ISSN 2522-6398 Vol. 4, Issue 3: 83-88, DOI: 10.25236/FER.2021.040317

Research on Hotel Internship Effect of Tourism Management Undergraduates: A Case of Hezhou University

Huaqian Huang[1, a], Fuda Li[2, b, *]

[1]College of Tourism and Sport Health, Hezhou University, Hezhou, Guangxi, 542899, China
[2]Business School, Hunan Normal University, Changsha, Hunan, 410000, China
[a] E-mail: huanghq1985@126.com; [b] E-mail: lifuda0217@163.com
**Corresponding author*

Abstract: *Hotel internship for undergraduates of tourism management is a learning process combining theory with practice, and the only way to achieve talent training. In this study, hotel internship effect of undergraduates of tourism management in Hezhou University was investigated, and three components of mayor effect, industry effect and occupation effect were extracted through exploratory factor analysis. Through the independent samples t-test and ANOVA, the research found that: (1) there was no significant difference in the mayor effects perceived by different gender interviewees, while the industry effects and occupation effects perceived by male interviewees were significantly higher than female interviewees; (2) There was no significant difference in the mayor effects and industry effects perceived by the respondents from different departments, while there were significant differences in the occupational effects perceived by the respondents from different departments.*

Keywords: *Tourism management, internship effect, hotel*

1. Introduction

It is an important embodiment of practicing practical teaching and the only way to achieve talent training to send undergraduates of tourism management major in universities to practice in hotels[1]. Hotel internship for undergraduates in tourism management is a learning process combining theory with practice, and a transition between theoretical learning and formal work[2]. Internship effect refers to the various experiences of students in the practice process, which has produced a series of changes in working psychology and working ability[3]. However, at present, the effect of hotel internship in tourism universities is not satisfactory[4]. Therefore, the improvement of hotel internship effect has become the focus of common concern of students, tourism colleges, internship hotels and academia. Deng and Cao[4] investigated interns' willingness to work in hotels after graduation, and found out their problems from three aspects: interns themselves, the school and the hotel. Ding et al.[5] constructed an evaluation model for the effect of hotel internship, including five factors, such as working ability, professionalism, behavior, follow-up learning and choice of hotel industry. According to the research of Yang and Zhu[1], the biggest gain from internship is to strengthen the ability to communicate and deal with interpersonal relationship. The study of An [6] found that the factors leading to poor performance of hotel internship mainly include schools, students and hotels. Among them, the personal aspect of students is one of the important factors leading to the insignificant effect of hotel internship, such as high expectation, bad attitude, poor adaptability, and not making full preparation for internship[2, 4]. This study investigated the effect of hotel internship for undergraduates of tourism management in Hezhou University, and provides reference for the revision of the talent training program of undergraduate tourism management and the practice of hotel internship management.

2. Research Method

2.1 Data Collection

This study investigated the hotel internship effect of undergraduates of tourism management in Hezhou University. A total of 98 questionnaires were collected, and 84 valid questionnaires were obtained, with an effective rate of 85.71%, after excluding the uncooperative subjects[7] who had the

ISSN 2522-6398 Vol. 4, Issue 3: 83-88, DOI: 10.25236/FER.2021.040317

same score in each question or presented a high regularity. The basic information of the samples is shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Sample Characteristics (N=84)

		Number	Percentage/%	Cumulative percentage/%
Gender	Female	60	71.4	71.4
	Male	24	28.6	100.0
	Total	84	100.0	
Department	Food and beverage department	34	40.5	40.5
	Housekeeping department	24	28.6	69.0
	Front Office	16	19.0	88.1
	Others	10	11.9	100.0
	Total	84	100.0	

2.2 Measure

The measurement of hotel internship effect refers to the research of Yang et al.[1] and Yang[8], including 15 indicators, as shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Measurement of the Effect of Hotel Internship

Codes	Indicators
HIE1	Enhanced the awareness of tourism management major
HIE2	Improved the learning ability of the school courses
HIE3	I have improved my interest in the study of tourism management
HIE4	Enhance the professional knowledge of tourism management
HIE5	Enhanced the understanding of the hotel industry
HIE6	Enhanced the pride of working in the hospitality industry
HIE7	Enhanced the confidence in the hotel industry
HIE8	Enhanced the preference for the hotel industry
HIE9	Enhanced the identity of the hotel industry
HIE10	Increased future employment opportunities
HIE11	Enhanced job sense of accomplishment
HIE12	Enhanced hotel service awareness
HIE13	Enhanced communication skills
HIE14	Enhanced the ability to work under pressure
HIE15	Enhanced the ability of teamwork

2.3 Data Analysis

SPSS25.0 was used to conduct reliability and validity analysis, descriptive statistical analysis, factor analysis, independent samples t-test and ANOVA.

3. Results

3.1 Reliability and Validity

Reliability and validity analysis results (Table 3) showed that Cronbach's Alpha coefficient (0.891) was greater than 0.7[9], indicating good internal consistency and stability of the scale. KMO value (0.857) is greater than 0.8, and the Sig. value of Bartlett's Test of Sphericity is less than 0.001, indicating that the scale has good structural validity and is suitable for factor analysis[10].

