



**FEEDBACK AND INTERNSHIP OUTCOMES: STUDENTS'  
PERCEPTIONS OF SUPERVISORY SUPPORT, MENTORSHIP,  
LEARNING AND CAREER PREPAREDNESS**

**Jazbat Syed Riaz<sup>1</sup>**

PhD Scholar, Integral Business School,  
Integral University, Kursi Road, Lucknow-226026, India.

(M): +91 9891060948

Email: [jsriaz@gmail.com](mailto:jsriaz@gmail.com)

ORCID ID: 0009-0005-5895-3933

**Dr. Shahab Ud Din<sup>2</sup>**

Assistant Professor, Integral Business School  
Integral University, Kursi Road, Lucknow-226026, India

Email: [sudin@iul.ac.in](mailto:sudin@iul.ac.in)

ORCID ID: 0000-0003-3507-9225

**Dr. Rizwana Atiq<sup>3</sup>**

Associate Professor, Department of Management, Integral Business School  
Integral University, Kursi Road, Lucknow-226026, India

Email: [rizwana@iul.ac.in](mailto:rizwana@iul.ac.in)

ORCID ID: 0000-0001-5323-7325

**Abstract:**

An internship is only as good as the guidance that comes with it. These placements are widely valued for connecting classroom theory to real workplace practice, but how much a student actually gains from one appears to depend heavily on the quality of the supervision and mentorship they receive along the way- a link that speaks directly to SDG 4's goal of quality education. This study examines how management students perceived the supervisory support and mentorship they experienced during their internships, and how those perceptions related to their learning, professional growth, career readiness, and overall satisfaction with the internship. Primary data were collected from 398 management students drawn equally from five public and five private universities in Uttar Pradesh, India. Data were analysed using descriptive statistics, Cronbach's alpha, Spearman's rank-order correlation, and the Mann-Whitney U test. The findings indicate generally favourable perceptions of supervisory support and mentorship, with the five-item scale demonstrating good internal consistency (Cronbach's  $\alpha = 0.795$ ). Supervisory support was positively and significantly associated with learning satisfaction, real-world preparation, job preparedness, management confidence, professional development, career-goal clarity, and overall internship satisfaction ( $p = 0.480-0.580$ ,  $p < .001$ ). Mentorship quality also showed significant positive associations with career-related outcomes and overall satisfaction ( $p = 0.426-0.503$ ,  $p < .001$ ). Public-private differences were limited, with a significant difference observed only in mentorship quality. The study highlights the need for structured supervision, regular feedback, and



meaningful mentoring arrangements to enhance internship effectiveness. Taken together, the findings point to a fairly simple conclusion: internships work better when supervision is structured, feedback is regular, and mentoring relationships are genuine.

**Keywords:** Feedback, mentorship, internships, learning outcomes, career.

## Introduction

An internship program in a graduate's professional career path is crucial not only because it provides a platform to apply their theoretical knowledge into real work situations but also because it gives a reality check as to what their current skill set is and how they can polish themselves further to become industry ready.

Feedback during and after the internship is one such mechanism that helps interns evaluate their performance and get genuine responses regarding their overall professional conduct. Receiving timely and accurate feedback and mentoring from industry supervisors and faculty supervisors is one of the most important parts of an internship program for the students, as the primary goal of an internship is not just to give industry exposure to the students but also to inculcate necessary skills and learnings for overall professional development. Hence, it is necessary that students receive detailed feedback about their performance, progress, and development throughout the internship period from both the supervisors to attain the required learning outcomes.

The key components involved in effective feedback mechanisms are:

1. Defining clear learning objectives and performance expectations in terms of tasks, responsibilities, and learning outcomes right at the beginning of the program.
2. Timely and regular feedback must be provided to the interns right after the completion of a task or project to ensure its effectiveness and relevance.
3. Specific, constructive & actionable feedback should be provided where the strength of the intern should be highlighted along with the areas of improvement.
4. There should be an open dialogue between the intern & supervisor so that the intern can openly ask questions seeking clarification & discuss feedback.
5. Appropriate channels of communication should be used to deliver feedback.
6. Various technology platforms & tools can be used to facilitate feedback process & documentation including online surveys, feedback forms or digital platforms.
7. Goals should be set in collaboration with interns that are Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-bound (SMART) goals based on feedback. (*How to Write SMART Goals*, 2023)

Universities & Industries must work together to design internship programs in a way that benefits the interns in the best way possible. And for this to happen, it is crucial to set well-defined internship objectives where the interns are prepared to deliver accordingly & based on that, their performance must be assessed. Constructive and timely feedback and mentoring must be provided to them so they may correct & work on their weaknesses & gain confidence in the tasks they perform well.



### **Literature Review**

The feedback mechanism in internships play a significant role in enhancing the overall learning experience for interns by refining their skills and boosting their career development. Effective feedback helps interns gain valuable insights into their performance, identify areas for improvement & work towards their professional growth.

### **Theoretical Framework**

All deliberate or purposeful acquisition of knowledge & learning is carried out with the objective of achieving a specific outcome. The process of receiving feedback serves as the mechanism through which the learner, or any other entity responsible for guiding the learning process, evaluates the extent of progress made towards the ultimate goal, as well as determining if the desired objective has been successfully accomplished.

Effective feedback can be delivered using various theories that are mentioned below.

