

# Are unpaid internships just as valuable? A comparison of U.S. work integrated learning students' perceptions of paid and unpaid experiences

JESSICA L. HURST

*Iowa State University, Iowa, United States of America*

PHILIP GARDNER<sup>1</sup>

*Michigan State University, Michigan, United States of America*

AMY DORIE

*San Francisco State University, California, United States of America*

---

The notion of compensation generates criticism, especially in the U.S. around unpaid internships in particular – the country's principal form of work-integrated learning (WIL). The distinction between unpaid and paid internships remains understudied and therefore, serves as the primary motivator to compare students' perceptions of unpaid and paid WIL experiences, using a large U.S. data set. The purpose of this study is to compare interns' perceptions of unpaid and paid experiences to gain a better understanding of how these experiences frame interns' supervisory support interactions, perceptions of advancement opportunities, career confirmation, and conversion intentions. The study is U.S. centric, surveying students who had recently completed their internships. Results indicated that regardless of pay (i.e., paid vs. unpaid), interns had similar expectations regarding supervisory support, career confirmation, and conversion intentions. Hence, confirming that both unpaid and paid internships provide a strong platform for students to obtain the support they need to launch their future careers.

Keywords: Interns, paid, unpaid, career management theories, USA, conversion intentions

---

In their definition of work integrated learning (WIL) Smith, Brooks, et al. (2009) acknowledge that this work may be paid or unpaid. Unpaid assignments for required professional practice found in the learning pedagogy of disciplines such as nursing, teaching, dietetics, counseling, and occupational therapy, as examples, find acceptance among WIL practitioners, faculty, and students. Their acceptance also extends to work with non-governmental agencies (non-profits), social service agencies, and many start-up enterprises and small firms. Criticism of unpaid WIL focuses on mid-size and large for-profit companies and selected governmental sectors, particularly in the U.S. (Greenhouse, 2010; McGregor, 2013). The U.S. situation has been particularly argumentative with contending pressures to eliminate unpaid experiences completely versus calls to relax the requirements classifying an experience unpaid (Ravishankar, 2021). The distinction between unpaid and paid internships remains understudied and serves as our motivation to undertake a deeper probe of the comparison of the socialization aspects of unpaid and paid WIL experiences, using a large U.S. data set. Groenewald et al. (2011) posit a broad taxonomy for WIL based on concepts developed by Drysdale et al. (2011). This inclusive taxonomy captures experiences that include service-learning, work-study, clinical rotations, teaching preparation assignments, apprenticeships, sandwich year engagements and much more.

In the past 20 years, internships have progressively become widely accepted in the U.S. labor market. Internships continue to be an ever-increasing, yet controversial, labor force phenomenon. Particularly, the issue of unpaid internships has become a source of pedagogical, legislative, judicial, and ethical

---

<sup>1</sup> Corresponding author: Philip Gardner, [gardnerp@msu.edu](mailto:gardnerp@msu.edu)

debate (Burke & Carton, 2013). Over the past decade, academic researchers have investigated college internships, both paid and unpaid, to improve their understanding of the fundamental elements surrounding the critical role that internships play in the professional development and career preparation of college students (e.g., Dixon et al., 2005; Gault, Leach, & Duey 2010; Gault, Redington, & Schlager, 2000; Hurst et al., 2012; Lei & Yin, 2019; McDermott, 2013; McHugh, 2017). Extant empirical literature on internships primarily focuses on the employment effects and career indicators of the internship experience (Binder et al., 2015) with limited empirical research regarding the policy and legal implications of internships surrounding pay. Hence, if college administrators, law-makers, and companies desire to develop the most mutually beneficial college-level internships, then more research is needed to provide further insight on the key elements surrounding internships and internship programs, especially as it relates to the impact of compensation.

Internships are critical tools through which many organizations hire recent college graduates. Internships provide a way for the organization and the student to find their 'best fit,' which often results in better short- and long-term retention rates for new hires (Hurst et al., 2012; Miller et al., 2018). Compensation (e.g., pay) plays a vital role in an organization's ability to attract and retain interns, who the organization will then work to convert into full-time, successful employees (McHugh, 2017).

In 2010, the national discussion heightened in response to increasing concerns regarding the equality and lawfulness of internships; primarily on issues relating to ethnicity, gender differences, social class and other socio-economic factors (Gardner, 2012). Moreover, arising from concern that stricter enforcement of employment regulations would inhibit internship opportunities, presidents from thirteen U.S. universities sent a letter to U.S. Labor Secretary, Hilda Solis, in April 2010 requesting that the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) relax their regulations on (unpaid) internships (Aoun et al., 2010; Eisenbrey, 2010). As a response to the increasing concern regarding the exploitation of students, the DOL issued "Fact Sheet #71: Internship Programs under the Fair Labor Standards Act (DOL, 2010). The purpose of Fact Sheet #71 was to clarify the legal position regarding internships and to ensure that for-profit organizations understood that enforcement of the rules was likely to increase (Cameron, 2013). Furthermore, Gardner (2011) states that "for lawmakers, economists, journalists, academics, and others, a debate is raging in the absence of good data, and reliable information about these complicated issues" (p 2).

The strong labor markets for talent development programs (internships, co-ops and similar programs) between 2011 and the onset of the COVID pandemic cooled the legal maneuvering and the political chest thumping surrounding unpaid internships. This quiet interlude offered the environment to address Gardner's (2011) point concerning the lack of solid research on this issue. Furthermore, it remains unclear if unpaid interns are the same or different from paid interns regarding work attitudes, behaviors, and experiences, and whether these experiences have an impact on intern's career development and future employment (Rogers et al., 2021). Therefore, the purpose of this study is to compare perceptions of unpaid and paid interns on how their internship experiences frame their expectations and decisions moving forward in their careers. A better understanding of student experiences in unpaid internships compared to students with paid internships enables faculty, practitioners, and organizations to develop improved WIL experiences.

## BACKGROUND AND LITERATURE REVIEW ON INTERNSHIPS

### *Internship Experience*

Internships are temporary work experiences typically offered to post-secondary students and recent graduates by organizations (Binder et al., 2015). Research regarding internships indicates that three parties benefit from the experience: the university, the host organization, and the student (Hoyle & Deschaine, 2016; Hoyle & Goffnett, 2013; Verner et al., 2001). For students, internships give them the opportunity to gain 'real world' work experience and see what working for that particular organization would be like. For the university, internships provide access to industry experts, facilitate in curriculum development, and enhance teaching methods. For the organization, interns provide a recruitment pool of candidates for future employment (Pianko, 1996) and serve as brand ambassadors for the organization when they return to campus. These internship experiences are either paid or unpaid; typically, in addition to non-profits, health services, education and government, smaller companies and those in fields related to communications, arts, apparel design, and media industry sectors are more likely to offer unpaid versus paid internships (Gardner, 2012).

### *Student and Organization Benefits of Internships*

College internships can be of great benefit to both the student and the organization (Hurst et al., 2012). For the students, aside from gaining valuable real world, hands-on experience, training, and the prospect of future employment, extant literature supports that students with internships are more likely to gain full time employment and have higher starting salaries than students without internships (Gault, Leach, & Duey, 2010; Gault, Redington, & Schlager, 2000). In addition, internships help students confirm/disconfirm career choices and gain greater career exploration (Rothman & Sisman, 2016). For the organization, aside from serving as a primary recruitment tool, utilizing internships may serve as a cost savings measure due to reduced pay or free labor (McHugh, 2017). According to the Collegiate Employment Research Institute (CERI), organizations primarily use internships and co-ops to identify and develop future talent (57%), while 23% use interns to supplement current staffing (Gardner, 2013; Gardner, 2019). Hence, internships often aid the organization in selecting and assessing the fit and potential of new hires (i.e., interns; Lei & Yin, 2019).

### *Credit-Bearing Versus Non-Credit Bearing Internships*

The number of students earning college credit through internships is on the rise (Gardner, 2012). This increase may be the result of several factors, such as: (1) legal ramifications regarding the unpaid internship; (2) the growth of internships as a degree completion requirement; and (3) the belief that organizations can reduce their compensation liability for student workers. Extant literature appears to avoid the distinction between credit-bearing and non-credit bearing internships, and while this differentiation is beyond the scope of the current study, it is certainly worth investigating further, as the authors suggest later in the limitations and future research section.

### *Frequency and Importance of Paid Versus Unpaid Internships*

According to most college and university career advisors and work-study counselors, the number of college internships, both paid and unpaid, has steadily risen over the past twenty years (McHugh, 2017). In 2008, the National Association of Colleges and Employers (NACE) found that 50% of graduating students had completed an internship during their college career (Collins & Koncz, 2018). Then, in 2017, NACE reported that 61% of graduating seniors had at least one internship experience during their

college career (Collins & Koncz, 2018). More recently, in 2018 over 84% of U.S. college graduates reported that they completed at least one internship during their college career (Porter, 2019).

