

Did They Get What They Came For?

WORK-INTEGRATED LEARNING AND POSTGRADUATE EMPLOYMENT OUTCOMES

Cassandra R. Kepple, Samantha Nix, Andrew Brady and Jackson de Andrade Silva

About the Authors

Cassandra R. Kepple, PhD, Samantha Nix, PhD, Andrew Brady, and Jackson de Andrade Silva are a team who have worked together in the Office of Institutional Research at Florida State University. The authors bring together decades of higher education practice and research experience, with emphases in student success and data analytics.

Abstract

In this study, we examined the relationship between work-integrated learning (WIL) participation and securing job offers. We used a sample of 18,966 graduation survey responses collected over 7 years at a large public research institution in Florida. Specifically, we investigated how this relationship may have changed post-COVID. In the 2016–2017, 2017–2018, and 2019–2020 surveys, we observed a negative relationship between WIL participation and securing a job offer; this relationship became positive in 2020–2021, however, and remained positive through the latest cohort, 2022–2023. We examined possible factors of this change, such as how students from different backgrounds engaged in WIL and how institutional policy affected them. These findings will be used by institutional research professionals to make suggestions for decisions regarding various programs at the institution as well as policies that are meant to support the post-graduation success of students. Beyond the emphasis of informing policy and practice on this specific campus, our intention for this study is to encourage further inquiry into the relationship between WIL experiences and postgraduate employment outcomes for students in other institutional contexts.

INTRODUCTION

Students enter college with the expectation that their experiences and attainment of a degree will help them secure employment (Eagan et al., 2016; Pryor et al., 2007). As part of the college experience, many institutions provide opportunities outside the classroom that are meant to help students develop competencies to reach their career goals. Among other names found in existing literature, these activities are referred to as high-impact practices (Kuh, 2008) and work-integrated learning (WIL) (Cooper et al., 2010). While the terms for these activities vary, they consistently include experiential learning opportunities such as internships, cooperative education programs (co-ops), and practica (Cooper et al., 2010; Kuh, 2008). Each of these activities is meant to connect the knowledge and skills gained through coursework to real-world work settings. There is an overwhelming amount of evidence across the higher education literature pointing to a positive relationship between participating in activities such as WIL and other career preparation, and securing a job after graduation (e.g., Bist et al., 2020; Coker et al., 2017; Huber, 2010; Jackson & Bridgstock, 2021; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Wyonch, 2020). Despite the wide array of positive findings from participation in these activities, some evidence shows this positive relationship can often be nonexistent, or the relationship can even be negative, for students with minoritized identities (Cocks & Thoresen, 2013; Moylan & Wood, 2016; Patton et al., 2015). Furthermore, institutions should continuously monitor the relationship between program engagement and student success outcomes to ensure quality and data-informed decision making (Fingerson & Troutman, 2019; Janice & Voight, 2016; Kinzie & Kuh, 2016; Mullin, 2012). In this study, our team engaged with this research to examine the relationship between WIL participation among seven

graduating cohorts at a large research institution in Florida, spanning academic years before, during, and after the COVID pandemic.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to longitudinally examine the relationship between participating in various work-related experiential learning opportunities and securing a job offer by the time of baccalaureate graduation. For brevity in this study, we use the term “work-integrated learning” (WIL) as an umbrella term for multiple experiential learning opportunities; see the Variables subsection in the Methods section for a list of these activities. Beyond examining the overall relationship between WIL participation and securing a job offer, we also looked explicitly into this relationship for minoritized students because of former research that suggests differential participation and outcomes for these populations (e.g., Finley & McNair, 2013; Kinzie & Gonyea, 2018; National Center for Educational Statistics [NCES], 2019; Wyonch, 2020). We examined the change in securing a job offer over time for students who are historically less represented in baccalaureate post-graduation employment outcomes: students from an underrepresented racial minority (URM), first-generation students, and Pell Grant-eligible students. Our data included graduating cohorts from 2016–2017 through 2022–2023. Because this range covers cohorts who graduated before, during, and after the heart of the COVID-19 pandemic—when there were significant shifts in educational practice and the labor market—we have used these three time-period categories throughout this paper. We recognize the challenges and innovations in offering WIL experiences during and after COVID, and we incorporate these concepts into our literature review and discussion of the results.

LITERATURE REVIEW

In the continuously evolving landscape of higher education, the integration of academic theory with practical, real-world application emerges as a guiding principle directing students toward success. WIL (Cooper et al., 2010), high-impact practices (Kuh, 2008), and other forms of experiential learning serve as dynamic educational strategies that adeptly interweave classroom-acquired knowledge with experiential work engagements. Due to the similarities, encompassing multiple activities such as internships and practica (Cooper et al., 2010), WIL and other experiential learning concepts allow students a comprehensive educational journey that extends beyond graduation. While there are many different terms referring to these activities, we first review literature related to WIL experiences and outcomes, and then, moving forward, we use “work-integrated learning” (WIL) to refer to all such activities throughout our paper.

Because students enroll in college expecting their experiences to help them attain their career goals, we examined extant literature on the connection between participating in WIL activities and postgraduate outcomes. Additionally, we explored existing evidence related to WIL participation and outcomes for traditionally underserved students.

Work-Integrated Learning in Higher Education

Employers and students alike recognize the importance for graduates to gain skills in college that will meet the needs of industry (DiBenedetto & Willis, 2020; Lisá et al., 2019; National Association of Colleges and Employers [NACE], 2022). Nevertheless, evidence from multiple studies shows that students often graduate without these necessary skills (Abbasi

et al., 2018; Bist et al., 2020; Koc & Konz, 2009; Pittenger et al., 2006). Scholars have examined WIL and related experiences as an educational method that combines coursework with hands-on job experiences (Patrick et al., 2009; Prinsley & Baranyai, 2015); these experiences afford students the opportunity to use theoretical principles in practical situations (Billett, 2009; Ferns & Zegwaard, 2014; Orrell, 2004), and to develop those often-cited missing employability skills.

In this study, we use a conceptual framework of WIL. WIL is a comprehensive term for experiential learning activities that is used widely in an international context, with many higher education systems adopting the form of education broadly (Jackson & Wilton, 2016; Universities Australia et al., 2015; Wyonch, 2020). According to Cooper et al. (2010), WIL is “the process of bringing together formal learning and productive work” (p. xiii). WIL activities include, but are not limited to, practica, internships, fieldwork, co-ops, field education, service learning, and international service learning (Cooper et al., 2010). This explicit list of activities considered to be WIL aligns with other research on high-impact practices (Kuh, 2008) and experiential learning. Connectivity to the curriculum, the promotion of learning, and experiential elements for an experience are necessary to qualify as WIL (Cooper et al., 2010). Prominent WIL scholars emphasize that WIL activities, although they are inherently within the umbrella of experiential learning, nevertheless are ultimately a subset of experiential learning that specifically connects to industry and the workplace (Jackson & Dean, 2022; Patrick et al., 2009). While the term “WIL” has not yet been adopted by many researchers or practitioners in the United States, we determined that it is a term that fits well with the requirements of our study. We specifically examine student participation in

experiential learning opportunities that directly relate to careers, and do not examine either a single type of activity such as internships or experiential learning in general.

Throughout three models of categorization, Cooper et al. (2010) conceptualize the meaning of WIL as a set of practices enabling students to actively participate throughout their college tenure, establishing direct connections between their academic learning and real-world workforce experiences. In addition to using the WIL framework, an abundance of research exists examining experiences akin to internships, co-ops, practica, and the like; that research often uses these terms interchangeably (e.g., Briel & Getzel, 2001; Main et al., 2020; Ryan et al., 1996; Wan et al., 2013). In this paper, we adopt the practice of using these terms interchangeably, mostly referencing them as “WIL” to align with the existing research on the multitude of experiential learning opportunities that can help enhance a student’s employability post-graduation.

Work-Integrated Learning Participation and Outcomes

Many studies provide evidence of a positive relationship between WIL and student success (e.g., Huber, 2010; Kuh, 2008; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005; Waiwaiole et al., 2016), including postgraduate employment skills and outcomes (e.g., Bist et al., 2020; Jackson & Bridgstock, 2021; Simons et al., 2012; Wan et al., 2013). Smith et al. (2015) reported findings that were directly related to WIL participants being more work-ready, while Jackson (2017) found that participation in WIL helped students build a pre-professional identity.

The positive relationship between WIL participation and work-related outcomes is well documented

across higher education literature, yet this positive relationship is not always consistent across populations. First, access to WIL activities remains inequitable. Data from the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) and the NCES’s Baccalaureate and Beyond Longitudinal Study continue to show that students with characteristics such as being first-generation, having Pell eligibility, or belonging to a minoritized racial/ethnic group participate in internships at consistently lower rates compared to their majoritized peers (Kinzie & Gonyea, 2018; NCES, 2019). Individuals from marginalized groups may encounter discrimination and hurdles that hinder their engagement in these activities (Cocks & Thoresen, 2013; Moylan & Wood, 2016; Patton et al., 2015). Yet McCormick et al.’s (2017) study revealed that students belonging to marginalized groups who did participate in WIL activities expressed higher satisfaction levels with their college experience compared to their racial/ethnic counterparts who did not participate in WIL activities. Additionally, both Finley and McNair (2013) and Wyonch (2020) show that, when minoritized students participate in these activities, they often perceive their learning gains to be higher than the gains of their majoritized peers, and they secure wages similar to their majoritized peers as compared to those who did not participate.

