https://doi.org/10.65166/rsahjx31

Asian Journal of Educational Leadership, Management and Pedagogy
Volume I, Issue 1, June 2026
https://journal.ijhba.com/index.php/ajelmp
https://slsipress.com

Clinical Internship Performance and Outputs of Bachelor of Science in Medical Technology Students: The Case of a Private HEI in Makati

Maria Carmen Shieller-Dizon, CEU-Makati

Abstract

Clinical internship is a critical component of Medical Technology education because it enables students to apply academic knowledge, technical competencies, professional values, and analytical skills in actual laboratory settings. This study evaluated the clinical internship performance and outputs of Bachelor of Science in Medical Technology students in a private higher education institution in Makati based on the assessments of graduates and industry partners. A descriptive-comparative design supplemented by qualitative data was employed. The respondents consisted of 124 graduates and 12 industry partners selected through purposive sampling. Data were gathered using an expert-reviewed and pilot-tested researcher-developed questionnaire, supplemented by open-ended responses and semi-structured interviews. Quantitative data were analyzed using means, standard deviations, and independent-samples t-tests, while qualitative data were examined through thematic analysis. The findings indicated that the interns were generally assessed positively in communication, work ethics, core competencies, and institutional graduate attributes. Work ethics emerged as the strongest performance dimension, whereas analytical skills, particularly error recognition, troubleshooting, and clinical interpretation, received comparatively lower assessments. Internship outputs were likewise rated favorably, particularly in comprehensive reporting, documentation compliance, and record traceability, although critical analysis and evidence-based application remained areas for improvement. Significant differences were found between the assessments of graduates and industry partners across the major performance and output dimensions, with industry partners consistently providing more conservative ratings. Qualitative findings further identified workload pressure, limited technical exposure, confidence concerns, documentation challenges, and inconsistent supervision and feedback. The study underscores the need for stronger academic-industry alignment, structured competency assessment, simulation-based preparation, and systematic supervisory feedback in clinical internship management.

Keywords: *clinical internship; Medical Technology education; internship performance; internship outputs; academic-industry alignment; competency-based education*

Article History: **Received:** May 30, 2026 **Revised:** June 12, 2026 **Accepted:** June 20, 2026

1. Introduction

Medical Technology plays an essential role in healthcare by generating laboratory information used in disease detection, diagnosis, treatment planning, patient monitoring, and clinical decision-making. The reliability of these functions depends substantially on the competence of medical technologists who perform laboratory procedures, evaluate test results, maintain quality standards, and communicate relevant findings to other healthcare professionals. Higher education institutions offering Medical Technology programs must therefore ensure that students acquire not only scientific knowledge and technical proficiency but also analytical reasoning, ethical responsibility, communication competence, and professional discipline.

Clinical internship constitutes the principal transition between academic preparation and professional laboratory practice. During internship, students are placed in actual healthcare environments where they are expected to apply classroom learning, perform laboratory procedures under supervision, respond to operational demands, and demonstrate the standards expected of entry-level practitioners. The experience allows students to encounter authentic laboratory workflows, quality-control procedures, documentation requirements, interprofessional relationships, and time-sensitive clinical responsibilities that cannot be fully reproduced in classroom and university laboratory settings.

In the Philippine context, clinical internship is a required and culminating component of the Bachelor of Science in Medical Technology or Medical Laboratory Science curriculum. The competency-based orientation of the program requires students to integrate knowledge, skills, and professional values across the major areas of laboratory practice. Internship is consequently more than a curricular requirement or a prescribed number of training hours. It represents an institutional mechanism for determining whether academic preparation can be transferred effectively to actual clinical practice.

From an educational management perspective, the effectiveness of internship depends on the coordination of several interconnected elements: curriculum design, pre-internship preparation, selection of clinical affiliates, quality of supervision, consistency of competency assessment, adequacy of feedback, and alignment between institutional outcomes and workplace expectations. Weakness in any of these components may affect students' opportunities to develop technical independence, analytical judgment, confidence, and professional readiness. Internship assessment therefore serves both an instructional and a quality-assurance function by providing evidence that may be used to improve curricula, strengthen academic-industry partnerships, and refine student-support mechanisms.

The study is informed by the transfer-of-training perspective, which emphasizes the extent to which knowledge, skills, and attitudes developed in an educational setting are applied and sustained in the workplace. Within Medical Technology education, the transfer of learning becomes observable through interns' actual conduct, technical execution, analytical decisions, professional interactions, and completed laboratory-related outputs. Effective transfer is therefore reflected not only in how students perform their responsibilities but also in the quality, accuracy, organization, and relevance of the outputs they produce during clinical training.

Clinical internship performance and clinical internship outputs represent related but distinct dimensions of educational effectiveness. Performance concerns how students function in the clinical environment. It includes communication skills, work ethics, analytical abilities, integration of knowledge, skills, and attitudes, and demonstration of institutional graduate attributes. Outputs, in comparison, provide tangible evidence of applied learning. These may include laboratory results, reports, records, logbooks, clinical interpretations, documentation, and outputs demonstrating adherence to current standards and evidence-based practices. Assessing only one dimension may produce an incomplete understanding of students' professional preparedness.

The evaluation of internship effectiveness also requires the consideration of multiple stakeholder perspectives. Graduates can provide reflective assessments based on their direct experience of the internship program, including their perceived competence, learning gains, and difficulties encountered during training. Industry partners, including clinical supervisors, training officers, and laboratory administrators, evaluate interns from the standpoint of actual workplace expectations. Their assessments are informed by direct observation of students' behavior, accuracy, efficiency, adaptability, and readiness to assume professional responsibilities. Differences between these perspectives may identify areas in which students' perceptions of preparedness do not fully correspond with the performance standards applied in clinical laboratories.

Although previous investigations have examined internship experiences, competency attainment, clinical preparedness, and training modalities, much of the available literature has treated internship performance and internship outputs separately. Studies have also commonly relied on a single respondent group, thereby limiting the ability to compare graduates' assessments with the evaluations of clinical-industry personnel. In addition, institution-specific investigations that connect stakeholder assessments with a structured program-enhancement framework remain limited in the Philippine Medical Technology education context. These limitations create a need for a more integrated evaluation that considers both the behavioral process of internship performance and the tangible outputs produced during clinical placement.

The present study addressed this need by examining the clinical internship performance and outputs of Bachelor of Science in Medical Technology students from a private higher education institution in Makati. It compared the assessments of graduates and industry partners and examined the problems encountered in developing clinical performance and producing quality internship outputs. The study also used the findings to formulate a Clinical Internship Program Enhancement Plan intended to strengthen student preparation, clinical supervision, competency assessment, feedback systems, and academic-industry coordination. The investigation consequently positions internship assessment as an evidence base for educational planning and continuous program improvement rather than as a purely administrative evaluation.

Objectives of the Study

This study aimed to evaluate the clinical internship performance and outputs of Bachelor of Science in Medical Technology students in a private higher education institution in Makati based on the assessments of graduates and industry partners. Specifically, it sought to:

1. assess the interns' clinical performance in terms of communication skills, work ethics, analytical skills, core competencies involving knowledge, skills, and attitudes, and manifestation of the institution's expected graduate attributes;

2. assess the interns' clinical internship outputs in terms of the accuracy and reliability of laboratory results, comprehensiveness and documentation of reports, critical analysis and relevance of outputs, innovation and application of evidence-based practices, and organization of laboratory records and logbooks;
3. determine whether the assessments of graduates and industry partners differed significantly in relation to clinical internship performance and clinical internship outputs;
4. identify the problems encountered by interns in enhancing clinical performance and producing quality outputs; and
5. formulate a Clinical Internship Program Enhancement Plan based on the findings of the study.