Another study conducted by NACE (2016) that investigated the correlation between internships and full-time employment, found that hiring rates for unpaid interns (37%) was similar to rates for students who had not completed any internship at all (35%). Furthermore, according to NACE's *Class of 2019 Student Survey*, the job offer rate was highly correlated to pay status; results indicated that 66% of paid interns received a job offer compared to 44% of unpaid interns that received a job offer (NACE, 2019).

Consequently, students who completed a paid internship were far more likely to attain employment than students who completed an unpaid internship (Burger, 2014). Unfortunately, these comparisons are not helpful unless one controls for academic major. For example, in engineering, nearly all engineers have paid internships and accept full-time offers from their host organizations. Conversely, in the so-called glamour/creative industries such as entertainment/music, media/communications, and fashion, over 60% of internships are unpaid with fewer opportunities to convert to full-time employment (Howe, 2014; Hunt & Scott, 2020). A better understanding of internships and attainment of employment should come from comparisons within an academic discipline or by controlling for academic discipline in the analysis. Therefore, in the current study, we control for such variables. Regardless, as internships become a necessity for graduates to secure post-graduation employment both paid and unpaid internships will be highly sought after (NACE, 2019).

Burke and Carton (2013) state that the primary beneficiary of the unpaid internship from a pedagogical, legal and ethical perspectives should be the student; however, this does not preclude the organization from benefitting. Moreover, for unpaid internships, 2010 sparked the national debate among college administrators, economists, the media, and government as to whether unpaid internships are legal, economically discriminatory, and generally fair in terms of who benefits the most, the student or the organization. This debate relates to both for-profit and non-profit internships, and the inherent differences between internships in the manufacturing, service, communications, technology, and financial sectors of the U.S. economy. As the prevalence of unpaid internships continues, so does the conversation regarding the legal ramifications regarding pay for interns. As the number of internships continues to increase, so does the controversy between paid vs unpaid interns (McHugh, 2017). Since 2011, over 30 lawsuits have been filed by unpaid interns against organizations in the U.S. (Suen & Brandeisky, 2014). While unpaid internships offer cost savings advantages to organizations, their growth is consistent with a trend toward precarious employment (Kalleberg, 2009).

Furthermore, the new Department of Labor 'primary beneficiary' guidelines released in January 2018 (U.S. Department of Labor, 2018) are more flexible than the previous six-prong test and may make it easier for companies to offer unpaid internships (Greenfield, 2018) as one emphasis is that nonmonetary benefits often transfer to interns during the WIL experience. Therefore, under the new guidelines, if at least 51% of the benefits go to the intern, he or she is the primary beneficiary and does not have to be paid (Smith, 2018). Moreover, anecdotal evidence by Perlin (2011) suggests that unpaid internships lack substantive benefits that a) help interns solidify their career interests, b) provide developmental guidance, and c) help interns identify potential employment options. In an effort to move beyond anecdotal evidence, additional empirical research is needed to provide further insight regarding the impact of compensation (paid vs unpaid) on interns' perceptions of supervisory support, advancement opportunities and ultimately, their conversion intentions. A legal analysis of the new DOL 2018 guidelines regarding paid and unpaid internships is beyond the scope of this paper, but is worthy of future research. In the current study, surveys from interns' facilitate the comparisons between paid and unpaid interns regarding their internship experiences and expectations.

*Importance of Compensation*

Extant literature on internship compensation has primarily focused on legal and regulatory issues (Coker, 2009; Curiale, 2010) and the responsibilities of educational institutions regarding unpaid internships (Bowman & Lipp, 2000; Svacina, 2012). In addition, most empirical studies regarding internships fail to determine whether interns are reporting about their paid or unpaid internship experience (McHugh, 2017). In studies that collect compensation data from interns, pay is usually not a focal variable (e.g., D'Abate et al., 2009; Dixon et al., 2005; Zhao & Liden, 2011). Moreover, according to Rose (2015), the predictive role of pay in internships has been largely neglected within the context of internship research. Therefore, Rose (2015) investigated the role of pay on interns' job satisfaction and performance and found that pay significantly influenced internship satisfaction, but not performance. Alternatively, unpaid interns may experience feelings of pay inequity, which may lower their level of satisfaction with their internship, especially if their immediate work group includes paid co-workers and/or peers participating in paid internships (Adams, 1963; Feldman & Turnley, 2004). Furthermore, most empirical studies connecting internships with the experiences' developmental value often omit the impact of compensation.

For organizations and universities, the underlying assumption is that unpaid internships offer significant developmental value to interns. This position suggests that the compensation received by unpaid interns is not financial but comes in the form of personal, professional and career developmental opportunities provided throughout the internship experience (Smith, Smith, & Caddell, 2015). This notion is further supported by Crain (2016), who found that unpaid interns reported higher statistically significant gains in understanding academic coursework compared to paid interns. Given the volume of organizational studies showing strong relationships between compensation and work-related outcomes, the lack of attention compensation has received from internship researchers is somewhat astounding (Currall et al., 2005) and warrants further investigation.

## THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

In the current study, we draw from a sample of over 5,000 interns, to address the hypotheses posed regarding their internship experiences, both paid and unpaid.

The current study uses theoretical underpinnings from organizational socialization theory (Feldman, 1976; Van Maanen, 1975) as it focuses on the learning and adjustment processes that enable newcomers to assume a role within the organization that fits both their needs and the needs of the organization (Chao, 2012). Interns are similar to new hires in terms of their socialization needs (McHugh, 2017). Strong mentoring relationships are imperative for newcomers as a part of the socialization process (Ostroff & Kozlowski, 1993). The current study investigates the impact of compensation (paid vs. unpaid) on newcomers (i.e., interns) as they learn the culture and values of their new job setting and develop the necessary work skills needed to adjust to their new work environment. With guidance from their supervisors, interns socialize and acclimate themselves to the organization's culture and values. They begin to learn more about the job itself, as well as the organization practices, procedures, and work networks. This internship experience gives interns a more realistic job preview and helps solidify if they have chosen the right career path and if they could see themselves working for their internship organization after graduation. Therefore, the hypotheses, posed in this exploratory study, compare paid and unpaid interns' perceptions of supervisory support, internship structure, advancement opportunities, career confirmation, and conversion intentions.

*Supervisory Support*

Supervisory support is the degree to which employees perceive their supervisor as providing direction, encouragement, and mentoring (Hurst et al., 2012). The role of the supervisor has been found to be vital during the early stages of the internship experience for several reasons: 1) supervisors control the degree of structure, ambiguity, and conflict in the work itself, 2) supervisors provide feedback regarding their performance and work behavior, and 3) supervisors control rewards and can possibly influence future job opportunities (Griffin et al., 2001; Krackhardt et al., 1981). All of these job experiences facilitated by supervisors are extremely important to newcomers (i.e., interns) as they are trying to familiarize themselves with a new organizational environment and culture (Van Maanen, 1975). Supportive supervisors are critical because they can enhance job satisfaction, provide training and development, and facilitate the pursuit of one's future career intentions (Knight et al., 2006). Moreover, Farmer and Fedor (1999) found that unpaid interns are likely to report less developmental value (i.e., supervisory support) during their internship experience compared to paid interns. The first hypothesis is:

H1: There is a significant difference in post-internship perceptions of supervisory support between unpaid and paid interns.

*Internship Structure*

Drawing from seminal work regarding job characteristics (i.e., task significance, skill variety, task autonomy) by Hackman and Oldham (1975) and work environment characteristics (i.e., learning opportunities and career development opportunities) by Herzberg (1965, 1974), the current study defines internship structure as a set of job characteristics that further explain what an intern does on the job. Extant literature findings indicate that the closer the fit between relevant job characteristics and existing skills of interns, the higher the likelihood that the intern will find the WIL experience satisfying (D'Abate et al., 2009; Hussien & La Lopa, 2018; Lord et al., 2011; Reiner & Zhao, 1999). While job characteristics are empirically well supported in the literature for full-time employees (Hackman & Oldham, 1975), there is less clear evidence regarding the importance of job characteristics (i.e., internship structure) as it relates to paid versus unpaid interns. Hence, we posit the following:

H2: There is a significant difference in post-internship perceptions of the structure of the internship between paid and unpaid interns.

*Advancement Opportunities*

Interns' perceptions of advancement opportunities are defined as "one's awareness or insight regarding promotion and advancement opportunities the company [organization] has to offer beyond the duration of the internship" (Hurst et al., 2012, p. 508). During the internship, interns interact with various individuals within the organization, and by doing so, gain experience and knowledge that allows them to formulate their own perceptions of what a career within that organization would look like upon graduation. According to Dixon et al. (2005), interns are more likely to want to remain with the organization once their internship is over, if they perceive good advancement opportunities and potential for continued growth. Hence, to discern the impact that compensation has on interns' advancement opportunity expectations, the next hypothesis poses:

H3: There is a significant difference in post-internship advancement opportunity expectations between paid and unpaid interns.

