Study on the Job Satisfaction of Hotel Interns from a Two-factor Perspective -- A Case Study of JW Marriott

Jun Qing Cai[1], An-Shin Shia[2*]

[1]*Student, School of Business, Lingnan Normal University, Zhanjiang524048, Guangdong, China;*
[2*]*AssociateProfessor, School ofBusiness, Lingnan Normal University, Zhanjiang524048, Guangdong, China.*

ABSTRACT: *The hotel industry is facing recruitment difficulties and a shortage of workers. Interns are the most important human resources of hotels. Job satisfaction affects not only the work attitude and performance of interns, but also their loyalty to the hotel and employment choice. Based on the two-factor theories, this paper takes the interns of JW Marriottas the research objects, and conducts a quantitative analysis of job satisfaction through questionnaire survey, and draws the following conclusions :(1) the overall job satisfaction level of hotel interns is not high, which is at a relatively low level. (2) Among all dimensions of job satisfaction level, the highest mean is interpersonal relationship, and the lowest is salary. (3) There is a significant positive correlation between each dimension of job satisfaction level and overall job satisfaction. (4) There is no significant difference on the overall job satisfaction of interns from different backgrounds. In addition, the author analyzes two important unsatisfactory aspects focusing on motivator and hygiene factors through interviews, and comes up with necessary countermeasures.*

Keywords: *Two-factor theory; Hotel interns; Job satisfaction*

INTRODUCTION

At the "2019 Hotel Review Talent Development Forum" hosted by Zhongrui Hotel Management School, dean Dr. Gao Songtao pointed out that the hotel industry was once a "stable and decent" industry, but now it is facing a "recruitment difficulty and labor shortage". The shortage of talents is a stumbling block to the sustainable development of the hotel industry. It is critical to train talents directly and prevent their outflow.

In recent years, a large number of hotels choose to recruit college interns to alleviate the problem of labor shortage through school-enterprise cooperation. Shi Yijie, director of human resources of Hyatt Group, pointed out that interns are an important human resource to alleviate the shortage of hotel talents in finding a worthy successor. More than half of the high-star hotels in China have cooperated with schools and interns account for 30% of the employees.

JW Marriott SHENZHEN BAO AN hotel(JW) is located in the heart of Baoan District, a first-tier city in Shenzhen, China. Since its opening in 2015, the average occupancy rate has reached 67.19%, which has been widely praised inside and outside the industry. General Manager Nicolas Tse said at the annual meeting: In 2021, JW exceeded the target set by the group and the owner and became the first Marriott hotel bonus in Southeast Asia, which increased a lot compared to last year. The staff bonus in 2020 is 4.5 months 'salary, and the hotel's operating income is very considerable. Still, JW is facing a serious employee turnover problem. In practice, the hotel takes interns as a way to alleviate the shortage of personnel through school-enterprise cooperation. The intern group is the reservoir of hotel talents. In order to emerge from the dilemma of "difficult recruitment and labor shortage", the hotel must pay attention to the intern group and retain the most valuable talent resources.

The purpose of this study is tantamount to explore the factors and reasons for the dissatisfaction, and put forward corresponding countermeasures to help hotels improve the management of interns. It serves as a reference for future research on intern job satisfaction. On the one hand, it helps hotel managers to adopt effective measures to retain intern talents in time. On the other hand, it mobilizes the enthusiasm of interns, enhances the internal cohesion of employees, and provides other service enterprises for reference.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Two-factor theory was put forward in 1959. In the enterprise, there are factors of satisfaction and dissatisfaction. The satisfaction factor makes people feel satisfied and motivated; dissatisfaction factors lead to opinions and negative behaviors. The two are called motivator factor and hygiene factor respectively, and deeply affect employee performance(Herzberg, 1959). Domestic and foreign scholars have applied it in various organizational management practices, and generally believe that it is suitable for explaining job satisfaction.

Job satisfaction: Job satisfaction refers to the employee's satisfaction with the working environment from both psychological and physical aspects (Hoppock,1935). It can be divided into three categories: study the influencing factors of job satisfaction and the moderating variables; the outcome variables and subsequent effects were studied. Employees' satisfaction with the hotel's job promotion system is not high, so it is necessary to establish systematic incentive countermeasures for the talent promotion system (Jin &Huang,2017). However, the lack of salary, accommodation, training and fairness in the hotel industry has always been a defect in the management of hotel employees (Dong,2013). Hotel interns have the lowest satisfaction with the work intensity, work remuneration and work content (Cheng., Chen., & Liu, 2019). While employees' proactive personality can have a direct positive impact on the internship performance (Yin Jing 2020). When resolving human resource conflicts in the hotel industry, the huge salary gap leads to psychological imbalance among front-line service employees and low satisfaction with salary (Li,2014). The satisfaction of hotel employees who are not regular workers is greatly impacted by factors such as work pressure, work psychology, and work unit recognition. Based on the spar management model, countermeasures are proposed to reform the personnel management system, restructure the salary hierarchy, strengthen incentive management and strengthen the job identity of non-regular employees (Wang., & Jin, 2008). The solution to employee dissatisfaction lies in improving communication and providing competitive remuneration to employees (Emmanuel & Mildred, 2016). Enhancing the response ability of front-line employees to emergencies can improve the work performance and satisfaction. In human resource management, authorization can benefit both employees and the hotel(Gayani., Peter., & Gordon, 2019).To sum up, the research on the job satisfaction of hotel employees focuses on the regular employees, and a small amount of literature studies the intern group. So the research on the job satisfaction of hotel interns is relatively blank.

