may require more effort and talent than the students have, or may require a higher initial knowledge than first considered. The negative influence of living at home indicates that students would prefer not to be living with their parents, despite that Spanish youth are those who leave home much later than any others in Europe. This may indicate that there are external conditions operating, such as minimal public subsidies for rentals to the young, and housing prices that prevent them leaving home. Regarding the positive significance of alcohol consumption by students, studies such as Murphy et al. (2005) indicate that alcohol use by male students shows a positive relationship to social satisfaction, which may be due to the fact that alcohol consumption among youths in Spain, which follows a binge drinking pattern, is a social phenomenon (the term “botellón” is

known in Spain to refer to meetings of young people in open public places for alcohol consumption in groups).

Column (3) in Table 3 shows the results of adding the variables related to the characteristics that the students value most for their future work, and the variable indicating whether students feel that their degree will be sufficient to obtain a job (1) or not (0). We find that students of *Health Sciences* ($p < 0.05$), *Art and Philosophy* ($p < 0.01$) and *Economics and Business* ($p < 0.10$) are more satisfied than students of *Engineering Sciences*. We find no significant changes with respect to the socio-demographic variables. Regarding the new variables introduced, we find that only the feeling about their future success (expectation) in getting a job is correlated with their level of satisfaction, with the feeling that the degree will be enough to obtain a job in the future being positively related ($p < 0.01$) with their level of satisfaction. Thus, we can conclude that those students with a better expectation regarding their future work are more satisfied at University. However, here we must recognize that this effect can be specific to the country, as the period when the survey was done is characterized by a high level of youth unemployment (INE, 2014), which may make expectations about the future work of students important in this context. It may be interesting to contrast whether this relationship is also significant in other countries.

Conclusions

In this paper, we analyze the satisfaction level of students, using data from a survey carried out at the University of Zaragoza (Spain), which is ranked among the top 20 universities in terms of number of students. In our analysis, we consider how satisfaction levels vary by field of study, controlling for socio-demographic characteristics, motivations, and expectations. Our findings indicate that students of *Engineering Sciences* are less satisfied with their university life, relative to students in other fields of study. Among the

socio-demographic factors, we find a positive relationship between satisfaction, on the one hand, and health status, alcohol, and tobacco consumption on the other. These positive relationships may be explained by the “botellon” phenomenon, where young people meet to drink in open and public spaces. We additionally find a negative association between living at home and doing extreme sports, and the level of satisfaction.

Our results allow us to make certain recommendations, for the university and for future employers. One significant correlate of student satisfaction is the fact that students consider that pursuing a university degree will be enough to obtain a job in the future. Thus, increasing the expectations of students regarding the usefulness of their degree may serve to increase the satisfaction of students, leading to better academic outcomes. One way that universities and firms can help to make this happen is to generate more agreements with potential employers, allowing students to participate in professional internships, which would be a more practical step towards meeting the demands of the labor market.

One limitation of our analysis is that our data is a cross-section of individuals, and thus we cannot take into account the unobserved heterogeneity of individuals. There may be unobserved factors at the individual level that correlate with the level of satisfaction, the choice of the field of study, and the level of motivation. Factors such as attitudes, monetary/financial status, social value orientation, social incentives, and socio-economic background may all influence the level of satisfaction and the choice of academic discipline. Thus, while we cannot identify any causal effect of motivation on the level of satisfaction, our analysis of the correlational structure of the data may serve as a first step in understanding the determinants of the satisfaction of undergraduate students. We leave this issue for further research.