### *Career Confirmation*

Existing literature regarding the impact of an internship on career confirmation has reported mixed results across a variety of majors (Callanan & Benzing, 2004; Cook et al., 2004; Cunningham et al., 2005; Fender & Watson, 2005; Liu et al., 2011). The primary focus of these studies, however, compares interns and non-interns in their career confirmation and rarely include compensation in the analysis. The awareness a student gains from their internship experience can confirm or disconfirm his/her expectations regarding what it would be like to be employed with that organization, as well as what it would be like to be employed in that profession/career/industry (Rothman & Sisman, 2016). For example, using in-depth interviews, Walmsley et al. (2012) found that for some interns, the internship experience made them reconsider their career choice, rather than refining it. Hence, even a negative internship experience can aid students in determining career choices (Odio et al., 2014; Templeton et al., 2012). The dearth of research examining the impact of the internship experience on career confirmation warrants further study, especially the impact that compensation has on career confirmation. For example, McHugh (2017) found that unpaid interns reported lower career pursuit intentions than paid interns, leading to the fourth hypothesis:

H4: There is a significant difference in post-internship career confirmation expectations between paid and unpaid interns.

### *Conversion Intentions*

Compensation appears as a key variable in studies of job search intentions (Aiman-Smith et al., 2001). According to a recent survey conducted by the NACE, students who completed a paid internship received more job offers and higher starting salaries than those participating in unpaid internships (NACE, 2019). Since many organizations use their internship programs as an extended recruitment process to attain new hires, the lack of compensation during the internship seems unfair. Thus, unpaid interns are more likely to report lower conversion intentions with their internship organization. As a result, hypothesis five states:

H5: There is a significant difference in post-internship conversion intentions between paid and unpaid interns.

## METHODS

### *Data Collection Procedure*

The Institutional Review Board (IRB) in the Office of Research Ethics approved the use of the internship data provided by InternBridge, with the stipulation that no personal identification information be included in the data set. This data set included responses from over 200 post-secondary U.S. institutions. Schools delivered their online survey information to their undergraduate students through a message from their career and internship offices that contained the HTML link to the survey. InternBridge, a research, publishing, and consulting firm, administered the data collection process. The analyses reported in this study focuses on students who had completed a work-learning experience (i.e., internship) at the time of the survey.

### *Instrument*

The online survey tapped student demographics, information about career readiness, and details of current and completed internships using existing scales or modifications of existing scales. Data collected for the current analyses included 11 items measuring supervisory support (Caplan et al., 1980), twelve items for internship structure modified from work by Hackman and Oldham (1975) and Herzberg (1965, 1974), seven items for advancement opportunity expectations (Hurst et al., 2012; Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969), five items for career confirmation expectations modified from work by Blau (1988), D'Abate et al. (2009), Feldman (1976), Feldman and Weitz (1990), Hackman and Oldham (1975), and Murphy and Ensher (1999), and seven items measuring conversion intentions (Hurst, 2007; Robinson, 1996). All measures came from previously validated and reliable scales. Additional variables pertinent to the current analyses (as control variables) included: academic major, type of educational institution, size of internship organization, and industry sector of internship. In addition, the data set contained personal characteristics, including age, gender, family income, financial aid, and ethnicity.

### *Participants*

The current sample comprised 5,735 students who had completed an internship at the time of the survey. Students represented a variety of majors such as, agriculture, engineering, social sciences, business/management/marketing, psychology, and journalism. Approximately 70% of the interns were females and 30% were males. Approximately 73% were White, non-Hispanic and were from households that reported family income below \$40,000 (27%) to above \$120,000 (17%). The majority of the sample (86.6%) consisted of juniors and seniors, with an average age of 23. The sample consisted of interns from a variety of institutional types across the U.S.: two-year colleges (1.7%), public college or university (53.7%), and private college or university (44.6%). Approximately 54% of the internships took place at for-profit companies, 29% at non-profit organizations, and 17% were at government agencies. Concerning pay, 2,470 (43%) of the internships were unpaid and 3,265 (57%) were paid (Table 1).

### *Data Analysis*

Data were analyzed using MPlus 8.4 and SPSS 24.0. Reliability and validity of the measures were assessed with Cronbach's alpha and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) with Maximum Likelihood Estimation, respectively. Measures with Cronbach's alpha coefficients above 0.70 were deemed acceptably reliable (Nunnally, 1978). Validity of the measures were assessed against established criteria for model fit indices: CFI > .95, TLI > .95, RMSEA < .06, SRMR < .08. (Hu & Bentler, 1999). Analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) uncovered differences in student outcomes between paid and unpaid internships while controlling for other relevant variables. The variable coded as paid versus unpaid internship served as the independent variable for all ANCOVAs and academic major, type of educational institution, size of organization, and industry sector of internship were included as control variables for these analyses. The dependent variables for the ANCOVAs were supervisory support (H1), internship structure (H2), advancement opportunity expectations (H3), career confirmation expectations (H4), and conversion intentions (H5). To test the assumptions of ANCOVA, such as equality of error variances and normality of residuals, Levene's Test, spread versus level plots, and plots of residual distributions were employed. Additionally, any potential issues with multicollinearity of predictor variables were investigated with Pearson correlation tables with correlations below .80 suggesting reliable ANCOVA estimates.



TABLE 1: Sample demographics of student interns.

Demographic	Category	Frequency	Percent	Percent with unpaid internship
Gender	Male	1728	30.1	32.5
	Female	4007	69.9	47.6
Race/Ethnicity	White, non-Hispanic	4170	72.7	43.3
	Hispanic or Latino	308	5.4	39.6
	African American or Black	353	6.2	46.5
	Asian American	477	8.3	39.4
	Native American	42	0.7	42.9
	Other	385	6.7	45.2
Family Income	Under \$40,000	1548	27.0	46.6
	\$40,000-\$79,999	1728	30.1	44.7
	\$80,00-\$119,999	1470	25.6	39.2
	\$120,000 and over	989	17.2	40.5
Major	Agriculture & Natural Resources	199	3.5	34.2
	Arts & Letters	656	11.4	56.9
	Physical Sciences & Math	156	2.7	17.9
	Communication Arts & Sciences	468	8.2	58.5
	Business	1,493	26.0	30.1
	Engineering & Architecture	582	10.1	10.8
	Computers & Technology	196	3.4	24.0
	Social Sciences	1073	18.7	62.9
	Biological & Health Sciences	620	10.8	48.7
	Education	163	2.8	65.6
	Vocational Studies	72	1.3	61.1
Interdisciplinary & Other Studies	57	1.0	43.1	
Type of Institution	Two-year college	95	1.7	55.8
	Small private college or university of 200 or fewer students	236	4.1	44.8
	Private college or university with more than 2,000 students	2327	40.6	44.3
	Public college or university of less than 5,000 students	292	5.1	45.9
	Public college or university of 5,000-15,000 students	1182	20.6	41.3
	Public college or university of more than 15,000 students	1603	28.0	41.0

After completion of the hypotheses testing, binary logistic regression (BLR) examined the influence of the control variables and personal characteristics on participation in unpaid and paid experiences. BLR deemed the appropriate approach as the dependent variable was binary (paid and unpaid). The method allowed for independent variables to be entered as a categorical items. Age entered the regression as a covariate and the remaining variables as categorical with the last listed item specified as the redundant or reference case against which other items in the variable were compared. The independent categories with the reference variable in parentheses included: gender (women), ethnicity

(White, non-Hispanic), family income (>\$120,000), major (business), institution type (public institutions >15,000 students), academic standing (fifth year student), company size (>10,000 employees) and industry sector (professional, business, and scientific services). In a major adjustment to the initial model, business replaced engineering as the reference item for major as more than 80% of engineering students received pay and thus were held out of the model. A test for multicollinearity raised concerns about family income and financial aid with the latter withheld from the analysis. The BLR proceeded in a block approach with personal characteristics entered first, followed by academic factors and finally, industry characteristics.

BLR also provides the odds ratio (Exp(B)) or the likelihood that a group within the categorical variable would be in a paid or unpaid internship compared to the reference group. A Exp(B) greater than 1 indicates that group is more likely to engage in paid internships than the reference and with value less than 1 the likelihood of being in an unpaid internship. For example, the Exp(B) for men is 1.898 which indicates that men are 1.9 (rounded) more likely to be in paid internships than women. For Social Science the Exp(B) is .715 which indicates that social science majors are 29.5% (1.000 - .715) more likely to be in unpaid internships than business majors.

## RESULTS

### *Reliability and Validity*

All measures exhibited acceptable reliability with Cronbach alpha coefficients above 0.76 (Nunnally, 1978; Appendix A 2). To achieve this level of reliability two items were dropped from the scale for career confirmation. Confirmatory Factor Analysis established the validity of the measures, with each scale exhibiting acceptable test statistics: supervisory support [ $\chi^2(27) = 983.88, p < .00, CFI = .97, TLI = .96, RMSEA = .08, SRMR = .03$ ], internship structure [ $\chi^2(20) = 365.70, p < .00, CFI = .95, TLI = .94, RMSEA = .08, SRMR = .04$ ], advancement opportunity expectations [ $\chi^2(2) = 1.13, p > .05, CFI = 1.00, TLI = 1.00, RMSEA = 0, SRMR = .002$ ], and conversion intentions [ $\chi^2(2) = 33.62, p < .00, CFI = 1.00, TLI = .99, RMSEA = .05, SRMR = .01$ ] (Appendix A). To improve the fit of the measures, two items were removed from the supervisory support expectations and advancement opportunity expectations scales, four items were removed from the internship structure scale, and three items were eliminated from the conversion intentions scale. Since career confirmation expectations was reduced to a three-item scale for reliability (after removing two items), the model was just identified, which resulted in parameter estimates that had a unique solution that perfectly reproduced the observed matrix (J. Templin, personal communication, 2016) requiring no fit statistics nor further CFA adjustments. See Appendix A for a full list of item measures and reliability coefficients (alpha) for each scale used in this study.