The evidence of equity effects found by Finley and McNair (2013) and Wyonch (2020) provide an argument for the possible benefits of these activities, especially for traditionally underserved students. While it is important to recognize these possible benefits, it is also important to recognize the possibility of negative experiences directly related to their identities, as presented by evidence from Patton et al. (2015). Following suit, Kepple (2023) examined an overall relationship between WIL participation and employment outcomes, as well as explicit interactions among minoritized identities on this relationship.

Kepple (2023) found an overall negative relationship between WIL participation and securing a job offer, as well as a significant negative interaction for students who identified as URMs. In response to their findings, Kepple (2023) suggested that this unprecedented overall negative relationship might be due to improper implementation of WIL while the significant negative interaction for URMs may connect to findings of previous studies related to discrimination of minoritized populations during WIL activities and in the workplace (Cocks & Thoresen, 2013; Moylan & Wood, 2016; Patton et al., 2015).

Advocacy for WIL is grounded in the potential to provide students with valuable professional experience, to enhance their networks, and to signal their readiness for the workforce. Because of this potential, WIL activities have garnered significant attention across disciplines (Bolli et al., 2021). Positive impacts, ranging from increased wages to enhanced career self-confidence, underscore the multifaceted benefits of WIL (Bolli et al., 2021; Dailey, 2016; Ocampo et al., 2020). However, access to WIL experiences remains a hurdle for low-income, first-generation, and working students, limiting their opportunities for experiential learning and professional development (Finley & McNair, 2013; Kinzie & Gonyea, 2018; Main et al., 2020; McCormick et al., 2007). The diversity in WIL programs, varying in duration, location, and supervision, complicates research efforts to identify essential features for a high-quality experience.

In addition, studies by Bosco and Ferns (2014), Ferns (2012), and Smith (2012) provide evidence supporting the integration of WIL programs into university curricula. Recommendations for the effective implementation of WIL programs are also available, as highlighted by Freudenberg et al. (2011), Jackson (2015), O'Shea (2014), and Smith

(2012). These recommendations include, but are not limited to, coordinating WIL activities with classroom instruction, developing precise placement design guidelines, encouraging cooperation between academics and practitioners, forging flexible and dynamic partnerships with outside organizations, and encouraging employer engagement.

While conventional WIL programs often involve physical placements, there is a growing trend toward incorporating simulated, virtual, authentic, and industry-based activities, as noted by Patrick et al. (2009) and Prinsley and Baranyai (2015). These supplementary activities present opportunities for creativity and exploration within the realm of higher education research and application.

Influence of COVID-19 on the Employment and Work-Integrated Learning Landscape

Prior to the COVID pandemic, the United States had a high employment rate. By the end of 2019, unemployment had dropped to a record low of 3.5% (Bureau of Labor Statistics [BLS], 2022a). Industries, including professional services, health care, and retail trade, were growing, and the labor market demonstrated steady employment growth. The pandemic, which started in March 2020 in the United States, resulted in historically high job losses. In April 2020 the national unemployment rate reached its highest level since the Great Depression, 14.7% (BLS, 2022a; Long & Van Dam, 2020). Then, in 2021 and 2022, the job market experienced a robust rebound. Employment in several sectors, including retail and professional services, had returned to or surpassed pre-pandemic levels by the end of 2021. By December 2021 the national unemployment rate had gradually decreased to 3.9% (BLS, 2022a). Bringing this issue to our regional context, from

2019 to 2020 Florida's unemployment rate increased from 3.3% to 7.7% (BLS, 2021). This shift in the labor market as a result of the pandemic led to changes by both employers and higher education institutions, especially related to the modality of services.

Technological advances and the disruptions caused by the COVID-19 pandemic in higher education have prompted institutions to explore virtual WIL experiences and other alternative approaches for collaboration with business partners (Klein & Scott, 2021; Patrick et al., 2009; Prinsley & Baranyai, 2015). While experiential learning programs have been impacted, this situation has also catalyzed a paradigm shift in learning, and prompted a reevaluation of conventional WIL methods. This paradigm shift presents an opportunity for in-depth exploration and understanding of the ramifications of various WIL models (Hora et al., 2021; Patrick et al., 2009; Prinsley & Baranyai, 2015). Notably, Hora et al. (2021) explored the landscape of online WIL experiences from 2020 to 2021. A few themes across their data were that (1) WIL participation was lower in 2020 to 2021 as compared to pre-COVID, (2) access and success barriers remained for traditionally underserved students, and (3) explicit attention was needed toward the infrastructure and implementation of WIL activities in this new modality. Youngblood (2020) qualitatively investigated the challenges with WIL becoming remote, and found that communication and understanding between WIL supervisors and students should be emphasized to make a successful online WIL experience.

While only a few studies exist on online WIL experiences during COVID-19, it is important to note that many remote opportunities persisted after in-person operations resumed. Prior to the pandemic, only 5% of internships were listed as remote. In 2021, 20% of internships were listed as remote

(Konkel, 2021). Looking at the job market, only 2.5% of job postings were listed as remote or hybrid before the pandemic, with this percentage growing throughout the pandemic and peaking at around 10.4% in 2022 (Hiring Lab, 2025). Through 2023, the job postings for remote positions stayed higher than pre-pandemic, making up approximately 8% of all listings, while hybrid positions made up more than 31% of all listings (Culbertson, 2023). We are still learning about the nuances of shifting to remote WIL options and the effects of that shift on labor market outcomes, but it appears that remote and hybrid options are here to stay.

From this perspective, it is possible to say that WIL, especially internships, could stand as a cornerstone in enhancing student employability and success. Despite the positive change, challenges persist, and there are still disparities based on students' identities. Addressing these challenges, promoting inclusivity, and exploring innovative modalities are imperative as WIL practices continue to evolve. Ongoing research contributes to unraveling the intricate dynamics of WIL experiences, to providing an understanding of their impact on students, and to illuminating the broader landscape of higher education.

Research Questions

Our study was founded in our practical work related to examining WIL participation and postgraduate outcomes, our knowledge of existing higher education literature around this relationship, and our recognition that the world of higher education and WIL has forever been changed by the COVID-19 pandemic. To connect each of these concepts, we explored the relationship between WIL participation and post-graduation employment outcomes at the institution longitudinally, while also explicitly examining what this relationship looked like for

minoritized students. Our study was guided by two research questions:

Research Question 1: How does the relationship between WIL participation and job offer change between 2016–2017 and 2022–2023?

Research Question 2: How do the rates of securing a job offer differ among minoritized students based on their WIL participation? Does this relationship change over time?

METHODS

In this study, we used quantitative data analysis to examine any relationship between participation in WIL activities and postgraduate employment outcomes. We used data from an exit survey collected from seven graduating cohorts of baccalaureate students and matched the results with institutional records related to demographics and academic progress. In this Methods section, we describe the study context, the sample, the variables, the analysis, and the limitations.

Study Context

This study was grounded in a single institutional context and developed from the work of an institutional research (IR) office that is committed to using data to engage with student success efforts. The institution is a large, public R1 university in Florida. Notably, this institution had implemented an experiential learning requirement as part of its graduation requirements starting with Summer 2019 matriculants. The requirement as stated in the undergraduate bulletin was to support experiences outside the classroom. In addition to traditional external WIL experiences, this requirement could

be fulfilled through undergraduate research, international experience, service, and leadership opportunities. Students could receive credit for the requirement through successfully completing one of a specific set of courses, earning a certificate through the central career center, or substituting successful course completion in a different graduation requirement category (e.g., applying scholarly learning to an individual research or creative project) that had been implemented for several years prior to 2019. We interrogate the potential impacts of this new graduation requirement on the results of this study more in the Robustness Checks subsection of this paper.

To measure multiple outcomes, including the relationship between college experiences and job offers, the institution implements an exit survey. Approximately 3 weeks before their graduation date, the survey is sent to graduating bachelor's students asking about experiences at the institution and their plans after graduation. This survey has been in practice for more than a decade and is part of a collaborative effort between the offices of IR, Student Affairs, and the Career Center. Prior to implementation of this survey, the institution had periodically sent post-graduation surveys to alumni through ad hoc email campaigns and physical mailings.

The current survey is administered via a Qualtrics survey by the IR office. The survey is listed as one of the graduation requirements, and consequently the response rate is about 93% annually. The IR office consults several offices on a regular basis to keep the survey fresh and relevant.