References

- Aitken, N. D. (1982). College student performance, satisfaction, and retention, *Journal of Higher Education* 53: 32
- Arnett, J.J. (2000). Emerging adulthood: A theory of development from the late teens through the twenties, *American psychologist*, 55(5): 469.
- Arnett, J.J. (2004). Emerging adulthood: The winding road from the late teens through the twenties, Oxford University Press.
- Bean, J.P., & Bradley, R.K. (1986). Untangling the satisfaction-performance relationship for college students, *Journal of Higher Education* 57: 393.
- Campbell, A. (1976). Subjective measures of well-being, *American Psychologist*, 31, 119–124.
- Duarte, R., Escario, J.J., & J.A. Molina (2009). El abuso juvenil de alcohol: estimaciones count data, *Revista de Economía Aplicada* 49: 81-104.
- Duarte, R., Escario, J.J., & J.A. Molina (2011). Peer effects, unobserved factors and risk behaviours in adolescence, *Revista de Economía Aplicada* 55: 125-151.
- Ferrer-i-Carbonell, A., & P. Frijters (2004). How Important is Methodology for the estimates of the determinants of Happiness, *Economic Journal* 114: 641-659.
- Gil, A., & J.A. Molina (2007). Human development and alcohol abuse in adolescence, *Applied Economics* 39: 1315-1323.
- Giménez-Nadal, J.I. & R. Ortega (2015). Time dedicated to family by university students: differences by academic area in a case study, *Journal of Family and Economic Issues* 36(1): 132-142.
- Huebner, E. S., Drane, W., & Valois, R. F. (2000). Levels of demographic correlates of adolescent life satisfaction reports, *School Psychology Quarterly*, 21, 281–292.

Instituto Nacional de Estadística (INE, 2014). <http://www.ine.es/>

Lee, G., Jolly, N., Kench, P., & Gelonesi, B. (2000). Factors related to student satisfaction with university, In Presented at the 4th Pacific Rim—first year in higher education conference: Creating futures for a new millennium, Brisbane.

Lykken, D., & Tellegen, A., (1996). Happiness in a stochastic phenomenon, *Psychological Science*. 7 (3): 186–189.

Molina, J.A. (2013). Altruism in the household: in-kind transfers in the context of kin selection, *Review of Economics of the Household* 11 (3): 309-312.

Molina, J.A. (2014). Altruism and monetary transfers in the household: inter- and intra generation issues, *Review of Economics of the Household* 12 (3): 407-410.

Murphy, J. G., McDevitt-Murphy, M. E., & Barnett, N. P. (2005). Drink and be merry? Gender, life satisfaction, and alcohol consumption among college students, *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors* 19: 184–191.

Pike, G.R. (1991). The effects of background, coursework, and involvement on students' grades and satisfaction, *Research in Higher Education* 32: 15.

Rausch, J.L., & Hamilton, M.W. (2006). Goals and distractions: Explanations of early attrition from traditional university freshmen, *The Qualitative Report* 11: 317–334.

Sojkin, B., Bartkowiak, P., & Skuza, A., (2012). Determinants of higher education choices and student satisfaction: the case of Poland, *Higher Education* 63: 565-581.

Suhre, C.J.M., Jansen, E.P.W.A., & Harskamp, E.G. (2006). Impact of degree program satisfaction on the persistence of college students, *Higher Education* 54: 207-226.

Tinto, V. (1993). Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Zullig, K. J., Huebner, E. S., & Pun, S. M. (2009). Demographic correlates of domain-based life satisfaction reports of college students, *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 10(2), 229-238

Table 1: Number of surveys, conducted by field of study

Field of study	(1) Students enrolled	(2) Students surveyed	(3) Weighting
<i>Economics and Business</i>	1502 (19.28%)	1121 (50.66%)	0.38
<i>Health Sciences</i>	1751 (22.48%)	468 (21.16%)	1.06
<i>Arts and Philosophy</i>	1321 (16.96%)	287 (12.97%)	1.31
<i>Engineering Sciences</i>	3215 (41.28%)	336 (15.19%)	2.72

Notes: The sample consists of students from the University of Zaragoza from the Faculty of Economics and Business, Faculty of Medicine, Faculty of Philosophy, School of Engineering, Faculty of Science, and Faculty of Health Sciences. In parenthesis the percentage of students corresponding to each academic field, both for the population (students enrolled) and the surveyed students