### *Hypothesis Testing*

After controlling for academic major, type of educational institution, size of organization, and industry sector of internship, the ANCOVA results of the five hypotheses posed in the current study are discussed below.

Hypothesis 1 (H1) posed a significant difference in interns supervisory support perceptions between paid and unpaid interns. Results indicated that after completing an internship, there were no significant differences in supervisory support experiences [ $F(1,5729) = .02, p > .05$ ] between paid ( $M = 4.05, SD = .80$ ) and unpaid ( $M = 4.05, SD = .82$ ) interns (Table 2); thus, H1 was not supported. This suggests that regardless of compensation (e.g. pay) interns had very similar supervisory support experiences during their internship. Finding no support for this hypothesis is noteworthy, as it not

only solidifies the importance of a supportive supervisor, regardless of pay, but it also reveals that unpaid interns can experience an equitable level of developmental instruction during their internship as paid interns.

TABLE 2: Results of ANCOVA for supervisory support perceptions (H1).

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Corrected model	9.948	5	1.990	3.022	.010
Intercept	.573	1	.573	.870	.351
Control variables					
Type of educational institution	3.721	1	3.721	5.652	.017
Academic Major	.282	1	.282	.428	.513
Industry sector of internship	2.487	1	2.487	3.778	.052
Size of internship organization	4.643	1	4.643	7.053	.008
Paid or unpaid internship	.016	1	.016	.024	.877
Error	3771.363	5729	.658		
Total	98022.753	5735			
Corrected total	3781.311	5734			

H2 stated that there would be a significant difference in perceptions of the internship structure between paid and unpaid interns. ANCOVA results indicated a significant difference between paid and unpaid interns regarding their experiences with internship structure [ $F(1,5729) = 23.52, p < .000$ ]. Paid interns reported a significantly higher internship structure ( $M = 4.00$ ) than unpaid interns ( $M = 3.90$ ); hence, supporting H2 (Table 3). This finding indicates that paid interns were more influenced by the structure of the internship (i.e., job characteristics) than unpaid interns. In fact, paid interns reported that they were able to set priorities, learn new skills, and were exposed to other areas of the organization at a significantly higher rate than unpaid interns. Alternatively, unpaid interns reported significantly higher levels of completing work that was highly related to their academic career interests and goals; this finding is consistent with previous literature that posits that the compensation for unpaid interns may be more in the form of professional and career development, rather than financial (McHugh, 2017). Interestingly, both paid and unpaid interns experienced meaningful projects that provided a benefit to the organization.

TABLE 3: Results of ANCOVA for internship structure (H2).

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Corrected model	32.715	5	6.543	12.991	.000
Intercept	1.367	1	1.367	2.715	.099
Control variables					
Type of educational institution	1.294	1	1.294	2.569	.109
Academic Major	0.298	1	0.298	0.591	.442
Industry sector of internship	3.340	1	3.340	6.631	.010
Size of internship organization	13.389	1	13.389	26.585	.000
Paid or unpaid internship	11.848	1	11.848	23.524	.000
Error	2885.389	5729	.504		
Total	51291.438	5735			
Corrected total	5548.681	5734			

H3 posited that a significant difference in advancement opportunity expectations exists between paid and unpaid interns. ANCOVA results revealed a significant difference between paid and unpaid interns in advancement opportunity expectations [ $F(1,5729) = 48.04, p < .000$ ] after controlling for education and industry factors. Paid interns had significantly higher ( $M = 3.66, SD = .86$ ) advancement opportunity expectations than unpaid interns ( $M = 3.42, SD = .89$ ); supporting H3 (Table 4). This finding indicates that paid interns had greater awareness or insight regarding the advancement opportunities within their organization and/or career field compared to unpaid interns. These results provide further insight for both industry and academia regarding the importance of sharing career advancement and career development opportunities with students during the internship experience. If the goal of the organization is to use their internship program as a recruitment tool for future hires, providing adequate knowledge of advancement opportunities with interns may act as a catalyst for converting interns into full-time hires after graduation. Extant literature supports this notion that if interns perceive good career advancement opportunities exist and feel that there is potential for continued growth within the organization, they are more likely to remain with that organization after their internship is over (Dixon et al., 2005).

TABLE 4: Results of ANCOVA for advancement opportunity expectations (H3).

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Corrected model	190.784	5	38.157	50.860	.000
Intercept	32.909	1	32.909	43.866	.000
Control variables					
Type of educational institution	.565	1	.565	.754	.385
Academic Major	20.117	1	20.117	26.814	.000
Industry sector of internship	9.986	1	9.986	13.310	.000
Size of internship organization	67.138	1	67.138	89.490	.000
Paid or unpaid internship	36.038	1	36.038	48.036	.000
Error	4298.048	5729	.750		
Total	77055.563	5735			
Corrected total	4488.832	5734			

H4 posited a significant difference in career confirmation expectations between paid and unpaid interns. After partitioning out the variance due to the control variables, the ANCOVA indicated no significant differences between the two groups [ $F(1,5729) = .34, p > .05$ ]. Paid interns ( $M = 3.69, SD = .92$ ) reported similar levels of career confirmation expectations as unpaid interns ( $M = 3.71, SD = .95$ ). Thus, H4 was not supported (Table 5). The fact that paid and unpaid interns had similar career confirmation expectations is notable, as it indicates that regardless of pay, all interns gained awareness and experience during their internship that helped confirm their career choice.

TABLE 5: Results of ANCOVA for career confirmation expectations (H4).

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Corrected model	32.007	5	6.401	7.397	.000
Intercept	9.418	1	9.418	10.883	.001
Control variables					
Type of educational institution	.001	1	.001	.001	.974
Academic Major	22.188	1	22.188	25.639	.000
Industry sector of internship	1.549	1	1.549	1.790	.181
Size of internship organization	6.112	1	6.112	7.063	.008
Paid or unpaid internship	.292	1	.292	.338	.561
Error	4957.965	5729	.865		
Total	83619.333	5735			
Corrected total	4989.973	5734			

The fifth analysis investigated the difference in conversion intentions between paid and unpaid interns (H5). After controlling for academic major, type of educational institution, size of organization, and industry sector of internship, the ANCOVA showed no significant differences between paid and unpaid interns in relation to conversion intentions [ $F(1,5729) = .02, p > .05$ ]. Paid interns ( $M = 2.86, SD = .99$ ) reported only marginally higher conversion intentions than unpaid interns ( $M = 2.78, SD = .97$ ); thus, not supporting H5 (Table 6). Regardless of pay, the internship experience itself provided a solid foundation for interns to base future career-related decisions, such as conversion intentions.

TABLE 6: Results of ANCOVA for conversion intentions (H5).

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Corrected model	142.986	5	28.597	30.308	.000
Intercept	73.245	1	73.245	77.625	.000
Control variables					
Type of educational institution	8.229	1	8.229	8.722	.003
Academic Major	1.067	1	1.067	1.131	.288
Industry sector of internship	.097	1	.097	.103	.749
Size of internship organization	114.267	1	114.267	121.101	.000
Paid or unpaid internship	.016	1	.016	.017	.897
Error	5405.695	5729	.944		
Total	51291.438	5735			
Corrected total	5548.681	5734			

In sum, hypotheses testing results indicated that paid interns had a significantly different perception of the internship structure (H2) and advancement opportunity expectations (H3) than unpaid interns. Although, not statistically significant, both paid and unpaid interns had similar supervisory support perceptions (H1), career confirmation expectations (H4), and conversion intentions (H5); indicating that regardless of pay, both paid and unpaid interns reported a worth-while internship experience that gave them the support they needed to continue in their chosen career. See Table 7 for a summary of testing results for all five hypotheses.

TABLE 7: Means standard deviations and results of hypothesis testing (H1 – H5).

Hypothesis	Mean (SD) paid	Mean (SD) unpaid	Hypothesis Test
H1: Supervisory Support Perceptions	4.05 (0.80)	4.05 (0.82)	Not supported
H2: Internship Structure	4.00 (0.01)	3.90 (0.02)	Supported
H3: Advancement Opportunity Expectations	3.66 (0.86)	3.42 (0.89)	Supported
H4: Career Confirmation Expectations	3.69 (0.92)	3.71 (0.95)	Not supported
H5: Conversion Intentions	2.86 (0.99)	2.86 (0.97)	Not supported

#### *Control and Personal Variable Comparisons*

The BLR for the first block of personal characteristics contributed only a small amount to understanding the difference between students engaged in unpaid and paid internships (Nagelkirke  $R^2 = .043$ ). Both age and gender showed significance with adult learners (older) being more likely in unpaid assignments as are women. Men are nearly 2 times (1.898) more likely to be in paid internships than women. Ethnicity proved insignificant. Family income entered significantly in the model but comparisons between the highest income group and others showed no significant comparisons. Concerning family income, students from lower income households showed a very slight tendency to participate in unpaid internships than did students from high income families.