1. **Experiential Learning Theory (ELT):** Kolb's approach to Experiential Learning Theory (ELT) places significant emphasis on the iterative nature of acquiring knowledge, which involves engaging in real-life encounters, introspective contemplation, conceptual comprehension, and practical experimentation. An integral element within this pedagogical cycle is the utilization of feedback from internships, which serves as a catalyst for experiential learning (McLeod, S. 2026).
2. **Social Learning Theory:** Bandura's Social Learning Theory posits that individuals learn through observation, imitation, and modeling of others' behavior. Feedback from supervisors and peers in internships provides opportunities for observational learning and skill acquisition (McLeod, S. 2025).
3. **Self-Determination Theory (SDT):** Deci and Ryan's SDT centers its attention on the internal drive and the satisfaction of cognitive requirements. Feedback that supports interns' autonomy, competence, and relatedness can enhance their motivation and engagement during the internship. The provision of feedback that fosters the interns' self-determination, proficiency, and interpersonal connections possesses the potential to amplify their motivation and involvement throughout the duration of the internship (Ryan & Deci, 2000).

### **Importance of Supervisory Feedback in Internships:**

Research by Ibrahim et.al (2014) highlights the importance of feedback from supervisors during internships as interns can't confidently judge their own performance. The performance appraisal formats need improvisation to better align with interns' expectations, to complement interns' learning objectives & to improve workplace practices.

Eralil (2017) explored the use of structured feedback and direct observation of procedural skills in improving the skills of interns. Providing feedback that is helpful in taking remedial steps and for enhancing overall development of interns is highly recommended.



Feedback isn't merely an exchange of messages but is more of a complex process of professional judgment involving educational principles and values (Ajjawi et.al, 2023).

Interns who underperform must be given feedback by nurturing relationships, developing feedback literacy & fostering productive emotions.

Maes et.al (2022) talk about feedback through co-assessment meetings between faculty supervisors & students to allow a shared and joint assessment where both entities play an active role. They emphasize on providing feedback that focuses on the process of understanding & self regulation amongst students.

Bender (2021) has described the use of internship supervisor evaluation feedback for the accreditation process for an interior designing degree program & has outlined that supervisors positively evaluated the intern's performance.

In the context of medical interns, McKenzie et.al (2017) have found that education by means of assessment with feedback is beneficial and should be followed universally. There is an emphasis on supervision through direct observation followed by assessment & feedback to ensure that interns enter the workplace with an updated knowledge about their skills & ability to perform medical practices, in specific.

Feedback once initiated should be carried throughout the project/internship for sustained higher levels of critical reflection performance. Delays in feedback may reduce the effectiveness of feedback (Dye et.al, 2011)

### **Perceptions of Interns Regarding Feedback & Mentorship:**

Lowenthal and Sosland (2021) bring into picture the importance of interns' perceptions and their feedback about the entire internship program as it highlights the strengths and weaknesses of the program that may help the organization and the university in working on those lines for better implementation of internship programs.

A study by Kushwaha (2014) reflects upon the importance of continuous dialogue & interaction between interns and supervisors to avoid disagreements & complaints. Interns perceive supervisor's feedback as a major factor in shaping their professional journey. They expect a balance of criticism and compliments to stay confident and motivated.

As reported by Luk & Chan (2015), Engineering students who undergo internship do not find the internship assessment criteria reliable as the faculty supervisors don't completely go through the reports submitted by the students until they follow the given word limit. The authors conducted focus groups & one on one interviews with final year engineering students to understand their perceptions about the assessment process of their internship experience. It was also reported that the assessment process needs to be made more transparent as students are placed in different companies (Ferns & Moore, 2012) with different sets of roles and responsibilities.

### **Challenges and Barriers in Feedback Mechanism:**

Stagini & Peres (2021) highlighted that supervisors in a medical school find it challenging to provide negative feedback that includes criticism particularly about behaviors and attitudes. However, interns accept criticisms sportily and expect more frequent feedback in practical stages.



Hausman et.al (2023) have emphasized on the emotional aspect involved with internships of nursing students.

Feedback provided to intern nurses results in changes in their learning behavior, motivation & self esteem. Therefore, feedback strategies should be designed such that students feel respected, understood & should know how to process that feedback.

Research also highlights the key role of the tone & focus of the feedback (Hausman et.al, 2023). Negative or positive feedback can heighten or dampen the motivation level of interns to act on the feedback provided to them. Hence, it's very important to provide constructive feedback.

Another study by An & Mauhey (2016) emphasized on interns' feedback of their internship experience where they revealed that the organizations support the interns with regard to work ethics, team work, regard for human resources etc. however, they lack on the communication aspect. The trainers do not provide enough time to interns to train or supervise them, they don't share good working relationships or the instructions provided are not clearly defined.

Anjum (2020) studied the internship programs of universities across Pakistan & claimed that almost all business schools in Pakistan encourage their students to participate in internships to gain practical experience, faculty supervisors evaluate the performance of students during internship through a viva voce, corporates prefer hiring interns for full time employment & even the government encourages internships at provincial level to fill in job vacancies. However, lack of coordination between the companies & institutes is also reported by the interns along with lack of proper feedback from the employer to the intern & faculty.

The advantages of an internship are well known to all, however, many times the interns come across challenges that hamper them from making the most out of their internship experience. Lack of defined objectives, little to no guidance or mentorship, poorly defined tasks, unrealistic timelines, no networking opportunities, exclusion from meetings or insufficient training, all add up to the barriers associated with internships (Alhur, 2023). Interns in the health informatics sector faced the challenge of not being able to connect with the internship coordinator timely.

### **Improving Feedback Mechanism:**

Sadeghi (2018) has discussed three main reasons as to why real time feedback is helpful for a successful career path. It enables consistent improvement, provides opportunities to review & reflect upon the performance through the course of time, and lastly, it's a platform for communication where you can build healthy relationships with your supervisors & colleagues.

