Industry-Education Integration for Competency Development in Application-Oriented Undergraduate Institutions: An Integrative Review and Implementation Framework

Rong Du*
Xinjiang Normal University, Urumqi, China
**Corresponding Author*

Abstract: Industry-education integration (IEI) has become a widely adopted approach for improving the relevance and quality of application-oriented undergraduate education by connecting curricula, teaching, and assessment with authentic workplace practices. Despite rapid expansion of partnerships such as co-developed courses, co-built training bases, and industry colleges, evidence suggests persistent implementation gaps, including goal misalignment between universities and firms, insufficient participation of industry mentors in curriculum and assessment, limited practice-oriented capacity among academic staff, and weak mechanisms for quality assurance and benefit sharing. Building on a previously compiled corpus of Chinese and international studies on IEI and related work-integrated learning models (2010-2025), this paper provides an integrative synthesis of key concepts, theoretical lenses, model typologies, and recurrent challenges. Based on this synthesis, we propose a multi-level implementation framework that links (i) competency standards and learning outcomes, (ii) modular curricula and project-based learning designs, (iii) dual-mentor arrangements and faculty development, and (iv) joint evaluation using a transparent input-process-output-outcome matrix. The framework clarifies operational mechanisms for partner selection, curriculum co-design, internship governance, and formative assessment, and offers measurable indicators for continuous improvement. The paper concludes with a research agenda emphasizing mixed-method evaluation, longitudinal tracking of competency growth, and digital technology support for scalable, high-quality IEI in undergraduate institutions.

Keywords: Industry-Education Integration; Competency-based Education; Stakeholder Alignment; Quality Assurance and Evaluation

1. Introduction

In many higher education systems, a recurring challenge is the mismatch between what graduates can do and what professional roles require at entry level. Application-oriented undergraduate institutions are expected to respond to this challenge by prioritizing practice-informed curricula, competency development, and employment-relevant learning experiences. Industry-education integration (IEI) is one prominent pathway: it promotes systematic collaboration among universities, industry partners, and other ecosystem actors to co-develop learning outcomes, learning environments, and assessment approaches that reflect real tasks, tools, and standards. In discussions of the connotative development of local universities, IEI is framed as a route for strengthening teaching quality and regional service functions while maintaining undergraduate standards.

A dissertation-level synthesis has provided an integrated analytical template for IEI-based talent cultivation in application-oriented undergraduate institutions [1]. Complementary conceptual work clarifies the positioning of application-oriented undergraduate universities [2], delineates IEI as deep coupling between education and industry beyond episodic cooperation [3], discusses IEI as a pathway to strengthen teaching quality and regional service functions in local universities [4], and specifies core elements of university talent cultivation models that can be operationalized through curricula, practice arrangements, and evaluation [5].

IEI is often discussed alongside related traditions such as cooperative education, dual education, and sandwich programs. Across these

approaches, a shared logic is the structured combination of academic learning and workplace learning, supported by joint supervision and explicit assessment of competencies. At the undergraduate level, however, IEI faces distinctive tensions. Universities must preserve academic depth and broad capability development, while industry partners may prioritize short-term productivity and role-specific skills. Sustainable IEI therefore depends on governance arrangements that balance educational integrity with workplace relevance and that make the costs, benefits, and responsibilities visible to all parties.

This paper focuses on IEI in application-oriented undergraduate institutions and asks three questions: (1) How have key concepts and theoretical lenses been used to explain IEI-based talent development models? (2) What implementation models and recurrent challenges are most frequently reported in the literature? (3) How can universities and partners operationalize IEI through a coherent framework that supports implementation and evaluation without reducing education to narrow training?

To answer these questions, the paper provides an integrative synthesis of existing studies and proposes a practical implementation framework and evaluation matrix. The contribution is primarily conceptual and design-oriented: rather than reporting a new field experiment, the paper consolidates evidence and translates it into actionable design principles and measurable indicators that can be used for program development and continuous improvement.

