UNDERGRADUATE HOSPITALITY STUDENTS'
PRE-ENTRY CAREER EXPECTATIONS

by

REBECCA A. DALE

B.S., KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY, 2007

A THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Hospitality Management and Dietetics
College of Human Ecology

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

2013

Approved by:

Major Professor
Kevin R. Roberts

Copyright

REBECCA DALE

2013

Abstract

The psychological contract is comprised of the perceived obligations between two parties, such as an employee and an employer. When an individual joins an organization, the employee has a specific set of personal needs to be satisfied, which will be fulfilled by the psychological contract. Research has historically focused on the consequences of the psychological contract violations. The antecedents and the formation of the psychological contract are less known.

Two types of psychological contracts exist: transactional and relational. In past research, undergraduate students enrolled in hospitality programs have indicated that transactional contracts are most important. Research has been limited on undergraduate hospitality students and their expectations of the workplace, thus the purpose of this study was to explore undergraduate hospitality students' pre-entry career expectations.

An online survey was distributed to undergraduate hospitality students at universities in the United States. Students highly ranked a safe work environment (8.7 ± 2.5), resources (7.8 ± 3.0) and equipment (7.4 ± 3.2) to do their jobs, training (8.2 ± 2.9), and job security (7.7 ± 3.1). The least important and expected items were work schedules with limited nights and weekends (2.5 ± 4.3) and working 40 or less hours per week (2.5 ± 4.1). The number of college credit hours completed and amount of work experience had the largest effects between expectations. Results of this study will assist hospitality educators in preparing students for post-graduation employment and offer industry recruiters insight into what expectations are important to new hospitality graduates.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I thank My Lord and Savior. It is only through Him I can do all things and I thank Him for guiding me back to school to fulfill the next chapter in His plan for me.

I would like to thank my family. My dad, Jas Dale, has constantly been the little voice in my head, telling me to keep working hard. My mom, Gail Dale, has always been a sounding board to help me overcome any obstacle that lay before me. And my sister, Alicia Burns, has been my biggest cheerleader from the beginning and is the strongest woman I know.

I thank my major professor, Dr. Kevin Roberts, for his guidance and support during this process. Without his commitment and direction, my thesis would not have come to fruition. I also thank my committee members, Dr. Kevin Sauer and Dr. Rebecca Gould. If not for their detailed comments and feedback, my research would not be where it is today.

I would also like to thank many of the faculty whom I have known for years. It is because of my amazing undergraduate experience with instructors and advisors like Mr. Pat Pesci, Dr. Betsy Barrett, and Dr. Deb Canter that I wanted to return to higher education and give future students that same experience. They have taught me so much, both inside and outside the classroom. I can never thank them enough for their mentoring and leadership.

Finally, my acknowledgements would not be complete without recognizing my friends and fellow graduate students for all of their support. Dr. Kelly Whitehair, Amber Grisamore, Becky Bolte, Shengjie Fan-Swindler, Young Gin Choi, Pei Liu, Jay Lee, and YeeMing Lee have all been very influential on this journey and I will forever be in debt for their support and encouragement.

Dedication

I would like to dedicate this thesis to my grandpa, George Seaton. He had such a positive impact on his students during his time in education. He was a kind, loving, and light-hearted person with the most honorable morals and values I strive to have every day. Thank you for being such an inspiration to everyone around you.

Introduction

An employee recruited by an organization forms a set of beliefs and obligations, known as the psychological contract. The psychological contract will ultimately shape the relationship between that employee and the organization (Rousseau, 1990). Previous research has focused on the consequences when a violation of this psychological contract occurs (Bal & Smit, 2012; Coyle-Shapiro & Kessler, 2000; Kotter, 1973; Lester & Kickul, 200; Robinson & Rousseau, 1994; Rousseau, 1990), rather than the antecedents that comprise the psychological contract, specifically the pre-entry career expectations of employees. This study will add to the literature and research concerning pre-entry career expectations of undergraduate hospitality students.

The distinction between pre-entry expectations and the psychological contract is a fine line, and the two terms are often used interchangeably. However, pre-entry expectations differ from psychological contracts in the sense that expectations are general intrinsic and extrinsic beliefs of employment (Rousseau, 1990). The psychological contract involves the perceived obligations or promises between an employee and employer (Robinson & Rousseau, 1994; Rousseau, 1990). Not all expectations are obligations (Rousseau, 1990). Robinson and Rousseau (1994) illustrate that an employee may expect to receive market wages in exchange for his hard work and his time at the job. If he does not receive market wages, he may be disappointed. However, if that same employee is promised market wages for hard work but does not receive them, he will feel wronged. They argue that broken promises or obligations produce feelings of anger and distrust, and are expected to have more significant consequences than unmet expectations.

Transactional and relational contracts are two types of psychological contracts formed between an employee and employer (MacNeil, 1985; Rousseau, 1990). Transactional contracts are monetizable (financial) practices, which can be characterized by highly competitive salaries and short-term commitments between the employee and employer (Rousseau, 1990). Relational contracts are both monetizable (financial) and nonmonetizable (relationship or personal) practices, typically characterized by loyalty and long-term commitments between the employee and employer (Rousseau, 1990).