It is the responsibility of the supervisors to invest in the internship experience of interns and provide timely & accurate feedback. It not only helps the interns in improving their skills and excel in their work but also develop the company's workforce pipeline by converting interns into future employees.

Improving internship effectiveness could be achieved through means like effective communication by ensuring clarity in assigned tasks, setting clear expectations for challenging assignments so they can be completed within a reasonable timeframe, providing continuous feedback, offering



mentoring opportunities, exposing interns to different parts of the business and treating them with respect (Rothman, 2007)

As recommended by Riaz & Ud Din (2026), Internship experiences can be improved by ensuring structured programs, timely evaluation and assessment of interns' performance, partnership between academic institutes and industry, and support services like career counselling and interview preparation. Additionally, as reported by Tripathi et.al. (2024) programs like Youth Employment Program by Tata Consultancy Services provide career guidance and interview skills to help the youth acquire relevant skills needed for professional growth.

### **Research Gap**

Although internships are widely recognised as an important mechanism for connecting classroom learning with workplace experience, existing research has predominantly examined internship effectiveness through broad indicators such as student satisfaction, skill acquisition, employability, and the relevance of academic knowledge. Comparatively less attention has been given to the role of supervisory support and mentorship as active learning mechanisms within the internship environment.

Previous studies have often emphasised the responsibilities of supervisors and mentors in providing guidance, monitoring progress, assigning tasks, and evaluating student performance. However, insufficient attention has been paid to how students themselves perceive the clarity of expectations, frequency of progress monitoring, helpfulness of supervisors, assistance in achieving learning goals, and overall quality of mentorship. The student's perception is particularly important because the same supervisory practices may not produce similar outcomes unless students consider the guidance meaningful, accessible, and useful.

A further gap exists in understanding how supervisory support is connected not only with immediate learning outcomes but also with broader professional and career-related outcomes. Much of the existing discussion treats feedback and mentorship as isolated components of internship administration rather than examining their relationship with learning satisfaction, management confidence, professional development, job preparedness, and overall internship satisfaction.

Moreover, limited empirical attention has been given to whether students' perceptions of supervisory support vary across different institutional contexts, particularly between public and private universities and between undergraduate and postgraduate management programmes. Such comparisons may help identify whether the quality and effectiveness of internship supervision are shaped by institutional or academic characteristics.

Therefore, the present study addresses these gaps by examining students' perceptions of supervisory support and mentorship during internships and by investigating their relationship with learning experiences, professional development, career preparedness, and overall internship



satisfaction. The study also explores whether these perceptions differ according to institutional type.

### **Research Objectives**

1. To examine management students' perceptions of supervisory support through feedback and mentorship during internships.
2. To investigate the relationship between supervisory support and students' learning and professional development outcomes.
3. To examine the relationship between mentorship quality and students' career preparedness and overall internship satisfaction.
4. To determine whether selected perceptions of supervisory support, mentorship, and internship outcomes differ between students from public and private institutions."

### **Hypotheses**

H1: Supervisory support is positively and significantly associated with students' learning and professional development outcomes.

H2: Mentorship quality is positively and significantly associated with students' career preparedness.

H3: Mentorship quality is positively and significantly associated with students' overall internship satisfaction.

H4: Overall supervisory support and mentorship differ between public and private institutions.

### **Research Methodology**

#### **Research Design**

The study adopted a cross-sectional, descriptive and analytical research design to examine management students' perceptions of feedback, supervisory support and mentorship during internships and to determine how these experiences were associated with learning, professional development, career preparedness, and overall internship satisfaction.

The descriptive component of the study was used to document students' experiences of internship supervision, including clarity of expectations, frequency of progress monitoring, supervisor helpfulness, support in achieving learning goals, and mentorship quality. The analytical component was used to examine relationships between supervisory support, mentorship, learning outcomes, career-related outcomes, and overall internship satisfaction. The study also examined whether students from public and private universities differed in their perceptions of supervisory support, mentorship, and selected internship outcomes.

A survey through a questionnaire was considered appropriate because the study sought to collect standardised responses from a relatively large group of management students and statistically examine patterns, relationships, and differences among the variables under investigation.



### **Study Area**

The study was conducted in the state of Uttar Pradesh, India. Uttar Pradesh was selected because of its large and diverse higher education system, substantial concentration of management education institutions, and the presence of both public and private universities offering undergraduate and postgraduate management programmes.

To obtain representation from different institutional settings, the study included management students from ten universities, comprising:

- Five public universities; and
- Five private universities.

The universities were selected on the basis of the concentration of higher educational institutions (HEIs) across different regions of Uttar Pradesh. This approach was adopted to avoid concentrating the study in only one geographical or institutional cluster and to provide broader coverage of management education in the state.

The inclusion of both public and private universities also enabled the study to examine whether institutional ownership was associated with differences in students' internship supervision, mentorship, career preparedness, and satisfaction.

### **Population of the Study**

The target population consisted of management students enrolled in undergraduate and postgraduate management programmes who had completed or undertaken an internship as part of their academic programme.

The study primarily covered students enrolled in:

- Bachelor of Business Administration (BBA); and
- Master of Business Administration (MBA)

programmes. These students were considered appropriate respondents because internships form an important component of management education and provide students with opportunities to apply theoretical knowledge, acquire practical skills, interact with workplace supervisors, and develop professional competencies.

The unit of analysis was the individual management student.

### **Sampling Procedure**

A multistage institutional sampling approach was followed.

In the first stage, Uttar Pradesh was considered as the geographical area of the study. The universities were identified by considering the concentration of higher educational institutions across different regions of the state.