Hotel intern management: With the rapid development of the hotel industry and the common needs of college talent training, a very important group for hotels has emerged, which is usually the students participating in the internship in colleges and universities. These special employees have the dual status of students and non-regular employees of enterprises. In recent years, a large number of hotels have cooperated with colleges and universities to train talents and recruit interns from colleges and universities to solve the problem of labor shortage. However, the turnover of interns is not optimistic. A large number of studies have shown that hotel interns generally have the problems of job burnout, low satisfaction and low willingness to stay. This shows the lack of intern management in hotels. The absence of proper communication from hotel management, inadequate remuneration, and unreasonable job arrangements are the foremost reasons for the interns' discontent (Ye, 2019). Hotel interns have the highest satisfaction with interpersonal relationships, have a common idea of inadequate training of grass-roots personnel, and express an active need for labor recognition and appreciation (Xu, 2012). Pay has a profound influence on students. Other welfare benefits provided by hotels to interns are extremely limited, and some hotels are deficient in the overtime compensation (Gao.,& Wang., 2018). Interns in the restaurant, housekeeping and concierge departments reported excessive workloads; many interviewed interns said that they suffered from unfair scheduling (Zhang., Wang., &Xie, 2019). Star-rated hotels lack sufficient care and practical training for interns in intern management (Fang, 2019). Hotels pay greater attention to the use of interns than training, unreasonable pay and lack of incentives, etc(Li., Zhong., & Chen, 2018). College students under higher education have relatively mature ideas, pursue individuality and freedom, and have higher comprehensive quality. At the same time, they are frequently more selective due to the broader range of career options available. Generally speaking, college students have a heavy utilitarian tendency and pay attention to wages; career selection is strongly influenced by family education. Pay attention to the influence and status value of the industry (Hou, 2018). Hotel interns have higher overall expectations but low satisfaction with hotels, with the hotel accommodation being in a weak area and internship wages and rotation opportunities in an improvement zone (Xi., Shao., & Yang, 2022). Internship salary is the main factor affecting internship satisfaction, and the evaluation of internship satisfaction in first-line departments is generally lower than that in second-line departments(Hou., Li.,& Li, 2023).

To sum up, due to the particularity of intern status, interns not only pursue the basic material of work, but also show the active demand for job rotation, knowledge and skills learning. Hotel intern management should consider the characteristics of students and work psychology of interns, so as to attain the purpose of stimulating work enthusiasm and improving satisfaction.

METHODOLOGY
3.1Research Subjects
This study takes JW, where the author works, as the research object, and makes a questionnaire prediction for 25 interns. Twenty three questionnaires were recovered, 3 of which were invalid, and 20 were valid, with a recovery rate of 92% and a usable rate of 87%. The pre-investigation study revealed that the reliability of the questionnaire was good; the standardized Cronbach α coefficient was 0.968; the validity value was up to standard and the KMO value was 0.781. According to the

analysis results, 72 copies were sent out to 100 interns by means of intentional sampling. There were 68 valid questionnaires and 95% of the questionnaire was adequately evaluated for analysis.

3.2 Research Instruments

Questionnaire survey method: The questionnaire of this study is mainly based on the questionnaire of Mingsunida's job satisfaction and the questionnaires of Liu Jintao (2016) and Ding Ting (2012), and is designed in combination with the current situation of hotel management. The questionnaire is divided into 14 dimensions, subdivided into 46 items, coded as follows: personal life (I) 6 questions; policy management (N), interpersonal relations (L), salary and treatment (J), social status (H), and so on; Three questions each for supervision (M), working conditions (K), safety at work (G), sense of achievement (F), appreciation (E), the job itself (D), development prospects (B) and promotion (A); Responsibility (C). The questionnaire was divided into three levels: demographic variables, job satisfaction survey and overall satisfaction survey, and was scored using 5-point Likert scale.Interview method: 8 interns were interviewed and the reasons for the dissatisfaction were analyzed in depth; interviews were conducted with 3 management personnel to understand the causes and countermeasures for interns' dissatisfaction.

3.3 Data Processing and Analysis

In this study, invalid questionnaires were removed, and then SPSS software was used to construct data files and analyze the reliability, validity, description, correlation and difference.

QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY RESULTS

4.1 Reliability and Validity Testing

Reliability can be utilized to judge whether the internal consistency of the questionnaire data is reliable. At present, alpha coefficient is the most commonly used criterion. After test, the Cronbach α value of this questionnaire is 0.982, indicating a very high reliability(See Table 1).

Table 1 Alpha Reliability Coefficient Analysis

Cronbach α	Judgement results
$\alpha>0.8$	High reliability
$0.8>\alpha>0.7$	Good reliability
$0.7>\alpha>0.6$	General reliability
$\alpha<0.6$	Poor reliability
Reliability Analysis	
Cronbach's Alpha 0.982	N of items 52

Validity analysis can be used to evaluate quantitative data, especially the rationality of scale question design. The author utilized structural validity in this test, and its evaluation criteria are shown in Table 2. After testing, the KMO value of this questionnaire was 0.806 and the p value was 0.000 (see Table 3), indicating that the validity of the research data was very good and could be used for further analysis.