Upon entering the second block of academic related variables the regression model improved with a Nagelkirke  $R^2 = .143$ . The major contributor was academic major. Agriculture and computer science/IT majors expressed no difference from business students in participating in unpaid or paid internships. All other major groups reported significant differences from business, all reporting higher levels of unpaid participation. Particularly high levels of unpaid internships appeared for arts and letters, communication and social science with 68%, 70% and 73% more likely to be in unpaid positions than business. Education and health science majors, as expected, were in unpaid assignments because these experiences are embedded in the curriculum and training. Academic standing revealed significant differences between 5th year students and other class levels. Age and gender remained significant while family income, grade point average, and institutional type proved insignificant.

With the addition of the final block of variables (industry sector and organization size), the Nagelkirke  $R^2$  improved to .242. Size comparisons showed that large organizations (over 5,000 employees) were more likely to provide paid internships than smaller organizations. Organizations with 100 or fewer employees were more likely to provide unpaid experiences. The professional, business and scientific services (PBSS) sector as the reference category represents a wide range of industry groups that offer paid internships (public accountancy, computer services and development, and engineering services, as examples) and unpaid internships (public relations, advertising, and environmental services, as examples). In comparison to PBSS, utilities, oil, and construction as a group, manufacturing and transportation services were more likely to have a preponderance of paid internships at a significant level. On the other hand, health services, arts & entertainment establishments, non-profit organizations (NGOs), and government agencies reported significantly higher levels of unpaid internships than PBSS. All remaining sectors showed no difference from PBSS. Age, gender, and academic major also were significant with ethnicity, family income, and institutional type remaining insignificant.

Four characteristics appear to clarify our understanding of unpaid WIL participation: gender, academic major, industry sector, and organizational size. The BLR confirms much of what we know about

unpaid internships. Appendix B presents the significant findings for each step in the construction of the BLR model with engineering students excluded.

## DISCUSSION: IMPLICATIONS

Findings of the current study provide noteworthy insight regarding the impact that paid and unpaid internships have on college students' perceptions of supervisory support experiences, internship structure, advancement opportunities, career confirmation, and conversion intentions. Results indicated that regardless of pay (i.e., paid vs. unpaid), interns had similar supervisory support expectations, career confirmation expectations, and conversion intentions. Therefore, the current study confirms that both unpaid and paid internships provide a strong platform for students to obtain the support they need to launch their careers.

Moreover, paid interns had higher internship structure and advancement opportunity perceptions compared to unpaid interns. First, in regard to internship structure, these findings are consistent with previous studies (e.g., D'Abate et al., 2009; Hussein & La Lopa, 2018; Lord et al., 2011) that discovered the impact of job characteristics (i.e., what interns do on the job) on interns' satisfaction with WIL experiences. Second, one plausible explanation concerning advancement opportunities, is that organizations offering unpaid opportunities may have limited opportunities for full-time employment as their host organizations have few positions available. Hence, the current study confirms that like paid interns, unpaid interns walk away from their internship experience with their career confirmed, but may have to look elsewhere for full-time employment due to the limited job openings available at the host organization.

### *Implications for Academia and Students*

Both unpaid and paid internships have quality issues that need to be acknowledged. For example, many students find their own internships without much guidance from institution staff (advisors) hence, if academic programs emphasize the importance of an internship, or even require it, then it is their responsibility to educate students on what makes a good internship and set solid expectations before students go searching for that internship. The quality of unpaid internships may be enhanced due to the adoption of the new (2018) DOL guidelines. The new guidelines are more beneficial to the student interns, as under these new guidelines interns can reap nonmonetary benefits and perform productive work that contributes to the well-being of the company. As under the previous 2010 six-factor test, interns were expected to be bystanders in the workplace and could not partake in activities that provided immediate advantages to the company. The new test changes that and may enhance the quality of the unpaid internship experience, as it attempts to assure the value of the learning experience by making the student, not the host organization, the primary beneficiary (Maurer, 2018). Academic programs need to be intentional in their efforts on building relationships with organizations, as a means to enhance the internship pipeline between their academic program and each organization; creating a win-win proposition for academia and industry.

### *Implications for Organizations (Practitioners) and Policymakers*

Existing literature continues to highlight the tension and complexity between paid and unpaid internships. The argument for paid interns centers primarily around the need to value and compensate accordingly (i.e., hourly wage) for work completed by interns, whereas the support for unpaid interns focuses on the investment of time, training, and experience gained rather than a formal hourly wage (Grasgreen, 2011). Most organizations prefer to hire students with existing industry experience (NACE,

2019), many of which now expect their new hires have prior internship or professional work experience. If that is the case, then it is the organizations' responsibility to provide quality experiences to students.

This notion finds support as expressed by Charles Kilfoye, EdD and Assistant Vice-President of Employer Engagement and Career Design at Northeastern University, who states two key points:

Employers today expect recent college graduates to demonstrate the equivalent of two years' worth of work experience in their domain before they'll consider hiring them ... [and]that's why it's important to build experiential opportunity right into our academic programs, so learners apply classroom skills to solve real-world problems for real workplace sponsors. (Knerl, 2018)

Therefore, reiterating how important it is for organizations and universities to work together to provide students with the most realistic job preview so they are prepared for their future careers. If industry and academia can work together to better understand workplace expectations, career preparedness, along with the benefits and challenges posed by both paid and unpaid internships, then organizations may have a more active role in the internship process, and gain access to a pipeline of talent provided by university internship programs.

The intent of the Federal Government's new 'primary beneficiary' test (adopted in 2018 by the U.S. Department of Labor) was to provide more flexibility with seven non-exhaustive factors and replace the older, more rigid six-factor test they adopted back in 2010 (Judish & Lauria, 2018). The new 'primary beneficiary' test prods organizations to pay their interns (at least minimum wage) as they would an employee, if they (the organization) are the primary beneficiary; however, if the intern is the primary beneficiary of the experience, then they can be unpaid. At which point, the organization is encouraged to enter into an educational agreement via a university internship program, whereby the student receives college credit but no monetary compensation from the organization. For those experiences falling under an educational agreement with no pay, the participants (student, university, and organization) need to acknowledge the burden that falls solely upon the student. Many students with unpaid internships often have to work a second (or even a third) job to earn enough money to pay for their internship credits and living expenses (food, housing, etc.). Post-hoc analysis of unpaid interns in the current study revealed that 75% had a second job for pay to cover living expenses and the college credits for their unpaid internship. Some colleges and universities help alleviate this burden through stipends, reduced credit requirements, federal work-study and other monetary incentives. Still, no easy fix to alleviate the burden of unpaid internship for students appears forthcoming. The best solution is to design experiences where students can develop those abilities necessary to transition into rewarding full-time positions.

## CONCLUSION

We showed in general that students in unpaid internships receive as much from their experiences as students in paid internships. Salary does have an impact on future decisions but appears not to be the primary or number one factor. Both types of internships provide the career development experience students need and produce equal levels of satisfaction whether paid or unpaid.

The troubling aspect of our findings is the overwhelming likelihood that women will be engaged in unpaid experiences, regardless of ethnic affiliation or family income. Their academic major choices, combined with their preferred career pathways into and through organizations that predominately offer unpaid experiences, position women to possibly face more financial constraints either through



higher loan needs to meet college expenses or entering lower paying occupations at the start of their careers.

Some schools are recognizing the longer-term financial implications of unpaid experiences. Some are providing stipend support while others are reducing the credit requirements to ease burdens. These policy changes alone will not mitigate the problems. A more comprehensive approach that incorporates career development, career pathway flexibility and stronger transition preparation to avoid entering low wage positions.

#### *Limitations and Future Research*

Using an online survey for data collection presented some limitations. First, the online nature of the survey instrument did not allow the researchers to fully control the number of respondents nor the timeframe in which they responded. Second, as with most survey research where data is collected using self-report measures, common-method bias and recall bias may be present.

Understanding the role that compensation plays in applicant attraction to internship opportunities would be an important area for continued research. Also, future research comparing unpaid credit-bearing internships (where students complete the internship as part of a university/college subject or as a degree requirement offered by an institution; which is likely to meet the DOL's 2018 primary beneficiary test), versus unpaid non-credit bearing internships, along with a comparison of paid credit-bearing and paid non-credit bearing would provide expanded insight to the phenomenon. Additionally, further investigation of early careerists (those in their first five years on the job), comparing those who entered the workforce with paid or unpaid experiences on career mobility, job responsibilities, and work satisfaction, would provide insight as to how their internship experiences shaped their transition into work.

