WORK-INTEGRATED LEARNING IN PRACTICE: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF UNDERGRADUATE WORK-PLACEMENT DESIGNS ACROSS DISCIPLINES.

T. O'Mahony[1], F.J. Mato Díaz[2], C. Murphy[1], I. Stengel[3], J. Cole[1]

[1]Munster Technological University (IRELAND)
[2]University of Oviedo (SPAIN)
[3]Karlsruhe University of Applied Sciences (GERMANY)

Abstract

Background: Work-Integrated Learning (WIL) is widely recognised as a powerful pedagogical approach that enhances graduate employability and bridges the gap between academic theory and professional practice. However, despite broad institutional and policy support, misconceptions about how WIL experiences are enacted in practice persist and much of the literature tends to focus on single disciplines or case studies.

Purpose: This study seeks to explore how undergraduate work-placement experiences are operationalised across a wide range of disciplines in two European universities. By examining programme structures, assessment practices, support mechanisms, and resource allocation, the research aims to identify patterns, highlight inequities, and surface examples of effective practice that can inform the broader WIL discourse.

Approach: A qualitative research design was employed, involving semi-structured interviews and focus groups with 28 academic staff responsible for coordinating placements across more than 30 undergraduate programmes, including business, engineering, medicine, nursing, education, social work, tourism, chemistry, agriculture, music and creative media disciplines. This rich, qualitative data was thematically analysed.

Findings: The findings reveal a highly decentralised WIL landscape, with substantial variation in ECTS weighting, placement duration, assessment balance, tutor engagement, and student remuneration. While all programmes appointed both academic and host-organisation supervisors - with the host-organisation supervisor directly contributing to the grading process - other design features differed markedly. Evidence of innovative practices, particularly in preparing and supporting students, was observed in select disciplines. However, significant disparities were also evident in how student effort was rewarded and how tutor involvement was resourced.

Conclusions & Implications: These findings underscore the need for more coherent and evidence-based WIL frameworks that prioritise student learning and balance disciplinary flexibility with institutional consistency. Addressing inequities in placement design, support, and assessment is critical to ensuring that all students can benefit equally from WIL. The study offers actionable insights for institutions seeking to enhance the quality and fairness of their placement programs.

Keywords: Workplace Learning; Internship; Placement; Work-Integrated Learning; Active and Experiential Learning; Curriculum Design.

1. INTRODUCTION

While Work-Integrated Learning (WIL) has a long history (Björck, 2021) it is becoming an increasingly dominant feature of contemporary higher education. This pedagogical approach is widely recognized for its capacity to enhance graduate employability, foster the development of personal attributes, and facilitate career development (Ferns et al., 2025; Jackson & Cook, 2023). However, despite a strong research base, ‘misconceptions about what WIL is and how WIL educative experiences are enacted in

practice' persist (Ferns et al., 2025, p. 1). The effective implementation of WIL is complex and multifaceted, involving a dynamic interplay between curriculum design, assessment practices, institutional support, and collaboration with external partners (Ferns et al., 2025; Lasen et al., 2018; Patrick et al., 2008). Despite its growing prominence, there is little evidence of a consistent approach to the design and delivery of WIL programs across disciplines and institutions, prompting important questions about quality, equity, and impact.

The specific focus of this study is on credit-bearing, work-placements or industry internships, defined as that part of an academic program where a student spends a period of their time away from the university, at work in an appropriate industrial or professional setting (Robinson et al., 2016). This paper contributes to that discourse by exploring how undergraduate work-placement experiences are operationalised across over 30 academic programmes in two European universities. Unlike much of the existing literature, which tends to focus on single disciplines or case studies (Dannenberg et al., 2025; Neill & Mulholland, 2003; Williamson et al., 2020), this research offers a broader cross-institutional and cross-disciplinary perspective. By doing so, it surfaces both best practices and systemic inequities, highlighting the need for more coherent and evidence-informed approaches to designing quality WIL experiences.