2. Conceptualization of Industry-Education Integration in Undergraduate Education

A clear conceptual foundation is essential because IEI is often used as an umbrella term, covering different partnership arrangements and pedagogical designs. This section summarizes how the literature defines (i) application-oriented undergraduate institutions, (ii) IEI, and (iii) IEI-based talent development models.

2.1 Application-Oriented Undergraduate Institutions

Application-oriented undergraduate institutions are commonly described as higher education providers that emphasize the cultivation of graduates who can apply disciplinary knowledge to practical problems, contribute to technology and service innovation, and adapt to evolving occupational contexts. Compared with research-intensive universities, their mission foregrounds practice-oriented learning, applied research linked to local or regional needs, and close interaction with employers and professional communities [2].

2.2 Industry-Education Integration and Talent Development Models

IEI can be understood as a deep form of collaboration between the education system and the industrial system, extending beyond episodic internships to include joint work on curriculum design, teaching resources, practice platforms, and evaluation. Compared with conventional university-enterprise cooperation, IEI stresses broader participation, stronger coupling, and longer-term institutionalization [3].

A talent development model refers to the structured arrangement through which an institution defines the intended knowledge-ability-quality profile of graduates and organizes curricula, pedagogy, practice experiences, and assessment to realize these intentions [5]. When embedded in IEI, the model becomes a multi-actor system in which universities, firms, and other ecosystem actors jointly shape key elements such as learning outcomes, learning environments, dual mentoring, internships, and quality assurance [1].

3. Theoretical Lenses for Explaining and Designing IEI

Because IEI involves multiple actors, cross-boundary learning, and institutional constraints, different theories have been adopted to interpret its mechanisms. The literature most frequently draws on innovation ecosystem perspectives (e.g., triple helix), complex systems and synergy perspectives, stakeholder theory, and human capital or competency-based education perspectives [6-9]. Each lens highlights different design priorities.

3.1 Innovation Ecosystem Perspectives

Innovation ecosystem perspectives view universities, firms, and public or intermediary actors as interdependent components of a regional or sectoral innovation system. In this view, IEI is not merely a teaching arrangement but part of a broader system that links talent development, applied research, and innovation diffusion. The triple-helix-informed literature emphasizes the interaction among core actors

and argues that stable partnership structures and boundary-spanning roles are needed to convert workplace needs into educational designs and to transform educational outputs into innovation capacity for organizations [6]. Related work has also proposed double-helix variants that conceptualize tighter coupling between education and industry subsystems and derive implications for partnership mechanisms [7].

3.2 Synergetics and Collaboration as a Complex System

Synergy-oriented accounts treat IEI as a complex system in which ordered outcomes emerge when subsystems coordinate around shared goals and compatible rules. From this perspective, collaboration mechanisms (e.g., joint committees, co-developed standards, shared platforms) function as coordination devices that reduce uncertainty and transaction costs. The key design implication is that IEI quality depends less on isolated activities and more on the coherence of the overall system, including resource flows, communication routines, and feedback loops [1].

3.3 Stakeholder Theory and Incentive Alignment

Stakeholder theory emphasizes that IEI involves actors with different objectives, constraints, and power resources, such as institutions, firms, students, and professional communities. Sustainable IEI requires explicit identification of stakeholder interests and the design of incentive-compatible arrangements, including benefit sharing, risk management, and transparent responsibility allocation [8]. A practical implication is that governance documents and performance indicators should reflect mutual value creation rather than one-sided expectations.

3.4 Human Capital and Competency-Based Education

Human capital perspectives highlight the economic and social value of skills and knowledge, while competency-based education focuses on clearly articulated learning outcomes and performance evidence. Within IEI, these perspectives support the design of modular curricula aligned with competency standards and the use of authentic assessment (e.g., projects, portfolios, workplace evaluations) to verify learning. Prior studies argue that competency-oriented curriculum reform can make practice components more than a time allocation issue; it can turn practice into a structured learning sequence with explicit competency progression [9].