2. Review of Related Literature

2.1 Clinical Internship and the Transfer of Learning

Clinical internship is the principal setting in which students convert academic preparation into observable workplace performance. In Medical Technology education, this conversion requires the coordinated application of scientific knowledge, laboratory techniques, communication, professional values, and analytical judgment within authentic clinical workflows. The transfer-of-training perspective explains the process according to the extent to which competencies developed during instruction are applied, maintained, and adapted in the workplace. Tonhäuser and Büker (2016) identified learner characteristics, training design, and workplace conditions as central determinants of effective transfer, indicating that readiness cannot be attributed to classroom preparation alone.

Authentic clinical environments provide learning conditions that cannot be reproduced fully through classroom discussion or controlled university laboratory exercises. Exposure to actual specimens, service demands, healthcare personnel, institutional protocols, and quality requirements enables students to understand how disciplinary concepts operate under time pressure and professional accountability. Leahy et al. (2018) observed that internship participation contributes to competency development and employment preparedness through direct engagement with professional settings. A comparable knowledge-to-action pattern has been documented in community health, where awareness showed only weak associations with preventive practice unless attitudes and enabling conditions supported implementation (Temporada et al., 2025).

The modality and quality of exposure influence the competencies students are able to develop. Yu et al. (2021) found that Medical Technology students perceived traditional clinical internship as more effective than online internship for knowledge retention, skill acquisition, problem-solving, critical decision-making, communication, and teamwork. Chua et al. (2021), however, reported that students participating in a virtual clinical internship generally perceived that they had acquired the intended competencies, although the reported levels still indicated opportunities for improvement. In a broader educational context, users perceived artificial-intelligence tools as more useful for engagement, content relevance, and feedback than for direct academic-performance gains, reinforcing the distinction between technology-supported learning and demonstrated competence (Rao et al., 2025).

These findings suggest that alternative and technology-supported modalities can strengthen preparation, but they do not eliminate the need for authentic application. Transfer is shaped further by the conditions of the receiving workplace, including supervisory availability, opportunities for progressive independence, feedback quality, equipment access, and exposure to varied procedures. Internship effectiveness must therefore be evaluated not only according to what students know before deployment but also according to whether the clinical environment permits them to apply, refine, and demonstrate that knowledge under professionally relevant conditions.

2.2 Internship Performance, Professional Competencies, and Graduate Attributes

Internship performance represents the behavioral and competency-based expression of student readiness in the clinical environment. It encompasses communication, work ethics, analytical reasoning, technical competence, teamwork, adaptability, and professional responsibility. Evaluating these dimensions provides evidence of whether disciplinary knowledge has been integrated with the attitudes and behaviors required in laboratory practice, rather than remaining as isolated academic achievement.

Communication is essential because clinical laboratory work requires interns to receive and clarify instructions, document procedures and results, report critical information, and coordinate with members of the healthcare team. Yu et al. (2021) identified interpersonal communication and teamwork among the competencies strengthened more effectively through direct clinical exposure. Chua et al. (2021) likewise included communication, leadership, professional responsibility, and

collaborative practice among the expected competencies of Medical Technology interns. Communication assessment should consequently address both interpersonal conduct and the accurate, timely, and context-appropriate exchange of laboratory information.

Work ethics and professionalism are equally fundamental because laboratory practice depends on honesty, accountability, punctuality, confidentiality, procedural compliance, and respect for patients and colleagues. Valdez (2010) found that employers and clinical supervisors considered technical competence and professional behavior jointly important among entry-level Medical Technology graduates. Professional readiness therefore requires more than the ability to perform procedures; it requires consistent adherence to ethical and organizational standards. In adjacent vocational education, craftsmanship spirit and internal professional values were positively associated with learning motivation, illustrating how professional identity can reinforce sustained engagement with skill development (Yan, 2026).

Analytical competence enables interns to interpret findings, recognize inconsistencies, troubleshoot procedural problems, and relate laboratory results to clinical conditions. Smith et al. (2019) reported improvement in critical-thinking dimensions among laboratory science students following clinical internship exposure, while Yu et al. (2021) identified problem-solving and critical decision-making as important outcomes of traditional clinical training. These higher-order competencies may develop more gradually than routine procedural skills because they require repeated encounters with varied cases, atypical findings, instrument limitations, and situations in which established procedures must be interpreted rather than merely followed.

Graduate attributes provide a broader institutional framework for evaluating this development. Barrie (2006) described graduate attributes as capabilities extending beyond discipline-specific knowledge, while Bowden et al. (2000) characterized them as enduring qualities and understandings that graduates apply across professional and social contexts. In Medical Technology education, these attributes connect technical competence with communication, ethical conduct, reflective thinking, lifelong learning, and professional productivity. At the system level, Philippine health-workforce analysis has similarly framed competency alignment as extending beyond personnel numbers to include technical readiness, digital documentation, and context-specific professional capabilities (Atento et al., 2025). The manifestation of such attributes during internship therefore indicates whether institutional outcomes have become observable workplace behaviors.

2.3 Quality of Internship Outputs, Documentation, and Evidence-Based Practice

Internship outputs provide tangible evidence of students' capacity to apply knowledge, procedures, and professional standards. In Medical Technology training, these outputs may include laboratory results, technical reports, case analyses, quality-control records, logbooks, clinical interpretations, and evidence-based recommendations. Their assessment complements behavioral evaluation by examining not only how interns perform their duties but also the accuracy, organization, analytical depth, and professional relevance of the work they produce.

Accuracy and reliability are foundational requirements of laboratory outputs. The World Health Organization (2011) emphasizes that quality laboratory systems require controlled processes across the pre-analytical, analytical, and post-analytical phases of testing, because errors at any stage may compromise diagnostic decisions and patient safety. Plebani (2017) likewise argued that quality in laboratory medicine depends on preventing, detecting, and correcting errors throughout the total testing process. A laboratory validation study of bone-biopsy decalcification further showed that procedural choices and endpoint verification affect downstream morphologic and immunohistochemical quality, illustrating the dependence of diagnostic outputs on controlled pre-analytical practice (Morcilla et al., 2025). Interns must consequently demonstrate correct specimen handling, procedural compliance, quality-control awareness, and careful verification before results are released.

Documentation translates laboratory activity into an auditable professional record. ISO 15189 identifies competence, traceability, documentation, and quality management as integral requirements of medical laboratory practice (International Organization for Standardization, 2012). Complete and retrievable records support accountability, service continuity, error investigation, internal audit, and quality improvement. Reports and logbooks must therefore contain accurate information, follow prescribed formats, correspond with procedures actually performed, and permit verification of the sequence through which results were generated and communicated.

The quality of internship outputs also reflects analytical reasoning. Chua et al. (2021) associated internship competency with critical thinking, research-related capability, leadership, ethical practice, and professional responsibility. Valdez (2010) likewise emphasized the application of professional competencies in actual clinical settings. In practice, this integration

becomes visible when interns interpret findings, identify possible sources of error, correlate laboratory information with clinical conditions, and justify decisions using accepted laboratory standards.

