

**AN EXAMINATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PERCEIVED
ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT AND
INTERNSHIPS**

A Thesis
Presented to
The Faculty of the Graduate School
At the University of Missouri

In Partial Fulfillment
Of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Science

by
BRANDON S. FICK
Dr. James Groves, Thesis Supervisor

JULY 2011

The undersigned, appointed by the dean of the Graduate School, have examined the thesis entitled

**AN EXAMINATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PERCEIVED
ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT AND INTERNSHIPS**

Presented by Brandon S. Fick,

A candidate for the degree of

Master of Science

And hereby certify that, in their opinion, it is worthy of acceptance.

Dr. James Groves, Food Science (HM)

Dr. Dae-Young Kim, Food Science (HM)

Dr. Mark Ellersieck, Statistics

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to first and foremost thank my advisor, Dr. Groves who has been an inspiration with his continuous patience and encouragement. If it was not for him I would still be at square one. I would also like to thank my committee members Dr. Eilersieck and Dr. Kim; with their help they made this process less grueling and provided realistic goals. The insight and encouragement given to me throughout this process pushed me through the darkened tunnel, giving me the ability to see the light on the other side. Without their help this would not have been possible.

I would also like to give thanks to my parents and my brother, for without their love and support throughout the many years, I would not have been able to accomplish this feat. I would like to thank them and send love from the bottom of my heart.

Lastly, I would like to give thanks to Jeff Guinn. His guidance, knowledge, support and friendship provided daily motivation and molded me into the person I've become over these last few years. The mentoring he provided has made me strive to become a great student, teacher, and colleague and for this I am forever grateful.

There are many more people that have changed and touched my life; I have appreciated everything they have done for me and will never forget it. I dedicate this thesis to everyone who has touched my life in a positive way.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	vi
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Purpose of Study	2
1.3 Statement of Purpose	3
1.4 Research Objectives	3
1.5 Definitions	3
1.5.1 Definition of Structured Internships	3
1.5.2 Definition of Unstructured Internships	4
1.6 Significance of Study	4
1.7 Outline of Subsequent Chapters	5
2. LITERATURE REVIEW	6
2.1 Introduction	6
2.2 Organizational Commitment	6
2.3 Turnover in Business	8
2.3.1 Difference Between Turnover and Retention	10
2.3.2 Past Study of Retention and Hospitality Employees	11
2.4 Structure of Retention Programs	12
2.5 Demographics and Retention	13
2.6 Internships	14
2.6.1 Internship Requirements	15
2.6.2 Company Suggestions for Internships	16
2.7 Conclusion	17
3. PROCEDURES AND METHODOLOGY	19
3.1 Introduction	19
3.2 Objectives of Study	19
3.3 Research Design	20
3.4 Population and Sampling	20
3.4.1 Population	20
3.4.2 Sample Frame	20

3.4.3	Sample	21
3.4.4	Sampling Error	21
3.4.5	Selection Error and Frame Error	21
3.5	Institutional Review Board	22
3.6	Instrumentation	22
3.6.1	Description	22
3.6.2	Measurement	22
3.6.3	Validity.....	23
3.7	Data Collection	23
3.8	Data Analysis.....	25
3.9	Summary	25
4.	ANALYSIS AND RESULTS.....	26
4.1	Introduction.....	26
4.2	Review of Study Objectives.....	26
4.3	Summary of Descriptive Statistics	26
4.3.1	Socio-Demographic Characteristics of Unstructured and Structure Internships.....	26
4.3.1.1	Socio-Demographics Characteristics of Unstructured Internships	27
4.3.1.2	Socio-Demographics Characteristics of Structured Internships.....	27
4.3.2	Interns' Level of Organizational Commitment for Unstructured and Structured Internships.....	30
4.3.2.1	Interns' Level of Organizational Commitment for Unstructured Internships	30
4.3.2.2	Interns' Level of Organizational Commitment for Structured Internships.....	33
4.3.3	Interns' Level of Organizational Commitment	34
4.3.4	Interns' Level of Organizational Commitment Amongst Demographics	35
4.4	Conclusion of Results.....	38
5.	DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION	39
5.1	Introduction.....	39
5.2	Conclusion.....	39
5.3	Implications.....	40
5.4	Limitations and Future Research.....	41
APPENDIX A	43
Missouri State University IRB Exempt Approval Letter		44
University of Missouri IRB Exempt Approval Letter		45
Invitation Letter for Questionnaire		46
Structured Internship Course Syllabus.....		47

Unstructured Internship Course Syllabus	50
Questionnaire for Study.....	52
REFERENCES	54

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Socio-Demographics Characteristics of Unstructured Internship Respondents.....	29
2. Organizational Commitment of Student Interns	32
3. Organizational Commitment Comparison Amongst Socio-Demographics.....	37

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

Internships play a vital role to students, companies, and academic programs. According to the University of Missouri (2007), an internship is defined as a professional work experience at a company or organization prior to graduation. Clark and Whitelegg (1998) state that internships are valuable learning experiences that are of great importance to the travel and tourism industry. Both the industry and academic programs provide support towards internships and properly advise the next generation of workers. Two types of internships currently exist, structured and unstructured. Both internships are currently practiced at universities across the nation and the world. Both types of internships are a step in developing students into professionals; they can also solve problems in today's businesses.

A challenge that arises in today's businesses is high turnover rates. The hospitality industry has one of the highest turnover rates in the country. It is 64.5%, which is double the average rate nation wide (US Department of Labor, 2010). Turnover hurts businesses in both turnover costs and efficiency ratings. The US Department of Labor suggests it costs company's one third of the new hire's salary (US Department of Labor, 2008). Businesses are always looking to

cut costs; one way to cut costs is by lowering turnover rates and putting more time and money into holding onto current employees.

Another way to approach turnover is to describe factors that keep employees from leaving their current companies or retention factors. Retention and turnover while related to each other are different. Retention is the study of what factors keep employees happy within the company. Turnover is the study of why employees leave the company. One factor that has been proven to describe the level of satisfaction amongst employees is organizational commitment.

Organizational commitment, or according to Allen and Meyers (1990) feelings of obligation towards continued employment, reduce turnover in companies; happy employees do not leave their organizations. Happy employees are more efficient, more motivated, have high satisfaction and need less unnecessary interventions (Batemen & Strasser, 1984; Lee, 1971). According to Buchanan (1974) the longer an employee stays with an organization the higher their level of commitment becomes. High organizational commitment retains employees saving the company money and time.

1.2 Purpose of Study

Studies on internships have been conducted describing factors internships should possess; however no studies have mentioned the impact of internships on organizational commitment. If internships are a breeding ground for future professionals than it is imperative to describe the level of organizational

commitment in internships. The types of internships also need to be distinguished in order to justify the time and potentially the extra cost in structured internships.

1.3 Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this study is to investigate if structured internships affect the intern's perceived organizational commitment compared to unstructured internships.

1.4 Research Objectives

The objectives of this study were:

- (1) To describe the demographics of interns for both structured and unstructured internships.
- (2) To compare level of organizational commitment between students in unstructured and structured internship programs.
- (3) To describe the intern's level of organizational commitment to the company.

1.5 Definitions

1.5.1 Definition of Structured Internships

Structured internships will be considered any internship with a defined curriculum and required hours of field related experience in the hospitality

industry. For this study the structured internship requires 750 total hours of field related work experience under supervision. The internship must also include three different areas of work, as well as four written papers to be completed throughout the internship. At the end of the internship an evaluation must be filled out and sent to the instructor.

1.5.2 Definition of Unstructured internships

Unstructured internships will be considered loosely defined curriculum and required hours of field related experience in the hospitality industry. The internship requires 400 hours working in the hospitality field. The choice of employment paid or unpaid is up to the student. A five-page report must be submitted at the end of the internship. An evaluation must be completed by the supervisor along with a self-evaluation and sent into the instructor.

1.6 Significance of the Study

The implications of this study will be beneficial to the tourism and hospitality industry, the hospitality academic community, and student interns. As students graduate and seek employment, previous experience is a positive contributing factor when companies look too higher (Dokki, Wilk, Rothbard, 2009). Internships can also lead to direct employment with the company they completed their internship. Academic communities will have insight into different internship programs to see, if any, which one produces higher organizational commitment. This will lead to a better understanding of which program to choose.