4. Method: Integrative Synthesis Based on a Prior Systematic Review Corpus

This paper is an integrative review and framework development study. The synthesis builds on a previously compiled literature corpus that surveyed research from 2010 to 2023 using keywords related to undergraduate institutions, IEI, and talent development models. The corpus included a broad pool of journal articles and theses, with focused analysis of representative high-quality studies and doctoral dissertations to ensure academic rigor [1].

Using this corpus as the evidence base, we conducted secondary thematic coding in three steps. First, we extracted concept definitions and theoretical lenses, and mapped them to a shared analytical template (actors, elements, mechanisms, outcomes). Second, we coded implementation models by identifying how teaching and workplace learning were organized (e.g., alternation patterns, project integration, platform construction). Third, we aggregated reported challenges and proposed solutions into a three-layer structure: stakeholder alignment, implementation processes, and enabling conditions. The outcome of this synthesis is a practical framework that integrates these layers and translates them into implementable design principles and evaluation indicators.

Because the study is based on existing literature and previously reported survey findings, it does not claim new primary data collection. The proposed evaluation matrix is intended as a design tool for future empirical studies and institutional quality assurance.

5. Results of the Integrative Synthesis

The synthesis indicates that the literature converges on two points: IEI is most effective when it is institutionalized (not episodic), and educational value depends on coherence among learning outcomes, learning processes, mentoring, and evaluation. At the same time, models vary substantially in how they structure learning alternation, distribute responsibilities, and ensure quality.

5.1 Typology of Implementation Models

Existing studies describe several recurring

implementation models at the undergraduate level. Internationally, structured work-integrated learning models such as dual education, cooperative education, and sandwich programs provide reference points for integrating extended workplace learning with academic study [10-12]. Domestically, models have expanded to include project-based collaboration, co-built practice bases, and industry colleges that reorganize program governance and resource allocation to enable deeper integration [1].

Rather than recommending a single model, the literature suggests selecting models based on disciplinary characteristics, partner capacity, and student development needs. Table 1 summarizes a pragmatic typology and highlights common quality management points.

Table 1. Typology of Industry-Education Integration Models at the Undergraduate Level

Model type	Core educational design	Key quality management points
Dual/alternating study (dual education)	Structured alternation between campus study and enterprise-based learning with defined competency standards.	Clarify learning outcomes for workplace phases; ensure mentor capacity and assessment consistency [10].
Cooperative education (co-op)	Repeated cycles of academic terms and paid/credit-bearing work placements supported by joint supervision.	Align placement tasks with curriculum modules; integrate reflection and portfolio evidence [11, 13].
Sandwich program	Extended placement (e.g., 6-12 months) inserted into a degree structure, typically 'study-practice-study'.	Prevent skill drift by maintaining academic connection; set milestone reviews and reintegration tasks [12, 14].
Project-based partnership	Courses organized around real or simulated industry projects jointly defined by faculty and partners.	Ensure project complexity matches learning stage; manage IP/confidentiality; use rubrics for fair grading [1].
Co-built training base	Shared physical or virtual platform for practice, equipment, and joint training activities.	Define access, safety, and maintenance responsibilities; embed platform use into curriculum sequences [1].
Industry college/program reorganization	Program-level integration with joint governance, shared resources, and often specialized tracks aligned with sectors.	Avoid over-specialization; maintain academic standards; establish benefit sharing and risk allocation rules [1].

5.2 Recurrent Challenges across Stakeholders, Processes, and Enabling Conditions

Stakeholder-level challenges are frequently reported. First, universities and firms may lack a shared understanding of the intended graduate profile, which leads to fragmented curriculum decisions and inconsistent internship expectations [1]. Second, firms may participate primarily at the internship placement stage, with limited involvement in curriculum design and assessment, partly due to unclear returns on investment and organizational constraints [15].