2. A WIL FRAMEWORK

Drawing on the literature, this paper identifies three broad themes that help conceptualise a quality WIL framework – a focus on learning, assessment practices and resourcing WIL.

2.1 A focus on learning

A critical theme in the WIL literature is that learning should be at the heart of WIL experiences (Duignan, 2003; Fleming et al., 2018) and that work-place learning is integrated with on-campus learning (Billet, 2011) Students should not just be 'placed' in a host organisation and everybody hope for the best, rather the environment should ensure that students recognise the value of this experience. For example, Smith et al. (2015) illustrates how their students largely saw the work-placement as somewhat instrumental – the primary purpose being to enhance employability and to earn a wage while Neill & Mulholland (2003) note that one-third of their participants reported that the WIL experience was not relevant to the curriculum. For learning and integration to happen, the WIL design needs to consider three phases before, during and after placement.

Pre-placement focuses on student preparation and aligning the expectations of students, academics and the host organisation (Patrick et al., 2008). This may be achieved through the development of individual negotiated learning outcomes or learning agreements (Ferns et al., 2025; Neill & Mulholland, 2003). Duignan (2003) and Neill & Mulholland (2003) highlight the need to support students to develop high quality CV's, preparing them for the interview process along with other professional (e.g. ethical responsibilities) and personal (e.g. wellbeing) skills. Tutors may organise workshops to discuss work-placement expectations and assessment requirements or may invite past students to share their experiences (Neill & Mulholland, 2003).

Active supervision by both the host-organisation and academic tutor is recommended to monitor the quality of the placement experience. This active supervision is also essential to support students to reflect on their experience and link this experiential learning to learning outcomes and help students recognise the range of skills and competencies that are being developed. Site visits by the academic tutor are common (Neill & Mulholland, 2003; Vairis et al., 2014) as they also serve to reinforce the relationship between the university and the host organisation (Fleming et al., 2018). If placement is not in the final year, the literature recommends deliberate post-placement practices to encourage further reflection and ongoing integration of work-placement experiences with the curriculum (Ferns et al., 2025; Jackson, 2015).

2.2 Assessment practices

In his theory of constructive alignment, Biggs (2014) advocates for the need for assessment to align with learning outcomes. This idea is picked up in the WIL literature which argues that assessment needs to support authentic practice and high quality intellectual engagement (Bosco & Ferns, 2014). The dominant use of traditional assessment methods is often perceived by students as little more than an exercise in ticking boxes (Elmholdt et al., 2016). Consequently, this literature advocates for more innovative assessments that encourage critical thinking and collaborative practice through self-evaluation and peer-feedback. This is especially important as these are skills that have been identified as deficient among graduates (Flores et al., 2012), yet are recognised as central to addressing future societal needs (HEA, 2011).

The WIL literature is equally critical of the dominant role that the academic supervisor plays in assessing learning. Consequently, there are numerous calls for supervisors from host-organisations to play a more prominent role in assessing learning in WIL settings (Bosco & Ferns, 2014; Lasen et al., 2018; Patrick et al., 2008), but that this assessment should be as 'finely graded' as traditional practices in academic settings (Jackson, 2015).

One of the fathers of experiential learning, John Dewey (1933, p. 78), stated that 'we do not learn from experience. We learn from reflecting on experience'. Much of the available evidence indicates that students spend much of their time documenting what they did rather than reflecting on that experience (Murphy & O'Mahony, 2023). This reflection is known to be critical to the development of the skills and competences expected from WIL and the transfer of learning from the WIL experience to pre and/or post academic experiences (Jackson, 2015). Consequently the WIL literature consistently calls for assessments that centre reflection (Bosco & Ferns, 2014; Lasen et al., 2018; Patrick et al., 2008) through strategies such as formative assessment, portfolios that spotlight critical incidents, self-evaluation and peer feedback and personal development plans (Ferns et al., 2025; Jackson, 2015).