This study will benefit the hospitality industry by providing another internship benefit. Internships also give the organization the first pick at future professionals. If organizational commitment is found in internships and turnover is reduced over time than internships will provide an advantage to the organization by hiring them for full time positions, which starts the employees with higher organizational commitment.

1.7 Outline of Subsequent Chapters

The following chapters include Literature Review, Methodology, Results, and Discussion. The Literature Review, Chapter 2, provides previous studies on organizational commitment, turnover, and internships. Chapter 3 or Methodology will be discussed here. Results will be presented in Chapter 4 and Chapter 5 will include a conclusion, implications, and limitations and future studies.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter reviews the literature on internships, and organizational commitment. This chapter also reviews retention programs and its demographic information. This chapter will also discuss turnover and how it affects businesses.

The literature review will focus on the following areas:

- 1) organizational commitment
- 2) turnover in business
- 3) structure of a retention program
- 4) demographics and retention
- 5) internships

2.2 Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment has been described to be an important factor in retaining employees. According to Lewicki (1981) the definition of organizational commitment is “the more dedicated and loyal members are to an organization, the harder they are willing to work for it and the more stress they are willing to endure on its behalf” (p.5). Dedication or employee commitment can be categorized into two types, affective and normative. Allen and Meyers (1990)

define normative commitment as actions that “reflect a feeling of obligation towards continued employment” while defining affective commitment as “feelings of belonging and sense of attachment to the organization.” Kuruüzüm, Cetin, and Irmak (2009) state that affective commitment and normative commitment are related to job satisfaction, but continuous commitment is not; building organizational commitment becomes important in increasing job satisfaction.

Improving the job itself or reducing job tension will result in higher satisfaction, but not higher commitment (Batemen & Strasser 1984); job selection techniques influence organization commitment. Other causes of commitment that can be identified will cut costs on unnecessary interventions, as well as allowing a focus on interventions that create positive behavioral consequences. The indirect outcomes of these actions are employee satisfaction. Buchanan (1974) identified that years of organizational service, social interaction with organizational peers and superiors, job achievement, and hierarchical advancement as determinants of various aspects of commitment. Furthermore, Buchanan (1974) has found that the longer a person stays with the organization the higher their level of commitment.

Job characteristics, training, development, compensation and fairness are related to satisfaction and commitment (Lam & Zhang 2003). Lee (1971) reveals that organizational identifiers consist of general satisfaction with the job, organization, and profession. The research continues to state if employees have high organization identifiers they are more productive, motivated, satisfied, and less likely to leave the organization than with low organization identifiers.

Describing newcomers in relation to organizational commitment is another area in which strong research has been conducted. Newcomers' predicted outcome value judgments are strongly related to newcomers' predicted organizational commitment. Madlock and Horan (2009) defines this as "organizational commitment is conceptualized as attitude based, suggesting that employees form an emotional and psychological attachment between themselves and the organization" (p.5), these predicted outcome value judgments were found to be the strongest predictor of newcomers' forecasted organizational commitment compared to socialization (organizational, work-group, and task).

Yang (2008) describes turnover as being determined by employees' beliefs about job satisfaction and individual commitment to an organization and the hotel profession in general. The study implied that individuals' commitment to an organization is largely dependent on their attitudes, feelings, and involvement in the organization. One precursor of commitment is the level of satisfaction newcomers' gain during organizational assimilation.

2.3 Turnover in Business

A challenge that arises in today's businesses is a high turnover rate. The average turnover rates nationwide between the years 2004-2006 is 22.7-23.4 percent (US Department of Labor, 2006). Price (1977) defined employee turnover as "the ratio of the number of organizational members who have left during the period being considered divided by the average number of people in that organization during the period." The hospitality industry has one of the

highest turnover rates in the country, for the leisure and hospitality industry during the year of 2009 experienced 65.4% (US Department of Labor, 2010). The difference between the average turnover rate and hospitality's turnover rate is over double. A solution to this problem is to retain employees for a longer period of time. Describing organizational commitment among hospitality employees and using this information to increase their commitment to the organization can lead to lowering hospitality turnover.

Turnover hurts businesses in both turnover costs and efficiency ratings. Businesses do not like to see high turnover within their company, simply because it costs money. Using a wage rate of only \$7 an hour, it costs a company \$4,350 for each departing employee (US Department of Labor, 2006). The US Department of Labor suggests it costs company's one third of the new hire's salary (US Department of Labor, 2008). There is other costs employers pay other than just training costs. According to Frumkin (2008) businesses pay Social Security and Medicare benefits for them; other costs can contain federal and state unemployment taxes, vacation and holiday leave, health care and dental programs, retirement benefits, and other contributions. According to Berta (2007) these costs are high for restaurant operators:

“With an estimated 44 million workers uninsured nationwide and legislation pending in 31 states to mandate health insurance for all workers, restaurant operators who can figure out now how to offer health benefits to their employees will be ahead of the game”

Businesses are always looking to cut costs in order to increase profits; in times of economic recessions, businesses cut costs to stay in business. Restaurateurs who have begun distributing such statements to their employees acknowledge that they can help improve morale and retention (Frumkin, 2008). One way to cut costs is by lowering turnover rate and putting more time and money into holding onto current employees. While retaining employees, recruiting costs should decrease saving the company money.

2.3.1 Difference between Turnover and Retention

Retention and turnover have both been discussed, while being related to each other they are different; retention is the study of what factors keep employees happy within the company or what is desirable, while turnover is the study of why employees leave the company or undesirable (Waldman & Arora, 2004). Retention is an effort by employers to create and foster an environment that has policies and practices in place to address diverse needs (Workforce Planning for Wisconsin State Government, 2005). In order to calculate retention the CIPD uses the formula “Number of leavers with more than one years service x 100.” In order to calculate turnover you use the formula “Total number of leavers over period x 100 Average total number employed over period Total number of staff in post one year ago” (CIPD, 2008). Turnover is a distinguishing feature of the hospitality industry (Carbery & Gravan 2003). Turnover is viewed

as both, a positive and negative occurrence, the industry and company view turnover as being negative while managers and employees view turnover being a natural occurrence (Carbery & Garavan, 2003). Either positive or negative, turnover needs to be reduced for a company to operate at top efficiency.

2.3.2 Past Study of Retention and Hospitality Employees

Factors in which influence employees stay within the company are broken down into two sets of factors, primary and secondary. Milman (2002) states the primary factors are: fulfillment with employees job; employee does not want to change management style; clear job responsibilities; and consistent work hours. Employees want to be able to plan their life and they want to know what is expected from them while working. Secondary factors include: performance reviews annually and on time; retirement plans, more specifically how does the company assist with their retirement; availability of day-care facilities; convenient travel distances. These factors mentioned above do not include monetary rewards such as pay level, paid holiday, health benefits, and free employee meals (Milman, 2002).

Another study was conducted involving retention and managers. The managers are reported to have different retention factors than their employees. Walsh and Taylor (2007) describes these factors as: growth and development; industry growth and development; satisfaction with their jobs; salary; and joy in their work. Similar findings by stating hourly workers, health benefits, base pay, life/work balance, and hours worked were work issues that were important to

retention (Borstorff & Marker, 2007). Conducting feedback sessions and communicating with new employees every four months during their first three years can be an important influencing factor (Borstorff & Marker, 2007). This could be a powerful tool for reducing turnover and is something every company could do affordably. Managers and supervisors should then be held accountable to be in tune with their employees' needs and should accommodate them when possible.

Quick-service restaurant managers have turned to outside firms to screen job candidates and have reported immediate improvements in worker retention, offering relief from the segment's notoriously high turnover (Berta, 2008). The system set in place uses an automated telephone as well as an internet-based screening program. National Cone Island saw a drop in turnover that fell below one hundred percent (Berta, 2008).

2.4 Structure of a Retention Program

A retention program is a business strategy that companies are currently developing and implementing to lower costs. According to Woods and Macaulay (1989), there are nine steps to create a successful program:

- 1) Surface your culture, describe the company's personality values, beliefs, even assumptions;
- 2) Find out why employees leave, create and distribute exiting surveys;
- 3) Find out why employees stay, look for what's positive about their jobs;

- 4) Ask employees what they want;
- 5) Give employees a voice, allow employees to give opinions on their job;
- 6) Check for managers' bias regarding employees, see how employees feel about their managers through questionnaires or interviews;
- 7) Developing a recruiting system, hire the right people from the start;
- 8) Develop orientation programs, employees need to feel comfortable and knowledgeable about their work environment from the start;
- 9) Taking interviewing seriously, this is the time that managers should stop from their busy schedules and sit down with the applicant.