Evidence-based practice extends output quality beyond correct formatting or completion of assigned requirements. Students must use credible scientific information, validated procedures, accepted standards, and current quality practices when preparing laboratory-related work. The World Health Organization (2011) and ISO 15189 both emphasize validated processes and continuous quality improvement as foundations of laboratory practice. Internship outputs should accordingly demonstrate not only procedural completion but also traceable reasoning, appropriate use of evidence, and responsible application of standards to clinical decision-making.

2.4 Stakeholder Assessment and Challenges in Clinical Training

Internship evaluation is influenced by the position, experience, and expectations of the evaluator. Graduates assess the program through their own academic preparation, effort, perceived learning, and confidence developed during training. Industry partners observe interns within operational laboratory settings and may give greater weight to accuracy, efficiency, independence, adaptability, and compliance with professional standards. Comparing these perspectives can reveal whether students' perceptions of readiness correspond with the expectations applied in actual service environments.

Valdez (2010) emphasized the importance of employer and supervisor assessments in identifying the competencies expected of entry-level Medical Technology graduates. Besares-Dayaganon and Limjuco (2016) likewise treated internship ratings as indicators of academic and professional preparedness. Industry evaluations therefore provide information that may not be captured fully through graduate self-assessment, because clinical supervisors judge performance according to service requirements, workplace consequences, and the level of independence demonstrated under routine operating conditions.

Differences between respondent groups may also arise from unequal exposure to the interns being evaluated. Graduates reflect on an entire internship experience, whereas industry partners may observe students only within particular sections, schedules, or clinical sites. Variation in supervision, workload, equipment, institutional procedures, and opportunities for independent work can therefore affect both actual performance and evaluative judgment. Standardized indicators can improve comparability, but they cannot remove all contextual differences among training environments.

Several conditions may restrict internship performance and output quality, including limited hands-on exposure, insufficient opportunities for independent practice, theory-practice gaps, workload pressure, adjustment difficulties, inconsistent feedback, and uneven supervision. Villena (2025) reported that limitations in clinical exposure reduced opportunities for students to apply theoretical knowledge and develop laboratory competence, while Baruth et al. (2018) emphasized direct observation, structured supervision, and competency-based evaluation as mechanisms for identifying and correcting performance deficiencies. An integrative review of health professions education similarly identified clinical-placement scarcity, curriculum-practice gaps, faculty workload, and resource constraints as interconnected leadership problems rather than isolated student deficiencies (Bermido et al., 2025).

The effects of workload and adjustment may extend beyond immediate task completion. In an adjacent medical-student context, sleep, screen time, and activity patterns were associated with dimensions of burnout, underscoring how workload-related and lifestyle conditions may shape students' capacity to sustain performance (Quinto et al., 2025). Weaknesses observed during internship should therefore not be attributed automatically to individual students. Performance emerges through the interaction of learner preparedness, training design, clinical opportunities, supervisory practices, and workplace conditions; program evaluation must examine both student competence and the educational structures that enable or constrain its development.

2.5 Synthesis and Research Gap

The literature establishes clinical internship as a central mechanism through which Medical Technology students transfer academic learning into professional laboratory practice. Direct exposure contributes to technical skill, communication, teamwork, analytical reasoning, ethical conduct, and workplace readiness, although the extent of development depends on training design and clinical conditions (Chua et al., 2021; Tonhäuser & Büker, 2016; Yu et al., 2021). Internship effectiveness must consequently be examined through both observable performance and the quality of outputs produced during clinical placement.

Reliable laboratory outputs require procedural accuracy, documentation, traceability, analytical interpretation, and compliance with quality-management standards (International Organization for Standardization, 2012; Plebani, 2017; World

Health Organization, 2011). At the same time, the literature shows that competence is conditioned by exposure, supervision, workload, equipment, and opportunities for guided independence. Comparable evidence from hospital accreditation implementation indicates that personnel may value quality-oriented systems while still encountering documentation burden and resource constraints, supporting the need to assess implementation capacity alongside formal standards (Garcia & Atento, 2026).

Despite these contributions, prior studies commonly examine competency attainment, internship modality, professional preparedness, laboratory quality, or output requirements as separate concerns. Limited evidence integrates clinical internship performance and internship outputs within a single evaluative framework, and comparative evidence involving graduates and industry partners remains particularly limited in institution-specific Philippine Medical Technology programs. The present study addresses this gap by combining performance assessment, output evaluation, stakeholder comparison, qualitative examination of internship challenges, and the development of a findings-based program enhancement plan.

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Design

The study employed a descriptive-comparative quantitative design supplemented by qualitative data. The quantitative component assessed the clinical internship performance and outputs of Bachelor of Science in Medical Technology students and compared the evaluations provided by graduates and industry partners. The qualitative component used open-ended responses and semi-structured interviews to provide contextual explanations of the challenges encountered during clinical internship and to support the formulation of the proposed program enhancement plan.

3.2 Respondents and Study Setting

The study involved 136 respondents from a private higher education institution in Makati offering a Bachelor of Science in Medical Technology program. The respondents consisted of 124 program graduates who had completed their clinical internship and 12 industry partners from affiliated, CHED-accredited hospital laboratories.

The industry respondents included chief medical technologists, training officers, and section supervisors who had directly supervised or observed interns from the institution. Their inclusion provided a workplace-based assessment of students' competencies and outputs, while the graduate respondents provided reflective assessments based on their internship experiences.

The clinical internship program placed students in affiliated hospital laboratories where they received supervised exposure to diagnostic procedures, laboratory operations, documentation practices, quality-control processes, and professional workplace responsibilities.

3.3 Sampling Technique

Purposive sampling was used because the study required respondents with direct knowledge of the clinical internship program. Graduate respondents were included when they had completed the Medical Technology program and the required clinical internship within the identified cohorts and were willing to participate. Graduates who had not completed the relevant internship period or did not have sufficient internship experience were excluded.

Industry partners were included when they were employed in an affiliated clinical laboratory, held a supervisory or training-related position, and had direct professional exposure to interns from the institution. Personnel who had no direct involvement in internship supervision or evaluation were excluded.

3.4 Research Instruments

The study used researcher-developed survey questionnaires and a semi-structured interview guide. Separate questionnaire forms were prepared for graduates and industry partners, but the forms contained identical constructs and indicators to permit direct comparison between the two respondent groups.

The survey questionnaire consisted of four parts. The first part contained 25 items assessing clinical internship performance across five dimensions: communication skills, work ethics, analytical skills, core competencies involving knowledge, skills, and attitudes, and manifestation of the institution's expected graduate attributes.

The second part contained 25 items assessing clinical internship outputs. The output dimensions covered the accuracy and reliability of laboratory results, comprehensiveness and documentation of reports, critical analysis and relevance of outputs, innovation and application of evidence-based practices, and organization and traceability of laboratory records and logbooks.

The third part contained 10 items addressing problems encountered in enhancing clinical performance and producing quality internship outputs. The fourth part consisted of open-ended questions concerning internship challenges, output-related difficulties, and recommendations for program improvement.

The performance and output items were rated using a four-point scale: 4 for Strongly Agree, 3 for Agree, 2 for Disagree, and 1 for Strongly Disagree. The absence of a neutral midpoint required respondents to indicate either agreement or disagreement with each statement.