Information that is collected in the survey is used for a variety of purposes, such as the following:

- To respond to surveys such as NACE, *US News & World Report*, and *The Princeton Review*
- To contribute to annual internal reporting to vice presidents and deans
- To contribute to program reviews and routine departmental reporting
- To contribute to ad hoc and other routine internal reporting
- To verify and update post-graduation contact information for alumni relations
- To offer an opportunity for graduates to connect with the Career Center as an aid for them to find employment

As part of the post-graduation outcomes process, IR also administers a 3-month follow-up survey to each graduate, whether they completed the survey or not. The 3-month follow-up survey focuses on the students' primary plan after college, and focuses particularly on those students who indicated pending employment or furthering education on the initial survey.

Additionally, IR conducts a knowledge rate search for those who indicated pending employment or furthering education on the initial survey and who did not complete the 3-month follow-up survey. This process includes a search of LinkedIn profiles for those who indicated employment as their primary plan and the National Student Clearinghouse collection for those who indicated furthering education.

Questions about experiences while attending the institution were asked only on the initial survey. These experiences included experiential learning opportunities that are designated and studied in this paper. For that reason, we focused on those students who had completed the initial survey,

or who had completed both the survey and the 3-month follow-up, establishing the survey rate. For this paper, we matched the WIL information and the job placement information found in the survey rate of the post-graduation outcomes collection. (The survey questions are available in Appendix A.)

Sample

This study's population included seven cohorts of graduating seniors from a single institution. The sample was first limited by including only those who responded to the exit survey, making the sample approximately 93% of the graduates across 7 years. We then limited the sample to include only first-time-in-college (FTIC) students. Transfer students are excluded because they had less time to participate in these WIL experiences after matriculation to the institution. FTIC students are those who matriculated to the institution after receiving their high school diploma and who had not earned 12 or more college credits between their high school graduation and their initial enrollment at the institution. The final inclusion criteria for this study were for students to have stated their primary plan after graduation to be employment and for the students to have indicated they had already applied for a job. We focused on only those students who had applied for a job since applying is required to secure a job offer. Notably, across the entire sample, 91% of all graduates whose primary plan was employment had applied for a job. This percentage was consistent across the degree years, ranging between 89% (this low during the 2019–2020 graduation year) and 92% (this high during the 2018–2019, 2020–2021, and 2021–2022 graduation years). The range in the share of graduates whose primary plan was employment and who applied for a job was even more consistent when looking at the sample pre-, during, and post-

COVID: that range was 91% across each of those eras. Since there was no clear pattern of increasing application rate across the graduation years, we determined that we could control for this variable without biasing our results by limiting the sample to only those who had applied.

After each of these inclusion criteria was applied, we had a resulting analytical sample of 18,966 students. The primary source of information used in this study is historically collected survey data. Since every graduating student receives the survey, we recognize that we do not have a random sample. Instead, we have seven cohorts of student responses, averaging around a 93% response rate. This ultimately leads us to generally explore the population of the institution's graduates. We describe the sample in the Descriptive Statistics subsection of the section Findings.

All students in the sample graduated between Summer 2016 and Spring 2023. Cohorts were defined using the academic year such that Summer 2016, Fall 2016, and Spring 2017 graduates represented the 2016–2017 cohort, and so on. We further divided cohorts based on the timing of their graduation with the COVID-19 pandemic. Specifically, graduates in the 2016–2017, 2017–2018, and 2018–2019 years were labeled pre-COVID; graduates in the 2019–2020 and 2020–2021 years were labeled COVID; and graduates in the 2021–2022 and 2022–2023 years were labeled post-COVID. We used these COVID eras to examine our research questions.

Variables

The two main variables of interest in this study were participation in at least one WIL activity (independent variable) and securing a job offer (dependent variable). Both variables were derived from survey

responses. In this study, we used the term “work-integrated learning” (WIL) as an encompassing term for various experiential learning opportunities available at this institution. The decision to equate these experiences was based on previous research (Cooper et al., 2010; Kepple, 2023) and consensus among a committee of WIL administrators at the institution. When we use the term “WIL” in this study, we are including the following experiences: internships, co-ops, fieldwork, student teaching, apprenticeships, and clinicals.

Additionally, the receipt of a job offer rather than the acceptance of a job offer was chosen as the dependent variable interest based on a previous study's use of the variable (Kepple, 2023). Kepple (2023) argued that receiving a job offer is an indicator of success in the search for employment while accepting a job offer is a form of success, but the decision to accept could be influenced by other factors. In the decision to use receipt of a job offer as the dependent variable, we are recognizing that the job offer in and of itself is a sign of success and is more inclusive than using acceptance of a job offer as the variable of interest.

In addition to our main variables of interest, we selected specific demographics and academic variables to include as controls in our models. We collected data on students' sex, race/ethnicity, first-generation status, Pell Grant eligibility, and final cumulative GPA, all obtained from the institution's official student records system. We also examined whether an interaction existed between WIL participation and race/ethnicity, first-generation status, or Pell Grant eligibility in predicting whether a student would receive a job offer. Since we observed possible interactions between minoritized identities and participation in WIL on predicting job offers, we dummy coded our variables with the minoritized

characteristic as 1 and the majoritized characteristic as 0. This resulted in the following variables: URM (0 if race/ethnicity was White or Asian, 1 for all other race/ethnicity categories, excluding Race Unknown and Nonresident Alien), first generation (0 for continuing generation, 1 for first generation), and Pell eligible (0 for non-Pell, 1 for Pell). In addition to the noted minoritized identities and their possible interactions, we used sex as a control because it is a demographic characteristic we could easily collect; we also used students' final cumulative GPA as a proxy for their academic achievement.

Analysis

Given the high response rates of this survey, we chose to begin our discussion of the findings using results of a descriptive analysis since these statistics provide observational information related to our research questions. To check statistical significance between groups we also ran a series of inferential statistics. For the descriptive analysis, we first examined rates of securing a job offer and rates of participating in a WIL activity in each COVID era for the overall sample and then for each identity group (URM, first generation, and Pell eligible) separately (see Tables 2 and 3 in section Findings). We then analyzed the rates of securing a job offer given WIL experience across the three COVID eras (before, during, and after). For this analysis, we also first investigated the results for the overall sample before focusing on results for each identity group: by URM, first-generation, and Pell-eligible status. These results are visualized using line charts (see Figures 1 through 4 in section Findings).

Next, we sought to examine if differences in secured job offer rates were statistically significant based on WIL participation or student characteristic. For instance, we asked if there was a statistically

significant difference in the job offer rate of URM graduates who participated in a WIL activity compared to the job offer rate of URM graduates who did not participate in any WIL activity. We utilized chi-square tests for these analyses. Finally, we extended our tests of statistical significance by predicting the probability of job offer, given the interaction between WIL participation and minoritized group membership, using logistic regression estimation methods. The advantage of this method is that it allows us to hold constant all our control variables and to account for error to better understand the potential weights of the WIL versus identity variables in the outcome of securing a job offer. Prior to running these logistic regressions, we generated pairwise correlations between all the variables in the model. Results were within the normal limit and did not suggest intercorrelative effects. For all inferential analyses, we determined statistical significance at the $p < .05$ level. We review the method used to answer each research question before presenting our findings.

Limitations

This study has several limitations we should acknowledge before sharing the findings of the analysis. First and foremost, this study is grounded in the context of a single institution. Derived from the work of an IR office at a large, public, R1 university in Florida, the results here may not be reflective of all institutions in the world or even all institutions in the United States; the results' transferability to other large, public, R1 institutional contexts may be limited dependent on state, student demographics, and graduation requirements.

Second, as with most research arising from IR offices, the post-graduation employment outcomes here were derived from self-reported data. Although

it is common to benchmark and even make policy decisions from this type of post-graduation employment outcome data, we acknowledge that self-reported information is subject to possible inaccuracies. Graduates may not know for sure their employment status at the time of the exit survey (i.e., at the time of graduation for this study) or they might lie, inflate, or deflate their employment status. Previous research provides evidence that self-reported student data can produce biased results, and that using a methodology such as state employment and salary may provide data that are more reliable (Bryant, 2021). Many IR offices do not have access to these forms of data sources, however. Additionally, the self-reported nature of these data means we do not have clear, consistent data on the compensation graduates received from their WIL experiences. Due to this limitation, this study cannot speak to any relationships between paid/unpaid WIL activities and employment outcomes.

FINDINGS

Descriptive Statistics

Before examining the relationship between WIL participation and securing a job offer, we first built a descriptive profile of the population. We focused this profile on the student characteristics that we used as controls in our regression model and examined for differential outcomes (Table 1). Of the 18,966 survey respondents who met our inclusion criteria, 25.7% qualified as first generation, 21.5% were Pell eligible, 33.1% were categorized as an URM, and 40.4% identified as male. The average GPA was 3.3. There were more than 4,000 graduates in each identity group of interest, thus reducing concerns in the inferential analyses of performing statistical tests on small sample sizes. Furthermore, the meaningful proportion of minoritized graduates in the overall population supported our efforts to examine outcomes for these groups.