ISSN 2522-6398 Vol. 4, Issue 3: 83-88, DOI: 10.25236/FER.2021.040317

Table 3. Reliability Statistics, KMO and Bartlett's Test

Cronbach's Alpha	KMO	Bartlett's Test of Sphericity		
		Approx. Chi-Square	df	Sig.
0.891	0.875	916.701	105	0.000

3.2 Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistical analysis results (Table 4) show that the mean value of all measurement indicators is between 3.45 and 4.69, the standard deviation is between 1.448 and 1.879, the absolute value of skewness is between 0.028 and 0.469, and the absolute value of kurtosis is between 0.512 and 1.152.

Table 4. Descriptive Statistics (N=84)

Codes	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis
HIE1	1	7	4.17	1.649	-0.257	-0.714
HIE2	1	7	4.20	1.527	0.273	-0.679
HIE3	1	7	4.00	1.448	-0.122	-0.512
HIE4	1	7	4.02	1.643	0.028	-0.838
HIE5	1	7	3.50	1.556	0.275	-0.675
HIE6	1	6	3.45	1.548	0.441	-1.069
HIE7	1	7	3.70	1.519	0.078	-1.091
HIE8	1	7	3.60	1.636	0.376	-0.829
HIE9	1	7	3.64	1.550	0.184	-0.813
HIE10	1	7	4.50	1.879	-0.357	-1.152
HIE11	1	7	3.77	1.660	0.176	-1.137
HIE12	1	7	4.37	1.842	-0.361	-0.996
HIE13	1	7	4.55	1.773	-0.439	-0.762
HIE14	1	7	4.69	1.756	-0.469	-0.882
HIE15	1	7	4.46	1.631	-0.276	-0.900

3.3 Exploratory Factor Analysis

Exploratory factor analysis uses principal component extraction method and maximal variance orthogonal rotation to extract components with eigenvalue greater than 1. The results (Table 5) show that three components are extracted and named as major effect (ME), industry effect (IE) and occupation effect (OE) respectively according to the meaning of each index contained. The cumulative variance Explained rate after rotation was 74.835%.

Table 5. Rotated Component Matrix and Total Variance Explained

Codes	OE	IE	ME
IE14	**0.913**	0.095	0.041
IE12	**0.913**	0.015	0.035
IE15	**0.881**	0.135	0.097
IE10	**0.858**	0.160	-0.003
IE13	**0.847**	0.163	0.206
IE11	**0.603**	-0.101	0.186
IE8	0.043	**0.866**	0.132
IE6	0.064	**0.844**	0.109
IE9	0.016	**0.832**	0.191
IE5	0.107	**0.815**	0.367
IE7	0.178	**0.775**	0.267
IE3	0.120	0.157	**0.851**
IE1	0.095	0.302	**0.846**
IE4	0.017	0.272	**0.837**
IE2	0.212	0.170	**0.786**
% of Variance	29.198	24.852	20.785
Sum	74.835		

Note: Extraction method is Principal Component Analysis. Rotation method is Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

ISSN 2522-6398 Vol. 4, Issue 3: 83-88, DOI: 10.25236/FER.2021.040317

3.4 Independent Samples T-test

In order to study whether there are significant differences in the perceived effects of hotel internship among respondents of different genders, independent samples t-test was conducted. Levene's Test for Equality of Variances results (Table 6) showed that there was homogeneity in the variance of mayor effect (Sig.=0.860>0.05), industry effect (Sig.= 0.198>0.05) and occupational effect (Sig.=0.119>0.05) among interviewees of different genders. The independent samples t-test results showed that there was no significant difference in the mayor effect (Sig.= 0.260>0.05) perceived by different genders. The industry effect (Sig.=0.003<0.05) and professional effect (Sig.=0.049<0.05) perceived by male interviewees were significantly higher than female interviewees.

Table 6. Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		**t-test for Equality of Means**			
		F	**Sig.**	**t**	**df**	**Sig. (2-tailed)**	**Mean Difference**
ME	Equal variances assumed	0.031	0.860	-1.135	82	0.260	-0.373
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.152	43.815	0.256	-0.373
IE	Equal variances assumed	1.688	0.198	-3.041	82	0.003	-0.940
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.221	48.152	0.002	-0.940
OE	Equal variances assumed	2.480	0.119	-2.000	82	0.049	-0.707
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.162	50.531	0.035	-0.707

3.5 ANOVA

In order to study whether there are differences in the perception of hotel internship effect among interviewees from different departments, variance analysis was conducted with department as grouping variable. According to the results of variance homogeneity test (Table 7), the variance of mayor effect (Sig. = 0.567 > 0.05) and industry effect (Sig. = 0.872 > 0.05) perceived by respondents in different departments is homogenous, while the variance of occupational effect (Sig. = 0.005 < 0.01) is not homogenous. According to the results of variance analysis (Table 8), there was no significant difference in the major effect (Sig. = 0.267 > 0.05) and industries effect (Sig. = 0.267 > 0.05) perceived by the respondents from different departments, while there were significant differences in the occupation effect (Sig. = 0.000 < 0.001) perceived by the respondents from different departments.