2.3 Resourcing WIL

While universities and organisations are increasingly committed to WIL, there is substantial evidence that this commitment does not always extend to resourcing these practices. Published case studies reveal that in some countries students must be paid while on work-placement (Vairis et al., 2014) while in other countries this is optional (Neill & Mulholland, 2003). Extended, unpaid WIL experiences may then create systematic inequities for some students who cannot afford to travel to the organisation, give up paid part-time work or who may have significant caring responsibilities (Smith et al., 2015). This is systematic as those who can afford to engage with WIL are likely to further benefit from enhanced grades (Jones et al., 2017) and enhanced employment prospects (Jackson & Cook, 2023). From an equality perspective, Smith et al. (2015) suggests that universities need to genuinely consider whether they should be encouraging students to consider unpaid placements.

Resourcing concerns also extend to academic tutors as WIL is 'widely acknowledged as both difficult and costly to implement' (Jackson, 2015). Similarly, Patrick et al. (2008) highlights that the 'workload and time constraints for staff of universities' is an issue and recommends that university leaders 'consider implementing a systematic approach to resourcing the provision of a diverse WIL curriculum'. However, this recommendation seems to have been largely unheeded with Vairis et al. (2014) reporting that academic supervisors 'do not receive any remuneration for their supervision or their visits to the internship firms' and Muller et al. (2021) observing that it is 'widely recognised that WIL Programmes require more resourcing'.

The literature also identifies potential challenges in ensuring standardization and quality assurance in employer contributions to assessment (Jackson, 2015). For example, the systematic literature review by Lasen et al. (2018) specifically calls out that 'papers showed a tendency for industry partners to award students high marks'. Neill & Mulholland (2003) report that 98% of their cohort in the academic

year 2000-01 were awarded an A or B grade (outstanding/very good), however they attribute this performance with the quality of their placement students noting that employers were ‘effusive in their praise of the placement students’.

This literature review has synthesised existing research to identify a set of themes that ca be understood as a framework for designing quality WIL experiences. The existing literature is dominated by conceptual articles discussing WIL (Ferns et al., 2025; Fleming et al., 2018; Jackson, 2015) or empirical articles evaluating WIL experiences. There are relatively few articles that present detailed case-studies. Notable exceptions are the study by Neill & Mulholland (2003) who discusses optional year-long placements within the Faculty of Informatics at the University of Ulster and the studies by Vairis et al. (2014) and Muller et al. (2021) who discuss how placement was introduced at the Technological Educational Institute of Crete, Greece and the University of Waikato, New Zealand. In these cases, some detail is provided that enables the reader to evaluate the quality of the WIL experience relative to this framework. However, these are singular instances within a single Faculty and a single University. The contribution of this article then is to explore how WIL is being realised across multiple faculties within two different universities in two different European countries. This broader perspective provides greater insight into how WIL is operationalised in practice and provides greater potential to identify patterns, highlight inequities, and surface examples of effective practice that may be generalisable.

3. RESEARCH METHOD

The aim of this research is to explore how internships or work-placement opportunities are operationalised across different disciplines and different European universities. The intent is to gain rich insights into how various faculties and universities implement and support work-placement in practice aligning with the recommendation ‘to look at practices – that is, what actually happens’ (Ajjawi et al., 2022, p. 44). An in-depth exploration will surface commonalities, points of divergence and examples of best practice that could be replicated elsewhere. This objective can only be achieved via rich, in-depth data, consequently a qualitative research method was selected as the most appropriate for this study.

3.1 Participants

Participants were drawn from the University of Oviedo in Spain and Munster Technological University in Ireland as both of these universities are partners in the INGENIUM university alliance[1]. A non-probability sample, based on purposive sampling, was selected. Purposive sampling was used to specifically identify individuals who ‘have in-depth knowledge about [the] particular issues’ (Cohen et al., 2017, p. 115). The authors contacted academic staff across a range of disciplines who were responsible for coordinating or implementing work-placement opportunities at these universities. At the University of Oviedo eight participants volunteered to participate while at Munster Technological University 20 volunteered. At the University of Oviedo, 50% of participants were male while at Munster Technological University, 25% were male. Combined, these 28 participants were responsible for work-placement opportunities across more than 30 different programmes spanning business, engineering, medicine, nursing, education, social work, tourism, chemistry, agriculture, music and creative media disciplines.