Table 1. Sample Characteristics

	Sample (n = 18,966)	Job Offers	WIL Participants
Identity Group			
First generation	25.7%	24.6%	24.2%
Pell eligible	21.5%	20.6%	20.9%
URM	33.1%	31.7%	32.0%
Male	40.4%	40.3%	37.7%
Final GPA			
Average	3.32	3.36	3.38
Median	3.37	3.38	3.42

Note. The sample includes students who were FTIC, whose primary plan after graduation was employment, and who had indicated that they had applied for a job.

We next examined the composition of graduates who had both received a job offer and participated in WIL to compare the representation of minoritized populations in these variables to their representation in the full sample. Among those who received a job offer, 24.6% were first-generation students, 20.6% were Pell-eligible students, and 31.7% were URM students. Among WIL participants, 24.2% were first generation, 20.9% were Pell eligible, and 32.0% were URM. While the share of each minoritized group within job offer recipients and WIL participants were all fairly similar to their representation in the whole sample, traditionally underserved populations secured job offers and participated in WIL activities at lower rates than their majoritized peers. Moving forward from this descriptive profile, we explored securing job offers and WIL participation across each COVID era and dissected these findings by student characteristics.

JOB OFFERS BY COVID ERA

Because we have framed our study around the differences that could be occurring due to the COVID-19 pandemic, it is pertinent for us to focus our analyses on these time periods rather than looking at the seven cohorts as a singular group. We first looked at overall job offer securement by COVID era, and found that overall job offers decreased by 3.7 percentage points from pre-COVID to COVID, but then rebounded and even increased slightly post-COVID (Table 2). When examining each of the minoritized identities in our analysis, we saw similar results for each identity as compared to the overall (Table 2). Notably, URM students had the largest decrease between pre-COVID and COVID (-5.7 percentage points) and subsequent greatest increase between COVID and post-COVID (+7.7 percentage points). On the other hand, the pattern for first-generation students had the smallest changes across the three eras.

Table 2. Secured Job Offers by COVID Era and Identity

	Pre-COVID	COVID	Post-COVID
Job Offers	73.9%	70.2%	75.7%
First generation	70.5%	68.1%	72.5%
Pell eligible	70.3%	67.3%	73.0%
URM	71.4%	65.7%	73.4%

WIL PARTICIPATION BY COVID ERA

When we examined WIL participation across COVID eras, we found a completely different pattern than we did with job offers. Unlike job offers, overall participation rates for WIL activities increased across COVID eras, with a dramatic increase between COVID and post-COVID eras (+8.2 percentage points) (Table 3). We generally found this same pattern across different identities (Table 3). We

also found that URM students had the greatest increase in WIL participation across time, going from 52.7% pre-COVID to 70.0% post-COVID. This 17.3-percentage-point change was not only the largest increase over time, but also, among the three identity groups examined, URM students went from the lowest pre-COVID participation to the second-highest post-COVID participation, switching places with first-generation students.

Table 3. Work-Integrated Learning Participation by COVID Era and Identity


	Pre-COVID	COVID	Post-COVID
WIL participation	57.6%	62.8%	71.0%
First generation	54.4%	58.3%	67.6%
Pell eligible	54.6%	60.7%	70.3%
URM	52.7%	61.9%	70.0%

Research Question 1: How Does the Relationship between Work-Integrated Learning Participation and Job Offer Change between 2016–2017 and 2022–2023?

After examining job offers and WIL participation separately, we compared the rates of securing a job offer by WIL participation across COVID eras to address the first research question. We found

that, in the pre-COVID era, students who did not participate in WIL activities secured job offers at a higher rate than those who did participate in WIL. As expected, job offer rates for both groups decreased during COVID. Then, post-COVID, we saw a reversal in the pre-COVID finding: students who participated in WIL secured job offers at higher rates than students who did not participate in WIL (Figure 1).

Figure 1. Secured Job Offers by Work-Integrated Learning Participation and COVID Era



The striking differences in the rates of securing a job offer based on WIL participation over time, along with the reversal in the relationship between these two variables, justified an examination of the relationship with inferential statistics. To answer Research Question 1, we first tested if the differences in job offer rate for WIL participants versus nonparticipants shown in Figure 1 were statistically significant using chi-squared tests. The tests confirmed that the gap between WIL participants and nonparticipants in job offer rates were statistically significantly different for each COVID era. The chi-squared tests measure only if the descriptive statistics we observed were statistically different, not the magnitude of the difference, however.

We then tested if these statistical differences would hold up after controlling for observed variables. We built a logistic regression model predicting securing a job offer by participation in WIL activities and controlling for first-generation status, Pell eligibility, URM status, sex, and final cumulative GPA. To handle the element of time, we developed multiple models. First, we included a categorical variable for COVID era in the model along with the stated controls. These results showed that, holding all else constant, the odds of securing a job offer in the post-COVID era were positive compared to the pre-COVID era, although the effect size is relatively small (odds ratio [OR] = 1.08; $p = .05$) (Appendix B, Table B1). We then interacted the categorical variable for each COVID era with WIL participation, and found a meaningfully statistically significant difference in the probability to receive a job offer post-COVID compared to a job offer pre-COVID. Specifically, the odds of securing a job offer for post-COVID WIL participants were about 3.5 times higher than the odds for pre-COVID WIL participants (OR = 3.54; $p < .00$) (Appendix B, Table B2).

We then analyzed differences over time by limiting the observations in each model based on the COVID era. Therefore, we ran the logistic regression model three times: once with respondents who graduated in 2016–2017 through 2018–2019 (the pre-COVID era), once with respondents who graduated in 2019–2020 and 2020–2021 (the COVID era), and once with respondents who graduated in 2021–2022 through 2022–2023 (the post-COVID era). The results broadly followed the pattern shown descriptively. The pre-COVID and COVID models each showed a significant negative relationship between WIL participation and securing a job offer (pre-COVID: OR = .541, $p < .00$, COVID: OR = .800, $p < .01$), net of all other effects. Again, following the descriptive results, the post-COVID model showed a significant positive relationship between participating in WIL and securing a job offer (OR = 2.05, $p < .00$), holding all else constant. Therefore, the negative association between WIL participation and securing a job offer seen in the pre-COVID and COVID eras and the positive association between the same variables post-COVID was statistically significant even after controlling for observed variables. The results of each regression model are shown in Appendix B, Table B3.

Research Question 2: How Do the Rates of Securing a Job Offer Differ Among Minoritized Students Based on Their Work-Integrated Learning Participation? Does This Relationship Change Over Time?

To further investigate the reversal in the relationship between WIL participation and securing a job offer pre- versus post-COVID, we examined this pattern descriptively for each characteristic of interest. We visualized our findings in line charts (Figures 2–4).

Regardless of the identity group evaluated, we found that the relationship between participating in WIL and securing a job offer seemed to flip from negative to positive between the pre- and post-COVID eras. In addition, in each analysis we found that minoritized WIL participants (solid lines with circles) went from having the lowest job offer rates pre-COVID and during COVID to having the second-highest job offer

rates, second only to WIL participants with majority identities (solid lines with squares). Descriptively, first-generation, Pell-eligible, and URM students who participated in WIL had lower job offer rates than their peers pre-COVID and during COVID, but received some benefit from those experiences post-COVID.

Figure 2. Secured Job Offers by Work-Integrated Learning Participation and First-Generation Status across COVID Eras




Figure 3. Secured Job Offers by Work-Integrated Learning Participation and Pell Eligibility across COVID Eras





Figure 4. Secured Job Offers by Work-Integrated Learning Participation and Underrepresented Minority Status across COVID Eras



We tested the differences in job offer rates across time (a) between WIL/not WIL participants within minoritized student characteristic group (comparing solid lines and dotted lines with the circles) and (b) between minoritized/majoritized groups within WIL participants (comparing solid lines with circles or squares), both using chi-squared tests. Across all the comparisons for the (a) analysis, we found statistically significant differences for the pre-COVID and post-COVID eras, meaning WIL was statistically negatively related to securing a job offer pre-COVID, but statistically positively related to securing a job offer post-COVID for first-generation, Pell-eligible, and URM students. However, during the COVID pandemic the negative relationship was statistically significant only for URM students. For Pell-eligible and first-generation students, there was no statistically significant difference in job securement rates based on WIL experiences during COVID. Similarly for the comparisons in the (b) analysis, we found statistically significant differences between minoritized and majoritized WIL participants in secured job offer rates pre- and post-COVID. During COVID there was only a statistically significant difference in the secured job offer rates of WIL participants by URM status.

The way that these findings for URM students differ compared to results for first-generation and Pell-eligible students is worth further synthesis. In Figure 4, we see that URM students had the largest decline in securing a job offer during COVID, and, more specifically, we see URM students who participated in WIL dropped further in their job offer rates than the URM students who did not participate in WIL during the pandemic. In fact, this was the one case when the difference in job offer rates for the minoritized versus majoritized WIL participants during COVID was found to be statistically significant.