Implementation-level challenges include curriculum imbalance (discipline-centered logic dominating over competency progression), insufficient practice proportions, and weak coupling between theory courses and workplace tasks [1, 9]. Evaluation practices are often not sufficiently co-designed with industry partners and tend to emphasize end results over transparent process evidence [16]. Faculty capacity is another bottleneck: academic staff may have limited recent industry experience and therefore need structured industry placement and development pathways [17], while practitioner instructors may require pedagogical preparation and role negotiation to participate effectively in teaching and assessment [18]. Internship governance problems also appear repeatedly, including low role fit, inconsistent mentoring, and superficial evaluation [19].

Enabling-condition challenges concern resources and institutional mechanisms. Studies note that funding sources can be narrow, and cost sharing mechanisms between institutions and firms are often underdeveloped [1, 20]. In addition, collaboration rules for benefit sharing, risk allocation, and decision-making may be insufficiently specified, reducing trust and continuity [15]. Together, these challenges indicate that IEI requires a system design approach rather than a collection of disconnected activities.

6. An Integrative Framework for Implementation and Evaluation

Based on the synthesis, we propose an

integrative framework with three nested layers: (i) competency and curriculum alignment, (ii) learning process and mentoring design, and (iii) governance and enabling mechanisms. The framework is intended to help institutions translate IEI from a general aspiration into a set of operational routines and measurable quality indicators.

6.1 Design Principles

Principle 1: Competency transparency. Define a competency framework that translates occupational requirements into measurable learning outcomes, and map each outcome to curriculum modules, practice tasks, and assessment evidence [5, 9].

Principle 2: Structured alternation and integration. Avoid treating workplace learning as an add-on. Instead, design a sequence in which classroom learning prepares for workplace tasks, workplace experience generates data for reflection, and subsequent coursework consolidates and extends learning [10-12].

Principle 3: Dual mentoring with role clarity. Establish a dual-mentor arrangement (academic mentor and industry mentor) with explicit responsibilities, communication routines, and workload recognition to prevent mentoring from becoming nominal [1, 19].

Principle 4: Co-evaluation and formative feedback. Combine process evaluation (learning logs, milestone reviews, mentor feedback) with outcome evaluation (projects, portfolios, competence tests), and ensure industry partners participate in criteria setting and scoring rubrics [16].

Principle 5: Institutionalization and value co-creation. Create stable governance structures (e.g., joint committees, partner agreements) and benefit sharing rules that support continuity and mutual value creation, including talent pipelines, joint projects, and faculty development opportunities [8, 15]. Historical-institutionalist analyses of cooperative education further suggest that governance and quality assurance arrangements evolve through path dependence and incremental change, which can shape the scalability of IEI reforms [21, 22].

6.2 Operational Mechanisms

Competency standard co-development: Establish a program advisory board that includes disciplinary faculty, industry experts, and where appropriate, professional associations. The board periodically reviews job-role analyses and updates competency descriptions and performance standards.

Curriculum modularization and project embedding: Translate competencies into modules that combine theory, methods, and tools with authentic tasks. Project-based learning can serve as the integration device, linking course outcomes to real or simulated industry problems [1].

Practice platform governance: For co-built training bases or industry colleges, define access rules, equipment maintenance responsibilities, and safety and ethics protocols. Data generated in practice (e.g., project artifacts) should be managed with clear intellectual property and confidentiality clauses.

Faculty and mentor development: Implement faculty industry placements and invite qualified practitioners as adjunct instructors with teaching support and evaluation. A shared mentor training program can reduce variability in mentoring quality and align expectations [17]. When practitioners enter academic settings, role identity and professional culture can influence engagement and instructional practices, so role negotiation and pedagogical support should be built into the partnership design [18].

Quality assurance loop: Build an annual quality cycle that collects evidence from student learning data, mentor evaluations, partner feedback, and graduate outcomes. Use the evidence to refine competencies, curricula, and partnership arrangements.