Table 2 Construct Validity Analysis

KMO	Judgement results
KMO>0.8	High validity
0.8>KMO>0.7	Good validity
0.7>KMO>0.6	General validity
KMO<0.6	Poor validity
Bartlett test p value needs to be less than0.05.	

Table 3 SPSS Output Validity Scale

KMO andBartlett test		
KMO value		0.806
	Asquare	3680.157
Bartlett test	Df	1128
	P value	0.000

4.2 Sample Analysis

Among the interns surveyed, women accounted for the majority (73.53%); Junior College degree (JC) accounted for 22.06%, Undergraduate (U) accounted for 77.94%; the main working departments are the Front Office Department (FO) accounting for 51.47% and the Restaurant Department (R) accounting for 27.94, while the Housekeeping Department (HK), the Executive Office (EO) and other departments (O) have a few branches accounting for 5.88%, 4.41% and 10.29%. The major of the interns is tourism management (TM) and foreign language (FL), accounting for 67.65% and 16.18% respectively. The internship duration is mainly 3-6 months (inclusive) and 6-12 months (inclusive), accounting for 61.76% and 32.35% (See Table 4).

Table 4Interns Basic Information Overview

	Items	Sample	%
Gender	Male (M)	18	26.47
	Female(F)	50	73.53
	Technical Secondary School Or Higher Vocational College (TH)	0	0
Education	Junior College(JC)	15	22.06
	Undergraduate(U)	53	77.94
	Other(O)	0	0
	Front Office Department(FO)	35	51.47
	Food & Beverage Department(FB)	19	27.94
Department	Housekeeping Department(HK)	4	5.88
	Executive Office(EO)	3	4.41
	Other(O)	7	10.29
	Tourism Management (TM)	46	67.65
	Foreign Languages(FL)	11	16.18
Major	Restaurant&Food & Beverage(R)	4	5.88
	Business Administration(BA)	5	7.35
	Other(O)	2	2.94
	1-3months	4	5.88
	3-6months	42	61.76
Internship	6-12months	22	32.35
	Over a year	0	0
Total (TT)		68	100

4.3 Job Satisfaction Empirical Analysis

4.3.1 Descriptive Analysis

Overall situation: according to the statistical results, the average score of the overall job satisfaction of the hotel interns is 3.353, which is slightly higher than the general score of 3 and lower than the relatively satisfied score of 4, indicating that the overall job satisfaction of the interns is at a relatively low level. At the same time, the standard deviation of scores in each dimension is less than 1, indicating a high degree of sample consistency(See Table 5).

Satisfaction of each dimension: the average value of dimension L is 3.809, which is the highest and close to 4 points of relative satisfaction. In the order of (K), (C), (N), (M), (B), (E), (G), (F), (D), (A), (I), (H), the average value of J is 3.026, which is the lowest and close to the general level. The mean value of each dimension is above 3.0 and below 4.0, indicating that interns' overall job satisfaction level is relatively mediocre.

Comparison of satisfaction and dissatisfaction in each dimension: the analysis results showed that (K) and (L) had the highest percentage of satisfaction, both of which were 85.37%; the two dimensions (J) and (H) had the highest percentage of dissatisfied people, 31.37% and 29.27%, respectively.

Table 5 Job Satisfaction Status of Hotel Interns

Dimension	Min	Max	Average	Standard Deviation	Median	Dissatisfaction	Satisfaction	Rank
(A)	1.333	5	3.221	0.673	3	19.51	60.98	11
(B)	1	5	3.387	0.832	3.167	17.07	65.85	6
(C)	1	5	3.588	0.777	4	4.88	70.73	3
(D)	1	5	3.255	0.747	3.333	21.95	70.73	10

(E)	1	5	3.373	0.799	3.333	16.43	68.29	7
(F)	1.333	5	3.299	0.74	3	24.39	63.41	9
(G)	1	5	3.368	0.677	3.333	14.63	70.73	8
(H)	1	5	3.121	0.708	3	29.27	58.54	13
(I)	1.333	4.833	3.201	0.675	3.167	24.39	65.85	12
(J)	1	5	3.026	0.795	3	31.37	58.54	14
(K)	2	5	3.647	0.633	3.667	4.88	85.37	2
(L)	2.25	5	3.809	0.72	3.75	4.88	85.37	1
(M)	1.667	5	3.48	0.692	3.5	12.2	65.85	5
(N)	1	5	3.526	0.661	3.625	9.76	75.61	4
TTSF	1	5	3.353	0.787	3	21.95	78.05	
PS:Overall Job Satisfaction ; TTSF								

4.3.2 Correlation Analysis

The Pearson correlation coefficient of (K) is 0.380, which is generally correlated with the overall job satisfaction. The Pearso(N) correlation coefficients of the remaining dimensions are above 0.4, indicating a close relationship. The level of significance is 0.01, which is significantly positively correlated with the overall job satisfaction. On the satisfaction, between the different dimensions and the overall Pearso (N) relevance ranking from high to low in turn for: (A), (B), (C), (E), (D), (M), (H), (N), (J), (F), (G), (I), (L) and (K)(See Table 6).