In the second stage, ten universities were selected, consisting of five public universities and five private universities. The selection was intended to provide institutional diversity and enable a comparative assessment of students studying in different types of universities.

In the third stage, management students who had internship experience were approached for participation in the survey. Respondents were selected based on their relevance to the study objectives and their ability to provide informed responses regarding internship supervision, mentorship, learning outcomes, and professional development.

The sampling approach may therefore be described as an institutionally stratified and purposive sampling approach, in which institutions were represented according to public and private ownership, while individual respondents were selected because they possessed relevant internship experience.

### Sample Size

The targeted sample size for the study was 400 management students. The sample was equally distributed across the two institutional categories:

| Institutional category | Number of universities | Target respondents |
|------------------------|------------------------|--------------------|
| Public universities    | 5                      | 200                |
| Private universities   | 5                      | 200                |
| Total                  | 10                     | 400                |

Following data screening and preparation, 398 valid responses were retained for the final statistical analysis. The final usable sample consisted of:

| Institutional category | Valid respondents | Percentage |
|------------------------|-------------------|------------|
| Public universities    | 199               | 50.0       |
| Private universities   | 199               | 50.0       |
| Total                  | 398               | 100.0      |

Thus, the final dataset represented an almost complete realization of the planned sample, with equal representation from public and private universities.

### Data Collection Instrument

Primary data were collected through a structured questionnaire designed to capture students' internship experiences and outcomes. The questionnaire included questions related to students' demographic and academic background, internship learning experiences, supervisory support, mentorship, career development, professional preparedness, workplace experience, and overall internship satisfaction.



The questions were structured using categorical and ordinal response options. These response formats enabled the researcher to summarise students' perceptions through frequencies and percentages and to conduct non-parametric statistical tests suitable for ordinal-level data.

### **Measurement of Supervisory Support and Mentorship**

Supervisory support and mentorship were assessed using five indicators:

- Clarity of expectations;
- Frequency of supervisor progress checks;
- Supervisor helpfulness;
- Support in achieving learning goals; and
- Mentorship quality.

A composite Supervisory Support and Mentorship Index was then created by combining the five indicators. The composite measure represented the overall perceived quality of supervision and mentorship received by students during their internships.

### **Reliability Testing**

The internal consistency of the five-item Supervisory Support and Mentorship scale was examined using Cronbach's alpha.

The scale produced a Cronbach's alpha value of 0.795, indicating good internal consistency among the items. This result suggests that the indicators were sufficiently related and could reasonably be treated as a combined measure of supervisory support and mentorship.

The reliability analysis supported the use of the composite index in subsequent correlation and group-comparison analyses.

### **Analytical Tools Used**

The analysis was conducted in accordance with the four research objectives. Both descriptive and inferential statistical techniques were applied.

Alignment of Analysis with Research Objectives:

| <b>Research objective</b>                                                                                       | <b>Analysis used</b>                                                       |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| To examine students' perceptions of supervisory support and mentorship                                          | Frequencies, percentages, descriptive statistics, and reliability analysis |
| <b>To investigate the relationship between supervisory support and learning/professional outcomes</b>           | Composite-index construction and Spearman's rank-order correlation         |
| <b>To examine the relationship between mentorship quality, career preparedness, and internship satisfaction</b> | Spearman's rank-order correlation                                          |
| <b>To determine whether perceptions differ between public and private universities</b>                          | Mann–Whitney U test and descriptive group comparison                       |



This objective-based analytical structure ensured that each research question was addressed using an appropriate statistical technique.

### **Level of Significance**

All inferential statistical tests were evaluated at a 5% level of significance.

The decision rule was:

- If  $p < .05$ , the null hypothesis was rejected and the relationship or difference was considered statistically significant.
- If  $p \geq .05$ , the null hypothesis was not rejected and the result was considered statistically non-significant.

Where applicable, p-values below .001 were reported as  $p < .001$ .

### **Ethical Considerations**

Participation in the study was voluntary. Respondents were informed about the academic purpose of the research and were encouraged to provide responses based on their actual internship experiences.

The information collected was used exclusively for academic and research purposes. Respondents' identities were not required for the statistical analysis, and the findings were presented in aggregated form to preserve confidentiality.

### **Methodological Scope**

The study focused on students' self-reported perceptions of internship supervision, mentorship, learning, professional development, and career preparedness. Therefore, the findings reflect students' experiences and evaluations rather than direct assessments by employers or internship supervisors.

Since the study used a cross-sectional survey design, the statistical relationships identified should be interpreted as associations rather than definitive evidence of causation. Nevertheless, the design provides useful empirical evidence regarding the role of supervisory support and mentorship in shaping management students' internship outcomes.

## **Results**

### **Objective 1**

To examine management students' perceptions of supervisory support and mentorship during internships.