The semi-structured interview guide contained three principal questions corresponding to the open-ended survey component. These questions addressed challenges affecting clinical performance, problems encountered in producing internship outputs, and recommendations for improving the clinical internship program. Probing questions were used to obtain clarification and more detailed accounts from selected graduate and industry participants.

3.5 Instrument Validation and Reliability

The survey questionnaire and interview guide underwent expert validation before administration. The validation panel included specialists in graduate education, Medical Technology program administration, clinical laboratory supervision, research instrument development, and statistical analysis. The instruments were evaluated for clarity, relevance, content coverage, organization, appropriateness of terminology, and alignment with the study objectives and conceptual framework.

Based on the validators' recommendations, ambiguous statements were revised, terminology was standardized, overlapping indicators were refined, and selected items were reorganized to improve construct alignment. The interview prompts were likewise revised to encourage fuller and more focused responses.

Separate pilot tests were conducted for the two respondent groups. The graduate questionnaire was pilot-tested with 13 Medical Technology graduates, while the industry-partner questionnaire was pilot-tested with 12 laboratory supervisors and training personnel who possessed characteristics comparable to those of the actual respondents. Pilot participants were excluded from the final sample.

For the graduate questionnaire, the complete 50-item performance and output instrument obtained a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of .9622. The Clinical Internship Performance and Clinical Internship Outputs subscales obtained coefficients of .9289 and .9231, respectively.

For the industry-partner questionnaire, the complete instrument obtained a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of .9848. The performance and output subscales obtained coefficients of .9550 and .9835, respectively. These coefficients indicated high internal consistency across the questionnaire forms and subscales.

3.6 Data-Gathering Procedure

Following the approval of the research proposal, the researcher secured permission from the appropriate university authorities and participating clinical affiliates. The validated questionnaires were converted into electronic format using Google Forms and distributed to eligible graduates and industry partners through official communication channels, email, and professional networks.

Respondents were first presented with an informed-consent statement explaining the study's purpose, procedures, voluntary nature, confidentiality measures, and right to discontinue participation. Only respondents who indicated consent were allowed to complete the questionnaire. Follow-up reminders were issued during the data-collection period. Completed responses were exported, checked for completeness and eligibility, and organized for analysis.

Qualitative data were gathered through the open-ended survey questions and separate semi-structured interview sessions with selected graduates and industry partners. The interviews were conducted through Zoom and lasted approximately 40 minutes per session. With participant permission, the sessions were audio- and video-recorded. The recordings were transcribed and reviewed before qualitative analysis.

3.7 Data Analysis

Means and standard deviations were computed to summarize the respondents' assessments of clinical internship performance, internship outputs, and the problems encountered during clinical training. Mean scores were interpreted using the following ranges: 3.50-4.00 as Strongly Agree, 2.50-3.49 as Agree, 1.50-2.49 as Disagree, and 1.00-1.49 as Strongly Disagree.

Independent-samples t-tests were used to determine whether the assessments of graduates and industry partners differed significantly across the performance and output dimensions. Statistical significance was evaluated at the .05 level.

The qualitative responses and interview transcripts were analyzed thematically. The researcher reviewed the data, identified meaningful statements and recurring patterns, assigned initial codes, and grouped related codes into broader categories and themes. The qualitative findings were used to explain the quantitative patterns and identify areas requiring program intervention.

The quantitative and qualitative findings were integrated during interpretation. The statistical results established the overall assessments and differences between respondent groups, while the qualitative themes provided contextual information concerning internship challenges, strengths, supervisory conditions, and recommended improvements.

3.8 Ethical Considerations

The study was conducted after the researcher had secured the necessary institutional and ethical approvals. Participation was voluntary, and informed consent was obtained from all survey respondents and interview participants before data collection. Participants were informed of the purpose of the study, the procedures involved, the confidentiality of their responses, and their right to decline participation or withdraw at any stage without penalty.

Confidentiality and privacy were maintained throughout the research process. Only information necessary for the study was collected, and quantitative findings were presented in aggregate form. Participant codes and general respondent classifications were used in reporting qualitative responses to prevent the identification of individual participants and affiliated institutions.

Permission was obtained before the recording of the online interview sessions. Audio and video recordings were used exclusively for transcription and research analysis and were not disclosed to unauthorized persons. Survey responses, recordings, transcripts, and related research files were stored in password-protected electronic locations accessible only to the researcher.

The collection, storage, processing, and reporting of data were undertaken in accordance with accepted principles of research ethics and the provisions of the Philippine Data Privacy Act of 2012.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Clinical Internship Performance

Table 1 presents the assessments of the graduates and industry partners across the five dimensions of clinical internship performance. The respondent groups are presented separately because of the substantial difference in their sample sizes.

Table 1. *Assessment of Clinical Internship Performance by Respondent Group*

Performance dimension	Graduates M	SD	VI	Industry partners M	SD	VI
Communication skills	3.77	0.341	SA	3.43	0.370	A
Work ethics	3.82	0.324	SA	3.43	0.339	A
Analytical skills	3.61	0.423	SA	3.13	0.477	A
Core competencies	3.79	0.356	SA	3.33	0.394	A
Expected graduate attributes	3.80	0.330	SA	3.35	0.483	A
Overall performance	**3.76**	**0.301**	**SA**	**3.33**	**0.360**	**A**

Note. SA = Strongly Agree; A = Agree. Interpretation: 3.50-4.00 = Strongly Agree; 2.50-3.49 = Agree.

The graduate respondents strongly agreed that the interns demonstrated the assessed performance competencies, with an overall mean of 3.76. Industry partners likewise evaluated the interns favorably, although their overall assessment was lower and was interpreted as Agree (M = 3.33). This pattern indicates that both groups recognized the presence of the expected competencies, but industry partners applied a more conservative assessment across all dimensions.

Work ethics received the highest assessment among the graduates (M = 3.82). The dimension covered punctuality, compliance with institutional policies and laboratory protocols, accountability, initiative, responsibility, and respect for patients and co-workers. Expected graduate attributes (M = 3.80) and core competencies (M = 3.79) followed closely. These results indicate that graduates viewed professional conduct, institutional values, and foundational knowledge, skills, and attitudes as the most consistently demonstrated aspects of internship performance.

Among industry partners, communication skills and work ethics both obtained the highest mean of 3.43. The results suggest that clinical supervisors generally recognized the interns' ability to interact professionally, follow instructions, comply with workplace expectations, and maintain appropriate behavior in clinical settings. However, these ratings remained below the Strongly Agree threshold, indicating that supervisors perceived room for further development in consistency, independence, and performance under actual workplace conditions.

Analytical skills received the lowest rating from both graduates (M = 3.61) and industry partners (M = 3.13). Although the graduates still strongly agreed that analytical competencies were demonstrated, industry partners provided the lowest mean for this dimension among all performance areas. The detailed indicators showed particular difficulty in recognizing and troubleshooting laboratory errors, correlating findings with clinical conditions, applying problem-solving techniques during unexpected situations, and maintaining accuracy while responding to complex testing demands. Analytical competence therefore emerged as the most evident developmental area in the internship program.

The difference between relatively strong professional behavior and comparatively weaker analytical reasoning suggests that procedural and affective competencies may be demonstrated earlier than higher-order diagnostic judgment. Interns can follow protocols, communicate respectfully, and perform assigned tasks while still requiring supervision when interpreting atypical results, resolving instrument problems, or deciding how to respond to inconsistencies. Such competencies generally require repeated exposure to varied cases and opportunities to make decisions under guided supervision.