Table 6Correlation Analysis between Job Satisfaction

	Pearso(N) correlation coefficient		
(A)		0.802**	0
(B)		0.728**	0
(C)		0.676**	0
(D)		0.607**	0
(E)		0.608**	0
(F)		0.537**	0
(G)	Correlation coefficient	0.509**	0
(H)		0.593**	P value 0
(I)		0.487**	0
(J)		0.537**	0
(K)		0.380**	0.001
(L)		0.457**	0
(M)		0.596**	0
(N)		0.541**	0
* p<0.05 ** p<0.01			

4.3.3 Difference Analysis

The difference analysis of gender on the satisfaction of each dimension of the two factors: Through the one - sample t - test, the gender difference showed a significant effect on three items (I),(G) and (L) (p>0.05), which means that men'ssatisfaction with (G), (I), (L) is higher than that of women. There were no significant differences in overall job satisfaction and other dimensions between gender samples (p> 0.05) (See Table 7).

Table 7 The Difference Analysis of Gender Satisfaction

Dimension	Gender	Sample Size	Average	Standard Deviation	p	Dimension	Average	Standard Deviation	p
(A)	M	18	2.39	0.61	0.344	(H)	2.17	0.79	0.6
	F	50	2.2	0.76			2.04	0.9	

Study on the Job Satisfaction of Hotel Interns from a Two-factor Perspective -- A Case Study of JW Marriott

Dimension		Sample Size	Average	Standard Deviation	p	Dimension	Average	Standard Deviation	p
(B)	M	18	2.28	0.83	0.92	(I)	2.67	0.69	0.015*
	F	50	2.3	0.79			2.14	0.93	
(C)	M	18	2.5	0.51	0.898	(J)	2.33	0.84	0.164
	F	50	2.48	0.58			1.98	0.94	
(D)	M	18	2.44	0.78	0.363	(K)	2.83	0.51	0.297
	F	50	2.24	0.82			2.66	0.63	
(E)	M	18	2.44	0.7	0.617	(L)	2.94	0.24	0.026*
	F	50	2.34	0.77			2.72	0.57	
(F)	M	18	2.39	0.78	0.354	(M)	2.61	0.5	0.407
	F	50	2.18	0.83			2.46	0.71	
(G)	M	18	2.72	0.46	0.046*	(N)	2.78	0.43	0.065
	F	50	2.4	0.81			2.5	0.76	
TTSF	M	18	2.5	0.51			Male(M)		
	F	50	2.28	0.76	0.259		Female(F)		

The difference analysis of education on the satisfaction of each dimension of the two factors: using one-way ANOVA, the different degree for the whole job satisfaction, (A), (B), (C), (D), (E), (F), (G), (H), (I), (J), (K), (L), (M) and (N) did not show significant (p> 0.05). That is to say, samples of different educational backgrounds show no significant differences in these aspects(See Table 8).

Table 8 The Difference Analysis of Degree Satisfaction

Dimension	Education	Sample Size	Average	Standard Deviation	p	Dimension	Average	Standard Deviation	p姆
(A)	JC	15	2.2	0.68	0.763	(H)	2	0.93	0.714
	U	53	2.26	0.74			2.09	0.86	
(B)	JC	15	2.13	0.64	0.378	(I)	2.33	0.98	0.794
	U	53	2.34	0.83			2.26	0.88	
(C)	JC	15	2.4	0.51	0.508	(J)	2.07	0.96	0.974
	U	53	2.51	0.58			2.08	0.92	
(D)	JC	15	2.07	0.8	0.221	(K)	2.87	0.52	0.243
	U	53	2.36	0.81			2.66	0.62	
(E)	JC	15	2.2	0.77	0.331	(L)	2.93	0.26	0.191
	U	53	2.42	0.75			2.74	0.56	
(F)	JC	15	2.13	0.74	0.586	(M)	2.6	0.51	0.509
	U	53	2.26	0.84			2.47	0.7	
(G)	JC	15	2.47	0.74	0.913	(N)	2.73	0.59	0.319
	U	53	2.49	0.75			2.53	0.72	
TTSF	JC	15	2.27	0.7	0.659		Junior College(JC)		
	U	53	2.36	0.71			Undergraduate(U)		

The difference analysis of departments on the satisfaction of each dimension of the two factors: using one-way ANOVA, it was found that different departments showed 0.05 levels of significance for (H), specifically for administrative Office (EO)>Food & Beverage Department (FB), Other (O)>Food and Beverage Department (FB). There was no significant difference among the departments for other satisfaction (p> 0.05) (See Table 9).

Table 9 The Difference Analysis of Department Satisfaction

Dimension	Department	Sample size	Average	Standard Deviation	P姆	Dimension	Average	Standard Deviation	P姆
(A)	FO	35	2.37	0.69	0.253	(H)	2.14	0.88	0.031*
	FB	19	1.95	0.71			1.68	0.82	
	HK	4	2.25	0.96			1.75	0.5	