3.2 Data Collection

Semi-structured interviews and focus-groups were used to collect data. The semi-structured nature of the data collection enabled a consistent set of data to be collected while at the same time prioritising the participant’s voice (Savin-Baden & Major, 2023). Data collection was structured/guided by the following questions: could you begin by discussing placement in your area of responsibility with reference to details like credits, year, duration, number of students, number of host organisations, etc?;

[1] https://ingenium-university.eu/

How do students source placement opportunities?; Are students supported pre-placement and during placement? Could you explain how placement is assessed?; What challenges do you experience?; What opportunities do you see? What one positive aspect would you highlight? This qualitative data was recorded, automatically transcribed and then de-identified to protect participants' identities. Ethical approval was received to conduct this research from MTU's Human Research Ethics Committee (approval no. MTU22067A)

3.3 Data Analysis

An inductive, qualitative, thematic analysis process, guided by Braun & Clarke (2006) and Savin-Baden & Major (2023) was used to make sense of the data. This involved immersion in the data by reading and re-reading transcripts to 'understand and be able to sense the whole, before beginning [the] process' of breaking the data down for analysis (Savin-Baden & Major, 2023, p. 446). This led to an initial analytical framework centred around module design and logistics (modality and credits, timing an duration, scale and scope); roles and processes (securing placement, tutor roles, academic governance); assessment (methods, grading, feedback); challenges and opportunities (operational hurdles, renumeration, recognition, competition, labour market, quality assurance) and perceived strengths (student satisfaction, relationships, best practice). The data was then descriptively coded based on this framework and subsequently refined based on the absence or prevalence of aspects of the analytical framework in the data. As advocated by Savin-Baden & Major (2023), a subsequent analysis cycle focused on synthesis, interpretation and consolidating meaning resulted in the framework presented in the descriptive tables labelled Table 1 & Table 2.

4. FINDINGS & DISCUSSION

Tables 1 and 2 summarise selected findings from the qualitative analysis of interview and focus group transcripts. Table 1 presents data related to programmes that contained a single work-placement opportunity while Table 2 presents data from programmes that offered multiple work-placement opportunities – typically situated in different years of the programme. Due to space constraints, Tables 1 and 2 present a selection of disciplines rather than the full dataset.

	University of Oviedo			**Munster Technological University**		
	Economics	Marketing and Tourism	Engineering	Business	Engineering	Theatre & Drama
Placement is Mandatory	Varies	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
Year & semester of placement	Year 4	Yr4; flexible	Year 4	Year 3	Year 3	Year 3
Timing	flexible	flexible	flexible	Sem 2	Sem 2	Summer
Total ECTS	12	12	6	30	15	5
Total Duration	300 hrs	8 days	120 hrs	540 hrs	252 hrs	216 hrs
Extra-curricular placement for credit	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No
Placement undertaken full-time	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Assessment balance (Academic/ Organisation)	20/80	50/50	20/80	50/50	70/30	90/10

Assessment method(s) - Host Organisation	Performance Evaluation	Performance Evaluation	Performance Evaluation	Performance Evaluation	Performance Evaluation	Feedback/ Performance Evaluation
Assessment method(s) – University	Report & Performance Evaluation	Report & Performance Evaluation	Report & Performance Evaluation	Reflection; PDP; Pre-placement	Log; Report; Presentation	Reflection; Report
Quantity of placements	130	120	500	85	25	18
No of organisations	70	60	400	50	20	20
Placement selection process	First Come	Grades & Market driven	Market driven	Market driven	Market driven	Market driven
Renumerated	15% paid	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Site visit	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes
Credit to time duration[2]	1 ECTS = 25hrs	1 ECTS = 5hrs	1 ECTS = 20hrs	1 ECTS = 18 hrs	1 ECTS = 16.8 hrs	1 ECTS = 43.2hrs
ECTS awarded by host supervisor	9.6 ECTS	6 ECTS	4.8 ECTS	15 ECTS	4.5 ECTS	0.5 ECTS