4.2 Clinical Internship Outputs

Table 2 summarizes the respondents' assessments of the outputs produced during clinical internship. The labels for innovation and evidence-based practice and for record and logbook organization are based on the actual content of their respective indicators.

Table 2. *Assessment of Clinical Internship Outputs by Respondent Group*

Output dimension	Graduates M	SD	VI	Industry partners M	SD	VI
Accuracy and reliability of laboratory results	3.80	0.324	SA	3.25	0.547	A
Comprehensiveness and documentation of reports	3.82	0.298	SA	3.35	0.460	A
Critical analysis and relevance of outputs	3.61	0.462	SA	3.25	0.610	A
Innovation and application of evidence-based practices	3.73	0.391	SA	3.15	0.699	A
Organization of laboratory records and logbooks	3.81	0.342	SA	3.36	0.474	A
Overall outputs	**3.75**	**0.312**	**SA**	**3.27**	**0.512**	**A**

Note. SA = Strongly Agree; A = Agree. Interpretation: 3.50-4.00 = Strongly Agree; 2.50-3.49 = Agree.

Graduate respondents strongly agreed that the interns produced the expected clinical outputs, with an overall mean of 3.75. Industry partners also provided a favorable overall assessment, although at the Agree level (M = 3.27). As in the performance results, graduates consistently reported higher assessments than industry partners.

For graduates, comprehensiveness and documentation of reports obtained the highest mean (M = 3.82), followed by organization of laboratory records and logbooks (M = 3.81) and accuracy and reliability of laboratory results (M = 3.80). These ratings indicate confidence in the interns' ability to complete reports, provide patient and specimen information, observe required documentation procedures, maintain records, and follow laboratory testing protocols.

Industry partners rated organization of laboratory records and logbooks highest (M = 3.36), followed by comprehensiveness and documentation of reports (M = 3.35). Their assessments suggest that interns generally complied with

prescribed formats, maintained identifiable and traceable records, and completed the administrative components of clinical work. Nevertheless, the ratings imply that consistency across interns and training sites was not uniformly strong.

Critical analysis and relevance of outputs received one of the lowest graduate assessments (M = 3.61) and an industry-partner mean of 3.25. This dimension included interpretation of laboratory findings, explanation of abnormal or unexpected results, identification of possible sources of error, application of pathophysiological knowledge, and integration of theoretical knowledge with clinical experience. The results parallel the relatively low analytical-skills ratings in Table 1 and reinforce the conclusion that interns were more confident in producing and organizing outputs than in independently interpreting complex laboratory information.

Innovation and application of evidence-based practices received the lowest industry-partner assessment (M = 3.15). These items examined the use of credible references, evidence-based explanations, current laboratory standards, awareness of recent technologies and quality practices, and the capacity to recommend practical improvements. The result indicates a need to move beyond compliance with routine requirements toward more active use of current evidence and professional standards in clinical outputs.

4.3 Differences Between Graduate and Industry-Partner Assessments

Independent-samples t-tests were conducted to determine whether the graduate and industry-partner assessments differed significantly. Table 3 combines the comparative results for the performance and output dimensions.

Table 3. *Differences in Clinical Internship Performance and Output Assessments*

Domain and dimension	Graduate M	Industry-partner M	t	p	Decision
Clinical internship performance					
Communication skills	3.77	3.43	3.053	.0093	Significant
Work ethics	3.82	3.43	3.825	.0021	Significant
Analytical skills	3.61	3.13	3.378	.0051	Significant
Core competencies	3.79	3.33	3.882	.0019	Significant
Expected graduate attributes	3.80	3.35	3.155	.0083	Significant
Overall performance	**3.76**	**3.33**	**3.951**	**.0018**	**Significant**
Clinical internship outputs					
Accuracy and reliability of results	3.80	3.25	3.476	.0047	Significant
Comprehensiveness and documentation	3.82	3.35	3.523	.0042	Significant
Critical analysis and relevance	3.61	3.25	2.016	.0663	Not significant
Innovation and evidence-based practices	3.73	3.15	2.836	.0154	Significant
Organization of records and logbooks	3.81	3.36	3.162	.0081	Significant
Overall outputs	**3.75**	**3.27**	**3.223**	**.0075**	**Significant**

Note. Significant at $p < .05$.

Significant differences were found between graduates and industry partners across all five performance dimensions and in overall internship performance. In each comparison, graduates provided higher ratings than industry partners. The largest mean differences were observed in analytical skills and core competencies, suggesting that the two groups differed particularly in their judgments of theory application, problem-solving, equipment use, procedural competence, and independent clinical reasoning.

Significant differences were also found in four of the five output dimensions and in overall internship outputs. Graduates provided higher assessments of result accuracy, report comprehensiveness, evidence-based application, record organization, and overall output quality.

Critical analysis and relevance of outputs was the only dimension for which the difference was not statistically significant, $t = 2.016$, $p = .0663$. Both groups therefore provided statistically comparable assessments of the interns' ability to interpret findings, explain abnormal results, identify errors, apply pathophysiological knowledge, and integrate theory with

clinical practice. This convergence is important because the dimension also received comparatively restrained ratings from both groups. The result suggests a shared recognition that critical analysis is an area requiring continued development.

The consistent difference in the remaining dimensions may reflect the distinct standards used by the two respondent groups. Graduates assessed competencies in relation to their educational progression, individual effort, and personal experience of completing the internship. Industry partners evaluated the same competencies against operational requirements, professional standards, laboratory efficiency, and the degree of independence expected within actual clinical settings. The industry assessments therefore provide an external reference point for identifying areas where confidence developed during academic preparation may not yet correspond fully with workplace expectations.

4.4 Challenges Affecting Clinical Performance and Output Quality

The qualitative responses identified recurring conditions that influenced the interns' performance and the quality of the outputs they produced. The themes reported by graduates and industry partners were closely aligned, although the respondent groups described them from different perspectives.

Table 4. *Summary of Qualitative Themes on Clinical Internship Challenges*

Area	Themes identified by graduates	Themes identified by industry partners
Clinical performance	Adjustment to fast-paced clinical environments, workload, and time pressure; limited exposure to advanced equipment and specialized procedures; lack of confidence and hesitation; difficulty applying theory and troubleshooting; limited supervision, feedback, and staff support	Workload, time constraints, and fatigue; limited exposure, resources, and theory-to-practice application; unclear instructions and inconsistent feedback; adjustment to hospital workflows; need for greater confidence, initiative, and practical readiness
Quality of internship outputs	Workload, deadlines, and fatigue; limited technical experience; lack of confidence and adjustment difficulties; resource, equipment, and institutional limitations; inconsistent supervision, communication, and guidance	Turnaround-time pressure and workload; transition to the professional environment; insufficient hands-on exposure; resource and learning-support limitations; communication, coordination, and teamwork challenges

The first major theme concerned adjustment to the pace and demands of clinical laboratory work. Graduates described difficulty managing patient and specimen volumes, strict turnaround times, unfamiliar equipment, extended duties, and simultaneous academic requirements. Industry partners similarly observed that time pressure and fatigue could reduce concentration, organization, and consistency. These findings indicate that internship performance is shaped partly by how effectively students transition from controlled academic exercises to time-sensitive service environments.