Dimension	Major	Sample Size	Average	Standard Deviation	p	Dimension	Average	Standard Deviation	p
	EO	3	2.67	0.58			3	0	
	O	7	2.29	0.76			2.57	0.79	
	FO	35	2.37	0.81			2.34	0.87	
	FB	19	2.11	0.74			2.05	0.97	
(B)	HK	4	2	0.82	0.369	(I)	2	1.15	0.425
	EO	3	3	0			3	0	
	O	7	2.29	0.95			2.43	0.79	
	FO	35	2.51	0.56			2.34	0.87	
	FB	19	2.37	0.5			1.68	0.89	
(C)	HK	4	2.25	0.96	0.55	(J)	1.75	0.96	0.106
	EO	3	2.67	0.58			2.33	1.15	
	O	7	2.71	0.49			1.86	0.9	
	FO	35	2.49	0.7			2.8	0.47	
	FB	19	2.05	0.85			2.63	0.68	
(D)	HK	4	1.75	0.96	0.247	(K)	2.25	0.96	0.344
	EO	3	2.33	1.15			3	0	
	O	7	2.29	0.95			2.57	0.79	
	FO	35	2.49	0.7			2.77	0.55	
	FB	19	2.21	0.79			2.89	0.32	
(E)	HK	4	1.75	0.96	0.3	(L)	2.5	1	0.436
	EO	3	2.67	0.58			3	0	
	O	7	2.43	0.79			2.57	0.53	
	FO	35	2.29	0.83			2.66	0.59	
	FB	19	1.95	0.78			2.26	0.73	
(F)	HK	4	2	0.82	0.15	(M)	2	0.82	0.067
	EO	3	3	0			3	0	
	O	7	2.57	0.79			2.43	0.53	
	FO	35	2.49	0.74			2.66	0.64	
	FB	19	2.32	0.82			2.53	0.7	
(G)	HK	4	2.5	0.58	0.553	(N)	2.5	1	0.359
	EO	3	3	0			3	0	
	O	7	2.71	0.76			2.14	0.9	
	FO	35	2.37	0.65		Front Office Department(FO)			
	FB	19	2.11	0.81		Food & Beverage Department(FB)			
TTSF	HK	4	2.25	0.96	0.229	Housekeeping Department(HK)			
	EO	3	3	0		Executive Office(EO)			
	O	7	2.57	0.53		Other(O)			

The difference analysis of majors on the satisfaction of each dimension of the two factors: using one-way ANOVA, professional differences of (A) (A), (B), (C), (D), (E), (F), (G), (H), (I), (J), (K), (L), (M), (N) and the overall job satisfaction do not show the significant (p>0.05), there was no difference in consistency(See Table 10).

Table 10 The Difference Analysis of Majors Satisfaction

Dimension	Major	Sample Size	Average	Standard Deviation	p	Dimension	Average	Standard Deviation	p
	TM	46	2.3	0.7			2.09	0.84	
	FL	11	1.91	0.83			1.91	0.94	
(A)	R	4	2	0.82	0.172	(H)	1.25	0.5	0.083
	BA	5	2.8	0.45			2.6	0.89	
	O	2	2	0			3	0	
(B)	TM	46	2.37	0.77	0.325	(I)	2.33	0.87	0.776

Dimension		Sample Size	Average	Std Dev	p	Dimension	Average	Std Dev	p
	FL	11	2	0.77			2.09	1.04	
	R	4	1.75	0.96			2	1.15	
	BA	5	2.6	0.89			2.6	0.89	
	O	2	2.5	0.71			2	0	
	TM	46	2.52	0.59			2.13	0.93	
	FL	11	2.27	0.47			1.91	0.94	
(C)	R	4	2.25	0.5	0.362	(J)	1.75	0.96	0.896
	BA	5	2.6	0.55			2.2	1.1	
	O	2	3	0			2	0	
	TM	46	2.39	0.77			2.7	0.63	
	FL	11	1.82	0.75			2.73	0.47	
(D)	R	4	2.5	1	0.302	(K)	3	0	0.856
	BA	5	2.2	1.1			2.6	0.89	
	O	2	2.5	0.71			2.5	0.71	
	TM	46	2.37	0.77			2.76	0.57	
	FL	11	2.09	0.83			2.91	0.3	
(E)	R	4	2.75	0.5	0.558	(L)	3	0	0.191
	BA	5	2.6	0.55			2.8	0.45	
	O	2	2.5	0.71			2	0	
	TM	46	2.26	0.8			2.48	0.69	
	FL	11	1.91	0.83			2.36	0.67	
(F)	R	4	1.75	0.96	0.111	(M)	3	0	0.288
	BA	5	2.8	0.45			2.8	0.45	
	O	2	3	0			2	0	
	TM	46	2.5	0.72			2.57	0.69	
	FL	11	2.18	0.87			2.64	0.67	
(G)	R	4	2.75	0.5	0.498	(N)	3	0	0.175
	BA	5	2.6	0.89			2.6	0.89	
	O	2	3	0			1.5	0.71	
	TM	46	2.39	0.68		Tourism Management (TM)			
	FL	11	1.91	0.83		Foreign Languages(FL)			
TTSF	R	4	2.25	0.5		Restaurant Food & Beverage(R)			
	BA	5	2.8	0.45		Business Administration(BA)			
	O	2	2.5	0.71	0.152	Other(O)			

* p<0.05 ** p<0.01

The difference analysis of internship on the satisfaction of each dimension of the two factors: using one-way ANOVA, the difference of internship for (A), (B), (C), (D), (E), (F), (G), (H), (I), (J), (K), (L), (M), (N) and the overall job satisfaction (TTSF) are not shown significant (p>0.05), there was no difference in consistency(See Table 11).