Multiple comparisons Based on Games-Howell Method was used to further analysis the difference of mayor effect perceived by respondents from different department. The results (table 9) show that there was no significant difference among food and beverage, housekeeping, and front office (Sig. > 0.05), while there were significant differences between other departments and food and beverage, housekeeping, and front office (Sig. < 0.05).

Table 7. Test of Homogeneity of Variances Based on Mean

	Levene Statistic	**df1**	**df2**	**Sig.**
ME	0.679	3	80	0.567
IE	0.234	3	80	0.872
OE	4.675	3	80	0.005

ISSN 2522-6398 Vol. 4, Issue 3: 83-88, DOI: 10.25236/FER.2021.040317

Table 8. ANOVA

One-way ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	**df**	**Mean Square**	**F**	**Sig.**
ME	Between Groups	7.379	3	2.460	1.340	0.267
	Within Groups	146.873	80	1.836		
	Total	154.252	83			
IE	Between Groups	7.162	3	2.387	1.342	0.267
	Within Groups	142.280	80	1.778		
	Total	149.441	83			
Welch' ANOVA						
	Statistic[a]	**df1**	**df2**	**Sig.**		
OE	10.818	3	39.049	0.000		

Table 9. Multiple Comparisons of OE Based on Games-Howell Method

(I) Department		**Mean Difference (I-J)**	**Std. Error**	**Sig.**
Food and beverage department	Housekeeping department	-0.31168	0.40351	0.867
	Front Office	-0.13113	0.46587	0.992
	Others	-1.50196*	0.30439	0.000
Housekeeping department	Food and beverage department	0.31168	0.40351	0.867
	Front Office	0.18056	0.49664	0.983
	Others	-1.19028*	0.34966	0.009
Front Office	Food and beverage department	0.13113	0.46587	0.992
	Housekeeping department	-0.18056	0.49664	0.983
	Others	-1.37083*	0.42010	0.019
Others	Food and beverage department	1.50196*	0.30439	0.000
	Housekeeping department	1.19028*	0.34966	0.009
	Front Office	1.37083*	0.42010	0.019

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

4. Summary

In this study, hotel internship effect of undergraduates of tourism management in Hezhou University was investigated, and three components of mayor effect, industry effect and occupation effect were extracted through exploratory factor analysis, and the contribution rate of cumulative variance after rotation was 74.835%. Through the independent samples t-test and ANOVA, the research

ISSN 2522-6398 Vol. 4, Issue 3: 83-88, DOI: 10.25236/FER.2021.040317

found that: (1) there was no significant difference in the mayor effects (Sig. = 0.260 > 0.05) perceived by different gender interviewees, while the industry effects (Sig. = 0.003 < 0.05) and occupation effects (Sig. = 0.049 < 0.05) perceived by male interviewees were significantly higher than female interviewees; (2) There was no significant difference in the mayor effects (Sig. = 0.267 > 0.05) and industry effects (Sig. = 0.267 > 0.05) perceived by the respondents from different departments, while there were significant differences in the occupational effects perceived by the respondents from different departments (Sig. = 0.000 < 0.001).

Acknowledgements

Supported by Hunan Key Laboratory of Macroeconomic Big Data Mining and its Application

References

[1] YANG Z, ZHU Q J. Investigation of hotel internship effect of tourism management undergraduates: A case of Anhui Normal University [J]. Journal of Nanyang Normal University, 2019,18(03): 56-61.
[2] ZHENG X. Summary of the study on the effect of internship in hotel management specialty [J]. Market Modernization, 2016(9): 246-247.
[3] GUAN Z T. Research on the influencing factors of the hotel internship effect on secondary vocational school students in tourism service and management [D]. Liaoning Normal University, 2019.
[4] DENG X H, CAO H M. Investigation and Research on Hotel Practice of Tourism Management Major in Undergraduate Colleges: A Case Study of Hubei Minzu University [J]. Journal of Higher Education, 2017(19): 50-53.
[5] DING H, LV C H, WANG W J. Evaluation and model research on the practice effect of the hotel Management undergraduate: Taking AS college as an example [J]. Pioneering with Science & Technology Monthly, 2017, 30(07): 72-75.
[6] AN N. Analysis on the influencing factors of college students' hotel internship effect and suggestions for improvement [J]. Ability and Wisdom, 2018(06): 12-14.
[7] WEN Z L, HUANG B B, TANG D D. Preliminary work for modeling questionnaire data [J]. Journal of Psychological Science, 2018, 41(01): 204-210.
[8] YANG D D. Analysis on the influence of hotel interns' perception of internship effect on their intention to choose a job [J]. Journal of Huaibei Normal University(Philosophy and Social Sciences), 2019, 40(02): 98-103.
[9] NUNNALLY J C. Psychometric Theory 3E [M]. New York: Mc Graw - Hill, 2010.
[10] NIE H T, WANG X J. Employee job satisfaction, organizational commitment and job performance in asset appraisal agency [J]. Friends of Accounting, 2018(08): 78-84.