Operationalization also requires attention to student support and equity. Placement quality can vary across partners, and students with weaker social capital may face disadvantages in accessing high-quality projects or mentors. Institutions can mitigate this by maintaining a curated partner pool, using transparent placement criteria, and offering preparatory modules (e.g., workplace communication, safety, ethics, and project management) before students enter practice sites. During placements, regular check-ins and grievance channels help ensure learning conditions, workload, and assessment opportunities are fair and consistent across cohorts.

A related mechanism concerns data governance. High-quality IEI increasingly relies on learning evidence generated in workplaces and on digital platforms (learning logs, project repositories, mentoring records). Clear rules for data

ownership, confidentiality, and consent are necessary to protect students and partners and to enable legitimate use of evidence for assessment and program improvement. Where partners have strict confidentiality constraints, institutions can design 'sanitized' project briefs and anonymized portfolios to balance authenticity with compliance. Recent work in the Chinese education literature has begun to map the contexts and practical pathways of 'digital-intelligence technology' in education, underscoring the importance of aligning technology use with pedagogical objectives and implementation conditions.

6.3 A Multi-Level Evaluation Matrix

Evaluation is a central weakness in many IEI initiatives because activities are implemented without clear indicators and data routines. To support continuous improvement, we propose an input-process-output-outcome matrix (Table 2) that can be adapted to disciplinary contexts.

Input indicators focus on partnership and capacity, such as the diversity and stability of partners, the availability of practice platforms, and faculty industry experience. Process indicators examine whether integration is implemented as designed, including the quality of mentoring interactions, curriculum-workplace alignment, and formative feedback routines. Output indicators capture measurable learning results, such as competency attainment evidence in portfolios and project performance. Outcome indicators track longer-term effects, including early career adaptability, employer satisfaction, and sustained partnership value creation [16].

The matrix does not assume a single metric can represent IEI quality. Instead, it encourages triangulation across data sources and emphasizes that evaluation should be used for improvement rather than compliance.

In applying the matrix, institutions can set minimum evidence requirements per competency (e.g., at least one workplace artifact and one reflective analysis per module) and specify how evidence is sampled and moderated to reduce variability across mentors. Moderation practices such as double-marking of portfolio samples, calibration meetings for mentors, and periodic external review by professional community representatives can improve reliability without imposing excessive administrative burden.

To connect evaluation with decision-making, indicators should be linked to specific improvement actions. For example, if process indicators show weak mentoring frequency, actions may include mentor workload recognition, mentor training, or redesign of communication routines. If output indicators show gaps in specific competencies, curriculum mapping can be revisited to adjust prerequisite knowledge, project sequencing, or simulation resources. In this sense, evaluation is most useful when it is embedded into an annual planning cycle rather than treated as an end-of-program audit.

Table 2. Proposed Evaluation Indicators for Industry-Education Integrated Talent Development

Evaluation level	Indicator dimensions (examples)	Typical evidence sources
Inputs	Partner stability and diversity; practice platform capacity; proportion of faculty with recent industry experience; mentor-to-student ratio.	Partner agreements; platform inventory; faculty CV records; mentor assignment logs.
Processes	Alignment between practice tasks and course outcomes; frequency and quality of mentoring interactions; completion of formative feedback milestones; student reflection quality.	Course syllabi; workplace task lists; mentor meeting records; learning logs/reflective journals.
Outputs	Competency attainment evidenced by projects/portfolios; performance in authentic assessments; completion and quality of capstone deliverables.	Portfolio reviews; project rubrics; capstone evaluation reports; skill tests where appropriate.
Outcomes	Early career adaptability; employer satisfaction; continuation of partnerships; joint innovation outputs (where applicable).	Graduate follow-up surveys/interviews; employer feedback; partnership renewal records; joint project reports.