2.5 Demographics and Retention

As the industry evolves and develops, demographic trends have changed and characterized the hospitality industry. According to Berta (2004) "the restaurant industry has a predominantly young workforce, operators must take note of the US' changing age demographics and plan for the future by recruiting and retaining older employees"dr. The percentage of older workers in the workforce reportedly is increasing faster than that of younger workers. The number of 16- to 24-year-olds in the American labor pool is projected to increase only 9 percent from 2002 to 2012, compared with the 20-percent jump for older American workers (Berta, 2004). Training is an important component of retention and the availability of training is critical for retaining older workers, which could be one of the important retention factors (Armstrong-Stassen & Templer, 2005).

2.6 Internships

Students and practitioners believed that internships are a vital part of academic programs; they should develop job skills, as well as play an important role in the transition of students from the college to the work force (Beggs, Ross, & Goodwin, 2008; Ross *et al.*, 2006). Ring, Dickinger, and Wöber (2009) state, both recruiters and educational leaders believe that internships is the number one important factor in undergraduate programs. Because of this, all students should be strongly encouraged to engage in an internship experience (Busby, 2003). Internships, by themselves, can be valuable learning experiences. Clark (2003) internships are also of great importance to the travel and tourism industry as they not only provide academically trained individuals to help supplement the work force, but they are also a breeding ground for the future leaders of the profession. Well-trained and supervised interns, whose job performance skills match the needs of the agency, are likely to stay employed at that agency (Antun, 2001). Students not only get a jump-start to a job as they graduate, but they learn something beyond the traditional classrooms. The goal of internships is to integrate classroom teachings and field-based application opportunities to prepare them for the entry into today's workforce (Elkins, 2002).

2.6.1 Internship requirements

Chi and Gursoy (2009) state that industry professionals consider an internship requirement by academic programs as the most important factor for success of career and placement services. It is critical that academic programs provide and support internships. These internships should have a curriculum. Carson and Fisher (2006) suggests that internships should provide explicit theoretical frameworks, incorporating critically reflective expectations in assessment criteria, and modeling critical reflection whenever possible.

Internships need improvements in order for students to keep up with our ever-changing industry. Petrillose and Montgomery (1998) lists internship requirements: most hospitality education programs require a 600 hour or less internship and is conducted over the summer months, while the hospitality industry recommends at least 600 hours and an internship lasting of 6 months; the internship should not consist of only frontline work, however should be geared towards management and leadership skills; and a written report and project should be required for interns.

Hobson and Jenkins (2009) believes improvements need to be made with both the academic and industry requirements; educational: providing a mandatory pre-internship workshop, reviewing and revising the on-campus training course, creating a mentoring program, and facilitating communication with all parties hospitality organizations; hospitality organizations: should hold regular meetings with the student interns employing proactive teaching styles, facilitating communications with the university improving the allocation of the

work force. Kay (2003) agrees with Hobson in that educational institutions and educational professionals need to have a stronger relationship to increase the effectiveness of internships; both parties need to be up to date on both the industry needs as well as their understanding for the needs of internships in the industry. Rothman (2007) goes on to add that employers should provide the following to interns: supervision, feedback, challenging assignments with expectations, provide exposure to the larger organization, and a clear understanding of what is to be accomplished.

The hospitality industry, while wanting to support the academic field in providing internships will also want to know how internships will directly effect them. Chi and Gursoy (2009) states that hiring interns enables hospitality companies to gain access to a pool of potential workers as well allows for direct involvement in training the interns. Mihail (2006) believes that an additional incentive for industries could be to increase the length of the internship while increasing the interns pay.

2.6.2 Company Suggestions for Internships

The industry's suggestions on internships are an important factor in the internship curriculum. Pursing feedback from the industry is vital to keep up with the changing times. Van-Hoof (2000), states students can make themselves more appealing by working in the industry while going to school, formal internships and school sponsored study abroad programs for a period of time are important as well; combining both of these by participating in an international

internship would be very valuable. Wildes and Mount (1998) comments on internship: no absolute rules apply to all situations and to all people; students who selected their industry career are more motivated in internships; good intern supervisor is someone who likes younger people and embraces the opportunity to educate them in the business arena; and evaluation of the program is a combined effort of both work and academic performance. Student workers are not your average workers. Winkler (2008), atypical workers should not be treated in the homogeneous group of typical and atypical workers; students are not atypical workers, they are looking for part time work and have a low level of organizational commitment. The student worker should not be confused with internships. Student workers look for part time work to make ends meet, while internships are used to strengthen their knowledge in their fields as well as gain real life experience.

2.7 Conclusion

This chapter reviews the literature on internships, and organizational commitment. This chapter also reviews retention programs and its demographic information. This chapter will also discuss turnover and how it affects businesses.

- 1) organizational commitment
- 2) turnover
- 3) structure of a retention program
- 4) demographics and retention
- 5) internships

The literature on turnover was split into two parts: difference between turnover and retention and past study of retention and hospitality employees. Internship was also split into two parts: internship requirements and company suggestions for internships.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter addresses the methodology used to conduct this study. Section 3.2 restates the purpose of this study. Section 3.3 presents the research design, followed by the population and sampling procedures in section 3.4. Section 3.5 discusses and reviews the procedure of the study through the Campus Institutional Review Board. Section 3.6 describes the instrumentation used in conducting this study. Section 3.7 describes the data collected and section 3.8 explains the data analysis procedures.

3.2 Objectives of Study

The purpose of this study is:

- (4) Describe the demographics of interns for both structured and unstructured internships.
- (5) Compare level of organizational commitment between students in unstructured and structured internship programs.
- (6) Describe the intern's level of organizational commitment to the company.

3.3 Research Design

The design that will be used for this research is descriptive survey. Descriptive survey correlates with the end sought of explore and describe. According to Ary, Jacobs Razaveih and Sorensen (2006), survey research gathers information from subjects or groups of subjects by using instruments such as questionnaires and interviews; Surveys allow the researcher to summarize characteristics and measure attitudes and opinions toward the researches issue. This study will measure organizational commitment between structured and unstructured internship program's interns.

3.4 Population and Sampling

3.4.1 Population

The target population of this study is college students enrolled in an internship course at a four-year university, in a hospitality program. The sample included in this study was gathered from local universities. The total population size is immeasurable due to vast number of four-year university's students in hospitality.

3.4.2 Sample Frame

An online questionnaire was used to collect data for this study. The sample frame consists of students from the University of Missouri Hotel and Restaurant Management Program and students from Missouri State University

Department of Hospitality and Restaurant Administration. Each program, with the written permission of the department head, supplied a list of the students currently enrolled in the internship course during the summer of 2009 as well as fall of 2009.

3.4.3 Sample

The sample used in this study was a convince sample due to the inability of determining all students in a four-year university hospitality program.

3.4.4 Sampling Error

To reduce sampling errors all participants enrolled in the class were sampled. This is possible due to the limited amount of students enrolled in each universities internship course.

3.4.5 Selection Error and Frame Error

In order to account for selection error, all duplicates were purged from the list. It is possible that the participants took the course for more than one semester; therefore the list of participants was purged before the questionnaire was disputed. Frame error was accounted for by receiving a course roster for the summer and fall sessions in the year 2010 from each university.

3.5 Institutional Review Board

Federal regulations and the University of Missouri require that The Institutional Review Board (IRB) approve research conducted involving human subjects. An application was sent into and approval obtained by The University of Missouri IRB before this research was conducted.

3.6 Instrumentation

3.6.1 Description

A self-administrated online questionnaire was developed and consists of two segments. The first segment was obtained from a previously developed organizational commitment questionnaire. Commeiras' and Fournier's (2001) research describes fifteen questions describing organizational commitment levels. The second segment identifies socio-demographic information, which includes gender, age, academic year, and area of study within the hospitality field.