As shown in the overall analysis and across the other groups, URM WIL participants' job offer rates rebounded in the post-COVID era. What stands out, however, is that the rebound in job offer rates for URM WIL participants between the COVID and post-COVID eras was a statistically significant and practically meaningful 15-percentage-point change. Although URM WIL participants had statistically lower rates of securing a job offer during the pandemic, they were much more likely to find employment post-COVID.

Holding all else constant using logistic regression estimation methods, the differences in job offer rates between minoritized graduates and their majoritized counterparts was still statistically significantly different (ORs ranged .85 – .92, p -values ranged .000 – .047) (Appendix B, Table B1). However, given the descriptive findings, we knew that this relationship likely varied based on WIL participation and COVID era. Models with interactions between COVID era and identity, and interactions between COVID eras, identity, and WIL participation, yielded null results. In other words, once we had controlled for everything else in the model, there is no evidence that the predicted job-offer rates differ for specific student characteristics groups given their WIL experiences in conjunction with time. To analyze possible changes in outcomes for students who hold multiple underrepresented student characteristics, we ran two-way interactions with combinations of each of the identities together, as well as a three-way interaction across each COVID era. We found no statistically significant evidence for any possible identity interactions in that analysis.

Integrating interactions between student characteristics and WIL also yielded null results, with the exception of the interaction between URM and WIL (OR = .86; p = .037). Additionally,

integrating a four-way interaction between WIL, first-generation, Pell-eligible, and URM participants returned a significant negative result only within the post-COVID era, although the effect size is relatively small ($OR = .42, p < .05$). Notably, when looking at this four-way interaction within each COVID era, we found the interaction to be statistically significant only within the post-COVID era. Upon further investigation, we found that the student profile that had the largest difference in predicted probability of securing a job offer based on WIL participation was the profile of students who identified as first generation, Pell eligible, and non-URM. Students with this combination of identities who participated in a WIL had a predicted probability to secure a job offer of 82.9% as opposed to 59.7% for students in the same identity categories who did not participate in WIL. When examining students who held all three underrepresented characteristics (first generation, Pell eligible, and URM), we found that those who participated in WIL had a 71.9% predicted probability to secure a job offer as opposed to 65.7% for those who did not participate in WIL. While we did find a significant interaction in this case, only 568 students, or 9.9%, in the post-COVID portion of the sample, exhibited this profile. Because this represents such a small amount of the study sample, and the study was designed to explore identities but not intersectionality, we do not feel we have enough information to pull inferences from it. We do want to acknowledge the findings, however. It is possible that this method of using interactions between multiple categorical variables could obscure differences that seem obvious in descriptive statistics. Furthermore, the significant interaction between WIL and URM was less interpretable when not considering time.

Therefore, we utilized our method of estimating logistic regression models of securing job offer given WIL participation, student characteristics, and

final cumulative GPA separately for each COVID era. In this analysis, we found that each minoritized identity was significantly negatively related to securing a job offer pre-COVID (OR ranges .86 – .87; p -value ranges .015 – .042) with only URM identity maintaining this significantly negative relationship in the COVID and post-COVID eras (OR ranges .76 – .87; p -values range .000 – .049) (Appendix B, Table B3). Adding interactions between WIL participation and identity for each COVID era, we found no significant interactions (Appendix B, Tables B4–B6). The lack of any significant interaction between WIL and identities in each COVID era suggested that the overall changes in the relationship between securing a job offer and WIL are mostly being driven by changes with WIL participation rather than with students' identities.

These analyses showed that the gap in securing a job offer between WIL participants and nonparticipants with minoritized identities decreases from pre-COVID to post-COVID. Additionally, WIL participants began to have higher success rates in securing a job offer post-COVID as compared to peers with similar identities who did not participate in WIL. Participating in WIL was positively related to higher securement of job offers post-COVID for the overall sample as well as for minoritized students.

Robustness Checks

As part of our analysis and the review process, we explored two key questions about the inclusion of variables: about (1) degree field of study and (2) the potential impact of the experiential learning graduation outcome at this institution. We developed additional models to evaluate the inclusion of these variables, and we report on the results here.

Higher education research has included much discourse on the importance of field of study on student experience and post-graduation outcomes. Since the nature of career development can vary widely based on student major, it is reasonable to assume that field of study can be associated with variation in post-graduation outcomes. To test these associations, we developed a seven-category field of study variable: business, education, fine arts, health, humanities, sciences, and social sciences. These categories were first developed using the 2020 Florida Board of Governors (BOG) Program of Strategic Emphasis (PSE) list to designate classification of instructional programs (CIP) codes that fell into the following categories: education, health, and STEM (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics). This initial list was chosen due to institutional context: this institution is in Florida. Acknowledging research showing differential outcomes for physical and life sciences versus social sciences, we then took the BOG PSE STEM category and disaggregated it into sciences versus social sciences. The BOG PSE list was developed to support industry in Florida specifically, so some CIP codes either were not categorized into one of their categories or were given a category not meaningful to non-Florida contexts, such as Gap Analysis or Global. We reviewed CIP categories and developed the additional business, fine arts, and humanities categories, moving CIP codes into them as apparent to the IR office. The final crosswalk of CIP codes to field of study has been published by the IR office for more than 3 years and has been used extensively for both data requests and data use by researchers external to the office, providing some reliability checks. We included this field of study categorical variable into the models discussed in the Findings section.

There were very few changes in the main results, suggesting that the inclusion of field of study

to our models does *not* provide additional context or meaningful insights. Specifically, for Research Question 1 investigating job offers by WIL participation and COVID era, there were no changes in the direction and statistical significance of variables reported in the findings. Students who participated in a WIL experience were more likely to secure a job post-COVID compared to pre-COVID, regardless of whether or not we control for field of study. For Research Question 2, investigating the interaction between WIL and identity, adding the field of study continued to yield no additional insights. There were no differences in the direction or statistical significance with the inclusion of field of study. Regardless of field of study, students of all identities seemed to have higher rates of securing job offers post-COVID, especially if they participated in WIL. For both research questions, inclusion of field of study yielded differences within a tenth of a point. Since this study was not explicitly concerned with investigating differences in student experience based on major or industry and to use the most parsimonious models available, we do not include field of study in our final models.

We additionally recognize that the institution studied in this project had implemented a new experiential learning graduation requirement as described in the Study Context subsection. This study is concerned with FTIC graduates from seven graduating cohorts from 2016–2017 to 2022–2023. The students matriculating under the new experiential learning requirement (starting in Summer 2019) were expected to graduate in Spring 2023, within the last graduation cohort included in this study. Those students make up about 15% of the total population in this study. It is possible that the implementation of the experiential learning graduation requirement supported the findings in this study. Although a single graduation cohort out of seven would not

be expected to drive the results, the development of the experiential learning requirement may have resulted in increased infrastructure for the identification of WIL opportunities and support of learning outcomes.

We therefore examined the occurrence of successful experiential learning course completion across the graduation cohorts. We found equitable rates of earned credit, between 20% and 30%, across most cohorts, with the Spring 2023 graduates at the lowest rate at 18%. There are several potential reasons we have observed similar experiential learning course completion rates across the graduation cohorts, with the last cohort having the lowest rates. First, students who had the graduation requirement in the last graduation cohort would have had the least amount of time to take these courses, since this would be exactly 4 years to graduate. Second, the graduation requirement could be fulfilled through multiple avenues: course completion for that specific graduation requirement, course completion for a different graduation requirement that had already been implemented for several years, or a certificate from the central career center. Since only the last cohort in our study had this requirement, which comprises 15% of the overall population, students in this transitional period behaved in the same way as prior cohorts by taking more courses in the other graduation requirement. This study does not capture the impact of the experiential learning graduation requirement policy change because there are not enough students who would have been impacted to fairly evaluate it. The evaluation of that graduation requirement is beyond the scope of this paper.

DISCUSSION

In this study, we analyzed the relationship between students participating in WIL and securing job offers by the time of graduation across seven cohorts, with an emphasis on the influence the COVID pandemic had on this relationship. Additionally, based on previous literature that shows access and success barriers for minoritized students (Cocks & Thoresen, 2013; Moylan & Wood, 2016; Patton et al., 2015), yet possible equity effects for them if they participated in WIL (Finley & McNair, 2013; Wyonch, 2020), we examined this relationship specifically for first-generation, Pell-eligible, and URM students. Generally, we found that rates of securing a job offer took a hit during the COVID-19 pandemic for graduates at this institution. The rates of securing a job offer returned to pre-pandemic levels in the post-COVID era.

Interestingly, where there had been a negative relationship between WIL participation and securing a job offer in both the pre-COVID and COVID eras, in the post-COVID era there was a positive relationship. This shift in the relationship from negative to positive was found both descriptively and inferentially, after holding demographic variables and final GPA constant. The reversal of the relationship between WIL participation and securing a job offer from negative to positive was consistent across minoritized populations descriptively. However, looking at the interactions between WIL and minoritized identities, the differences were not significant inferentially. This shows that there is no evidence that outcomes for WIL participants differ based on students' identity. Additionally, the overall regression with no interactions and with WIL as the standalone independent variable was quite significant and showed a reversal in the direction of the relationship post-COVID. These findings suggest

that the WIL activity alone supports securing a job offer in the post-COVID era.