Table 2: Sum Stats of variables

<i>Variables</i>	(1)		(2)		(3)		(4)		(5)	
	Total		Economics and Business		Health Sciences		Arts and Philosophy		Engineering Sciences	
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SE</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SE</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SE</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SE</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SE</u>
<i>Satisfaction</i>	3.620	(0.917)	3.606	(0.862)	3.688	(0.965)	3.659	(0.913)	3.564	(0.906)
<i>Age</i>	20.477	(3.307)	19.811	(2.493)	21.283	(4.199)	20.693	(4.016)	20.122	(2.339)
<i>First course</i>	0.310	(0.462)	0.508	(0.500)	0.297	(0.457)	0.314	(0.465)	0.237	(0.426)
<i>Second course</i>	0.255	(0.436)	0.224	(0.417)	0.000	(0.000)	0.218	(0.414)	0.449	(0.498)
<i>Third course</i>	0.294	(0.455)	0.268	(0.443)	0.165	(0.372)	0.464	(0.500)	0.312	(0.464)
<i>Fourth course</i>	0.142	(0.349)	0.000	(0.000)	0.538	(0.499)	0.004	(0.062)	0.003	(0.056)
<i>Gender</i>	0.535	(0.499)	0.494	(0.500)	0.775	(0.418)	0.716	(0.452)	0.315	(0.465)
<i>Living at home</i>	0.580	(0.494)	0.651	(0.477)	0.600	(0.490)	0.513	(0.501)	0.567	(0.496)
<i>Divorced Parents</i>	0.092	(0.290)	0.116	(0.321)	0.067	(0.250)	0.126	(0.333)	0.084	(0.278)
<i>Primary education/parents</i>	0.127	(0.333)	0.125	(0.331)	0.118	(0.323)	0.172	(0.378)	0.112	(0.316)
<i>Secondary education/parents</i>	0.439	(0.496)	0.477	(0.500)	0.355	(0.479)	0.452	(0.499)	0.474	(0.500)
<i>University education/parents</i>	0.434	(0.496)	0.398	(0.490)	0.527	(0.500)	0.375	(0.485)	0.414	(0.493)
<i>Dependents</i>	0.126	(0.332)	0.161	(0.367)	0.071	(0.258)	0.142	(0.349)	0.140	(0.348)
<i>Siblings</i>	0.807	(0.395)	0.810	(0.392)	0.813	(0.391)	0.759	(0.429)	0.822	(0.383)
<i>Surgery last year</i>	0.059	(0.236)	0.070	(0.255)	0.047	(0.212)	0.046	(0.210)	0.069	(0.253)
<i>Health (very poor)</i>	0.003	(0.053)	0.006	(0.076)	0.000	(0.000)	0.004	(0.062)	0.003	(0.056)
<i>Health (poor)</i>	0.019	(0.136)	0.016	(0.127)	0.011	(0.105)	0.019	(0.137)	0.025	(0.156)
<i>Health (fair)</i>	0.071	(0.258)	0.076	(0.264)	0.058	(0.234)	0.115	(0.320)	0.059	(0.236)
<i>Health (good)</i>	0.431	(0.495)	0.446	(0.497)	0.371	(0.483)	0.479	(0.501)	0.442	(0.497)
<i>Health (very good)</i>	0.476	(0.500)	0.456	(0.498)	0.560	(0.497)	0.383	(0.487)	0.470	(0.500)
<i>Activity no risk</i>	0.459	(0.498)	0.366	(0.482)	0.489	(0.500)	0.506	(0.501)	0.455	(0.499)
<i>Alcohol</i>	0.435	(0.496)	0.516	(0.500)	0.444	(0.497)	0.341	(0.475)	0.439	(0.497)
<i>Smoke</i>	0.098	(0.297)	0.130	(0.336)	0.049	(0.216)	0.115	(0.320)	0.109	(0.312)
<i>Substances</i>	0.039	(0.193)	0.047	(0.213)	0.011	(0.105)	0.054	(0.226)	0.047	(0.211)
<i>Extreme Sports</i>	0.057	(0.231)	0.054	(0.227)	0.038	(0.191)	0.038	(0.192)	0.078	(0.268)
<i>Other risk activity</i>	0.034	(0.182)	0.043	(0.202)	0.018	(0.133)	0.050	(0.218)	0.034	(0.182)
<i>Degree sufficient to get a job</i>	0.657	(0.475)	0.583	(0.493)	0.752	(0.432)	0.375	(0.485)	0.751	(0.433)
<i>Wage</i>	0.629	(0.483)	0.766	(0.424)	0.525	(0.500)	0.621	(0.486)	0.645	(0.479)
<i>Autonomy</i>	0.189	(0.391)	0.155	(0.362)	0.179	(0.383)	0.169	(0.375)	0.218	(0.414)
<i>Social Recognition</i>	0.205	(0.404)	0.190	(0.392)	0.281	(0.450)	0.199	(0.400)	0.165	(0.372)
<i>Flexibility</i>	0.211	(0.408)	0.239	(0.427)	0.112	(0.315)	0.222	(0.417)	0.259	(0.439)
<i>Safety</i>	0.169	(0.375)	0.176	(0.381)	0.192	(0.394)	0.207	(0.406)	0.134	(0.341)
<i>Work environment</i>	0.328	(0.470)	0.273	(0.446)	0.417	(0.494)	0.307	(0.462)	0.302	(0.460)
<i>Other motives</i>	0.096	(0.295)	0.047	(0.213)	0.116	(0.321)	0.123	(0.329)	0.090	(0.287)