3.6.2 Measurement

The first segment of the questionnaire questions were measured using a 5-point Likert scale, "1 = Disagree to 5 = Agree." The second segment's questions were each measured on independent scales due to the socio-demographic information being measured. An example of these questions is:

“What area of hospitality is/was your internship focused in?” with answers being “Food & Beverage, Lodging, Event Planning, and Other (Please List).”

3.6.3 Validity

Validity for this questionnaire was pre-established in Commeiras’ and Fournier’s research (2001). Questions used in the first segment of this research were obtained from Commeiras’ and Fournier’s research “Critical Evaluation of Porter, Steers, Mowday, & Boulian (1974) Organizational Commitment Questionnaire: Implication for Researchers.” Segment two contains socio-demographic questions, these questions were created by the researcher and distributed to nine graduate students in the Food Science Department to provide feedback. From these pilot tests recommendations were used to make revisions.

3.7 Data Collection

The participants’ name and email addresses were obtained from the enrollment lists of each universities hospitality internship course from the summer and fall sessions in the year of 2010. An online questionnaire database (Survey Monkey) was used to distribute the questionnaires. According to Denscombe (2009) there are no significant differences between online questionnaire distribution and paper distribution. The researcher inputted the list of participants attending the University of Missouri; while the instructor of the internship course at the Missouri State University inputted the list of their participants. Each participant was emailed with a unique link to the questionnaire; this insured

duplicate responses were not created. Since individual emails were sent it reduces the risk of these emails going into the email spam folder.

The email received extended a personal invitation to be in the study. This invitation included a brief description of the study, contact information for any questions or concerns, the explanation of anonymity, and the ability to opt-out. All responses were kept anonymous to protect the participants and create an atmosphere in which the participants can answer the questionnaire honestly without any reproach from instructors, the researcher, or companies they interned at.

Once the participants clicked the link emailed to them, their browser was redirected where they were asked to accept the conditions of the questionnaire and given instructions to follow. There was no incentive for this research.

The total number of participants that were contacted for this study was 152. This is two less than the sample frame. One email address bounced, and one email address was opted out of completing questionnaires from Survey Monkey. The questionnaire was available for the participants at the University of Missouri from August 16th, 2010 to September 08th 2010. After two weeks of the questionnaire being sent a reminder email was sent out to remaining participants to increase response rate. The questionnaire was sent to the participants at the Missouri State University from September 14th 2010 to October 13th 2010. After two weeks of the initial email a reminder email was sent to increase the response rate. Though the questionnaires were sent out at different times this does not affect the response rate. The response rate was 28.8%; all responses were used in this research.

3.8 Data Analysis

The data analysis for this study followed the following procedures. All questionnaires were used in this study; questions with out responses are noted accordingly. All responses are analyzed first by socio-demographic characteristics of the respondents. Organizational commitment amongst all interns will be described using the mean and standard deviation. An accumulation of all questions' means and standard deviations was preformed. Organizational commitment amongst structured and unstructured interns was also described separately using means and standard deviation. A one tailed t-test was used to describe if there is any significant difference between the two groups; an alpha of .05 will be used.

3.9 Summary

This chapter describes the methodology utilized to conduct this study. The first section restates the purpose of this study. The second section presents the research design, followed by he population and sampling procedures in section three. Section four discusses and reviews the procedure of the study through the Campus Institutional Review Board. The fifth section describes the instrumentation used in conducting this study. Section six describes the data collected and section seven explains the data analysis procedures used when conducting this study.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

4.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the statistical analysis of the data. Section two will review the study objectives. Section three will present the descriptive statistics and a summary of the statistical results. This section will be broken down into three parts:

- 1) characteristics of unstructured and structured internships
- 2) interns level of organizational commitment for unstructured and structured Internships.
- 3) interns' level of organizational commitment

4.2 Review of Study Objectives

The objectives of the study were:

- 1) Describe the demographics of interns for both structured and unstructured internships.
- 2) Describe the intern's level of organizational commitment to the company.
- 3) Compare level of organizational commitment between students in unstructured and structured internship programs.

4.3 Summary of Descriptive Statistics

4.3.1 Socio-demographics of Unstructured and Structured Internships

4.3.1.1 Socio-Demographics Characteristics of Unstructured Internships

Table 1 states 82.61% (n=19) of respondents were female and 17.39% (n=4) were male. Ages are broken down into 34.78% (n=8) being twenty-one years of age and younger, 56.52% (n=13) being between the ages of twenty-two and twenty-four, 8.70% (n=2) being twenty-five years of age and older. The respondents focus areas in hospitality are 43.48% (n=10) was in food and beverage, 21.74% (n=5) was in lodging, and 34.78% (n=8) was in event planning. The respondent's job experience in the hospitality field was 13.04% (n=3) had no experience, 30.43% (n=7) had one to four years of experience, and 52.17% (n=12) had over five years experience; one respondent left this question blank. Seniors represent 91.30% (n=21) of respondents and 4.35%(n=1) were juniors; one respondent did not respond. Respondents answered 34.78% (n=8) yes and 65.22% (n=15) no, to previous employment with the company.

4.3.1.2 Socio-Demographics Characteristics of Structured Internships

Table 1 states 72.22% (n=13) of respondents were female and 27.78% (n=5) were male. Ages are broken down into 55.56 (n=10) being twenty-one years of age and younger, 33.33% (n=6) being between the ages of twenty-two and twenty-four, and 5.56% (n=1) being twenty-five years of age and older; one

respondent did not answer. The respondents focus areas in hospitality are 44.44% (n=8) was in food and beverage, 38.89% (n=7) was in lodging, and 16.67% (n=3) was other. The respondent's job experience in the hospitality field was 11.11% (n=2) had no experience, 61.11% (n=11) had one to four years of experience, and 27.78% (n=5) had over five years experience. Seniors represent 100.00% (n=18) of respondents. Respondents answered 44.44% (n=8) yes and 55.56% (n=15) no to previous employment with the company.

Table 1

Socio-demographics of Unstructured Internship Respondents

Characteristic	Unstructured		Structured		Total n	Total %
	n	%	n	%		
Gender						
Female	19	82.61	13	72.22	32	78.05
Male	4	17.39	5	27.78	9	21.95
Total	23	100.00	18	100.00	41	100.00
Age						
21 years and under	8	34.78	10	55.56	18	43.90
22-24 years	13	56.52	6	33.33	19	46.34
25 years and older	2	8.70	1	5.56	3	7.32
Total	23	100.00	17	94.44*	40	97.56*
Area of Focus						
Food and Beverage	10	43.48	8	44.44	18	43.90
Lodging	5	21.74	7	38.89	12	29.27
Event Planning	8	34.78	0	0.00	8	19.51
Other	0	0.00	3	16.67	3	7.32
Total	23	100.00	18	100.00	41	100.00
Job Experience						
No experience	3	13.04	2	11.11	5	12.20
1-4 years	7	30.43	11	61.11	18	43.90
5 + years	12	52.17	5	27.78	17	41.46
Total	22	95.65*	18	100.00	40	97.56*
Previous Employment with the Company						
Yes	8	34.78	8	44.44	16	39.02
No	15	65.22	10	55.56	25	60.98
Total	23	100.00	18	100.00	41	100.00

* indicates a non-response

4.3.2 Interns' Level of Organizational Commitment for Unstructured and Structured Internships

Organizational commitment of respondents between structured and unstructured internships was measured using a 5 point likeRT scale; As table 2 shows, each question was asked using a likeRT 5 point scale, 1 = disagree, 2 = slightly disagree, 3 = Neither Agree Nor Disagree, 4 slightly agree, 5 = Agree. Fifteen questions means were summed and a two-tailed T-test with alpha set at .05 was used to compare the two groups means; the t-test was 0.726 with $P > .05$. The result indicates that there is no statistically significant difference between structured internships (Mean: 3.596, S.D: 1.301) and unstructured internships (Mean: 3.635, S.D: 1.385).

4.3.2.1 Interns' Level of Organizational Commitment for Unstructured Internships

The following data reflects student intern responses for unstructured internships. The responses with a rating of four or higher are considered the highest organizational commitment. All reverse questions will be treated as follows: the responses were switched one to five, two to four, and three kept constant and vice versa. Question one has a mean of 4.61 with a standard deviation of .66. Question two has a mean of 4.22 with a standard deviation of 1.04. Question five has a mean of 4.00 with a standard deviation of 1.28. Question six has a mean of 4.09 with a standard deviation of 1.16. Question thirteen has a mean of 4.09 with a standard deviation of .95. Question fifteen is a

reverse question with the mean of 4.13 and a standard deviation of 1.25. All of these questions represent the highest organizational commitment responses.