Limited clinical exposure was another recurring theme. Respondents referred to insufficient experience with advanced laboratory instruments, specialized procedures, phlebotomy, troubleshooting, and actual patient cases. Differences between university laboratory equipment and the technologies used in affiliated hospitals may intensify the theory-practice gap. Interns may understand a procedure conceptually but still require guided repetition before performing it confidently under clinical conditions.

Confidence and initiative were also affected by fear of making errors. Some interns hesitated to ask questions, operate unfamiliar equipment, handle critical specimens, or perform tasks independently. Such hesitation is understandable in a high-stakes healthcare environment, but prolonged dependence may restrict learning opportunities and slow the development of professional judgment.

Supervision and feedback emerged as cross-cutting concerns. Graduates reported inconsistent instructions, limited access to staff guidance, and reliance on other interns when supervisors were unavailable. Industry partners likewise identified the need for clearer coordination and more structured support. The results suggest that internship quality varies not only according to student preparedness but also according to the availability and instructional capacity of clinical supervisors.

Output-related challenges were strongly connected to the same conditions. Heavy workload and limited time could affect the completeness of reports and logbooks. Limited exposure and equipment differences could restrict the range of procedures students were able to document. Conflicting instructions could create uncertainty regarding report formats and performance expectations. Resource disparities among training sites could also produce unequal opportunities to complete quotas, encounter specialized procedures, or use current laboratory technologies.

Supplementary responses nevertheless identified several strengths among the interns, including willingness to learn, adaptability, professionalism, teamwork, and foundational technical competence. These strengths suggest that the reported difficulties did not represent an absence of readiness but rather areas in which motivated interns required more structured opportunities, feedback, and progressive responsibility.

4.5 Clinical Internship Program Enhancement Framework

The original study proposed extensive operational plans for performance and output development. For journal presentation, these are consolidated into a program-level enhancement framework.

Table 5. *Condensed Clinical Internship Program Enhancement Framework*

Priority area	Evidence from the findings	Proposed program actions	Expected indicator
Pre-internship readiness and communication	Adjustment difficulties; lower communication ratings from industry partners	Conduct structured endorsement, patient-interaction, critical-value reporting, and interprofessional communication simulations before deployment	Improved initial clinical-evaluation ratings and fewer communication-related deficiencies
Analytical and diagnostic reasoning	Analytical skills and critical analysis received comparatively low ratings	Use case-based interpretation, abnormal-result analysis, error-identification exercises, and troubleshooting simulations	Improved performance in result interpretation, clinical correlation, and error resolution
Technical exposure and equipment readiness	Limited exposure to advanced equipment and specialized procedures	Provide equipment familiarization, rotational simulation, phlebotomy practice, and partnerships for specialized laboratory exposure	Greater confidence and reduced need for corrective supervision during early rotations
Professional integrity, resilience, and initiative	Strong work ethics but reported hesitation, fatigue, and workload pressure	Reinforce ethics, accountability, stress management, time management, reflective practice, and graduated responsibility	Sustained professionalism with increased initiative and independent task completion
Quality assurance and result accuracy	Favorable ratings but significant graduate-industry assessment differences	Strengthen quality-control interpretation, result verification, calibration, and pre-analytical error-prevention exercises	Fewer documentation and verification errors
Documentation and records management	Documentation was favorable but affected by workload and inconsistent instructions	Standardize report templates, logbook requirements, critical-value documentation, incident reporting, and digital-record orientation	More complete, traceable, timely, and consistently formatted records
Evidence-based and technology-oriented practice	Lowest industry rating among output dimensions	Integrate current standards, credible-source appraisal, laboratory informatics, emerging technologies, and quality-improvement projects	Increased use of current evidence and standards in internship outputs
Supervision and academic-industry coordination	Inconsistent feedback and variation across clinical sites	Establish common evaluation rubrics, scheduled feedback sessions, supervisor orientation, and regular academe-industry calibration meetings	Greater consistency in ratings, expectations, mentoring, and corrective action

The framework treats internship improvement as a shared institutional responsibility. It combines student preparation with clinical-site management, supervisor development, standardized assessment, and continuous academic-industry coordination. Its purpose is not to add disconnected activities to the internship but to align preparation, supervision, performance evidence, and program evaluation.

4.6 Discussion

The findings demonstrate that the clinical internship program generally supported the transfer of professional behaviors, foundational competencies, and output-production skills into the clinical environment. Both respondent groups agreed that the interns demonstrated communication, work ethics, core competencies, graduate attributes, and the capacity to produce required laboratory-related outputs. This general pattern is consistent with the position that internship provides an essential environment

for applying competencies that cannot be fully developed through classroom instruction alone (Leahy et al., 2018; Tonhäuser & Büker, 2016).

Work ethics emerged as the strongest performance dimension among graduates and one of the strongest dimensions among industry partners. This indicates that punctuality, accountability, protocol compliance, integrity, and respect were visible features of internship performance. Professional behavior is particularly important in Medical Technology because laboratory work depends on accurate handling of specimens, confidentiality, procedural discipline, and transparent reporting of errors.

Analytical skills were less strongly assessed, particularly by industry partners. The finding supports the distinction between performing prescribed procedures and exercising independent clinical judgment. Interns may competently follow standard operating procedures while still experiencing difficulty when results are inconsistent, instruments malfunction, quality-control values fall outside acceptable limits, or findings require correlation with a patient's condition. Prior studies similarly identify critical thinking and problem-solving as competencies strengthened through sustained clinical exposure rather than through theoretical preparation alone (Smith et al., 2019; Yu et al., 2021).

The output findings revealed a related pattern. Interns were perceived as relatively capable of completing reports and maintaining records, but their capacity to produce analytically sophisticated and evidence-informed outputs remained less developed. WHO laboratory quality guidance and ISO 15189 emphasize that documentation, traceability, result accuracy, competence, and quality improvement are interconnected. An output may be complete in form but still require stronger interpretation, evidence use, and clinical relevance. The program should therefore avoid treating logbook completion or report submission as sufficient evidence of higher-order competence.

The consistently higher graduate ratings require careful interpretation. The results do not necessarily indicate that graduates assessed themselves inaccurately or that industry partners judged them unfairly. Instead, the respondent groups occupied different evaluative positions. Graduates understood their learning trajectory and the effort required to complete the internship, whereas industry partners assessed performance against routine professional operations and service expectations. Valdez (2010) similarly emphasized that employer and supervisor evaluations provide an important external perspective on entry-level competence.

The non-significant difference in critical analysis is especially informative. Unlike the other dimensions, both groups converged statistically in assessing the interns' analytical outputs. Since these ratings were comparatively moderate, the result indicates a shared understanding that clinical correlation, interpretation of unusual findings, and identification of error sources remain developmental competencies. This area should be prioritized because it links technical execution with the professional judgment expected of future medical technologists.

The qualitative findings clarify why these competency gaps occurred. Workload, unfamiliar equipment, limited exposure, anxiety, inconsistent supervision, and differences among training sites affected both performance and output quality. These findings are compatible with the transfer-of-training perspective, which holds that workplace support and opportunities for application influence whether acquired knowledge is demonstrated effectively (Tonhäuser & Büker, 2016). Competency deficiencies should therefore not be interpreted solely as student weaknesses; they may also reflect differences in training conditions and the structure of clinical supervision.

From an educational-management standpoint, the results indicate that internship quality requires active coordination rather than simple student placement. Higher education institutions must calibrate academic preparation with industry expectations, define common assessment criteria, monitor the quality of affiliated sites, and ensure that clinical supervisors understand their instructional role. Industry partners, in turn, need feasible mechanisms for structured feedback and progressive entrustment of responsibilities.