7. Discussion and Research Agenda

The proposed framework aligns with the major theoretical lenses identified in the literature. Ecosystem perspectives justify the need for boundary-spanning structures and stable

partnerships. Synergy-oriented perspectives emphasize systemic coherence and feedback loops. Stakeholder theory highlights incentive compatibility and mutual value creation, while competency-based education clarifies how learning outcomes can guide curriculum and assessment [6, 8, 9].

A recurring tension concerns the balance between occupational specificity and educational breadth. If curricula are overly tailored to the current needs of a single firm or narrow technology stack, graduates may lack transferability when technologies change. Conversely, if integration is too generic, workplace learning risks becoming observational rather than developmental. The framework therefore treats competency standards as a boundary object: they should be specific enough to guide task design and assessment, but abstract enough to remain relevant across multiple employers and evolving job roles.

Several research directions emerge. First, evaluation research should move beyond cross-sectional satisfaction surveys toward mixed-method designs that combine learning analytics, competence assessment, qualitative evidence from mentoring interactions, and longitudinal graduate tracking. Second, more work is needed on the micro-mechanisms of curriculum co-design, including how conflicts between academic standards and workplace specificity are negotiated. Third, digital technologies (e.g., virtual simulation, online project management, AI-supported feedback) may enable scalable practice learning, but their pedagogical validity and equity implications require empirical testing. Finally, comparative research can clarify which elements of international models are transferable to different institutional and disciplinary contexts without assuming a one-size-fits-all solution [23].

Recent scholarship on digital-intelligence technologies in education has begun to map implementation contexts and practical pathways, highlighting the need to align technology adoption with pedagogical objectives and organizational conditions [24].

7.1 Limitations of the Current Evidence Base

The evidence base synthesized here has several limitations. First, many studies rely on single-case descriptions or cross-sectional surveys, which makes causal inference difficult. Reported benefits may partly reflect selection effects (e.g., highly motivated students choosing integrated tracks) rather than the effect of IEI design itself. Second, outcome measures are often restricted to employment rates or satisfaction, while direct measures of competency growth and workplace performance are less common [16]. Third, the depth of partner participation is not always clearly operationalized, making it hard to compare models or identify which design elements drive outcomes.

7.2 Directions for Empirical Evaluation and Design Research

Future research can strengthen the field through three methodological strategies. (1) Longitudinal designs: track students from entry to graduation and into early career stages to examine competency trajectories and the durability of learning. (2) Quasi-experimental comparisons: where randomization is infeasible, use matched comparison groups or difference-in-differences designs to compare integrated and non-integrated cohorts while controlling for baseline differences. (3) Design-based implementation research: iterate IEI interventions (e.g., dual-mentor training, portfolio assessment) across cycles, documenting how contextual factors shape implementation fidelity and outcomes.

Substantively, research should examine under-studied domains such as non-engineering majors and interdisciplinary programs, where workplace tasks may be less standardized but still require authentic practice. Another priority is the study of digital and hybrid forms of integration, including virtual internships and distributed project teams. These formats can expand access to practice learning but also raise questions about supervision quality, assessment integrity, and student well-being. Empirical evidence on these trade-offs will help institutions design integration that is both scalable and educationally sound.

8. Conclusion

IEI provides a promising pathway for strengthening competency development in application-oriented undergraduate institutions, but its effectiveness depends on coherent design across competencies, curricula, mentoring, and evaluation. By synthesizing existing studies and translating them into a multi-level implementation framework and evaluation matrix, this paper offers actionable guidance for program development and a structured agenda

for future empirical research. The key message is that high-quality IEI is achieved through institutionalized collaboration and continuous evidence-informed improvement, not through isolated partnership activities.

References

[1] Liu, Weiwei. Research on the Industry–Education Integration Talent Cultivation Model in Application-Oriented Undergraduate Universities. Guilin: Guangxi Normal University, 2023.

[2] Pan, Maoyuan. What Is an Application-Oriented Undergraduate University? Higher Education Exploration, 2010(1):10-11.