Table 1: Summary Placement Design and Organisation (single placements)

	University of Oviedo			**Munster Technological University**		
	Social Work	Medicine	Education	Social Care	Nursing	Hospitality
Placement is Mandatory	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Number of placements	2	4	3	2	5	2
Year placement happens	Years 3 & 4	Years 3, 4, 5 & 6	Year 2, 3 & 4	Year 2 & 3	Year 1 to 4	Year 1 and Year 3
Timing	Sem 2	fixed	Sem2	Sem 1 then Sem 2	Sem 1 and Sem 2	Sem 1 then Sem 2
Total ECTS	18	50+	36	60	60	35
Total Duration	14 weeks	1 semester	3 semesters	24 weeks	2,835 hrs	32 weeks
Extra-curricular placement for credit	No	No	No	No	No	No
Placement undertaken full-time	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yr 1 No; Yr 3 Yes
Assessment balance (Academic/ Organisation)	30/70	0/100	60/40	100/0	0/100	100/0
Assessment instrument(s) - Host Organisation	Performance Evaluation	OSCE	Performance Evaluation	Performance Evaluation	Competency Assessment by Preceptor	-

[2] Calculated on the assumption of a 36 hour working week.

Assessment instrument(s) – University	Project & Report	-	Report & Observation	PE, reflection, intervention		Logs
Quantity of placements	140	600	1,600	110	348	20
No of organisations	60	3	300	72	50	30
Placement selection process	Grades	Grades	Grades	Needs-matching	Random allocation	Matching plus Market
Renumeration	No	No	No	No	No	Yes
Site visit	Yes		Yes	Yes		Yes
Credit to time duration	1 ECTS = 24hrs	1 ECTS = 10hrs	1 ECTS = 42hrs	1 ECTS = 14hrs	1 ECTS = 47.25hrs	1 ECTS = 32.9hrs
ECTS awarded by host organisation	8.4 ECTS	50 ECTS	7.2 ECTS	0 ECTS	60 ECTS	0 ECTS

Table 2: Summary Placement Design and Organisation (multiple placements)

Much of the existing literature has focused internships or placements within individual disciplines or institutions studies (Dannenberg et al., 2025; Neill & Mulholland, 2003; Williamson et al., 2020). In contrast, this research has explored the operationalisation of undergraduate placements across a broad range of disciplines and within two European universities. This broader perspective encompassed over 30 different programmes spanning a range of disciplines that included business, engineering, medicine, nursing, education, social work, tourism, chemistry, agriculture, music and creative media. This broader perspective reveals a highly diverse and decentralised work-placement landscape – even within the same university. The only elements that were common to all work-placement designs included the appointment of both an academic and a host-organisation supervisor. Every other design consideration - including the ECTS weighting, duration of placement, whether placement was mandatory or elective, where placement happens in a programme, whether it was undertaken in a full-time or part-time capacity, the support prior to and during placement, whether students were paid or not, how placement was assessed and the role that both the academic and host-organisation played in assessment - varied. While this decentralised work-placement landscape provides the flexibility to tailor the design or work-placement to the needs to individual disciplines and programmes, it also raises questions around the equity of these design decisions, the extent to which these are being informed by the WIL literature, and whether WIL practice would benefit from stronger institutional or indeed international models.