The findings should be interpreted in light of the unequal group sizes, particularly the smaller number of industry partners. The industry assessments remain valuable because they represent direct clinical observations, but they should not be treated as universally representative of all possible training sites. Future program evaluation should seek broader participation from clinical supervisors and examine whether ratings vary by laboratory section, hospital type, duration of supervision, or degree of contact with particular interns.

Overall, the study contributes an integrated framework for examining internship effectiveness through performance, outputs, stakeholder comparison, and contextual challenges. The evidence supports retaining the program's strengths in

professional conduct, communication, documentation, and foundational competence while prioritizing analytical reasoning, evidence-based application, technical exposure, supervisory consistency, and stronger academic-industry alignment.

5. Conclusions, Recommendations, and Implications

5.1 Conclusions

The study concludes that the Bachelor of Science in Medical Technology interns were generally perceived to have demonstrated the professional behaviors, foundational competencies, and output-production skills expected during clinical training. Graduate respondents strongly agreed that the interns demonstrated the assessed performance and output indicators, while industry partners also provided favorable but consistently more moderate evaluations.

Work ethics emerged as the strongest performance dimension among the graduate respondents and one of the highest-rated dimensions among industry partners. The interns were perceived to demonstrate accountability, compliance with institutional and laboratory policies, professional conduct, respect, and responsibility. Communication skills, core competencies, and expected graduate attributes were likewise assessed positively, indicating that the internship program supported the application of professional values, teamwork, technical knowledge, and interpersonal competencies in clinical settings.

Analytical skills received the lowest performance assessment from both respondent groups. The comparatively lower ratings for error recognition, troubleshooting, clinical correlation, and problem-solving indicate that the interns were more proficient in following established procedures than in independently resolving unfamiliar or complex laboratory situations. These findings suggest that higher-order clinical reasoning remains a developmental area requiring repeated exposure, guided decision-making, and structured feedback.

Clinical internship outputs were also assessed favorably. Graduates gave their highest ratings to report comprehensiveness, documentation, record organization, and the accuracy and reliability of laboratory results. Industry partners similarly recognized the interns' ability to maintain records and comply with documentation requirements. The findings indicate that the interns were generally able to produce the routine technical and administrative outputs required during clinical placement.

However, critical analysis and the application of evidence-based practices received comparatively lower assessments. Interns appeared to experience greater difficulty in explaining abnormal findings, identifying possible sources of laboratory error, applying pathophysiological knowledge, integrating current evidence, and proposing improvements based on clinical experience. Completion and organization of outputs therefore appeared stronger than the analytical depth and evidence-based reasoning reflected in those outputs.

Significant differences were found between the assessments of graduates and industry partners across all dimensions of clinical internship performance and most dimensions of internship outputs. Graduates consistently provided higher ratings. These differences indicate that the two respondent groups evaluated internship competence from distinct perspectives. Graduates assessed their development in relation to their educational experience and perceived learning, whereas industry partners applied workplace-based expectations involving accuracy, efficiency, independence, and professional readiness.

Critical analysis and relevance of outputs was the only output dimension in which the difference between the two groups was not statistically significant. Both groups provided comparable assessments of this area, confirming that the development of deeper interpretation, clinical correlation, and analytical judgment should be prioritized in the internship program.

The qualitative findings further show that internship performance and output quality were influenced by adjustment to the clinical environment, workload and time pressure, limited exposure to specialized procedures and equipment, lack of confidence, theory-practice gaps, inconsistent supervision, and variations in feedback. These challenges demonstrate that competency development depends not only on students' academic preparation but also on the quality of clinical exposure, mentoring, and support provided by training affiliates.

Overall, the internship program demonstrated strengths in developing work ethics, professionalism, communication, adaptability, teamwork, technical foundations, documentation practices, and willingness to learn. Nevertheless, the findings justify a structured enhancement program focusing on analytical reasoning, troubleshooting, evidence-based practice, technical exposure, confidence-building, supervisory consistency, and stronger alignment between academic preparation and industry expectations.

5.2 Recommendations

The Medical Technology program should strengthen pre-internship preparation through structured simulation and competency-readiness activities. These activities should include abnormal-result interpretation, error identification, quality-control analysis, troubleshooting, specimen handling, phlebotomy and biosafety procedures, critical-value communication, and clinical documentation. Simulation should expose students to both routine and unexpected laboratory situations before deployment.

Case-based and problem-based learning should be integrated more systematically into professional courses and internship preparation. Students should be required to analyze atypical findings, relate laboratory results to clinical conditions, determine possible pre-analytical and analytical errors, and justify corrective actions. These activities should emphasize reasoning and decision-making rather than the memorization of procedures.

Clinical responsibilities should be assigned progressively. Interns may initially perform tasks under close supervision and subsequently receive greater independence after demonstrating the required competence. Progressive entrustment can improve confidence and initiative while maintaining patient safety and procedural accountability.

The academic institution and its clinical affiliates should adopt common competency indicators, evaluation rubrics, and documentation requirements. Orientation and calibration sessions should be conducted for internship coordinators, clinical instructors, training officers, and section supervisors to improve consistency in rating standards, instructions, feedback, and performance expectations.

Structured feedback mechanisms should be established throughout the internship period. Interns should receive scheduled formative evaluations rather than feedback only at the completion of a rotation. Feedback should identify specific strengths, deficiencies, corrective actions, and expected performance targets. Reflective self-assessment may be incorporated to help interns compare their own judgments with supervisor evaluations.

Documentation and evidence-based practice should be reinforced through standardized report templates, logbook guidelines, incident-reporting procedures, quality-control documentation, and laboratory information-system orientation. Internship outputs should be evaluated not only for completeness but also for analytical relevance, use of current standards, evidence quality, traceability, and clinical application.

Clinical affiliates should be periodically evaluated according to the adequacy of equipment, diversity of procedures, availability of qualified supervisors, quality of mentoring, and opportunities for hands-on practice. Where exposure to specialized tests or technologies is limited, the institution should provide supplementary simulation, laboratory demonstrations, or rotational experiences in other qualified facilities.

The proposed Clinical Internship Program Enhancement Framework should be implemented in phases and evaluated using measurable indicators. These may include changes in supervisor ratings, documentation errors, troubleshooting performance, student confidence, completion of required procedures, quality-control competence, and agreement between graduate and industry assessments.

Future studies should include a larger and more diverse group of industry partners and clinical affiliates. Subsequent research may compare internship outcomes across hospital classifications, laboratory sections, or training modalities. Longitudinal studies may also examine whether internship performance predicts licensure outcomes, employment readiness, early-career performance, or professional retention. Objective performance records may be used alongside perception-based ratings to provide a more comprehensive assessment of competence.

5.3 Implications of the Study

The findings have important educational implications for Medical Technology curriculum design. Positive assessments of professional behavior and foundational competencies suggest that the existing program provides a sound basis for clinical preparation. However, the relatively lower assessments of analytical reasoning and evidence-based outputs indicate that the curriculum should provide more opportunities for students to interpret, troubleshoot, justify decisions, and apply knowledge in uncertain clinical situations.

The results also have institutional and managerial implications. Clinical internship should be managed as an integrated academic-industry learning system rather than as a student-placement requirement. Effective internship management requires clear agreements, common assessment standards, supervisor preparation, regular communication, monitoring of affiliate conditions, and mechanisms for resolving inconsistencies in training experiences.