When exploring the outcomes, we found in the pre-COVID and COVID eras that minoritized students who participated in WIL had the lowest likelihood of securing a job offer, whereas post-COVID these students saw some benefit to their WIL experiences. Descriptively, in the post-COVID era, minoritized students who participated in WIL had higher secured job offer rates than their non-WIL counterparts. In fact, minoritized students who participated in WIL had secured employment rates that were second only to their majoritized counterparts who also participated in WIL. Furthermore, the gaps between minoritized and majoritized WIL participants in their secured job offer rate closed in the post-COVID era compared to the pre-COVID era.

Possible Explanations

Based on our findings and extant literature, we posit two possible explanations for the results of this study: increased remote opportunities/quality of experiences, and increased value for WIL experiences. We explore these possible explanations below.

EXPLANATION 1: INCREASED REMOTE OPPORTUNITIES/QUALITY OF EXPERIENCES

Our analysis showed that more students participated in WIL in the post-COVID era than in the pre-COVID and COVID eras. There was a 13.4-percentage-point increase in WIL participation for the entire sample, with a 13.2-percentage-point increase for first-generation students, 15.7-percentage-point increase for Pell-eligible students, and 17.3-percentage-point increase for URM students. The institution implemented policy changes in 2019 requiring newly matriculating students to participate in WIL-like experiences

as part of graduation requirements. The cohorts of students who received that mandate have not fully flowed through to the graduating cohorts in this study, but the availability of the courses and programs related to that policy change could have benefited the students in this study, nonetheless. It is also likely that the move of jobs to remote work opened opportunities for more college students to participate in WIL remotely. This institution is in a small- to medium-sized city, with the closest metropolitan area approximately 3 hours away. Not only did the number of remote WIL listings quadruple during the pandemic (Konkel, 2021), but also the number of job postings offering remote or hybrid options increased, and even stayed afterward, with 38% of listings citing work locations alternative to in-person-only options in 2023 (Culbertson, 2023). Whereas pre-COVID cohorts could have struggled to identify in-person opportunities in the relatively low-population area of their university, post-COVID graduates benefited from remote work options.

Furthermore, minoritized students may not have experienced the level of discrimination in remote WIL that had been found in prior research on traditional, in-person WIL experiences. Prior research shows that minoritized students and employees sometimes report discrimination in workplace environments based on their identities (Cocks & Thoresen, 2013; Moylan & Wood, 2016; Patton et al., 2015). While the research related to online experiences during COVID is limited, Gutzwa (2022) noted in their study on Trans* student experiences in the classroom that the students in their study reported feeling more comfortable and experiencing less discrimination in an online class than in person. We would like to explore this concept further as it applies to WIL experiences, since it supports our findings, but recognize this would best be examined qualitatively in a future study.

EXPLANATION 2: INCREASED VALUE FOR WORK-INTEGRATED LEARNING EXPERIENCES

All students who participated in a WIL experience enjoyed greater rates of receiving job offers in the post-COVID era compared to WIL participants in the pre-COVID era. This signals that, post-COVID, either participants gained more job skills from WIL experiences, or those with WIL experiences became more valuable to employers, or a mix of both. The post-COVID era also included the Great Resignation, when remote and alternative work opportunities opened up more job opportunities for seasoned employees, and therefore more entry-level positions for new workers (BLS, 2022b). Employers seeking to fill vacant positions could also have found WIL experiences more valuable during this period as a form of work experience. It is consistently cited in the literature that employers are looking for the kinds of skills in graduates that should be attained with WIL participation (DiBenedetto & Willis, 2020; Gray, 2024; Lisá et al., 2019; NACE, 2022). It is possible that employers began to look more toward opportunities such as WIL as part of their holistic resumé review in response to an increased need for additional skilled workers because of the Great Resignation as well as the fact that students were not able to participate in many other activities such as student organizations or community service at the same level as they did pre-pandemic.

Conclusion

We examined the relationship between participating in WIL and securing a job offer by the time of graduation for seven cohorts of graduating students at a large public research institution in the southeastern United States, and found unexpected, yet positive, results. Recognizing the massive changes the world went through during

the COVID-19 pandemic, we put a COVID-era lens across the cohorts of students. When examining pre-, during, and post-COVID eras, we found major changes to the relationship between WIL participation and securing a job offer, namely going from a significant negative to a significant positive relationship. Based on evidence in the literature as well as practical knowledge, we broke down this relationship to examine whether there were differences for students with select minoritized identities—first-generation, Pell-eligible, or URM status. While we found no significant interaction for these identities, we do see that the positive change in the overall WIL relationship persists for students with these identities, with students in the post-COVID cohorts participating in WIL and securing job offers at higher rates than in the pre-COVID and COVID eras. We believe these findings could be related, at least in part, to the increase in remote WIL and job opportunities; increased quality in those experiences, especially for minoritized students; and increased value for WIL experiences in securing a job after college. We hope to continue to explore these relationships and other findings at the institution; we also hope that the structure and findings of this study may be informative for other higher education practitioners and researchers.

APPENDIX A. SURVEY QUESTIONS

Your “primary plan” is the ONE post-college activity that will be your focus after graduation. If you plan to do more than one of the activities below, you will have an opportunity to share that information later in the survey.

Please select the statement which **MOST CLOSELY** describes your **PRIMARY** plan **IMMEDIATELY** after graduation.

- Employment (seeking, applying or secured, full-time or part-time, internship, paid or unpaid) (1)
- Continuing education (applying or admitted to graduate school, professional school, or other post-college education) (2)
- Military service (3)
- Volunteering (e.g. AmeriCorps, community service, etc.) (4)
- Starting or raising a family (5)
- Taking time off (6)

Which statement best describes your **current employment status**?

- Have accepted a position to begin in the coming months (including residency and internship positions) (1)
- Working in a position I plan to continue after graduation (7)
- Have been offered a position or multiple positions, but declined offers and still searching for preferred position (2)
- Considering one or more offers (4)
- Searching or waiting on offers (5)
- Will begin searching for a position in the coming months (6)

The survey will now present you with a series of questions about any internships or other forms of experiential learning in which you may have participated. Please indicate your participation by checking the boxes next to the activities listed.

Internships & Experiential Learning

Check the activities in which you were engaged during your time at [Redacted]. (Select all that apply.)

- Internship
- Cooperative education (co-op)
- Practica
- Field Work
- Student Teaching
- Apprenticeship
- Clinical
- Leadership
- Fellowship
- Other _____
- None of the above

APPENDIX B. SELECTED REGRESSION ANALYSES

Table B1. Logistic Regression Analysis of Securing a Job Offer by COVID Era (Pre-COVID as Reference Group)

Job Offer (<i>n</i> = 18,701)	OR	SE	<i>p</i> -value	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
COVID eras					
COVID	.827*	.033	.000	.764	.895
Post-COVID	1.08	.044	.053	.999	1.17
WIL	.868*	.031	.000	.809	.930
First generation	.908*	.038	.020	.838	.985
Pell eligible	.916*	.040	.047	.841	.999
URM	.852*	.031	.000	.792	.915
Male	1.02	.035	.661	.948	1.09
Cumulative GPA	1.32*	.054	.000	1.22	1.43

**p* < .05. OR = odds ratio, SE = standard error.

Table B2. Logistic Regression Analysis of Securing a Job Offer by COVID Era with WIL Participation Interaction (Pre-COVID as reference group)

Job Offer (<i>n</i> = 18,701)	OR	SE	<i>p</i> -value	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
COVID eras					
COVID	.665*	.045	.000	.583	.759
Post-COVID	.474*	.032	.000	.415	.542
WIL	.553*	.300	.000	.497	.615
COVID era × WIL					
COVID × WIL	1.44*	.120	.000	1.22	1.69
Post-COVID × WIL	3.54*	.300	.000	3.00	4.18
First generation	.911*	.038	.026	.840	.989
Pell eligible	.911*	.040	.034	.835	.993
URM	.840*	.031	.000	.781	.904
Male	1.01	.036	.714	.946	1.09
Cumulative GPA	1.30*	.053	.000	1.20	1.40