**Table 1: Students' Perceptions of Supervisory Support and Mentorship**

| Indicator                                    | Response category  | Frequency | Percentage |
|----------------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------|------------|
| Clarity of expectations (Item 1)             | Yes                | 242       | 60.8       |
|                                              | To some extent     | 147       | 36.9       |
|                                              | No                 | 9         | 2.3        |
| Frequency of progress checks (Item 2)        | Daily              | 176       | 44.2       |
|                                              | Weekly             | 168       | 42.2       |
|                                              | Monthly            | 30        | 7.5        |
|                                              | Rarely             | 15        | 3.8        |
|                                              | Never              | 9         | 2.3        |
| Supervisor helpfulness (Item 3)              | Extremely helpful  | 124       | 31.2       |
|                                              | Very helpful       | 198       | 49.7       |
|                                              | Moderately helpful | 62        | 15.6       |
|                                              | Slightly helpful   | 9         | 2.3        |
|                                              | Not helpful at all | 5         | 1.3        |
| Support in achieving learning goals (Item 4) | To a large extent  | 184       | 46.2       |
|                                              | To some extent     | 186       | 46.7       |
|                                              | Not much           | 22        | 5.5        |
|                                              | Not at all         | 6         | 1.5        |
| Mentorship quality (Item 5)                  | Excellent          | 171       | 43.0       |
|                                              | Good               | 184       | 46.2       |
|                                              | Average            | 40        | 10.1       |
|                                              | Poor               | 3         | 0.8        |

### Interpretation

The findings indicate that students generally experienced favourable supervisory support and mentorship during their internships. A total of 97.7% of respondents reported that their supervisors communicated expectations either clearly or to some extent, while only 2.3% reported a complete lack of clarity.

Progress monitoring was also relatively frequent. Approximately 86.4% of students indicated that supervisors checked their progress either daily or weekly. This suggests that most students received regular monitoring and opportunities for guidance during their internships.

Supervisor helpfulness was particularly positive. Approximately 80.9% of respondents rated their supervisors as either very helpful or extremely helpful. Only 3.6% described their supervisors as slightly helpful or not helpful at all.

Similarly, 92.9% of students reported that supervisors supported them to a large or some extent in achieving their learning goals. This demonstrates that supervisory relationships were generally aligned with the educational purpose of the internship.



Mentorship quality was also rated positively, with 89.2% of respondents describing mentorship as good or excellent. Only 0.8% rated mentorship as poor.

Overall, the descriptive results suggest that the internship experiences of the students were characterized by relatively strong supervisory involvement, regular feedback, learning-oriented support, and positive mentorship.

### Reliability Analysis

**Table 2: Reliability Statistics for the Supervisory Support and Mentorship Scale**

| Scale                              | Number of items | Cronbach's alpha |
|------------------------------------|-----------------|------------------|
| Supervisory Support and Mentorship | 5               | 0.795            |

### Interpretation

The five-item Supervisory Support and Mentorship scale produced a Cronbach's alpha of 0.795. This indicates good internal consistency among the items measuring students' perceptions of supervisory support, progress monitoring, supervisor helpfulness, learning-goal support, and mentorship quality.

The result confirms that the items can reasonably be treated as a coherent measure of supervisory support and mentorship during internships. Therefore, a composite index was created for subsequent relational analysis.

### Composite Index Descriptive Statistics

**Table 3: Descriptive Statistics for the Supervisory Support and Mentorship Index**

| Statistic                 | Value |
|---------------------------|-------|
| Valid N                   | 398   |
| <b>Mean</b>               | 3.515 |
| <b>Standard deviation</b> | 0.543 |
| <b>Minimum</b>            | 1.000 |
| <b>Maximum</b>            | 4.200 |
| <b>Median</b>             | 3.600 |

### Interpretation

The Supervisory Support and Mentorship Index had a mean score of 3.515, with a median of 3.600, indicating generally favourable perceptions of supervisory support and mentorship. The relatively low standard deviation of 0.543 suggests that responses were reasonably concentrated around the favourable end of the scale rather than being widely dispersed.



These findings provide evidence that most students experienced a supportive supervisory environment during their internships.

## Objective 2

To investigate the relationship between supervisory support and students' learning and professional development outcomes, Spearman's rank-order correlation was used because the variables were measured using ordinal response categories and did not necessarily meet the assumptions required for parametric correlation analysis.

The composite Supervisory Support and Mentorship Index was correlated with:

- Real-world preparation
- Learning satisfaction
- Career-goal clarity
- Job preparedness
- Management confidence
- Professional development
- Overall internship satisfaction

**Table 4: Relationship Between Supervisory Support and Student Outcomes**

| Outcome variable                       | Spearman's rho | p-value | Relationship strength | Decision    |
|----------------------------------------|----------------|---------|-----------------------|-------------|
| Real-world preparation                 | 0.560          | < .001  | Moderate positive     | Significant |
| <b>Learning satisfaction</b>           | 0.580          | < .001  | Moderate positive     | Significant |
| <b>Career-goal clarity</b>             | 0.480          | < .001  | Moderate positive     | Significant |
| <b>Job preparedness</b>                | 0.547          | < .001  | Moderate positive     | Significant |
| <b>Management confidence</b>           | 0.508          | < .001  | Moderate positive     | Significant |
| <b>Professional development</b>        | 0.572          | < .001  | Moderate positive     | Significant |
| <b>Overall internship satisfaction</b> | 0.558          | < .001  | Moderate positive     | Significant |

## Interpretation

The results show that supervisory support and mentorship were positively and significantly associated with all examined learning and professional-development outcomes.

The strongest relationship was observed between supervisory support and learning satisfaction:

$$\rho = 0.580, p < .001$$

This indicates that students who experienced stronger supervisory support were more likely to report greater satisfaction with their internship learning.



Supervisory support was also positively associated with:

- Professional development:  $\rho = 0.572$ ,  $p < .001$
- Real-world preparation:  $\rho = 0.560$ ,  $p < .001$
- Overall internship satisfaction:  $\rho = 0.558$ ,  $p < .001$
- Job preparedness:  $\rho = 0.547$ ,  $p < .001$
- Management confidence:  $\rho = 0.508$ ,  $p < .001$
- Career-goal clarity:  $\rho = 0.480$ ,  $p < .001$

Although the relationships are correlational and therefore do not establish causation, the findings indicate that stronger supervision and mentorship tend to accompany more favourable learning, confidence, preparedness, and professional-development outcomes.