#### REFERENCES

- Adams, J. S. (1963). Towards an understanding of inequity. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 67(5), 422–436.
- Aiman-Smith, L., Bauer, T. N., & Cable, D. M. (2001). Are you attracted? Do you intend to pursue? A recruiting policy capturing study. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 16(2) 219–237.
- Aoun, J. E., Brown, R. A., Cole, S. A., Garibaldi, A. M., Middleton, C. R., Reilly, K. P., & Turner, R. G. (2010). Letter to the honorable Hilda L. Solis, secretary of Labor. [https://files.epi.org/page/-/pdf/20100428\\_univ\\_presidents\\_letter\\_to\\_USDOL.pdf](https://files.epi.org/page/-/pdf/20100428_univ_presidents_letter_to_USDOL.pdf)
- Binder, J. F., Baguley, T., Crook, C., & Miller, F. (2015). The academic value of internships: Benefits across disciplines and student backgrounds. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 41, 73–82. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2014.12.001>
- Blau, G. (1988). Testing the generalizability of career commitment measure and its impact on employee turnover. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 35(1), 88–103. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791\(89\)90050-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791(89)90050-X)
- Bowman, C., & Lipp, M. (2000). Legal limbo of the student intern: The responsibility of colleges and universities to protect student interns against sexual harassment. *Harvard Women's Law Journal*, 23, 95–131.
- Burger, R. (2014, January 14). Why your unpaid internship makes you less employable? *Forbes*. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/realspin/2014/01/16/why-your-unpaid-internship-makes-you-less-employable/#98880ff75017>
- Burke, D. D., & Carton, R. (2013). The pedagogical, legal, and ethical implications of unpaid internships. *Journal of Legal Studies Education*, 30(1), 99 – 130.
- Callanan, G., & Benzing, C. (2004). Assessing the role of internships in the career-oriented employment of graduating college students. *Education & Training*, 46(2), 82–89. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00400910410525261>
- Cameron, C. (2013). The vulnerable worker? A labor law challenge for WIL and work experience. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Cooperative Education*, 14(3), 135–146.
- Caplan, R. D., Cobb, S., French, J. R. P., Van Harrison, R., & Pinneau, S. R. (1980). *Job demands and worker health: Main effects and occupational differences*. Institute of Social Research.
- Chao, G. T. (2012). Organizational socialization: Background, basics, and a blueprint for adjustment at work. In S. W. J. Kozlowski (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of organizational psychology* (pp. 579–614). Oxford University Press.

- Coker, L. (2009). Legal implications of unpaid internships. *Employee Relations Law Journal*, 35 (3), 35–39.
- Collins, M., & Koncz, A. (2018). *Trend is toward paid internships*. National Association of Colleges and Employers.
- Cook, S., Parker, R. S., & Pettijohn, C. E. (2004). The perceptions of interns: A Longitudinal case study. *Journal of Education for Business*, 79(3), 179-185.
- Crain, A. (2016). *Understanding the impact of unpaid internships on college student career development and employment outcomes*. NACE.
- Cunningham, G. B., Sagas, M., Dixon, M., Kent, A., & Turner, B. A. (2005). Anticipated career satisfaction, affective occupational commitment, and intentions to enter the sport management profession. *Journal of Sport Management*, 19(1), 43-47. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsm.19.1.43>
- Curiale, J. (2010). America's new glass ceiling: Unpaid internships, the fair labor standards act, and the urgent need for change. *Hastings Law Journal*, 6, 1531-1560.
- Currall, S. C., Towler, A. J., Judge, T. A., & Kohn, L. (2005). Pay satisfaction and organizational outcomes. *Personnel Psychology*, 58(3), 613–640. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2005.00245.x>
- D'Abate, C. P., Youndt, M. A., & Wenzel, K. E. (2009). Making the most of an internship: An empirical study of internship satisfaction. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 8(4), 527–539. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.8.4.zqr527>
- Dixon, M. A., Turner, B. A., Cunningham, G. B., Sagas, M., & Kent, A. (2005). Challenge is key: An investigation of affective organizational commitment in undergraduate interns. *Journal of Education for Business*, 80(3), 172–180. <https://doi.org/10.3200/JOEB.80.3.172-180>
- Drysdale, M., Johnston, N., & Chiupka, C. (2011). *Experiential learning in post-secondary education: A proposed model* [Unpublished work].
- Eisenbrey, R. (2010, May 5). *EPI responds to university presidents on internship regulations*. <http://www.epi.org/publication/epi-responds-to-university-presidents-on-internship-regulations/>
- Farmer, S. M., & Fedor, D. B. (1999). Volunteer participation and withdrawal: A psychological contract perspective on role expectations and organizational support. *Nonprofit Management & Leadership*, 9(4), 349-368. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nml.9402>
- Feldman, D. C. (1976). A contingency theory of socialization. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 21(3), 433-452.
- Feldman, D. C., & Turnley, W. H. (2004). Contingent employment in academic careers: Relative deprivation among adjunct faculty. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 64(2), 284–307. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2002.11.003>
- Feldman, D. C., & Weitz, B. A. (1990). Summer interns: Factors contributing to positive developmental experiences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 37(3), 267–284. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791\(90\)90045-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791(90)90045-4)
- Fender, D. L., & Watson, L. E. (2005). OSH internships. *Professional Safety*, 36-40. <https://aeasseincludess.asp.org/professionalsafety/pastissues/050/04/030405as.pdf>
- Gardner, P. (2011). *The debate over unpaid college internships*. Intern Bridge.
- Gardner, P. (2012). *A comparison of credit and non-credit internships in their expectations and the utilization of campus resources*. Intern Bridge. <https://tinyurl.com/4hhapne6>
- Gardner, P. (2013). *Framing internships from an employers' perspective: Length, number, and relevancy*. Collegiate Employment Research Institute, Michigan State University. <https://ceri.msu.edu/assets/pdfs/recruiting-trend-2019-20/Recruiting-Trends-2019-20-Report.pdf>
- Gardner, P. (2019). *Recruiting trends 2019-2020* (49th ed.). Collegiate Employment Research Institute, Michigan State University. <https://ceri.msu.edu/assets/pdfs/recruiting-trend-2019-20/Recruiting-Trends-2019-20-Report.pdf>
- Gault, J., Leach, E., & Duey, M. (2010). Effects of business internships on job marketability: The Employers' perspective. *Education & Training*, 52(1), 76–88
- Gault, J., Redington, J., & Schlager, T. (2000). Undergraduate business internships and career success: Are they related? *Journal of Marketing Education*, 22(1), 45–53. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0273475300221006>
- Grasgreen, A. (2011, April 11). Intern nation. *Inside Higher Education*. <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2011/04/15/intern-nation>
- Greenfield, R. (2018, January 11). Unpaid internships are back with the labor department's blessing. *Bloomberg Asia Edition*. <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2018-01-10/unpaid-internships-are-back-with-the-labor-department-s-blessing>
- Greenhouse, S. (2010, April 2). The unpaid intern: Legal or not. *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2010/04/03/business/03intern.html>
- Griffin, A., Collela, A., & Goparaju, S. (2001). Newcomer and organizational socialization tactics: An interactionists perspective. *Human Resource Management Review*, 10(4), 453–474. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822\(00\)00036-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822(00)00036-X)
- Groenewald, T., Drysdale, M., Chiupka, C., & Johnston, N. (2011). Towards a definition and models of practice for cooperative and work-integrated education. In R. K. Coll & K. E. Zegwaard (Eds.), *International handbook for cooperative & work-integrated education* (2nd ed., pp. 17-24). World Association for Cooperative Education.
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1975). Development of the job diagnostic survey. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60(2), 159–170. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0076546>
- Herzberg, F. (1965). The motivation to work among Finnish supervisors. *Personnel Psychology*, 28(4), 393-402.
- Herzberg, F. (1974). Motivation-hygiene profiles: Pinpointing what ails the organization. *Organizational Dynamics*, 3(2), 18-29.