The literature argues that work-placement should not just be about placing students, rather the focus should be on what students learn from and through this experience. While all work-placement designs included academic tutors whose role was to organise placement and help support students, the data suggested that in many cases this support was not very proactive and it was largely the student's responsibility to contact the academic supervisor – which may be intimidating or challenging in the absence of an established relationship and given the unfamiliar work-placement context. In contrast to this practice, in the Social Care programme at the University of Oviedo, academic tutors organise six collaborative workshops with students, two before placement and four during placement. These workshops were developed to address the issue that the 'information that that the university provides is maybe too general' and these meetings offer the scope for 'debate, reflection, collective work' around specific challenges that students may be experiencing in their particular placements. Similarly, the Faculty of Education invites 'professional teachers into the faculty to explain the work-placement experience in their schools' to help prepare students prior to placement. The Faculty of Business at Munster Technological University, formally support students to prepare CVs and prepare for interviews, as host organisations are competitively selecting students based on CVs and an interview process. An engineering program at Munster Technological University requires students to make a presentation on their placement experience and this presentation is delivered 'in front of the third years that could be

going out [on work-placement] that following summer' to help prepare these students for the variety of placements they may experience. This variation in proactive support is also evident from Table 1 and 2 and the percentage of academic tutors that organise site visits to students while they are on placement.

As Tables 1 and 2 evidence, in almost all programmes the host-organisation supervisor was directly responsible for some portion of the assessment. This contrast with the existing literature where this direct involvement is advocated for but less evident (Bosco & Ferns, 2014; Lasen et al., 2018; Patrick et al., 2008). However, the input of the host-organisation supervisor varied significantly from being responsible for 60 ECTS in the Nursing programme at Munster Technological University to 0.5 ECTS in Musical Theatre also at Munster Technological University. Both Nursing and Medicine adopt rigorous assessment approaches defined by national documents or the standardised Objective Structured Clinical Examination (OSCE) practical assessment. In all other programmes the assessment process is much more subjective and host-organisation supervisors award marks based on holistic judgements guided by an evaluation form which is as 'finely graded' as academic assessment practices in other module (Jackson, 2015). Across both universities there was a recognition that these supervisors at the host-organisation award higher marks than their academic counterparts. A focus-group participant from Munster Technological University, commented how the host-organisation grade 'might inflate the grade of the student versus other marks in some cases' while a participant from the University of Oviedo observed that the grade from the host-organisation supervisor is 'always between 8 and 10, mostly closer to ten. The academic tutor is always lower'. However, academic staff at Munster Technological University were much more concerned about the impact of this potentially inflated grade than their counterparts at the University of Oviedo. This concern led many disciplines at Munster Technological University to locate placement in year 3 rather than year 4, to prevent potentially inflated grades from impacting final year performance. In other disciplines, the academic team has 'reduced the percentage from the employer over the last few years' from 30% to 10% of a 10 ECTS placement. One programme from the Faculty of Business at Munster Technological University proactively work with host-organisations on the grading process. They ask host-organisations to formatively grade students mid-way through the placement process and then discuss this grade with students (as a form of feedback) and the academic tutor. This provides an opportunity for the student to get 'an idea of where they sit in terms of an academic grade', to 'explain academic grading' and ensure that the host-organisation supervisor 'is fully aware of how the grading should be completed'.

As highlighted in the literature review, the WIL literature consistently calls for assessments that centre reflection (Bosco & Ferns, 2014; Lasen et al., 2018; Patrick et al., 2008) yet the data, as documented in Table 1 and 2, suggests that fostering deep reflection among students is an assessment challenge. Across interviews and focus groups it was much more common to hear participants talk about students documenting tasks rather than reflecting on experience. For example, participants from engineering and tourism programmes talked about how the assessment task 'gives us a glimpse as to what they're doing', how 'students report back what they do every two weeks' and how the assessment serves 'to make sure that they're doing things that are of value and we can check-in on that on a weekly basis'. In contrast, programmes from the Faculty of Business at Munster Technological University talked about trying to shift that focus and nudge students into 'actually thinking about what they did'. Some programmes within the Faculty of Business used feedback from the academic tutor at the mid-point mark to help shift submissions from 'painting a good picture' to focus more on 'your thoughts and your feelings' so that the reflection is 'more about the learning experience'. Similarly, Nyanjom et al. (2020) identify how early feedback can powerfully shift the focus to more reflective and critical writing.