### **Hypothesis Testing**

**H1:** Supervisory support is positively and significantly associated with students' learning and professional development outcomes.

Decision: Supported.

The Supervisory Support and Mentorship Index was positively and significantly associated with learning satisfaction, real-world preparation, job preparedness, management confidence, professional development, and overall internship satisfaction, with all p-values below .001.

The findings provide empirical support for the importance of supervisory support in shaping students' internship outcomes. Supervisory support demonstrated significant positive relationships with learning satisfaction, real-world preparation, job preparedness, management confidence, professional development, and overall internship satisfaction. The correlations ranged from 0.480 to 0.580, indicating moderate positive associations. The strongest relationship was found between supervisory support and learning satisfaction, suggesting that students who received clearer guidance, more frequent monitoring, greater supervisor helpfulness, and stronger mentorship were more likely to perceive their internships as meaningful learning experiences. These results indicate that supervision is not merely an administrative component of internship implementation but an important educational mechanism through which students translate workplace exposure into learning and professional development.

### **Objective 3**

To examine the relationship between mentorship quality and students' career preparedness and overall internship satisfaction.

For this objective, mentorship quality was examined in relation to:

- Job preparedness
- Career-goal clarity
- Overall internship satisfaction
- Professional development
- Management confidence



**Table 5: Correlation Between Mentorship Quality and Career-Related Outcomes**

| Outcome variable                       | Spearman's rho | p-value | Relationship strength | Decision    |
|----------------------------------------|----------------|---------|-----------------------|-------------|
| Career-goal clarity                    | 0.426          | < .001  | Moderate positive     | Significant |
| <b>Job preparedness</b>                | 0.484          | < .001  | Moderate positive     | Significant |
| <b>Management confidence</b>           | 0.451          | < .001  | Moderate positive     | Significant |
| <b>Professional development</b>        | 0.493          | < .001  | Moderate positive     | Significant |
| <b>Overall internship satisfaction</b> | 0.503          | < .001  | Moderate positive     | Significant |

### Interpretation

Mentorship quality was positively and significantly associated with all five career-related and internship-outcome variables.

The strongest relationship was between mentorship quality and overall internship satisfaction:  $\rho = 0.503, p < .001$

This suggests that students who perceived their mentorship as good or excellent were more likely to report higher satisfaction with their internship experience.

Mentorship quality also demonstrated significant positive relationships with:

- Professional development:  $\rho = 0.493, p < .001$
- Job preparedness:  $\rho = 0.484, p < .001$
- Management confidence:  $\rho = 0.451, p < .001$
- Career-goal clarity:  $\rho = 0.426, p < .001$

These results indicate that effective mentorship may help students better understand career possibilities, develop workplace confidence, strengthen professional capabilities, and feel more prepared for employment.

### Hypothesis Testing

**H2:** Mentorship quality is positively and significantly associated with students' career preparedness.

Decision: Supported.

Mentorship quality was significantly and positively associated with job preparedness:

$\rho = 0.484, p < .001$

**H3:** Mentorship quality is positively and significantly associated with students' overall internship satisfaction.

Decision: Supported.

Mentorship quality was significantly and positively associated with overall internship satisfaction:

$\rho = 0.503, p < .001$



The findings demonstrate that mentorship quality is significantly associated with students' career-related outcomes and overall internship satisfaction. Mentorship quality showed a moderate positive relationship with job preparedness, indicating that students who received higher-quality mentoring were more likely to feel prepared for future employment. A significant positive relationship was also found between mentorship quality and career-goal clarity, suggesting that mentoring may help students understand their professional interests and future career direction. Furthermore, mentorship quality was positively associated with management confidence and professional development. The strongest relationship was observed between mentorship quality and overall internship satisfaction, indicating that the quality of interpersonal guidance and professional support received during the internship is an important contributor to students' overall evaluation of the internship experience.

#### Objective 4

To determine whether perceptions of supervisory support and mentorship differ between students from public and private institutions.

As the variables were ordinal and the two groups were independent, the Mann–Whitney U test was used to compare students from public and private institutions.

The groups were equally sized:

- Public institutions: n = 199
- Private institutions: n = 199

#### Comparison of the Composite Supervisory Support and Mentorship Index

**Table 6: Public–Private Differences in Supervisory Support and Mentorship**

| Variable                            | Public Median | Public Mean Rank | Private Median | Private Mean Rank | Mann–Whitney U | p-value | Decision        |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|------------------|----------------|-------------------|----------------|---------|-----------------|
| Clear expectations and objectives   | 1.000         | 202.04           | 1.000          | 196.96            | 20,306.50      | .605    | Not significant |
| Progress checking                   | 2.000         | 194.80           | 2.000          | 204.20            | 18,865.00      | .373    | Not significant |
| Supervisor guidance and support     | 2.000         | 206.43           | 2.000          | 192.57            | 21,179.50      | .191    | Not significant |
| Support in achieving learning goals | 2.000         | 195.33           | 2.000          | 203.67            | 18,970.50      | .419    | Not significant |
| Mentorship quality and guidance     | 2.000         | 210.23           | 2.000          | 188.77            | 21,936.00      | .040    | Significant     |



**Note:** Public institutions = 199; private institutions = 199. Significance level = 0.05.

### **Interpretation**

The Mann–Whitney U results indicate that there were no statistically significant differences between public and private institution students regarding clear expectations, progress checking, supervisor guidance, or support in achieving learning goals, as all p-values were greater than .05. However, a statistically significant difference was observed in the perceived quality of mentorship and guidance ( $U = 21,936.00$ ,  $p = .040$ ). Public institution students reported a higher mean rank (210.23) than private institution students (188.77), indicating more favourable perceptions of mentorship quality among public institution students.