**p* < .05. OR = odds ratio, SE = standard error.

Table B3. Logistic Regression Analysis of Securing a Job Offer within COVID Era

Job Offer	OR	SE	<i>p</i> -value	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Pre-COVID (<i>n</i> = 7,867)					
WIL	.541*	.030	.000	.486	.603
First generation	.861*	.056	.021	.759	.978
Pell eligible	.869*	.060	.042	.760	.995
URM	.868*	.051	.015	.774	.973
Male	.983	.054	.748	.883	1.09
Cumulative GPA	1.51*	.094	.000	1.34	1.71
COVID (<i>n</i> = 5,150)					
WIL	.800*	.052	.001	.704	.908
First generation	1.00	.077	.999	.860	1.16
Pell eligible	.935	.075	.405	.799	1.09
URM	.762*	.052	.000	.668	.870
Male	1.00	.064	.950	.885	1.14
Cumulative GPA	1.28*	.096	.001	1.10	1.48
Post-COVID (<i>n</i> = 5,684)					
WIL	2.05*	.136	.000	1.79	2.33
First generation	.889	.069	.127	.764	1.03
Pell eligible	.939	.078	.452	.798	1.11
URM	.874*	.060	.049	.763	.999
Male	1.07	.071	.286	.943	1.22
Cumulative GPA	1.03	.082	.667	.886	1.21

**p* < .05. OR = odds ratio, SE = standard error.

Table B4. Logistic Regression Analysis of Securing a Job Offer with First-Generation Status
Interaction within COVID Era

Job Offer	OR	SE	<i>p</i> -value	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Pre-COVID (<i>n</i> = 7,867)					
WIL	.549*	.035	.000	.485	.623
First generation	.892	.089	.250	.733	1.08
WIL × First generation	.945	.116	.645	.743	1.20
Pell eligible	.870*	.060	.043	.760	.996
URM	.868*	.051	.015	.774	.973
Male	.983	.054	.758	.884	1.09
Cumulative GPA	1.51*	.094	.000	1.34	1.71
COVID (<i>n</i> = 5,150)					
WIL	.779*	.060	.001	.669	.907
First generation	.948	.110	.643	.755	1.19
WIL × First generation	1.09	.153	.536	.829	1.43
Pell eligible	.936	.075	.408	.799	1.10
URM	.762*	.052	.000	.668	.871
Male	1.00	.064	.954	.885	1.14
Cumulative GPA	1.28*	.096	.001	1.10	1.48
Post-COVID (<i>n</i> = 5,684)					
WIL	2.10*	.166	.000	1.80	2.45
First generation	.939	.110	.594	.747	1.18
WIL × First generation	.914	.130	.528	.691	1.21
Pell eligible	.940	.078	.456	.799	1.11
URM	.875	.060	.052	.765	1.00
Male	1.07	.071	.278	.944	1.22
Cumulative GPA	1.03	.082	.665	.886	1.21

**p* < .05. OR = odds ratio, SE = standard error.

Table B5. Logistic Regression Analysis of Securing a Job Offer with Pell- eligible Status Interaction within COVID Era

Job Offer	OR	SE	<i>p</i> -value	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Pre-COVID (<i>n</i> = 7,867)					
WIL	.568*	.035	.000	.503	.641
Pell eligible	.993	.106	.945	.805	1.22
WIL × Pell eligible	.806	.106	.100	.624	1.04
First generation	.863*	.056	.023	.760	.980
URM	.869*	.051	.016	.775	.974
Male	.985	.054	.778	.885	1.10
Cumulative GPA	1.51*	.094	.000	1.34	1.71
COVID (<i>n</i> = 5,150)					
WIL	.786*	.059	.001	.678	.910
Pell eligible	.894	.111	.366	.702	1.14
WIL × Pell eligible	1.07	.159	.635	.803	1.43
First generation	1.00	.077	.988	.861	1.16
URM	.762*	.052	.000	.667	.870
Male	1.00	.064	.951	.885	1.14
Cumulative GPA	1.28*	.096	.001	1.10	1.48
Post-COVID (<i>n</i> = 5,684)					
WIL	2.17*	.165	.000	1.87	2.52
Pell eligible	1.10	.143	.465	.853	1.42
WIL × Pell eligible	.783	.120	.112	.580	1.06
First generation	.889	.069	.128	.764	1.03
URM	.872*	.060	.047	.762	.998
Male	1.07	.071	.279	.944	1.22
Cumulative GPA	1.03	.817	.696	.883	1.20

**p* < .05. OR = odds ratio, SE = standard error.

Table B6. Logistic Regression Analysis of Securing a Job Offer with Underrepresented Racial Minority Status Interaction within COVID Era

Job Offer	OR	SE	<i>p</i> -value	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Pre-COVID (<i>n</i> = 7,867)					
WIL	.582*	.039	.000	.511	.664
URM	.995	.092	.957	.830	1.19
WIL × URM	.801	.093	.055	.639	1.00
First generation	.860*	.056	.020	.757	.976
Pell eligible	.871*	.060	.045	.761	.997
Male	.984	.054	.769	.884	1.10
Cumulative GPA	1.51*	.094	.000	1.34	1.71
COVID (<i>n</i> = 5,150)					
WIL	.872	.071	.092	.744	1.02
URM	.887	.097	.273	.715	1.10
WIL × URM	.792	.105	.079	.611	1.03
First generation	.997	.077	.972	.858	1.16
Pell eligible	.937	.075	.416	.800	1.10
Male	1.01	.065	.899	.889	1.14
Cumulative GPA	1.28*	.096	.001	1.10	1.48
Post-COVID (<i>n</i> = 5,684)					
WIL	2.17*	.183	.000	1.84	2.56
URM	.961	.105	.718	.775	1.19
WIL × URM	.860	.115	.262	.662	1.12
First generation	.892	.069	.140	.767	1.04
Pell eligible	.937	.078	.437	.797	1.10
Male	1.07	.071	.278	.944	1.22
Cumulative GPA	1.03	.082	.673	.885	1.21

**p* < .05. OR = odds ratio, SE

REFERENCES

- Abbasi, F. K., Ali, A., & Bibi, N. (2018). Analysis of skill gap for business graduates: Managerial perspective from banking industry. *Education + Training*, 60(4), 354–367. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ET-08-2017-0120>
- Billett, S. (2009). Realising the educational worth of integrating work experiences in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*, 34(7), 827–843. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070802706561>
- Bist, S. S., Mehta, N., Mehta, D., & Meghrajani, I. (2020). Employers' perception regarding employability skills of management students undergoing internship. *International Journal of Work-Integrated Learning*, 21(2), 145–161.
- Bolli, T., Caves, K., & Oswald-Egg, M. E. (2021). Valuable experience: How university internships affect graduates' income. *Research in Higher Education*, 62, 1–50. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-021-09637-9>
- Bosco, A., & Ferns, S. (2014). Embedding of authentic assessment in work-integrated learning curriculum. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Cooperative Education*, 15(4), 281–290.
- Briel, L., & Getzel, E. (2001). Internships in higher education: Promoting success for students with disabilities. *Disability Studies Quarterly*, 21(1), Article 1. <https://doi.org/10.18061/dsq.v21i1.254>
- Bryant, M. (2021, Fall). Using state workforce data to report graduate outcomes. *The AIR Professional File*, Article 154. <https://doi.org/10.34315/apf1542021>
- Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS). (2021, March). *Regional and state unemployment—2020 annual averages*. https://www.bls.gov/news.release/archives/srgune_03032021.pdf
- Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS). (2022a, January). Economic news release: *Employment situation summary*. <https://www.bls.gov/news.release/empsit.nr0.htm>
- Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS). (2022b, July). *The “great resignation” in perspective*. <https://www.bls.gov/opub/mlr/2022/article/the-great-resignation-in-perspective.htm>
- Cocks, E., & Thoresen, S. H. (2013). *Barriers and facilitators affecting course completions by apprentices and trainees with disabilities*. National Centre for Vocational Education Research, Adelaide, Australia.
- Coker, J. S., Heiser, E., Taylor, L., & Book, C. (2017). Impacts of experiential learning depth and breadth on student outcomes. *Journal of Experiential Education*, 40(1), 5–23. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1053825916678265>
- Cooper, L., Orrell, J., & Bowden, M. (2010). *Work integrated learning: A guide to effective practice*. Taylor & Francis Group.
- Culbertson, D. (2023, December 12). *Remote work remains a steady presence in the labor market*. Hiring Lab. <https://www.hiringlab.org/2023/12/12/remote-work-remains-a-steady-presence-in-the-labor-market/>
- Dailey, S. L. (2016). What happens before full-time employment? Internships as a mechanism of anticipatory socialization. *Western Journal of Communication*, 80(4), 453–480.
- DiBenedetto, C. A., & Willis, V. C. (2020). Post-secondary students' perceptions of career readiness skills. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 61(1), 44–59.