A consistent theme across the University of Oviedo data was the limited recognition by the University of the time invested by academic tutors in managing work-placement. At the University of Oviedo, tutoring a student on work-placement results in a one-hour reduction in a tutors' teaching workload – up to a maximum reduction of 10 hours. In contrast, at Munster Technological University, academic tutors generally receive a one-hour reduction per week for every three students that they tutor. Directly comparing the Economics program at the University of Oviedo with the Engineering programme at

Munster Technological University (which have similar hours and ECTS – see Table 1), Economics academic tutors receive 0.003 hours per student hour of placement while Engineering academic tutors receive almost three times that allowance (0.0085 hours per student hour of placement). This inequity in recognition, may also explain some of the WIL design decisions which may necessarily be influenced by resourcing constraints rather than learning considerations. Inequity is also evident from the student perspective with Engineering students typically benefitting from paid work-placements while those in disciplines such as social care and education do not. The decentralised work-placement landscape also results in inequities in student effort and grades. Students studying Marketing or Tourism at the University of Oviedo are expected to invest 5 hrs to gain 1 ECTS while those studying Musical Theatre at Munster Technological University need to invest 46.8hrs to gain the same 1 ECTS. With the exception of programmes like Nursing and Medicine where host-organisation tutors are trained and the assessment process is more rigorous, there was a consensus that host-organisation tutors award high marks. As illustrated in Table 1, this results in inequity across programmes with the host-organisation tutor being responsible for 15 ECTS-worth of marks in some programmes and 0.5 ECTS-worth of marks in others.

5. CONCLUSION

This study has highlighted the complex and uneven landscape of undergraduate work-placement or internship practices across two European universities, revealing considerable variation in design, assessment, and support practices. While such flexibility allows programmes to tailor placements to disciplinary needs, it also results in systemic inequities for both students and staff. The findings suggest that a more coherent institutional or cross-institutional approach—grounded in the WIL literature and informed by best practice—could help ensure more equitable, consistent, and pedagogically enhanced experiences. Strengthening institutional oversight, fostering reflective assessment, and appropriately resourcing academic involvement are suggestions for enhancing the quality and impact of WIL for all stakeholders.

6. REFERENCES

Biggs, J. (2014). Constructive alignment in university teaching. *HERDSA Review of Higher Education*, *1*, 5–22.

Billet, S. (2011). *Curriculum and pedagogic bases for effectively integrating practice based experiences*. Australian Learning and Teaching Council.

Björck, V. (2021). Taking issue with how the Work-integrated Learning discourse ascribes a dualistic meaning to graduate employability. *Higher Education*, *82*(2), 307–322. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-020-00650-y

Bosco, A. M., & Ferns, S. (2014). Embedding of authentic assessment in work-integrated learning curriculum. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Cooperative Education*, *15*(4), 281–290.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2017). *Research Methods in Education* (8th ed.). Routledge. https://www.routledge.com/Research-Methods-in-Education/Cohen-Manion-Morrison/p/book/9781138209886

Dannenberg, C. J., Sato, M., Astall, C., Murray, C., Wu, J., & Farley, H. (2025). Navigating trauma: Proximity, wellbeing and work- integrated learning in higher education. *International Journal of Work-Integrated Learning*, *26*(1), 113–128.

Dewey, J. (1933). *How We Think: A Restatement of the Relation of Reflective Thinking to the Educative Process*. D.C. Heath & Co Publishers.

Duignan, J. (2003). Placement and adding value to the academic performance of undergraduates: Reconfiguring the architecture - an empirical investigation[1,] *Journal of Vocational Education & Training*, *55*(3), 335–350. https://doi.org/10.1080/13636820300200233

Elmholdt, K., Elmholdt, C., Tanggaard, L., & Mersh, L. H. (2016). Learning good leadership: A matter of assessment? *Human Resource Development International*, *19*(5), 406–428. https://doi.org/10.1080/13678868.2016.1206362

Ferns, S. J., Zegwaard, K. E., Pretti, T. J., & Rowe, A. D. (2025). Defining and designing work-integrated learning curriculum. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *44*(2), 371–385. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2024.2399072

Fleming, J., Mclachlan, K., & Pretti, T. J. (2018). Successful work-integrated learning relationships: A framework for sustainability. *International Journal of Work-Integrated Learning*, *19*(4), 321–335.