### **Hypothesis Testing**

**H4:** There is a statistically significant difference in perceived supervisory support and mentorship between students from public and private institutions.

Decision: Partially supported

The hypothesis proposed that there is a statistically significant difference in perceived supervisory support and mentorship between students from public and private institutions. The Mann–Whitney U test results indicate that most dimensions of supervisory support did not differ significantly between the two groups, including clarity of expectations, frequency of progress checks, supervisor guidance, and support for learning goals ( $p > .05$ ). However, a statistically significant difference was observed in perceived mentorship quality ( $p = .040$ ), with public-institution students reporting higher mean ranks than private-institution students. Therefore, H4 is partially supported, as institutional differences were identified only for mentorship quality and not across all dimensions of supervisory support and mentorship.

### **Discussion**

The findings indicate that management students generally experienced favourable supervisory support and mentorship during their internships. Most respondents reported receiving clear expectations, regular progress monitoring, helpful supervision, support in achieving learning goals, and good or excellent mentorship. This suggests that the internships generally provided an adequate structure for guidance and workplace learning.

The reliability results confirmed that the supervisory support and mentorship indicators formed a consistent construct. The significant positive relationships between supervisory support and learning satisfaction, real-world preparation, job preparedness, management confidence, professional development, career-goal clarity, and overall internship satisfaction demonstrate the importance of effective supervision in enhancing the educational and professional value of internships.



Mentorship quality was also significantly associated with career preparedness and overall internship satisfaction. This indicates that mentoring relationships contribute beyond routine supervision by helping students develop professional confidence, clarify career goals, understand workplace expectations, and feel better prepared for employment.

The comparison between public and private universities showed no significant difference in the overall supervisory support and mentorship index. However, significant differences were observed in mentorship quality and job preparedness. This suggests that institutional type may influence selected aspects of internship experiences, although overall internship outcomes were broadly similar across the two groups.

Overall, the findings emphasize that internships become more valuable when students receive structured guidance, regular feedback, constructive supervision, and meaningful mentorship. Universities and host organizations should therefore strengthen supervision and mentoring mechanisms to improve students' learning, professional development, career preparedness, and internship satisfaction.

## **Conclusion**

This study set out to examine how supervisory support and mentorship shape the internship experience for management students, drawing on responses from selected public and private universities across Uttar Pradesh. What emerges is a generally positive picture: most students described clear expectations, regular monitoring of their progress, supervisors they found helpful, real support toward their learning goals, and mentorship rated good or excellent.

The study found significant positive relationships between supervisory support and students' learning satisfaction, real-world preparation, job preparedness, management confidence, professional development, career-goal clarity, and overall internship satisfaction. These results indicate that effective supervision plays a significant role in converting internship participation into meaningful educational and professional outcomes.

Mentorship quality was also positively associated with career preparedness, professional development, management confidence, career-goal clarity, and overall internship satisfaction. This demonstrates that mentoring provides an important developmental contribution by helping students understand workplace expectations, strengthen professional confidence, clarify career aspirations, and prepare for employment.

Although the overall level of supervisory support and mentorship did not differ significantly between public and private universities, differences were observed in mentorship quality and job preparedness. This suggests that institutional ownership does not necessarily determine the overall quality of internship supervision, although it may influence selected aspects of students' career-related experiences.



The study concludes that supervisory support and mentorship should be treated as essential components of effective management internships. Universities and host organizations should therefore focus on developing structured supervision systems, clear learning expectations, regular feedback mechanisms, and formal mentoring arrangements. Such initiatives can improve students' learning experiences, professional development, career preparedness, and overall satisfaction.

In summary, internships are most effective when they are supported by purposeful supervision and meaningful mentorship. The findings emphasize that the educational and career-development value of internships depends not merely on workplace exposure but on the extent to which students are guided, supported, encouraged, and professionally developed throughout the internship process.

### **Limitations & Future Research**

This study has certain limitations that should be considered when interpreting its findings. First, the research used a cross-sectional design, which captures students' perceptions at one point in time and therefore does not establish causal relationships between supervisory support, mentorship, and internship outcomes. Second, the study relied on self-reported questionnaire responses, which may be influenced by personal experiences, response bias, or differences in students' expectations. Third, the sample was limited to management students from selected public and private universities in Uttar Pradesh, restricting the generalizability of the findings to other disciplines, regions, or educational settings. Additionally, the study focused primarily on students' perceptions and did not include the perspectives of supervisors, mentors, or host organizations.

Future research could adopt a longitudinal design to examine how internship experiences influence students' skills, confidence, and career outcomes over time. Comparative studies involving different academic disciplines, states, and institutional contexts may provide broader insights. Further research could also incorporate supervisors' and employers' perspectives to develop a more comprehensive understanding of internship effectiveness. Qualitative interviews or mixed-method approaches may help explain the specific supervisory and mentoring practices that contribute most strongly to student learning, professional development, and career preparedness.