The following questions are considered high organizational commitment with a rating of three to three and ninety-nine hundredths. Question three is a reverse question with a mean of 3.35 and a standard deviation of 1.58. Question four has a mean of 3.26 with a standard deviation of 1.32. Question eight has a mean of 3.70 with a standard deviation of 1.22. Question eleven is a reverse question with a mean of 3.43 and a standard deviation of 1.59. Question twelve is a reverse question with a mean of 3.70 and a standard deviation of 1.42. Question fourteen has a mean of 3.13 with a standard deviation of 1.25.

The following two questions are low organizational commitment responses, or means lower than three. Question seven and nine are reverse questions, the mean is 2.35 with a standard deviation of 1.37 and question nine the mean is 2.39 with a standard deviation of 1.27. The mean of all fifteen responses for unstructured interns is 3.63 with a standard deviation of 1.39.

Table 2

Organizational Commitment of Student Interns

Items	Total		Unstructured		Structured	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
1. I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this organization to succeed.	4.66	.57	4.61	.66	4.72	.46
2. I tell my friends that this is a great organization to work for.	4.22	1.01	4.22	1.04	4.22	1.00
*3. I feel very little loyalty to this organization.	3.32	1.56	3.35	1.58	3.28	1.56
4. I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this organization.	3.15	1.26	3.27	1.32	3.00	1.19
5. I find that my values and the organization's values are very similar.	3.80	1.29	4.00	1.28	3.56	1.29
6. I am proud to tell others that I am part of this organization.	4.12	1.10	4.09	1.16	4.17	1.04
*7. I could just as well be working for a different organization as long as the type of work was similar.	2.59	1.34	2.35	1.37	2.89	1.28
8. This organization really inspires the best in me in the way of job performance.	3.68	1.19	3.70	1.22	3.67	1.19
*9. It would take very little change in my present circumstances to cause me to leave this organization.	2.49	1.16	2.39	1.27	2.61	1.04
10. I am extremely glad I chose this organization to work for over others I was considering at the time I joined.	3.93	1.25	4.09	1.16	3.72	1.36
*11. There's not much to be gained by sticking with this organization indefinitely.	3.49	1.45	3.43	1.59	3.56	1.29
*12. Often, I find it difficult to agree with this organization's policies on important matters relating to its employees.	3.49	1.40	3.70	1.42	3.22	1.35
13. I really care about the fate of this organization.	4.00	1.05	4.09	.95	3.89	1.18
14. For me, this is the best of all organizations for which to work.	3.17	1.32	3.13	1.25	3.22	1.44
*15. Deciding to work for this organization was a definite mistake on my part.	4.17	1.14	4.13	1.25	4.22	1.00
Total	3.62	1.35	3.63	1.39	3.60	1.30

* indicates a reverse item, Note: scale 1- 5, 5 being high OC

4.3.2.2 Interns' Level of Organizational Commitment for Structured Internships.

The following data reflects student intern responses for structured internships. As table 2 shows, each question was asked using a likeRT 5 point scale, 1 = disagree, 2 = slightly disagree, 3 = Neither Agree Nor Disagree, 4 slightly agree, 5 = Agree. The responses with a rating of four or higher are considered the highest organizational commitment. All reverse questions will be treated as follows: the responses were switched one to five, two to four, and three kept constant and vice versa. Question one has a mean of 4.72 with a standard deviation of .46. Question two has a mean of 4.22 with a standard deviation of 1.00. Question six has a mean of 4.17 with a standard deviation of 1.04. Question fifteen is a reverse question with the mean of 4.22 and a standard deviation of 1.00. All of these questions represent the highest organizational commitment responses.

The following questions are considered high organizational commitment with a rating of three to three and ninety-nine hundredths. Question three has a mean of 3.28 and a standard deviation of 1.56. Question four has a mean of 3.00 with a standard deviation of 1.19. Question five has a mean of 3.56 with a standard deviation of 1.29. Question eight has a mean of 3.67 with a standard deviation of 1.19. Question ten has a mean of 3.72 with a standard deviation of 1.36. Question eleven is a reverse question with a mean of 3.56 and a standard deviation of 1.29. Question twelve is a reverse question with a mean of 3.22 and a standard deviation of 1.35. Question thirteen has a mean of 3.89 with a

standard deviation of 1.18. Question fourteen has a mean of 3.22 with a standard deviation of 1.44.

The following two questions are low organizational commitment responses, or means lower than three. Questions seven and nine are reverse questions. The mean of question seven is 2.89 with a standard deviation of 1.28 and question nine has a mean is 2.61 with a standard deviation of 1.04. The mean of all fifteen responses for unstructured interns is 3.60 with a standard deviation of 1.30.

4.3.3 Interns' Level of Organizational Commitment

The following data reflects all student intern responses for internships. As table 2 shows, each question was asked using a likeRT 5 point scale, 1 = disagree, 2 = slightly disagree, 3 = Neither Agree Nor Disagree, 4 slightly agree, 5 = Agree. The responses with a rating of four or higher are considered the highest organizational commitment. All reverse questions will be treated as follows: the responses were switched one to five, two to four, and three kept constant and vice versa. Question one has a mean of 4.66 with a standard deviation of .57. Question two has a mean of 4.22 with a standard deviation of 1.01. Question six has a mean of 4.12 with a standard deviation of 1.10. Question thirteen has a mean of 4.00 with a standard deviation of 1.05. Question fifteen is a reverse question with the mean of 4.17 and a standard deviation of 1.14. All of these questions represent the highest organizational commitment responses.

The following questions are considered high organizational commitment with a rating of three to three and ninety-nine hundredths. Question three has a mean of 3.32 and a standard deviation of 1.56. Question four has a mean of 3.15 with a standard deviation of 1.26. Question five has a mean of 3.80 with a standard deviation of 1.29. Question eight has a mean of 3.67 with a standard deviation of 1.19. Question ten has a mean of 3.93 with a standard deviation of 1.25. Question eleven is a reverse question with a mean of 3.49 and a standard deviation of 1.45. Question twelve is a reverse question with a mean of 3.49 and a standard deviation of 1.35. Question fourteen has a mean of 3.17 with a standard deviation of 1.32.

The following two questions are low organizational commitment responses, or means lower than three. Questions seven and nine are reverse questions. The mean of question seven is 2.59 with a standard deviation of 1.34 and question nine has a mean of 2.49 with a standard deviation of 1.16. The mean of all fifteen responses for unstructured interns is 3.62 with a standard deviation of 1.35.

4.3.4 Interns' Level of Organizational Commitment Amongst Demographics

The following data represents organizational commitment amongst socio-demographic information. After observing table one, socio-demographic questions were split into two groups by the researcher. A two by two factorial was used to compare commitment amongst these questions.

Socio-demographic question two of was split into food and beverage as one and other as two. Question three was split between zero to three years experience as one and four plus years experience as two. Question five was split into 21 years and younger as one and 22 years and older as two. Questions one, four, six, and seven were in nature grouped as ones and twos; no changes were made to these questions. The significant differences amongst socio-demographic groups are questions two and seven. Question two had a significant difference of .05 or lower. Both 1 and 2 had organizational commitment; level 1 has a mean of 3.22 with a .78 standard deviation and level 2 has a mean of 3.90 with a standard deviation of .64. Question seven has a significance level of .01 or lower. Only level 1 had high organizational commitment, level 2 was lower organizational commitment. Level 1 has a mean of 4.03 with a standard deviation of .49 and level 2 has a mean of 2.80 with a standard deviation of .53.