Flores, K. L., Matkin, G. S., Burbach, M. E., Quinn, C. E., & Harding, H. (2012). Deficient Critical Thinking Skills among College Graduates: Implications for leadership. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, *44*(2), 212–230. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-5812.2010.00672.x

HEA. (2011). *National strategy for Higher-Education 2030*. Department of Education and Skills. hea.ie/assets/uploads/2017/06/National-Strategy-for-Higher-Education-2030.pdf

Jackson, D. (2015). Employability skill development in work-integrated learning: Barriers and best practice. *Studies in Higher Education*, *40*(2), 350–367. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2013.842221

Jackson, D., & Cook, E. J. (2023). Benefits of work-integrated learning for students. In *The Routledge International Handbook of Work-Integrated Learning* (3rd ed.). Routledge. https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9781003156420-8/benefits-work-integrated-learning-students-denise-jackson-elizabeth-cook

Jones, C. M., Green, J. P., & Higson, H. E. (2017). Do work placements improve final year academic performance or do high-calibre students choose to do work placements? *Studies in Higher Education*, *42*(6), 976–992. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2015.1073249

Lasen, M., Evans, S., Tsey, K., Campbell, C., & Kinchin, I. (2018). Quality of WIL assessment design in higher education: A systematic literature review. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *37*(4), 788–804. https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2018.1450359

Muller, S., Zegwaard, K. E., & Ferrier-Kerr, H. (2021). *Developing institutional-wide practice of work-integrated learning*. 41–46.

Murphy, C., & O'Mahony, T. (2023). Submitting the 'right' reflection. *Reflective Practice*, *24*(3), 347–360. https://doi.org/10.1080/14623943.2023.2198204

Neill, N. T., & Mulholland, G. E. (2003). Student placement – structure, skills and e-support. *Education + Training*, *45*(2), 89–99. https://doi.org/10.1108/00400910310464062

Nyanjom, J., Goh, E., & Yang, E. C. L. (2020). Integrating authentic assessment tasks in work integrated learning hospitality internships. *Journal of Vocational Education & Training*, *0*(0), 1–23. https://doi.org/10.1080/13636820.2020.1841821

Patrick, C., Peach, D., Pocknee, C., Webb, F., Fletcher, M., & Pretto, G. (2008). *The WIL (Work Integrated Learning) report: A national scoping study [Final Report]*. Queensland University of Technology. http://www.altc.edu.au

Robinson, R. N. S., Ruhanen, L., & Breakey, N. M. (2016). Tourism and hospitality internships: Influences on student career aspirations. *Current Issues in Tourism*, *19*(6), 513–527. https://doi.org/10.1080/13683500.2015.1020772

Savin-Baden, M., & Major, C. H. (2023). *Qualitative Research: The Essential Guide to Theory and Practice*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003377986

Smith, S., Smith, C., & Caddell, M. (2015). Can pay, should pay? Exploring employer and student perceptions of paid and unpaid placements. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, *16*(2), 149–164. https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787415574049

Vairis, A., Loulakakis, K., & Petousis, M. (2014). The role of internships in a higher education institute. *Engineering Leaders World Congress on Engineering Education 2013*. Engineering Leaders World Congress on Engineering Education 2013, Qatar National Convention Center, Doha, Qatar,. https://doi.org/10.5339/qproc.2014.wcee2013.27

Williamson, J., Wardle, K., & Hasmi, H. (2020). Developing WIL curriculum which enhances hospitality students capabilities. *Higher Education, Skills and Work-Based Learning*, *11*(3), 635–648. https://doi.org/10.1108/HESWBL-04-2020-0055