Notes: Standard deviations in parenthesis. The sample consists of students from the University of Zaragoza from the Faculty of Economics and Business, Faculty of Medicine, Faculty of Philosophy, School of Engineering, Faculty of Science, and Faculty of Health Sciences. Sample weights are computed considering the percentage of students corresponding to each academic field, both for the population (students enrolled) and the surveyed students. The level of satisfaction is obtained from the question: “What is the current level of satisfaction with your university life?”, with Possible responses selected on a scale from 1 to 5, with the value “1” referring to very dissatisfied, and the value 5 referring to very satisfied.

Table 3. OLS regressions for the level of satisfaction

Satisfaction	(1)	(2)	(3)
Health Sciences	0.124** (0.046)	0.220** (0.071)	0.213** (0.078)
Art and philosophy	0.095* (0.046)	0.151** (0.044)	0.233*** (0.051)
Economics and Business	0.042 (0.046)	0.004 (0.024)	0.061* (0.024)
Age	-	-0.118*** (0.025)	-0.120** (0.030)
Age squared	-	0.151*** (0.025)	0.153*** (0.033)
Academic year	-	-0.104 (0.059)	-0.101 (0.052)
Female (Ref.: Male)	-	-0.001 (0.065)	0.007 (0.066)
Living at home	-	-0.178** (0.059)	-0.170** (0.057)
Divorced Parents	-	0.079 (0.073)	0.087 (0.069)
Secondary education (Ref.: primary)	-	0.017 (0.067)	0.017 (0.067)
University education (Ref.: primary)	-	0.081 (0.076)	0.070 (0.073)
Dependents	-	-0.113 (0.064)	-0.087 (0.051)
Siblings	-	-0.019 (0.047)	-0.028 (0.045)
Surgery last year	-	0.125 (0.115)	0.132 (0.107)
Poor health (ref.: very poor health)	-	0.178 (0.293)	0.154 (0.359)
Fair health (ref.: very poor health)	-	0.463*** (0.103)	0.425* (0.180)
Good health (ref.: very poor health)	-	0.649*** (0.107)	0.590** (0.156)
Very good health (ref.: very poor health)	-	0.979*** (0.079)	0.924*** (0.151)
No risky behavior	-	0.157 (0.125)	0.129 (0.105)
Alcohol	-	0.180* (0.078)	0.153* (0.070)
Smoke	-	0.170** (0.064)	0.161** (0.052)
Substances	-	0.129 (0.117)	0.155 (0.113)
Extreme sports	-	-0.147* (0.063)	-0.160* (0.065)
Other risky activity	-	-0.007 (0.077)	0.004 (0.084)
Degree sufficient to get a job	-	-	0.230*** (0.048)
Wage	-	-	-0.144 (0.075)
Autonomy	-	-	0.047 (0.168)
Social Recognition	-	-	0.056 (0.107)
Flexibility	-	-	0.110 (0.088)
Safety	-	-	-0.015 (0.106)
Work environment	-	-	-0.003 (0.075)
Constant	3.564*** (0.046)	4.678*** (0.389)	4.642*** (0.446)
N° Observations	2063	2063	2063
R-Squared	0.003	0.105	0.126

Notes: Robust standard errors in parenthesis. The sample consists of students from the University of Zaragoza from the Faculty of Economics and Business, Faculty of Medicine, Faculty of Philosophy, School of Engineering, Faculty of Science, and Faculty of Health Sciences *Significant at the 90% level **Significant at the 95% level ***Significant at the 99% level.