Table 3

Organizational Commitment Comparison Amongst Socio-Demographics

Items	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	Mean
SD 1																
S/U	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
SD 1	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	S**	NS	S†	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Grp*1	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
SD 2																
S/U	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	S*	NS	NS
SD 2	NS	NS	NS	NS	S*	NS	S*	S*	NS	S*	S*	S*	S*	NS	S*	S*
Grp*2	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	S*	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
SD 3																
S/U	NS	S*	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
SD 3	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Grp*3	NS	NS	NS	NS	S*	NS	S*	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	S*	NS	NS
SD 4																
S/U	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
SD 4	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Grp*4	NS	NS	S*	NS	NS	S*	NS	NS	S*	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	S*	NS
SD 5																
S/U	NS	S*	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
SD 5	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Grp*3	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
SD 6																
S/U	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	S*	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
SD 6	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	S**	NS	NS	S*	NS	NS	NS
Grp*4	NS	NS	S*	NS	NS	NS	S*	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
SD 7																
S/U	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
SD 7	NS	S**	NS	S**	S**	S**	NS	S**	NS	S**	S**	S**	S**	S**	S**	S**
Grp*7	NS	NS	NS	S*	NS	NS	NS	S*	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS

S/U = Difference between Structured and Unstructured

SD # = Socio-demographic difference

NS = Non-Significant

S=Significant

** = P-value ≤ .001

* = P-value ≤ .01

4.4 Conclusion of Results

This chapter's purpose was to discuss the statistical analysis of the data. Section two reviewed the study objectives. Section three presented the descriptive statistics and a summary of the statistical results. This section was broken down into three parts characteristics of unstructured and structured internships, interns' level of organizational commitment, and interns level of organizational commitment for unstructured and structured Internships.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

5.1 Introduction

This chapter includes the conclusion, implications, and future studies and limitations. The conclusion section will sum the findings of this research. The implications section will relate the results of this research and apply them to practical uses. The last section, future studies and limitations, will discuss further research needed and any limitations of this study.

5.2 Conclusion

The findings of this research provide a glimpse into student interns' organizational commitment. The intent of this research was to compare structured and unstructured internships and describe the results of its findings. As Table 2 shows, there is no significant difference between structured and unstructured internships. Looking at the data the difference between structured and unstructured internships is to minute to infer any practical differences.

This research found four organizational factors among structured and unstructured internships that respondents considered the highest commitment; the difference between each factor mean was .11 or less. The factors are: willing to put forth great effort to help the organization succeed, telling friends that this is

a great organization to work for, they are proud to work for the organization, and working for the organization was not a mistake. Nine organizational factors were considered high and less than .48 difference between the means of each internship. The remaining two factors had low organizational commitment with a difference of means .54 or less; both questions were reverse questions, a further look at the data suggests confusion among respondents due to the extremes in the responses. Both internships had an average mean of 3.60 or higher showing student interns have high organizational.

Socio-demographics had two significant differences of organizational commitment. The first occurs between the fields in which the internships were conducted, particularly food and beverage and other hospitality areas. This research also shows that interns with low commitment will not continue to work for the company if offered a full time job, while interns with organizational commitment will stay full time if asked to stay.

5.3 Implications

Internships are positive to academic programs, students, and hospitality organizations. According to Clark (2003) internships are an important part of the students learning process in higher education. The results from this research do provide evidence that students in a hospitality internship course have high organizational commitment; this supports Chi and Gursoy (2009) that hiring interns will have a positive impact on companies. While there may be no significant difference between types of internships, this research does show that

high organizational commitment is found in internships and if the intern has organizational commitment then they are likely to stay for a full time position.

5.4 Limitations and Future Research

This research cannot be generalized to the population of students in internship courses; it can only be generalized towards the sample, students in college internship courses in the Midwest region of the United States, in this research. After conducting this research it is clear that the sample size used in this research, along with the rate of response, was minuscule. For future research a larger sample should be used in order to better represent the population of student interns enrolled in college internship courses. This larger sample should also include schools across the United States as well as the world.

The results from this study described that internships whether structured or unstructured are not significantly different; if there is no difference between the two organizations than the difference of time commitment should be addressed. A cost benefit analyses between the two styles of courses should be conducted to determine if the extra time spent on structured internship courses is necessary and beneficial to the students. A cost benefit analysis could also be conducted on whether the time spent teaching this style of the course is worth the time and money.

Another limitation of this study was the time of the questionnaire's release. No research has been conducted on the appropriate release date of

questionnaires relating to internships. For this research it was in the researchers opinion that, late Summer when students are just returning to school, would produce accurate results due to the fact most students conduct their internship over the nontraditional summer months, in hopes that their experiences will be fresh in their minds. This time was also believed to accumulate the most responses due to higher enrollment in these courses. For future research, studies should be conducted on student interns' responses at different times of the year to obtain a better understanding of when internship students might respond.

APPENDIX A

Missouri State University IRB Exempt Approval Letter



July 27, 2010

Mr. Brandon Fick
Eckles Café General Manager
MU BBQ Team Consultant
Bsfm84@mail.mizzou.edu

Dear Mr. Fick:

I would like to take this opportunity to respond to your email inquiry and application regarding the need for review and approval of your research project by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Missouri State University (MSU).

Missouri State's IRB policies and procedures limit its jurisdiction in research involving human subjects to activities in which our faculty, staff, or students are *engaged in research*, according to the federal definition of engagement. Missouri State's only role in this project would be as voluntary research participants, should individuals choose to participate. Since Missouri State will not be engaged in this project, your research does not require approval by the Missouri State IRB.

This letter should serve as reference to the University of Missouri's IRB that no approval from Missouri State University's IRB is needed for your project. Please have a representative from their office contact me should further information be required.

I do appreciate you contacting our office. If you have additional questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at erinparrish@missouristate.edu or (417) 836-4132.

Sincerely,

Erin E. Parrish
Director of Research Compliance

OFFICE OF RESEARCH COMPLIANCE

901 South National Avenue • Springfield, Missouri 65897 • 417-836-4132 • Fax 417-836-6266

www.missouristate.edu

An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Institution

Click here to enter text.

University of Missouri IRB Exempt Approval Letter

Dear Investigator:

Your human subject research project entitled To investigate how structured and unstructured internships affect the interns perceived organizational commitment in hospitality organizations. meets the criteria for EXEMPT APPROVAL and will expire on July 29, 2011. Your approval will be contingent upon your agreement to annually submit the "Annual Exempt Research Certification" form to maintain current IRB approval.

You must submit the Annual Exempt Research Certification form 30 days prior to the expiration date. Failure to timely submit the certification form by the deadline will result in automatic expiration of IRB approval.

Study Changes: If you wish to revise your exempt project, you must complete the Exempt Amendment Form for review.

Please be aware that all human subject research activities must receive prior approval by the IRB prior to initiation, regardless of the review level status. If you have any questions regarding the IRB process, do not hesitate to contact the Campus IRB office at (573) 882-9585.

Campus Institutional Review Board

Invitation Letter for Questionnaire



University of Missouri

Researcher:

Brandon Fick
Hotel and Restaurant Management
University of Missouri-Columbia
Bsfm84@mail.missouri.edu
314.537.5418

Advisor:

Dr. James Groves
Associate Professor
Hotel and Restaurant Management
University of Missouri-Columbia
grovesj@missouri.edu
573.884.7816

You are being asked to volunteer to participate in a research study, which is being conducted to determine the level of organizational commitment amongst college students interning with hospitality companies. We are asking you to take part in this study because you are enrolled in an internship course through the university. Please read this form carefully and ask any questions you may have before agreeing to take part in the study.

If you agree to be in this study, then answer the following questions in the questionnaire. The questionnaire will include questions about your feelings towards the company you interned with. The questionnaire will take about 10 minutes to complete.

Your participation will benefit future internship courses and students taking these classes.

I do not anticipate any risks to you participating in this study other than those encountered in day-to-day life.

The records of this study will be kept private. In any sort of report we make public we will not include any information that will make it possible to identify you. Research records will be kept in a locked file; only the researchers will have access to the records.

Taking part in this study is completely voluntary. You may skip any questions that you do not want to answer. If you decide not to take part or to skip some of the questions, it will not affect you or any other questions in any way.

The researcher conducting this study is Brandon Fick. Please email or call with any questions or concerns you may have, Bsfm84@mail.missouri.edu or at 314.537.5418. If you have any questions or concerns regarding your rights as a subject in this study, you may contact the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at 607-255-5138.

I have read the above information, and have received answers to any questions I asked. I consent to take part in the study.
(Please click the box "I agree to participate in this study")

Structured Internship Course Syllabus

HRA 499: Internship (6 credits) Spring 2010

Course Description:

Supervised experience in a cooperative program in hospitality.