Table 11 The Difference Analysis of Internship Satisfaction

Dimension	Internship/ Month	Sample Size	Average	Standard Deviation	p姆	Dimension	Average	Standard Deviation	p
	1-3	4	2	0.82			2.5	0.58	
(A)	3-6	42	2.12	0.71	0.059	(I)	2.21	0.95	0.725
	6-12	22	2.55	0.67			2.36	0.85	
	1-3	4	2.25	0.96			2	0.82	
(B)	3-6	42	2.19	0.83	0.336	(J)	1.95	0.96	0.319
	6-12	22	2.5	0.67			2.32	0.84	
	1-3	4	2.75	0.5			2.75	0.5	
(C)	3-6	42	2.4	0.54	0.284	(K)	2.64	0.66	0.541
	6-12	22	2.59	0.59			2.82	0.5	

Label	Range	N	Mean	SD	P	Label	Mean	SD	P
	1-3	4	2.25	0.96			2.5	0.58	
(D)	3-6	42	2.24	0.82	0.727	(L)	2.79	0.52	0.525
	6-12	22	2.41	0.8			2.82	0.5	
	1-3	4	2.25	0.96			2.25	0.5	
(E)	3-6	42	2.33	0.79	0.792	(M)	2.48	0.67	0.598
	6-12	22	2.45	0.67			2.59	0.67	
	1-3	4	3	0			2	0.82	
(F)	3-6	42	2.1	0.79	0.067	(N)	2.57	0.7	0.201
	6-12	22	2.36	0.85			2.68	0.65	
	1-3	4	3	0			2.5	0.58	
(G)	3-6	42	2.38	0.76	0.205	(O)	2.26	0.7	0.528
	6-12	22	2.59	0.73			2.45	0.74	
	1-3	4	2.75	0.5					
(H)	3-6	42	1.93	0.89	0.117				
	6-12	22	2.23	0.81					
	1-3	4	2.5	0.58					
TTSF	3-6	42	2.26	0.7	0.528				
	6-12	22	2.45	0.74					

4.4 Research Results

As shown in Table5, the average value of interns' overall job satisfaction is 3.353, which is relatively low, indicating that there is no discernible attitude deviation of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with hotel internship satisfaction, and the overall satisfaction is not high.

The dimensions' satisfaction in order are listed below: (L), (K), (C), (N), (M), (B), (E), (G), (F), (D), (A), (I), (H) and (J). Among them, (L) has the highest average satisfaction (3.809), and (J) has the lowest average satisfaction (3.026). This indicates that interns are most satisfied with (L) and are full of expectations for team work; at the same time,(J) is the least satisfied dimension. They believe that the work is underpaid and does not match the labor effort. In the dimensions of job satisfaction, the number of satisfied people is greater than the number of dissatisfied people. Among them, the difference in the number of satisfied and dissatisfied samples in the two dimensions (K) and (L) is the largest, indicating that the research subjects have the largest difference in the degree of satisfaction and dissatisfaction with (K) and (L).

As shown in Table 6, except for the general positive correlation between (K) and overall job satisfaction, the other dimensions are significantly positively correlated with overall job satisfaction. The influence of the overall job satisfaction correlation dimension descending order for (A), (B), (C), (E), (D), (M), (H), (N), (J), (F), (G), (I), (L) and (K), suggesting that (A) is the most important factor to affect interns satisfaction.

As shown in Table 7, the significance P-values of (G), (I) and (L) for different genders were all lower than the significance level 0.05, indicating that male students had higher satisfaction with (G), (I) and (L) than female students. It shows that women are more sensitive and demanding than men in (G), (I) and (L).

As shown in Table 8, different educational backgrounds do not show significant differences in all dimensions of job satisfaction and overall job satisfaction (p>0.05). There is no significant difference in the score of job satisfaction in all dimensions and overall job satisfaction between interns with college and undergraduate degrees. This is not consistent with the conclusions of some previous scholars.

As shown in Table 9, there are significant differences in (H) among different departments. The satisfaction scores of the interns in the Administration Office, other departments and the front Office were much higher than the 1.68 in the Food and Beverage department and the 1.75 in the housekeeping department. This indicates that interns in the second-line department and the front office department have relatively high job satisfaction and happiness, while interns in the catering department and the housekeeping department are prone to dissatisfaction due to high work intensity and long working hours, which leads to low satisfaction.

As shown in Table 10, different majors do not show significant differences in each dimension of job satisfaction and overall job satisfaction (p>0.05). Interns of tourism management, foreign language, restaurant and other majors have no significant

difference in the score selection of job satisfaction, which does not exist as a interfering variable affecting the overall job satisfaction.

As shown in Table 11, internship has no significant effect on all dimensions of job satisfaction and overall job satisfaction (p>0.05). This indicates that the length of internship does not make a difference in the job satisfaction of interns.

Problems existing in hygiene factor: according to Table 5, the average of job satisfaction in the eight dimensions of motivator factor is between 3 points general and 4 points satisfactory, which is in a low degree of satisfaction. (J), (I) and (H) are lower than overall job satisfaction. (J) had the lowest satisfaction with an average score of 3.026, followed by (I) and (H) with average satisfaction of 3.201 and 3.121, respectively. The problem with the health factor is that hotel interns are less satisfied with (J), (I) and (H).

Problems with motivator factor: according to Table 5, the average satisfaction of the six dimensions of hygiene factor is between 3 points general and 4 points relatively satisfactory, with low satisfaction. The average satisfaction of three dimensions (A), (D) and (F) was 3.221, 3.255 and 3.299, respectively, which was lower than the overall job satisfaction. The problem with motivators is that hotel interns are less satisfied with (A), (D) and (F).