- Howe, N. (2014, April 22). The unhappy rise of the millennial intern. *Forbes*.  
<https://www.forbes.com/sites/realspin/2014/04/22/the-unhappy-rise-of-the-millennial-intern/#70bf43601328>
- Hoyle, J., & Deschaine, M. E. (2016). An interdisciplinary exploration of collegiate internships: Requirements for undergraduate and graduate program. *Education & Training, 58*(4), 372-389. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ET-10-2015-0098>
- Hoyle, J., & Goffnett, S. (2013). A stakeholder framework for designing and directing effective marketing internships. *Journal for Advancement of Marketing Education, 21*(1), 1-15.
- Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling, 6*(1), 1-55. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118>
- Hunt, W., & Scott, P. (2020). Paid and unpaid graduate internships: Prevalence, quality and motivations at six months after graduation. *Studies in Higher Education, 45*(2), 464-476. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2018.1541450>
- Hurst, J. L. (2007). *Factors involved in increasing conversion rates of interns into full-time employees* [Unpublished dissertation]. Michigan State University.
- Hurst, J. L., Good, L. K., & Gardner, P. (2012). Conversion intentions of interns: What are the motivating factors? *Education and Training, 54*(6), 504-522. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00400911211254280>
- Hussien, F. M., & La Lopa, M. (2018). The determinants of student satisfaction with internship programs in the hospitality industry: A case study in the USA. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism, 17*(4), 502-527. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15332845.2018.1486600>
- Judish, J. E., & Lauria, A. J. (2018, January 11). Department of Labor changes rules on unpaid internships: The U.S. Department of Labor has endorsed a seven-factor test for determining whether an intern is considered an employee under the Fair Labor Standards Act. *Pillsbury Insights*. <https://www.pillsburylaw.com/en/news-and-insights/department-of-labor-changes-rules-on-unpaid-internships.html>
- Kalleberg, A. L. (2009). Precarious work, insecure workers: Employment relations in transition. *American Sociological Review, 74*(1), 1-22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000312240907400101>
- Knerl, L. (2018, November 29). Education vs. experience: Which do employers value more? *Northeastern University Graduate Programs Blog*. <https://www.northeastern.edu/graduate/blog/education-vs-experience/>
- Knight, D., Crutsinger, K., & Kim, H. (2006). The impact of retail work experience, career expectation and job satisfaction on retail career intention. *Clothing & Textiles Research Journal, 24*(1), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0887302X0602400101>
- Krackhardt, D., McKenna, J., Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (1981). Supervisory behavior and employee turnover: A field experiment. *Academy of Management Journal, 24*(2), 249-259.
- Lei, S. A., & Yin, D. (2019). Evaluating benefits and drawbacks of internships: Perspectives of college students. *College Student Journal, 53*(2), 181-189.
- Liu, Y., Xu, J., & Weitz, B. A. (2011). The role of emotional expression and mentoring in internship learning. *Academy of Management Learning & Education, 10*(1), 94-110. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.10.1.zqr94>
- Lord, K., Sumrall, D., & Sambandam, R. (2011). Satisfaction determinants in business internships. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business, 2*(10), 11-22.
- Maurer, R. (2018, March 1). Unpaid internships: What employers need to know. *SHRM*. <https://www.shrm.org/resourcesandtools/hr-topics/talent-acquisition/pages/unpaid-internships-new-dol-intern-test.aspx>
- McDermott, C. (2013, June 24). Colleges draw criticism for their role in fostering unpaid internships. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. <https://www.chronicle.com/article/colleges-draw-criticism-for-their-role-in-fostering-unpaid-internships/>
- McGregor, J. (2013, June 13). It's summer. You have interns. Are you paying them what you should? *The Washington Post*.
- McHugh, P. P. (2017). The impact of compensation, supervision and work design on internship efficacy: Implications for educators, employers and prospective interns. *Journal of Education and Work, 30*(4), 367-382.
- Miller, A. L., Rocconi, L. M., & Rumford, A. D. (2018). Focus on the finish line: Does high impact practice participation influence career plans and job attainment? *Higher Education, 75*, 489-506. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-017-0151-z>
- Murphy, S. E., & Ensher, E. A. (1999). The effects of leader and subordinate characteristics in the development of leader-member exchange quality. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 29*(7), 1371-1394. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.1999.tb00144.x>
- National Association of Colleges and Employers. (2016). *2016 Internship and co-op report*.
- National Association of Colleges and Employers. (2019, May 13). *Job offers for class of 2019 grads impacted by internship experience*. <https://www.nacweb.org/job-market/trends-and-predictions/job-offers-for-class-of-2019-grads-impacted-by-internship-experience/>
- Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2nd ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Odio, M., Sagas, M., & Kerwin, S. (2014). The influence of the internship on students' career decision making. *Sport Management Education Journal, 8*(1), 46-57. <https://doi.org/10.1123/smej.2013-0011>
- Ostroff, C., & Kozlowski, S. W. J. (1993). The role of mentoring in the information gathering processes of newcomers during early organizational socialization. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 42*(2), 170-183. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jvbe.1993.1012>
- Perlin, R. (2011). *Intern nation: How to earn nothing and learn little in the brave new economy*. Verso.
- Pianko, D. (1996). Power internships. *Management Review, 85*(12), 31-33.

- Porter, R. (2019, August 26). How important are internships and co-ops? *College Recruiter*.  
<https://www.collegerecruiter.com/blog/2019/08/26/how-important-are-internships-and-co-ops>
- Ravishankar, R. A. (2021, May 26). It's time to officially end unpaid internships. *Harvard Business Review*.  
<https://hbr.org/2021/05/its-time-to-officially-end-unpaid-internships>
- Reiner, M., & Zhao, J. (1999). The determinants of job satisfaction among United States air force police: A test of rival theoretical predictive models. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 19(3), 5–18. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0734371X9901900301>
- Robinson, S. L. (1996). Trust and breach of the psychological contract. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41(4), 574–99.  
<https://doi.org/10.2307/2393868>
- Rogers, S. E., Miller, C. D., Flinchbaugh, C., Giddarie, M., & Barker, B. (2021). All internships are not created equal: Job design, satisfaction, and vocational development in paid and unpaid internships. *Human Resource Management Review*, 31(1), Article 100723. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2019.100723>
- Rose, P. (2015). Beyond regular employment contexts: The transferability of pay, satisfaction and performance linkages to internships. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Cooperative Education*, 16(4), 267–278.
- Rothman, M., & Sisman, R. (2016). Internship impact on career consideration among business students. *Education & Training*, 58(9), 1003–1013. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ET-04-2015-0027>
- Smith, A. (2018, January 9). Will DOL's new intern test revive unpaid internships? New test provides employers with more flexibility. *SHRM*. <https://www.shrm.org/resourcesandtools/legal-and-compliance/employment-law/pages/intern-employee-dol-new-test.aspx>
- Smith, M., Brooks, S., Lichtenberg, A., McIlveen, P., & Tyler, J. (2009). *Career development learning. Maximizing the contribution of work-integrated learning to student experience: Final project report*. Australian Learning and Teaching Council.
- 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.
- Smith, P. C., Kendall, L. M., & Hulin, C. L. (1969). *The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement: A strategy for the study of attitudes*. Rand McNally.
- Suen, S., & Brandeisky, K. (2014, April 15). Tracking intern lawsuits. *Pro Publica: Journalism in the Public Interest*.  
<https://projects.propublica.org/graphics/intern-suits>
- Svacina, L. (2012). A review of research on unpaid internship legal issues: implications for career services professionals. *Journal of Cooperative Education & Internships*, 46(1), pp. 77–87.
- Templeton, W., Updyke, K., & Bennet, R. B. (2012). Internships and the assessment of student learning. *Business Education & Accreditation*, 6(2), pp. 27–38.
- U.S. Department of Labor. (2010). *Fact sheet #71: Internship programs under the Fair Labor Standards Act*.  
<https://businesslaw.handponist.com/blog/wp-content/uploads/2011/03/Fact-Sheet-71-2010.pdf>
- U.S. Department of Labor. (2018). *Fact sheet #71: Internship programs under the Fair Labor Standards Act*.  
<https://www.dol.gov/sites/dolgov/files/WHD/legacy/files/whdfs71.pdf>
- Van Maanen, J. (1975). Police socialization: A longitudinal examination of job attitudes in an urban police department. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 20(2), pp. 207–228. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2391695>
- Verner, M. E., Keyser, B. B., & Morrow, M. J. (2001). Experiential learning through field experiences: internships and practice. In B. L. Parkhouse (Ed.), *The management of sport: Its foundations and application* ( pp. 30–53). McGraw Hill.
- Walmsley, A., Thomas, R., & Jameson, S. (2012). Internships in SMEs and career intentions. *Journal of Education and Work*, 25(2), 185–204.
- Zhao, H., & Liden, R. C. (2011). Internship: A recruitment and selection perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 96(1), 221–229. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0021295>

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: Cronbach's alpha coefficients, average variance extracted (AVE) and factor loadings for confirmatory factor analyses.