450 Hours (Maximum 390 hours in one area, minimum of 30 hours each in 2 other areas) of evaluated/ paid work experience in the Hospitality Industry.

Note: The work experience requirement at Missouri State University requires a total of 750 hours. You must have accumulated a minimum of 300 hours of previous hospitality work experience and be able to document it before receiving credit for this course. If you don't have this or cannot document it, you will be required to complete 750 hours.

Objectives:

1. To gain insight in career direction.
2. To improve your marketability in the job market
3. To practice the principals learned in the classroom courses.
4. To discover a greater understanding of the dynamics of the Hospitality Industry.
5. To learn the importance of understanding the politics of the Hospitality Industry.

Assignments:

1. Obtain a challenging job in the hospitality industry, with at least **three** different areas of work. (Maximum 390 hours in one area, with a minimum of 30 hours each in two other areas).
2. Develop or update a professional quality resume. Due by **February 12th, 2010** at 5:00 p.m.
3. Complete 4 papers as described in the *Internship Summary Guide for Papers and Posts*
 - a. See *Internship Summary Guide for Papers and Posts* for specific material that should be included in each paper.
 - b. At the top of each paper, please indicate the total number of hours you have worked during the entire internship over the 450 hours you need to complete.
 - i. Example: Your Name Weeks Ending (Date)80/450 *
 - c. To receive credit, all papers are due by the date on the paper summary and should be of professional quality. No late papers are accepted
4. Employer evaluation: Must be filled out and received by **May 7th, 2010** or you will receive an "I" grade for the course. I have enclosed a copy of the evaluation form for your information; however, I will contract your employer directly via e-mail.

5. Summary Paper (4 pages typed) due by **May 7th, 2010** :
 - a. See *Internship Summary Guide for Papers and Posts* for specific material that should be included in the paper.
6. Post and respond to the **BlackBoard Discussion Board** on or before the dates specified
 - a. See *Internship Summary Guide for Papers and Posts* for specific material that should be included in the post.
 - b. You will be graded on both the quantity and the quality of your postings.
7. Updated Resume that includes this internship.
8. Please Note: ***Any assignments not received by the due date will not receive credit unless prior arrangements have been made and agreed upon.***

Evaluation Technique and Grading Scale:

- Papers:40 (4 @ 10 pts. Each)
 - BlackBoard Postings20 (4 @ 5 pts. Each)
 - Summary Paper:30 points
 - Updated Resume:10 points
 - Employer's Evaluation:100 points
- Total200 points**

Employer's Evaluation may be confidential at their option and may not be shared with you.

Your grade will be significantly impacted if you fail to complete any part of your internship (papers, summary paper, resume, BlackBoard postings or the employer evaluation). If you are having difficulty at work, please talk to me as soon as possible; remember if you are fired, you will receive an automatic "F", unless you have documented potential problems.

Grades will be assigned as follows:

92-100A77-79C+
90-92A-73-76C
87-89B+70-72C-
83-86B67-69D+
80-82B-60-66D
<60F

Important: Please read this document carefully and when you have finished, please send me an e-mail with the following wording.

I have read and understand the policies outlined in the Syllabus for HRA 499 for Spring Semester 2010

Unstructured Internship Course Syllabus

HRM 4941 – Internship
Hotel and Restaurant Management
University of Missouri-Columbia

Office Hours: By appointment, best made by e-mail.

Course Description: Combines study, observation and employment in an area of hotel and restaurant management. Written reports, faculty evaluation. Prerequisites: 90 hours including three courses in department and instructor's consent.

Course Objectives:

1. To gain professional work experience.
2. To observe managerial and leadership aspects of a specific functioning department within the field.
3. To analyze the working environment and apply critical thinking skills towards a given situation.
4. Analyze and develop communication skills for the effective management of the operation.

ADA Statement: If you need accommodations because of a disability, if you have emergency medical information to share with me, or if you need special arrangements in case the building must be evacuated, please inform me immediately. Please see me privately after class, or at my office. To request academic accommodations (for example, a note taker), students must also register with Disability Services, A048 Brady Commons, 882-4696. It is the campus office responsible for reviewing documentation provided by students requesting academic accommodations, and for accommodations planning in cooperation with students and instructors, as needed and consistent with course requirements. Another resource, MU's Adaptive Computing Technology Center, 884-2828, is available to provide computing assistance to students with disabilities. For more information about the rights of people with disabilities, please see ada.missouri.edu or call 884-7278. ADA accommodations in the workplace are the responsibility of the employer. If a disability severely hinders or prohibits you from completing this course, contact your academic advisor immediately.

Academic Dishonesty: Academic honesty is fundamental to the activities and principles of a university. All members of the academic community must be confident that each person's work has been responsibly and honorably acquired, developed, and presented. Any effort to gain an advantage not given to all students is dishonest whether or not the effort is successful. The academic community regards academic dishonesty as an extremely serious matter, with serious consequences that range from

probation to expulsion. When in doubt about plagiarism, paraphrasing, quoting, or collaboration, consult the course instructor.

Responsibilities of the Student:

1. Secure employment of a suitable nature to meet the requirements of this course.
2. Explain to the employer the need for a learning experience that meets the course requirements.
3. Document and show verification of hours worked.
4. Provide a feedback form to your immediate supervisor.
5. Provide the name of the internship company to the faculty internship coordinator by the end of the second week of the semester.

Completion of the course is denoted by:

1. Completion of the minimum number of work hours required for credit level.
2. Submission of an appropriate written report.
3. Receipt of supervisor(s) evaluation.
4. Completion of a self-evaluation form.
5. Check the due date at the bottom of this page.

Work experience hours and written report requirements:

	Work experience hours	Paper length
1 credit hour	400 hours	5 pages
3 credit hours	400 hours	10 pages

For credit other than 1 or 3 hours, see the internship coordinator.

Written Report

See the documents entitled internship paper for exact contents of written reports.

Grading

Each report will be assigned a letter grade after evaluation by the internship coordinator. The report is due the Friday before finals week begins. A penalty of 1/3 grade per day (including weekends) will apply for all late submissions. A one letter grade penalty will apply for not notifying the instructor of the name of your internship company.

Questionnaire for Study

Part I:

Please answer the following questions based on your experience with the company you completed your internship:

(Please circle one)

Use the following Scale for the next 15 questions.

1 Disagree;2 Slightly Disagree;3 Neither Agree Nor Disagree;

4 Slightly Agree;5 Agree

1. I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this organization to succeed	1	2	3	4	5
2. I tell my friends that this is a great organization to work for	1	2	3	4	5
3. I feel very little loyalty to this organization	1	2	3	4	5
4. I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this organization	1	2	3	4	5
5. I find that my values and the organization's values are very similar	1	2	3	4	5
6. I am proud to tell others that I am part of this organization	1	2	3	4	5
7. I could just as well be working for different organization as long as the type of work were similar	1	2	3	4	5
8. This organization really inspires the best in me in the way of job performance	1	2	3	4	5
9. It would take very little change in my present circumstances to cause me to leave this organization	1	2	3	4	5
10. I am extremely glad I chose this organization to work for over others I was considering at the time I joined	1	2	3	4	5
11. There's not much to be gained by sticking with this organization indefinitely	1	2	3	4	5
12. Often, I find it difficult to agree with this organization's policies on important matters relating to its employees	1	2	3	4	5
13. I really care about the fate of this organization	1	2	3	4	5
14. For me, this is the best of all organizations for which to work	1	2	3	4	5
15. Deciding to work for this organization was a definite mistake on my part	1	2	3	4	5

Part II:

1. Was your internship a paid internship? (Circle one) Yes No

2. What area of hospitality is/was your internship focused in?

Food & Beverage Lodging Event Planning

Other (Please List) _____

3. For how many years have you worked in the hospitality industry? _____
4. Did you previously work for the company before you started your internship? (Circle one)
Yes No
5. What is your age? _____
6. What is your gender? (Circle one) Female Male
7. If offered a full time job with this company, would you take it?(Circle one) Yes No