### **REFERENCES**

1. Ajjawi R, Bearman M, Molloy E, Noble C. (2023). The role of feedback in supporting trainees who underperform in clinical environments. *Front Med (Lausanne)*. 10. doi: 10.3389/fmed.2023.1121602. PMID: 37181376; PMCID: PMC10167016.
2. An, I., Mauhey, R.C. (2016). Interns' Feedback on Industry Partners: Inputs for an Enhanced Internship Program. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, Arts and Sciences*. 3(2). 74-81



3. Anjum, S. (2020). Impact of internship programs on professional and personal development of business students: a case study from Pakistan, *Future Business Journal*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1186/s43093-019-0007-3>
4. Alhur, A. A.. (2023). Health Informatics Internship: What Are the Students Perceptions Regard Internship Effectiveness?, *Indonesian Journal Of Educational Research and Review*, 6(1), 32–45. <https://doi.org/10.23887/ijerr.v6i1.46715>
5. Bender D.M. (2021). Internship assessment in professional program accreditation: a 10-year study, *Education+Training*, 63(2), 256-270. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ET-11-2019-0251>
6. Dye, D., Scott, K. W., Ostrom, L., Devine, N., & Leight, J. (2011). The Effect of Specific Feedback on Critical Reflection of Physical Therapy Students During Internships. *Journal of Adult Education*. 40(2), 9–18.
7. Eralil, G.J. (2017). Role of Structured Feedback of Direct Observation of Procedural Skills in improving Clinical Skill of Interns. *Journal of Postgraduate Medicine, Education and Research*, 51(1):22-27. doi: 10.5005/JPMER-51-1-22
8. Ferns, S., & Moore, K. (2012). Assessing student outcomes in fieldwork placements: An overview of current practice. *Asia Pacific Journal of Cooperative Education*, 13(4), 207-224.  
[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/281642768\\_Assessment\\_for\\_learning\\_in\\_engineering\\_internship\\_programmes\\_in\\_Hong\\_Kong\\_How\\_far\\_are\\_we](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/281642768_Assessment_for_learning_in_engineering_internship_programmes_in_Hong_Kong_How_far_are_we) [accessed Jan 19 2024].
9. Hausman, M., Dancot, J., Pétré, B., Guillaume, M., & Detroz, P. (2023). ‘I don’t know if people realize the impact of their words’: how does feedback during internship impact nursing student learning? *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 48(6), 777–789. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2022.2130168>
10. Hausman, M., Detroz, P., Pétré, B., Guillaume, M., & Dancot, J. (2023). Feedback processing and emotion regulation in nursing students during internship. *Learning & Instruction*. 87. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2023.101804>
11. How to write SMART goals. (2023, December 26). How to write SMART goals. Atlassian. <https://www.atlassian.com/blog/productivity/how-to-write-smart-goals#:~:text=What%20are%20SMART%20goals%3F,within%20a%20certain%20time%20frame>
12. Ibrahim J, MacPhail A, Chadwick L, Jeffcott S. (2014). Interns' Perceptions of Performance Feedback. *Medical Education*. 48(4). 417-429. doi: 10.1111/medu.12381. PMID: 24606625.
13. Kushwaha, A. (2014). Feedback in Teacher Education: Interns' Perceptions. *IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education*, 4(3):01-05. doi: 10.9790/7388-04330105
14. Lowenthal, D. J., & Sosland, J. K.. (2021). Assessment in Internships: A 360-Degree Review for Students, Supervisors, and Professors. American University.
15. Luk, L. Y. Y., & Chan, C. K. Y. (2015, May). Assessment for learning in engineering internship programmes in Hong Kong: How far are we?. *International Conference -*



- Assessment for Learning in Higher Education, Hong Kong.  
<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/281642768>
16. Maes, O., Van Nieuwenhoven, C., & Colognesi, S.. (2022). The Feedback Given by University Supervisors to Student Teachers During Their Co-assessment Meetings. *Front Educ.* 7. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2022.848547>
  17. McKenzie, S., Burgess, A., & Mellis, C. (2017). Interns reflect: the effect of formative assessment with feedback during pre-internship. *Advances in Medical Education and Practice*, 8, 51–56. <https://doi.org/10.2147/AMEP.S114480>
  18. McLeod, S. (2025). Albert Bandura's Social Learning Theory. *Simply Psychology*. <https://www.simplypsychology.org/bandura.html>
  19. McLeod, S. (2026). Kolb's Learning Cycle. *Simply Psychology*. <https://www.simplypsychology.org/learning-kolb.html>
  20. Riaz, J.S & Ud Din, S. (2026). Learning by Doing: A Review of Internships as Catalysts for Academic and Career Success. *Well Testing Journal*, 35(3), 409–424. Retrieved from <https://welltestingjournal.com/index.php/WT/article/view/347>
  21. Rothman, M. (2007). Lessons Learned: Advice to Employers From Interns. *Journal of Education for Business*, 82(3), 140–144. <https://doi.org/10.3200/JOEB.82.3.140-144>
  22. Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55, 68-78.
  23. Sadeghi, A. (2018, June 1). 3 Reasons Why Real-Time Feedback is Essential for Success in the Workplace. *Symba*. <https://symba.io/blog/early-talent-and-retention-strategy/internship-program-management/3-reasons-why-real-time-feedback-is-essential-for-success-in-the-workplace/#:~:text=Getting%20feedback%20from%20an%20employer,forward%20in%20their%20career%20paths>. Accessed on 15th March, 2024
  24. Stagini, S., & Peres, L. V. C.. (2021). Teachers and students' perceptions about feedback in clinical internships in medical school. *Revista Brasileira de Educação Médica*. 45(3). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1590/1981-5271v45.3-20200444.ING>
  25. Tripathi, S.K., Farooque, A., Ahmad, S.A. (2024). Corporate Social Responsibility in India: A Review of Corporate Contributions to Sustainable Development Goals. *Educational Administration Theory and Practices*. 30.(4).581-593. 10.53555/kuey.v30i4.1508.