- Eagan, M. K., Stolzenberg, E. B., Ramirez, J. J., Aragon, M. C., Suchard, M. R., & Rios-Aguilar, C. (2016). *The American freshman: Fifty-year trends, 1966–2015*. Higher Education Research Institute, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Ferns, S. (2012, October 29–November 2). *Graduate employability: Teaching staff, employer and graduate perceptions*. Paper presented at the 2012 Australian Collaborative Education Network National Conference, Deakin University, Geelong, Australia.
- Ferns, S., & Zegwaard, K. (2014). Critical assessment issues in work-integrated learning. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Cooperative Education*, 15(3), 179–188. <https://www.tandfonline.com/toc/cape20/current>.
- Fingerson, L., & Troutman, D. R. (2019). Measuring and enhancing student success. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, 2019(184), 33–46. <https://doi.org/10.1002/IR.20320>
- Finley, A., & McNair, T. (2013). Assessing underserved students' engagement in high-impact practices. With an assessing equity in high-impact practices toolkit. Association of American Colleges and Universities. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED582014>
- Freudenberg, B., Brimble, M., & Cameron, C. (2011). WIL and generic skill development: The development of business students' generic skills through work-integrated learning. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Cooperative Education* 12(2), 79–93.
- Gray, K. (2024, December 9). *What are employers looking for when reviewing college students' resumes?*. National Association of Colleges and Employers. <https://www.nacweb.org/talent-acquisition/candidate-selection/the-key-attributes-employers-are-looking-for-on-graduates-resumes>
- Gutzwa, J. A. (2022). *Trans* funds of identity: Exploring trans* collegians' classroom experiences to envision anti-oppressive education*. [Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles]. ProQuest ID: Gutzwa_ucla_0031D_21176. <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/0wv9862z>
- Hiring Lab (2025). *Indeed remote tracker: Share (%) of job postings and searches on Indeed mentioning remote/hybrid terms*. Hiring Lab: Economic research by Indeed. <https://data.indeed.com/#/remote>
- Hora, M. T., Lee, C., Chen, Z., & Hernandez, A. (2021). Exploring online internships amidst the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020–2021: Results from a multi-site case study. Working Paper No. 2021-5, Wisconsin Center for Education Research, University of Wisconsin–Madison.
- Huber, B. (2010). Does participation in multiple high impact practices affect student success at Cal State Northridge?: Some preliminary insights. California State Northridge Office of Institutional Research. <https://www.csun.edu/sites/default/files/MultHIPOverviewFinal.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. (2017). Developing pre-professional identity in undergraduates through work-integrated learning. *Higher Education*, 74(5), 833–853. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-016-0080-2>
- Jackson, D., & Bridgstock, R. (2021). What actually works to enhance graduate employability? The relative value of curricular, co-curricular, and extra-curricular learning and paid work. *Higher Education: The International Journal of Higher Education Research*, 81(4), 723–739. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-020-00570-x>

Jackson, D., & Dean, B. A. (2022). The contribution of different types of work-integrated learning to graduate employability. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 42(1), 93–110. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2022.2048638>

Jackson, D., & Wilton, N. (2016). Perceived employability among undergraduates and the importance of career self-management, work experience and individual characteristics. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 36(4), 747–762. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2016.1229270>

Janice, A., & Voight, M. (2016). *Toward convergence: A technical guide for the post-secondary metrics framework*. Institute for Higher Education Policy. https://www.ihep.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/uploads_docs_pubs_factsheets_ihep_toward_convergence_executive_summary.pdf

Kepple, C. R. (2023). *From college to career: Connecting student participation in work-integrated learning with employment outcomes*. (Order No. 30314094) [Doctoral dissertation, Florida State University]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.

Kinzie, J., & Gonyea, R. (2018, February 23). *The HIP landscape at public institutions: Exploring variation in intention and participation by student characteristics* [Conference presentation]. High-Impact Practices in the States Annual Conference, Dominguez Hills, CA. <https://hdl.handle.net/2022/24260>

Kinzie, J., & Kuh, G. (2016). Reframing student success in college: Advancing know-what and know-how. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 49(3), 19–27.

Klein, L. B., & Scott, C. L. (2021). Managing virtual internships during the Covid-19 pandemic era: Implications for academic instructors and business leaders. *Journal of Higher Education Theory and Practice*, 21(7), 2011–2018.

Koc, E., & Koncz, A. (2009). *Job outlook 2010*. National Association of Colleges and Employers.

Konkel, A. (2021, April 27). *Remote internships jump during pandemic*. Indeed. <https://www.hiringlab.org/2021/04/27/remote-internships-jump-during-pandemic/>

Kuh, G. D. (2008). *High-impact educational practices: What they are, who has access to them, and why they matter*. Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Lisá, E., Hannelová, K., & Newman, D. (2019). Comparison between employers' and students' expectations in respect of employability skills of university graduates. *International Journal of Work-Integrated Learning*, 20(1), 71–82.

Long, H., & Van Dam, A. (2020, May 8). U.S. unemployment rate soars to 14.7 percent, the worst since the Depression era. *The Washington Post*.

Main, J. B., Johnson, B. N., Ramirez, N. M., Ohland, M. W., & Groll, E. A. (2020). A case for disaggregating engineering majors in engineering education research: The relationship between co-op participation and student academic outcomes. *International Journal of Engineering Education*, 36(1), 170–185.

McCormick, A. C., Kinzie, J., & Gonyea, R. M. (2017, November 9–11). *High-impact practices: Is the impact positive or negative for students of color?* [Conference presentation]. Association for the Study of Higher Education.

- Moylan, C. A., & Wood, L. (2016). Sexual harassment in social work field placements: Prevalence and characteristics. *Affilia*, 31(4), 405–417. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886109916644643>
- Mullin, C. M. (2012). Student success: Institutional and individual perspectives. *Community College Review*, 40(2), 126–144.
- National Association of Colleges and Employers (NACE). (2022). *What is career readiness?* <https://www.nacweb.org/career-readiness/competencies/career-readiness-defined/>
- National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES). (2019, December). *2016–17 Baccalaureate and beyond longitudinal study (B&B:16/17)*. <https://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2020941>
- National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES). (2022). College enrollment rates. *Condition of education*. <https://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator/cpb>
- Ocampo, A. C. G., Reyes, M. L., Chen, Y., Restubog, S. L. D., Chih, Y. Y., Chua-Garcia, L., & Guan, P. (2020). The role of internship participation and conscientiousness in developing career adaptability: A five-wave growth mixture model analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 120(103426), 1–15.
- Orrell, J. (2004, July 7–9). *Work-integrated learning programmes: Management and educational quality*. Paper presented at the Proceedings of the Australian Universities Quality Forum, Adelaide, Australia.
- O'Shea, A. (2014). Models of WIL. In S. Ferns (Ed.), *HERDSA guide: Work integrated learning in the curriculum*. Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australasia.
- Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (2005). *How college affects students: A third decade of research*, Vol. 2. Jossey-Bass.
- Patrick, C., Peach, D., Pocknee, C., Webb, F., Fletcher, M., & Pretto, G. (2009). *The WIL report: A national scoping study*. Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, Australia.
- Patton, L. D., Harper, S.R., & Harris, J. (2015). Using critical race theory to (re)interpret widely-studied topics in U.S. higher education. In A. M. Martínez-Alemán, B. Pusser, & E. M. Bensimon (Eds.), *Critical approaches to the study of higher education: A practical introduction*. Johns Hopkins University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1353/book.72242>
- Pittenger, K. S., Miller, M. C., & Allison, J. (2006). Can we succeed in teaching business students to write effectively? *Business Communication Quarterly*, 69(3), 257–263.
- Prinsley, R., & Baranyai, K. (2015). *STEM-trained and job-ready*. Office of the Chief Scientist, Australian Government. https://www.chiefscientist.gov.au/sites/default/files/OPS12-WIL_web.pdf
- Pryor, J. H., Hurtado, S., Saenz, V. B., Santos, J. L., Korn, W. S. (2007). *The American freshman: Forty-year trends*. Higher Education Research Institute, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Ryan, G., Toohey, S., & Hughes, C. (1996). The purpose, value and structure of the practicum in higher education: A literature review. *Higher Education*, 31(3), 355–377. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00128437>

Simons, L., Fehr, L., Blank, N., Connell, H., Georganas, D., Fernandez, D., & Peterson, V. (2012). Lessons learned from experiential learning: What do students learn from a practicum/internship? *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 24(3), 325–334.

Smith, C. (2012). Evaluating the quality of work-integrated learning curricula: A comprehensive framework. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 31(2), 247–262. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2011.558072>

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>

Universities Australia, Business Council of Australia, Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry, AI Group, and Australian Collaborative Education Network Limited. (2015). *National strategy on work integrated learning in university education*. Universities Australia. <https://acen.edu.au/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/National-WIL-Strategy-in-university-education-032015.pdf>

Waiwaiiole, E. N., Bohlig, E. M., & Massey, K. J. (2016). Student success: Identifying high-impact practices. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 2016(175), 45–55. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cc.20211>

Wan, C.-S., Yang, J., Cheng, S., & Su, C. (2013). A longitudinal study on internship effectiveness in vocational higher education. *Educational Review*, 65(1), 36–55. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2011.634969>

Wyonch, R. (2020). *Work-ready graduates: The role of co-op programs in labour market success* (SSRN Scholarly Paper No. 3520206). <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3520206>

Youngblood, P. D. (2020). Working relationships among supervisors and interns in virtual Internships. (Order No 2 7740601) [Doctoral dissertation, University of the Incarnate Word]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.