REFERENCES

- Allen, N., & Meyer, J. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63(1-18).
- Antun, J.M. (2001) Internships develop valuable employees. *AAHOA Hospitality*, 6(9), 65-67.
- Armstrong-Stassen, M., & Templer, A. (2005). Adapting Training for Older Employees: The Canadian Response to an Aging Workforce. *The Journal of Management Development*, 24(1/2), 57-67. Retrieved May 14, 2009, from ABI/INFORM Global database.
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L., Razaveih, A., & Sorensen C. (2006). *Introduction to Research in Education*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thompson Learning.
- Batemen, T. S., & Strasser, S. (1984). A longitudinal analysis of the antecedents of organizational commitment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 27(1), 95-112.
- Beggs, B., Ross, C. M., & Goodwin, B. (2008). A comparison of student and practitioner perspectives of the and tourism internship. *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport, and Tourism Education*, 7(1), 31-39.
- Berta, D. (2004, October). Operators Look to Older Workers to Swell Ranks. *Nation's Restaurant News*, 38(41), 4,16. Retrieved May 14, 2009, from ABI/INFORM Global database.
- Berta, D. (2007, July). Mayfield: Offering Health Insurance also Covers Employers. *Nation's Restaurant News*, 41(30), 14. Retrieved May 14, 2009, from ABI/INFORM Global database.
- Berta, D. (2008, April). Quick-service Operators Cut High Turnover with Automated Screening of Hourly Job Applicants. *Nation's Restaurant News*, 42(15), 20,78. Retrieved May 14, 2009, from ABI/INFORM Global database.

- Borstorff, P., & Marker, M. (2007, June). Turnover Drivers and Retention Factors. *Management Review: An International*, 2(1), Retrieved May 11, 2009, from [http://www.kinforms.org/index.files/MRIJ-2\(1\)2007\(14-27\).pdf](http://www.kinforms.org/index.files/MRIJ-2(1)2007(14-27).pdf).
- Buchanan, B. (1974). Building organizational commitment: The socialization of managers in work organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 19(4), 533-546.
- Busby, G. (2003) Tourism degree internships: a longitudinal study. *Journal of Vocational Education and Training* , 55(3), 319-334.
- Carbery, R., & Garavan, T. (2003). Predicting Hotel Managers' Turnover Cognitions. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 18(7/8), 649-679. Retrieved October 12, 2008, from ABI/INFORM Global database.
- Carson, L., & Fisher, K. (2006). Raising the bar on criticality: students' critical reflection in an internship program. *Journal of Management Education*, 30(5), 700-723.
- Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development (CIPD) (2008, August). Employee Turnover and Retention. Retrieved May 13, 2009, from <http://www.cipd.co.uk/subjects/hrpract/turnover/empturnretent.htm>
- Chi, C. G., & Gursoy, D. (2009). How to help your graduates secure better jobs? An industry perspective. *School of Hospitality Business Management*, 21(3), 308-322.
- Clark, G., & Whitelegg, J. (1998). Maximising the benefits from work-based learning: The effectiveness of environmental audits. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 22(3), 325-334.
- Clark, S. C. (2003). Enhancing the educational value of business internships. *Journal of Management Education*, 27(4), 472-484.
- Commeiras, N., & Fournier, C. (2001). Critical evaluation of porter et al.'s organizational commitment questionnaire: implication for researchers. *The Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, 21(3), 239-245.
- Denscombe, M. (2009). Item non-response rates; a comparison of online and paper questionnaires. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 12(4), 281-291.
- Dokki, G., Wilk, S., & Rothbard, N. (2009). Unpacking Prior Experience: How Career History Affects Job Performance. *Organization Science*, 20(1), 51-68.

- Elkins, T. J. (2002). Academic internships with the equal employment opportunity commission: an experiential approach to teaching human resource management. *Advanced Management Journal*, 67(3), 40-47.
- Frumkin, P. (2008, September). Telling Employees Exactly How Much You Invest in them can Increase Retention, Pick Up Morale. *Nation's Restaurant News*, 42(37), 37. Retrieved May 14, 2009, from ABI/INFORM Global database.
- Hobson, P., & Jenkins, J. M. (2009). University-industry cooperation in action: a case study of the integrated internship program (iip) in taiwan. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Education*, 21(1), 4-16.
- Kay, C. (2003). A survey of lodging executives' views on internship programs and cooperatives. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Education*, 15(1), 24-29.
- Kuruüzüm, A., Cetin, E., & Irmak, S. (2009). Path analysis of organizational commitment, job involvement and job satisfaction in turkish hospitality industry. *Tourism Review of AIAEST: International Association of Scientific Experts in Tourism*, 64(1), 4-16.
- Lam, T., & Zhang, H. Q. (2003). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment in the Hong Kong fast food Industry. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 15(4), 214-220.
- Lee, S. M. (1971). An empirical analysis of organizational identification. *Academy of Management Journal*, 14(2), 213-226.
- Lewicki, R. J. (1981). Organizational seduction: building commitment to organizations. *Organizational Dynamics*, 10(2), 5-21.
- Madlock, P. E., & Horan, S. M. (2009). Predicted outcome value of organizational commitment. *Communication Research Reports*, 26(1), 40-49.
- Mihail, D. M. (2006). Internships at greek universities: an exploratory study. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 18(12), 28-41.
- Milman, A (2002, January). Hourly Employee Retention in the Attraction Industry: Research from Small and Medium-sized Facilities in Orlando, Florida. *Journal of Leisure Property*, 2(1), 40-51. . Retrieved October 10, 2008, from ABI/INFORM Global database.
- Petrillose, M. J., & Montgomery, R. (1998). An exploratory study of internship practices in hospitality education and industry's perception of the importance of internships in hospitality curriculum. *The Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Education*, 9(4), 46-51.

- Porter, L., Steers, R., Mowday, R., & Boulian, P. (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59(5), 603 - 609.
- Price, J. L. (1977). *The study of turnover*. Ames, IA: Iowa State University Press. (97).
- Ross, C.M., Beggs, B.A., and Young, S.J. (2006) *Mastering the job search process in recreation and leisure services*. Boston: MA: Jones and Bartlett Publishers.
- Rothman, M. (2007). Lessons learned: advice to employers from interns. *Journal of Education for Business*, 82(3), 140-144.
- Van-Hoof, H. B. (2000). The international internship as part of hospitality management curriculum: combining work experience with international exposure. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Education*, 12(1), 6-9.
- Waldman, D., & Arora, S. (2004). Measuring Retention Rather Than Turnover: A Different and Complementary HR Calculus. *Human Resource Planning*, 27, 2004 Retrieved May 12, 2009, from <http://74.125.95.132/search?q=cache:d8JgJo4TpYIJ:www.peopleinaid.org/pool/files/publications/turnover-and-retention-lit-review-jan-2006.pdf+difference+turnover+retention&cd=2&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=us>
- Walsh, K., & Taylor, M.S. (2007). Developing In-House Careers and Retaining Management Talent: What Hospitality Professionals Want from Their Jobs. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 48(2), 163-182. Retrieved October 4, 2008, from ABI/INFORM Global database.
- Wildes, V. J., & Mount, D. J. (1998). Effect of structure on hospitality on hospitality internship programs. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Education*, 9(4), 43-45.
- Winkler, I. (2008). Students as non-standard employees. exploring work related issues in students' perceptions on their term-time job. *Management Revue*, 19(3), 179-199.
- Woods, R., & Macaulay, J. (1989, May) Rx for Turnover: Retention Programs that Work. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 30(1), 78-90. Retrieved October 25, 2008, from ABI/INFORM Global database.
- Workforce Planning for Wisconsin State Government. (2005). *Employee Retention*. Retrieved October 27, 2005, from <http://workforceplanning.wi.gov/category.asp?linkcatid=15&linkid=18>

- Yang, J. (2008). Effect of newcomer socialisation on organisational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover intention in the hotel industry. *The Service Industries Journal*, 28(5), 429-443.
- University of Missouri. (2007). Internships & other work experiences. Retrieved 9/1/2010, 2010, from <http://business.missouri.edu/1722/default.aspx>
- US Department of Labor Statistics, (2006). US Department of Labor Statistics, 2006. *Occupational Outlook Handbook*, 2005–06 edition. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office
- US Department of Labor Statistics, (2008). US Department of Labor Statistics, 2008. *Occupational Outlook Handbook*, 2008–09 edition. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- US Department of Labor Statistics, (2010). US Department of Labor Statistics, 2010. *Occupational Outlook Handbook*, 2009–10 edition. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.