Factor	$\alpha$	AVE	Estimate	SE	<i>p</i>
	0.9				
<b>Supervisory Support Experiences</b>	2	0.58			
1. My supervisor was readily available for face to face consultation			0.72	0.007	0.00
2. My supervisor was a member of senior management <sup>d</sup>					
3. My supervisor worked in close proximity to me <sup>d</sup>					
4. My supervisor made life easy for me.			0.69	0.007	0.00
5. My supervisor was easy to talk with			0.83	0.005	0.00
6. My supervisor was responsive to my requests			0.84	0.004	0.00
7. My supervisor provided constructive feedback on my performance			0.76	0.006	0.00
8. My supervisor respected me treating me as a professional			0.83	0.005	0.00
9. My supervisor provided me with explicit details on my assignment			0.70	0.007	0.00
10. My supervisor discussed career opportunities with me			0.61	0.009	0.00
11. My supervisor appreciated the work that I did while at the organization			0.81	0.005	0.00
*Scale: 1 to 5 (1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree); <sup>d</sup> item deleted to improve fit					
Factor	$\alpha$	AVE	Estimate	SE	<i>p</i>
	0.8				
<b>Internship Structure</b>	4	0.45			
1. My assignment gave me a realistic preview of this occupation or field <sup>d</sup>					
2. I was given the opportunity to set priorities			0.72	0.019	0.00
3. I was given the opportunity to learn new skills			0.61	0.014	0.00
4. I had enough work to keep me busy <sup>d</sup>					
5. I was exposed to other areas of the organization that was not related to my specific job			0.59	0.020	0.00
6. I was assigned meaningful projects to complete			0.76	0.018	0.00
7. The work I completed provided a benefit to the organization			0.56	0.015	0.00
8. I was given the opportunity to work in groups			0.67	0.024	0.00

- 9. The work I completed was highly related to my academic interests<sup>d</sup>
- 10. I was able to assume additional responsibilities as my experience increased 0.79 0.017 0.00
- 11. I was given the opportunity to explore various career opportunities 0.63 0.022 0.00
- 12. The work I completed was highly related to my career goals<sup>d</sup>

\*Scale: 1 to 5 (1 = Strongly disagree, 5 = Strongly agree); <sup>d</sup>item deleted to improve fit

Factor	$\alpha$	AVE	Estimate	SE	<i>p</i>
	0.8				
<b>Advancement Opportunity Expectations</b>	5	.60			
1. Chances for promotion in my internship/co-op organization appear good			0.66	0.008	0.00
2. Opportunities for advancements in this career field appear reasonable			0.81	0.006	0.00
3. Opportunities for advancement in this career field appear to be strong			0.87	0.005	0.00
4. There appears to be plenty of good jobs in this career field for those who want to get ahead			0.75	0.007	0.00
5. The jobs in this career field appear to be dead ends ( <b>Reverse</b> ) <sup>d</sup>					
6. The work assignments did not give me much incentive to improve my performance ( <b>Reverse</b> ) <sup>d</sup>					

\*Scale: 1 to 5 (1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree); <sup>d</sup>item deleted to improve fit

Factor	$\alpha$	AVE	Estimate	SE	<i>p</i>
	0.8				
<b>Career Confirmation Expectations</b>	5	0.66			
1. This internship experience has helped me confirm my career choice.			0.90	0.006	0.00
2. This internship experience has made me change my mind about my career choice <sup>d</sup>					
3. As a result of my internship I am more certain than ever that I have chosen the right career for me			0.81	0.007	0.00
4. This internship has helped me decide what career path I will seek in the future			0.72	0.008	0.00
5. I would accept a job offer from any other organization before considering a job offer from my internship or co-op organization <sup>d</sup>					

\*Scale: 1 to 5 (1 = Strongly disagree, 5 = Strongly agree); <sup>d</sup>item deleted to improve fit

Factor	$\alpha$	AVE	Estimate	SE	$p$
	0.7				
<b>Conversion Intentions</b>	7	0.49			
1. I would decline any offer from the company where I interned co-oped <b>(Reverse)</b> <sup>d</sup>					
2. If I have my way I will be working for my internship co-op organization after I graduate			0.87	0.007	0.00
3. While still on my internship co-op I discussed opportunities for post college employment with the organization			0.53	0.011	0.00
4. I would accept a job offer from my internship co-op organization before considering a job offer from any other company			0.79	0.008	0.00
5. I have not thought of working for any other organization since I completed my internship co-op			0.54	0.011	0.00
6. Before my internship co-op was over I decided not to pursue a career with my internship co-op organization <b>(Reverse)</b> <sup>d</sup>					
7. I am looking for other jobs now rather than considering a job with my internship co-op company <b>(Reverse)</b> <sup>d</sup>					
*Scale: 1 to 5 (1 = Strongly disagree, 5 = Strongly agree); <sup>d</sup> item deleted to improve fit					

APPENDIX B: Results of Binary Logistical Regression for Personal, Academic, and Industry Characteristics in Paid and Unpaid Internships with Engineering Majors excluded. (Only significant results reported)

<b>Model 1: Personal Variables</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>S.E.</b>	<b>Wald</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>Sig.</b>	<b>Exp (B)</b>
<b>Constant</b>	.875	.127	45.165	1	.000	2.355
<b>Age</b>	-.032	.005	41.522	1	.000	.968
<b>Gender:</b>	.641	.061	111.042	1	.000	1.898
<b>Family Income</b>			11.536	3	.009	
<b>Model 2: Personal + Academic</b>						
<b>Constant</b>	1.685	.240	49.383	1	.000	5.310
<b>Hispanic /Latino</b>	.334	.138	5.862	1	.015	1.397
<b>Age</b>	-.035	.006	32.997	1	.000	.966
<b>Gender</b>	.265	.070	14.161	1	.000	1.303
<b>Academic Major</b>			403.411	9	.000	
<b>Arts &amp; Letters</b>	-1.143	.100	130.591	1	.000	.319
<b>Physical Sciences</b>	.606	.218	7.723	1	.005	1.833
<b>Communication Arts</b>	-1.202	.112	114.796	1	.000	.301
<b>Social Science</b>	-1.327	.087	230.405	1	.000	.265
<b>Biological &amp; Health</b>	-.727	.101	51.362	1	.000	.484
<b>Education</b>	-1.374	.180	58.182	1	.000	.236
<b>Vocational &amp; Other</b>	-1.445	.198	53.491	1	.000	.236
<b>GPA</b>			13.956	4	.007	
<b>&gt;3.70</b>	.301	.157	3.670	1	.055	1.352
<b>Class Standing</b>			13.321	4	.010	
<b>First Yr.</b>	-.395	.186	4.528	1	.033	.674
<b>Second Yr.</b>	-.428	.127	11.409	1	.001	.652
<b>Third Yr.</b>	-.226	.102	4.924	1	.026	.798
<b>Fourth Yr.</b>	-.224	.089	6.284	1	.012	.799
<b>Model 3: Personal + Academic + Industry</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>S.E.</b>	<b>Wald</b>	<b>df</b>	<b>Sig.</b>	<b>Exp (B)</b>
<b>Constant</b>	2.699	.284	90.456	1	.000	14.866



<b>Age</b>	-.034	.006	29.243	1	.000	.967
<b>Gender</b>	.200	.074	7.271	1	.007	1.222
<b>Academic Major</b>			167.969	9	.000	
<b>Arts &amp; Letters</b>	-.594	.110	28.876	1	.000	.552
<b>Physical Sciences</b>	.654	.229	8.168	1	.004	1.923
<b>Communication Arts</b>	-.826	.123	45.140	1	.000	.438
<b>Social Science</b>	-.852	.098	75.624	1	.000	.426
<b>Biological &amp; Health</b>	-.335	.117	8.244	1	.004	.715
<b>Education</b>	-1.088	.196	30.847	1	.000	.337
<b>Vocational &amp; Other</b>	-1.188	.211	31.781	1	.000	.385
<b>GPA</b>			9.322	4	.054	
<b>Class Standing</b>			14.160	4	.007	
<b>First Yr.</b>	-.457	.193	5.573	1	.018	.633
<b>Second Yr.</b>	-.440	.133	10.918	1	.001	.644
<b>Fourth Yr.</b>	-.245	.107	5.285	1	.022	.783
<b>Fifth Yr.</b>	-.270	.094	8.293	1	.004	.764
<b>Industry</b>			257.033	13	.000	
<b>Oil &amp; Construction</b>	1.381	.536	6.641	1	.010	3.980
<b>Manufacturing</b>	.311	.161	3.731	1	.053	1.365
<b>Transportation</b>	1.179	.450	6.864	1	.009	3.252
<b>Health</b>	-1.023	.113	82.466	1	.000	.360
<b>Arts &amp; Entertainment</b>	-1.257	.126	99.065	1	.000	.284
<b>Non-profit</b>	-.748	.118	40.470	1	.000	.473
<b>Government</b>	-.841	.118	50.802	1	.000	.431
<b>Organization Size</b>			121.588	6	.000	
<10	-1.297	.139	87.076	1	.000	.273
11 -- 100	-1.050	.130	64.936	1	.000	.350
101 - 500	-.815	.147	30.762	1	.000	.442
501 -1000	-.815	.169	23.356	1	.000	.443
1001 - 5000	-.508	.169	9.002	1	.000	.601

*Note.* Variable(s) entered: Model 1 with reference/redundant item in parentheses: Ethnicity (White Non-Hispanic), Age, Gender (Women) and Family Income (>\$120,000). Model 2 with reference/redundant item in parentheses: Ethnicity (White Non-Hispanic), Age, Gender (Women), Family Income (>\$120,000), Institution Type (Public institutions > 15,000 students), Academic Major (Business), GPA and Class Standing (Fifth Year). Model 3 with reference/redundant item in parentheses: Ethnicity (White Non-Hispanic), Age, Gender (Women), Family Income (>\$120,000), Institution Type (Public institutions > 15,000 students), Academic Major (Business), GPA, Class Standing (Fifth Year), Industry Sector (Professional, Business & Scientific Services) and Organizational Size (>10,000 employees).