CAUSE ANALYSIS OF EXISTING PROBLEMS AND SUGGESTIONS

5.1 Cause Analysis of Existing Problems
The author invited eight hotel interns to conduct interviews (see Appendix C). The internship team consists of 8 individuals, with one being responsible for each of the following: front desk, concierge, switchboard, Western restaurant waiter and concierge; executive lounge; housekeeping; and finance receivable. It comprehensively covers the departments where the interns are distributed, which is relatively representative. Based on the interview results and work experience, this paper analyzes the existing problems.

5.1.1 Dimensions of Dissatisfaction in Hygiene Factor
Pay is low: the work place of hotel attendants is extremely luxurious, but the actual income is not high, especially the grass-roots interns. Joe from Metropolis Shangshan Restaurant said, "It's hard and tiring and the salary is low. Although it is said that hotel work includes food and accommodation, the salary of 1,800 is not enough to cover the expenses in Shenzhen." There is no way that the interns are cheap labor. They do the most work to get the least money and can not easily leave "leading to the psychological imbalance of interns, resulting in dissatisfaction.

Personal inconvenience: JW Marriott removed the staff dormitory in early 2021 due to the expiration of the contract. The new staff accommodation is located in an industrial park 50 minutes from the hotel and is not easily accessible. Jasmine from the switchboard said, "I'm mainly not happy with the staff dormitory. There are too many people in the industrial park and the environment is not good. There is no subway near the dormitory, and the nearest bus stop is a 15-minute walk away. It takes too much time." This leads to minimal satisfaction.

Low social status: there is no distinction between high and low jobs, but people's prejudices give work a higher status. The social identity of the hotel industry has never been prominent in China. Michael, the concierge, said, "My family has a bias against working in a hotel. They think it's about cleaning dishes and they don't approve of my internship." Yuki of the executive Lounge said, "Some guests make people feel very warm, and some guests look down on us, thinking that we are inferior." The hotel has not carried out a more faultless care plan for interns, resulting in inability to digest professional disapproval, resulting in dissatisfaction.

5.1.2 Dimensions of Dissatisfaction in Motivator Factor
Unreasonable promotion: Even if the intern does well in the position, they have to go back to school to further their studies, coupled with the awareness of their "cheap labor", and have a negative attitude towards promotion opportunities. The hotel lacks the management system for internal promotion of interns.

Dull work: Joe said, "I repeat the boring work in the western restaurant every day. There is nothing else I can think of. I just hope I am not too busy today." Interns do repetitive mechanical work in fixed positions for a long time, leading to dissatisfaction.

Low sense of achievement: Table 4 shows that more than 70% of hotel interns come from undergraduate colleges across the country, and about 20% of interns are junior colleges. Front-line service interns are tired of dealing with customers and have a low sense of accomplishment.

5.2 Suggestions

5.2.1 Improving Hygiene Measures Affecting Job Satisfaction

Improve the salary and welfare system: due to the transparency of the salary of employees in the hotel industry, the basic salary of interns cannot be effectively increased. The hotel may try to deduct part of the service charge from the guest as a reward for staff; The QR code tip system is implemented. Through WeChat, Ali pay and other third-party platforms, guests can directly send tips to employees' personal accounts according to their own wishes. Use service fees and tips to motivate employees, thereby increasing pay.

Improve the personal life of employees: the staff dormitory can be optimized internally, such as strengthening security and regulating the surrounding environment. In view of the inconvenient traffic situation, the number of vehicles should be appropriately increased and reasonable traffic subsidies should be given.

Emotional facilitation: due to the objective fact that the career stability and social identity of the hotel industry are not high, the psychological emotions of interns are very complicated. Hotels should pay attention to their spiritual and emotional satisfaction, strengthen communication and exchange, set up intern seminars, listen to the aspirations of interns, reasonably handle complaints, and implement staff care.

5.2.2 Improving Motivator Measures Affecting Job Satisfaction

Intern career management: 67.65% of the hotel's interns are from undergraduate and junior colleges all over the country, with more systematic professional knowledge and higher cultural quality. The hotel should develop a talent training program for interns, and set up suitable internship positions for interns, such as floor internship director and the supervisor assistant. (Zhou,2011).

Arrange suitable positions and optimize the rotation system: According to the actual situation, the hotel should allow interns with a longer internship period to rotate. In this way, the hotel can develop versatile staff. Interns can be directed to support a department when there is an urgent shortage of staff. The hotel makes a rotation plan for intern positions and the best solution is tantamount to rotate every four months. And they can adjust it according to the needs of the hotel.(Dong, 2013). Reasonable decentralization: Apple, manager of the western restaurant, said in an interview: "Decentralization should be conducted reasonably and effectively, and interns should be given more power to deal with emergencies in the work." In the case of personalized requirements, complaints, reception of VIP guests and other problems, we should give interns certain rights to assist in handling.

Constructing intern self - motivation mechanism: Highly self-motivation is effective. On the one hand, it is necessary to adhere to the ingrained education of corporate culture and customer service, so that interns can be proud of serving others. On the other hand, it is necessary to create opportunities for them to play and give them spiritual and material rewards, so as to maximize the enthusiasm and sense of achievement of interns.

CONCLUSION

Based on the two - factor theory, this paper investigates the job satisfaction problem of interns. After statistical analysis, the results show that:

(1) The overall job satisfaction of hotel interns is not high and is at a relatively low level.