[3] Huang, Yan. Research and Practice of Industry–Education Integration. Beijing: Beijing Institute of Technology Press, 2019.

[4] He, Zubin. Connotative Development of Local Universities under the Background of "Double First-Class" Construction. China University Teaching, 2018(9):16.

[5] Dong, Zefang. Concept Definition and Element Analysis of Talent Cultivation Models in Universities. University Education Science, 2012(3):33-34.

[6] Chen, Guixiang. Formation Analysis of an Innovation and Entrepreneurship Talent Cultivation Mechanism Based on the Triple Helix: Coupling among Universities, Government, and Enterprises. University Education Science, 2015(1):43.

[7] Zou, Yuxiang. Constructing a Double-Helix Talent Cultivation Model for Vocational Colleges under Industry–Education Integration. Vocational Education Forum, 2021(4):141.

[8] Li, Yanqing. Industry–Education Integration from a Stakeholder Theory Perspective. China Adult Education, 2018(4):17-21.

[9] Wei, Wenlian. Application-Oriented Undergraduate Talent Cultivation from the Perspective of Competency-Based Education. Jiangsu Higher Education, 2017(2):44.

[10] Zhang, Ye; Huang, Qiuming. The German Dual System for Application-Oriented Undergraduate Talent Cultivation: A Case Study of the Baden-Württemberg Cooperative State University. Vocational Education Forum, 2018(2):171-175.

[11] Xu, Ping. Basic Models of Cooperative Education in the United States. Foreign Education Research, 2003(8):1-4.

[12] Peng, Xiwei; Xu, Jin; Liao, Xiaozhong. The "Sandwich" Education Model in UK Higher Education and Its Implications. Higher Education Forum, 2013(7):126-129.

[13] Lin, Jian; Peng, Lin. Analysis of the Cooperative Education Accreditation System in the United States and Its Implications for China. Research in Higher Engineering Education, 2017(4):49.

[14] Wang, Xia; Cui, Yingfen. Integrating Employability Development into the Curriculum: UK Experience. Research in Higher Education, 2011(3):100-106.

[15] Lei, Wanghong. Practical Dilemmas and Solutions of Industry–Education Integration from an Organizational Collaboration Perspective. Research in Higher Engineering Education, 2022(1):104-109.

[16] Chen, Wenyuan; Pan, Yuju; Gao, Yupeng; et al. Research on an Evaluation System for High-Quality Application-Oriented Talent in Local Undergraduate Universities. Research in Higher Engineering Education, 2011(5):141.

[17] Zhang, Daliang. Grasping the Positioning of "University as the Principal Actor and Local Responsibility" and Guiding the Transformation Development of Some Local Undergraduate Universities. China Higher Education, 2015(10):23-29.

[18] Zhu, Chenglin. The Identity of Teachers in Higher Vocational Colleges and Its Cultural Construction. Teacher Education Research, 2017(5):19-22.

[19] Li, Shihui; Long, Siyuan. University Internship Mechanisms from a "Five-Dimension Linkage" Perspective. Modern University Education, 2017(5):102-111.

[20] Xu, Zhengzhong. Theoretical System of Modern Vocational Education in China. Beijing: People's Publishing House, 2013:66.

[21] Peng, Lin; Jesiek, Brent. Historical Institutionalism and Policy Change of Cooperative Education in U.S. Industry–University–Research Collaboration: An Analysis. Tsinghua Journal of Education, 2021(6):52.

[22] North, Douglas C. Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance. Hang, Xing (Trans.). Shanghai: Gezhi Press, 2008.

[23] Liu, David; Zhou, Hui. Comparative Study of Industry–Education Integration Models in Chinese and Foreign Universities. People's Tribune, 2022(3):110-112.

[24]Hou, Lanmei. Context, Value Implications and Practical Pathways of Digital-Intelligence Technology Empowering Education. Journal of Ethnic Education Studies, 2023(2):45-52.