The differences between graduate and industry-partner assessments demonstrate the value of multi-stakeholder evaluation. Graduate assessments provide evidence of perceived learning and personal development, while industry assessments offer an external measure of alignment with workplace expectations. Using both perspectives can produce a more balanced basis for curriculum review and program enhancement than relying on either group alone.

The study further supports the transfer-of-training perspective by showing that the application of academic learning is influenced by opportunities for practice, supervisory support, feedback, workload, equipment, and the conditions of the clinical environment. Internship outcomes cannot therefore be explained exclusively by student ability. They reflect the interaction among learner readiness, educational design, workplace support, and clinical expectations.

For clinical affiliates, the findings imply that supervisors perform both operational and educational roles. Clear instructions, constructive feedback, graduated responsibility, and supportive communication contribute directly to competence development. Strengthening the instructional preparation of clinical supervisors may improve the consistency and quality of internship experiences.

At the policy and quality-assurance levels, the study indicates that internship evaluation systems should assess both performance and outputs. Behavioral competence, technical execution, documentation quality, analytical reasoning, evidence use, and professional judgment should be considered complementary indicators of readiness. This broader evaluation approach can support continuous improvement, accreditation compliance, and stronger alignment between higher education and healthcare practice.

The findings are based primarily on respondent assessments and do not establish causal relationships between specific program components and internship outcomes. Nevertheless, the integration of graduate evaluations, industry-partner assessments, quantitative comparisons, and qualitative accounts provides a practical evidence base for improving the management and educational quality of clinical internship programs.

6. References

Atento, R. G. O., Quinto, L. F., & Espelita, C. A. M. H. (2025). Bridging global health workforce gaps 2050: A multilevel analysis of global demand, Philippine supply fragilities, and competency alignment. *International Journal of Health and Business Analytics, 1*(2), 1–30. https://doi.org/10.65166/kgbpey79

Barrie, S. C. (2006). Understanding what we mean by the generic attributes of graduates. *Higher Education, 51*(2), 215-241. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-004-6387-z

Baruth, M., Adam, J. K., & Krishna, S. B. N. (2018). Direct observation as an assessment tool for evaluation of technical competence of intern medical technologists: A realistic approach. *International Journal of Environmental and Science Education, 13*(4), 407-417.

Bermido, C. M., Quinto, L. F., & Atento, R. G. O. (2025). A qualitative thematic review of contemporary challenges affecting health professions education: Implications for higher education leadership. *International Journal of Health and Business Analytics, 1*(2). https://doi.org/10.65166/yfm5w791

Besares-Dayaganon, A. J., & Limjuco, R. P. (2016). Academic proficiency, internship performance rating, and the preparedness to ASCP certification of the Medical Technology graduates in Region XI: Basis for the enhancement of clinical internship curriculum. *International Journal of Applied Business and Economic Research, 14*(2), 1237-1260.

Bowden, J., Hart, G., King, B., Trigwell, K., & Watts, O. (2000). *Generic capabilities of ATN university graduates*. Australian Technology Network.

Chua, M. A. T., Justiniano, B. F. D., Ocampo, J. C. L., Pamplona, J. L. L., Pedarse, L. J. V., Reyes, Y. A., Martin, G. L. I., & Navidad, F. C. (2021). Virtual clinical internship competencies of Medical Technology students. *International Journal of Arts, Sciences and Education, 2*(1), 174-198.

Garcia, A. E., & Atento, R. G. O. (2026). Engagement and perceptions of middle managers in PhilHealth Benchbook II accreditation: Evidence from a tertiary hospital case study. *Journal of Enterprise Strategy & Management Innovation, 1*(1). https://doi.org/10.65166/jev58v44

International Organization for Standardization. (2012). *Medical laboratories-Requirements for quality and competence (ISO Standard No. 15189:2012)*.

Leahy, I. C., Baier, A. W., & Hickey, P. R. (2018). More than academic competence: The importance and utility of internship to gain clinical and research experiences. *Medical Science Educator, 28*(4), 789-792. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40670-018-0599-x

Morcilla, J. S., Al Bozom, I., Adham, A., Murshed, K., & Quinto, L. F. (2025). Investigation of an appropriate decalcifying agent for bone biopsy specimens submitted for histomorphologic analyses and immunohistochemical studies. *International Journal of Health & Business Analytics, 1*(2), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.65166/y1s38453

Plebani, M. (2017). Errors in clinical laboratories or errors in laboratory medicine? *Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine, 55*(7), 915-917. https://doi.org/10.1515/cclm-2017-0172

Quinto, L., Agang-Ang, G., Kim, Y., Eustaquio, J. C., De Vera, R. K., Crisologo, J., ... & Lavalle, D. K. (2025). Gender Differences in Nutrition, Lifestyle, and Distress Among Dormitory Medical Students: A Cross-Sectional Study. *International Journal of Health & Business Analytics, 1*(1). https://doi.org/10.65166/xngg1k50

Rao, L., Tian, Y., & Atento, R. G. O. (2025). Adoption and perceived effectiveness of AI in education: Personalization, outcomes, and equity. *International Journal of Health & Business Analytics, 1*(1). https://doi.org/10.65166/qgq89291

Republic Act No. 10173. (2012). *Data Privacy Act of 2012*.

Smith, C., Key, J., & Anders, M. (2019). Examination of clinical internship impact on critical thinking utilizing the Health Science Reasoning Test. *American Journal of Clinical Pathology, 152*(Supplement 1), S99-S100. https://doi.org/10.1093/ajcp/aqz119.002

Temporada, K., Quinto, L., Tarraya, D. A., Sison, F. C., Marfil, J. F., Ramirez, C., & Ng, W. J. (2025). Awareness and preventive practices on leptospirosis in flood-prone communities of Marikina City, Philippines. *International Journal of Health & Business Analytics, 1*(1). https://doi.org/10.65166/x71zvx65

Tonhäuser, C., & Büker, L. (2016). Determinants of transfer of training: A comprehensive literature review. *International Journal for Research in Vocational Education and Training, 3*(2), 127-165. https://doi.org/10.13152/IJRVET.3.2.4

Valdez, A. P. (2010). Competencies of career-entry Medical Technology graduates of Lyceum of Batangas: Basis for enhancement of the internship training program. *JPAIR Multidisciplinary Research, 4*(1), 16-33. https://doi.org/10.7719/jpair.v4i1.98

Villena, J. T. S. (2025). Clinical internship experience of Medical Technology students: A case study. *International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research, 7*(2), 1-10. https://doi.org/10.36948/ijfmr.2025.v07i02.41181

World Health Organization. (2011). *Laboratory quality management system: Handbook*.

Yan, H. (2026). Craftsmanship spirit, professional values, and learning motivation among Chinese higher vocational college students. *International Journal of Behavioral and Social Analytics, 1*(1). https://doi.org/10.65166/wvm4ge89

Yu, C. M. O., Carton, D. R. J., Cruz, E. C. V., Fagut, Z. M. H., Tanpo, L. A. C., Tio, M. S. K. N., Yap, E. K. M., & Meim, R. G. (2021). A quantitative study on the perceived learning effectiveness between the online and traditional internship of Medical Technology students. *International Journal of Progressive Research in Science and Engineering, 2*(8), 642-652.