(2) the mean satisfaction each dimension descending order is: (L), (K), (C), (N), (M), (B), (E), (G), (F), (D), (A), (I), (H) and (J). Among them, the two dimensions (J) and (H) have the largest number of dissatisfied people.

(3) Each dimension of satisfaction has a significant positive correlation with the overall satisfaction.

(4) Demographic variables do not affect interns' overall job satisfaction as interfering variables.

Interviews were conducted with 8 interns and 3 management personnel to deeply analyze the factors of dissatisfaction. On this basis, the improvement measures are proposed from two levels of health care and incentive factors:

(1) Improving the compensation and welfare system

(2) Improve the personal life of interns

(3) Emotional counseling

(4) Arrange suitable positions for intern career management

(5) Optimize the job rotation system and delegate power reasonably
(6) Target the target
(7) Build a self-motivation mechanism for interns

From the perspective of enterprise management, this paper studies interns as a special group, combines Herzberg's two-factor theory with relevant research on job satisfaction, conducts the questionnaire survey and empirical analysis on individual cases, and deeply analyzes the reasons behind interns' dissatisfaction through interviews and puts forward targeted countermeasures, which has strong objectivity and feasibility.

Due to the impact of the epidemic, the study was limited in personal activities, which was unable to conduct field investigations and face-to-face interviews, which greatly limited the study. In addition, due to the mobility problem of hotel interns, it is impossible to investigate more groups, and there are certain limitations in the number of survey samples.

REFERENCES

[1]   Lin, C. (2003). Great Dictionary of Psychology. Shanghai: Shanghai Education PublishingHouse,95-96.

[2]   Hoppock. (1935). Job Satisfaction．New York: Harper & Brother Publisher,9-10.

[3]   Jin, Q., &Huang, C. T. (2017). Research on Hotel Staff Incentive Mechanism -- Taking Nanjing Jinling Hotel as an Example. Journal of Huaihai Institute of Technology (Humanities and Social Sciences Edition),15, 159101-104.

[4]   Dong, Q. Y. (2013). Research on Intern Incentive Management in Qingdao Hotel H. Ocean University of China.

[5]   Cheng, Q., Chen, K. X., &Liu X. R. (2019). Study on Job Satisfaction of Hotel Interns based on School-Enterprise Cooperation and Its Influencing Factors. Theoretical Observations,160,63-65.

[6]   Yin, J. (2020). The Impact of Proactive Personality on Internship Performance and Retention Intention: Based on a Study of Tourism Management Majors in Higher Vocational Colleges. Exploration of Higher Vocational Education,77-84.

[7]   Li, Y. (2014). School of Tourism, Sichuan University. Thinking on Solving the Contradiction of Human Resources in Hotel Industry. China Tourism News,01-22.007.

[8]   Wang, S. F., &Jin, Y. Y. (2008). Study on Job Satisfaction of Non-regular Hotel Employees. Tourism Tribune,145,86-90.

[9]   Eunice Fay Amissah.,Emmanuel Gamor.,Mildred Nuong Deri., &Agnes, Amissah.(2016). Factors Influencing Employee Job Satisfaction in Ghana's Hotel Industry.Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism,15(2),166-183.

[10]   Gayani Hewagama.,Peter Boxall.,Gordon Cheung.,&Ann Hutchison.(2019). Service Recovery Through Empowerment? Hrm, Employee Performance and Job Satisfaction in Hotels.International Journal of Hospitality Management,81,73-82.

[11]   Ye, L. J. (2019). Problems and Improvement Measures in Hotel Intern Management: A Case Study of Xiamen Star Hotels. Business Economics,519,87-89.

[12]   Xu, S. (2012). Study on Vocational College Students' Satisfaction and Retention Intention in Hotel Internship. Modern Economic Information,265-266.

[13]   Gao, X., &Wang, Y. (2018). A Study on Vocational Tourism Management Students' Satisfaction and Turnover Intention. Journal of Wuxi Vocational and Technical College of Commerce,18:91,91-96.

[14]   Zhang, J., Wang, Z. K., & Xie, N. T. (2019). A Study on Job Satisfaction and Retention Intention of High-star Hotel Interns: A case Study of Hotel Interns from Guilin University of Tourism. Market Forum,178,35-38+43.

[15]   Fang, J. (2019). Research on Problems and Countermeasures of Intern Management in Star-Rated Hotels. China Management Informatization,22:392118-119.

[16]   Li, P., Zhong,J. F., & Chen, N. (2019). Analysis of Intern Management in University Tourism Management from the Perspective of Intern hotel. Travel Overview,295,65+67.

[17]   Hou, X-Y.,Yang, N., & Bai, Y. (2018). Influencing Factors and Countermeasures of Post-1995 College Students' Career Choice Intention. Foreign Economic and Trade,294,117-120.

[18]   Zhou, C. F. (2011). Analysis on the Causes of Job Burnout of Hotel Interns. Modern Commerce and Industry,23,127-128.

[19]   Xi, W.,Shao, X. Y., &Yang, C. F. (2022). IPA Analysis of Job Satisfaction of Hotel interns.Productivity Research,(6):124-129.

[20]   Hou, Y. X., Li Y. W., & Li, L. F. (2023). Study on the Impact of Internship Satisfaction on Employment Intention of Hotel Management Undergraduates from the Perspective of Integration of Industry and Education. Journal of Sichuan Tourism Institute,(4):91-95.