Hospitality, like all industries, has its own set of unique characteristics that exemplify the workplace. Age and gender have been found as mediating factors when researching industry career expectations, the psychological contract, and violations of the psychological contract (Bal & Smith, 2012; Blomme, Van Rheede, & Tromp; 2010; Kelley-Peterson & George, 2002; Robinson & Rousseau, 1994; Rousseau, 1990).

Justification

The psychological contract has helped shape the relationship between an employee and employer. The psychological contract consists of the perceived beliefs and obligations between the two parties (Rousseau, 1990). However, the negative consequences of violating a psychological contract can lead to decreased job performance, loss of employee trust, decreased organizational commitment and job satisfaction, and increased intent to turnover and actual turnover (Lester, Turnley, Bloodgood, & Bolino, 2002; Robinson & Rousseau, 1994; Suazo, Turnley, & Mai-Dalton, 2005). Understanding the antecedents that comprise the psychological contract could help decrease the number of contract violations or minimize the negative consequences when a violation does occur.

Reducing such violations and negative consequences could be done by providing educators and industry recruiters with the pre-entry career expectations that undergraduate hospitality students have prior to entering the hospitality industry.   Limited research has been conducted on undergraduate hospitality students, and much of that research has been completed outside of the United States (Barron & Maxwell, 1993; Blomme et al., 2009; Casado, 1992; Jenkins, 2001; Kelley-Peterson & George, 2002; Lub, Bijvank, Bal, Blomme, & Schalk, 2012). Therefore, this study explored those pre-entry career expectations in order to assist educators in preparing students for post-graduation employment and offer insight to industry recruiters into the expectations new graduate students have of the hospitality industry.

Purpose of Research

The purpose of this study was to explore undergraduate hospitality students' pre-entry career expectations and their relative importance to students.

Research Questions

With the knowledge that expectations could become obligations of the psychological contract, the following research questions are addressed by this study:

1. What pre-entry career expectations do undergraduate hospitality students have of the hospitality industry?

2. What is the relative importance of various pre-entry career expectations?

3. Do pre-entry career expectations differ based on number of college credit hours completed?

4. Do pre-entry career expectations differ among age groups?

5. Do pre-entry career expectations differ between male and female students?

6. Do pre-entry career expectations differ based on the amount of experience worked in the hospitality industry?

7. Do pre-entry career expectations differ between students who have completed an internship/work experience and students who have not completed an internship/work experience?

Significance of Study

Since the identification of the psychological contract in workplace settings, the research has primarily focused on the violation of the contract as opposed to the creation of the contract. This study examined the pre-entry career expectations that could take part in the creation of a psychological contract in the hospitality industry. While this study did not examine all factors that form the psychological contract, it was designed to shed light on students' expectations, which hospitality educators and recruiters can address when working with undergraduate hospitality students. Educators will have a better understanding of the pre-entry career expectations students have prior to graduation, allowing them to tailor the curriculum to better communicate real world and realistic experiences. Hospitality recruiters will have a better understanding of the expectations of future employees, which would allow for better preparation when recruiting.

Limitations

The survey for this study was sent to undergraduate hospitality students during the last few weeks of the semester before summer break, which could have attributed to a low response rate. Response bias may have occurred because respondents who completed the survey may have different views than respondents who did not complete the survey. Also, this survey was not sent to students in every 4-year hospitality management program across the United States.

Students attending the universities not surveyed may have different responses. The researcher did not have direct access to the respondents, therefore had to rely on faculty members from participating programs to distribute the survey. This means the researcher had no control as to whether the faculty members actually sent the survey to their students as promised. Finally, this survey is exploratory in nature and does not cover all expectations students may have of their future employer in the hospitality industry.

Definition of Terms

Employee – A person who is paid to work for another person, company, or organization

(*Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*, 1995, p. 450)

Employer – A person, company, or organization that pays individuals to work for them

(*Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*, 1995, p. 450)

Hospitality Industry – The range of businesses that are committed to providing services to people who are away from their home, including travel, lodging, restaurants, and managed services, recreation, and assembly and event management (Walker, 2013)

Mutuality – Having the same or reciprocal relationship or feeling between two or more people

(*The American Heritage College Dictionary,* 2002, p. 919)

Psychological Contract – The perceived implicit and explicit obligations that an employee and the organization are expected to give and receive from one another (Kotter, 1973)

Promises – A statement declaring that one will or will not do something or an indication of something positive to come in the future (*The American Heritage College Dictionary*, 2002, p. 1115)

Relational Contract – One of two psychological contracts that focus on both financial and non-financial exchanges between the two parties and leads to the longer-term relationship (Rousseau, 1990)

Schema – A cognitive structure that represents knowledge about a specific concept or a defined stimulus (Fiske & Taylor, 1984, p. 140; Taylor & Crocker, 1981, p. 91)

Transactional Contract – One of two psychological contracts that focus on financial exchanges between the two parties and leads to the shorter-term relationship (Rousseau, 1990)

Chapter 2 - Review of Literature

The psychological contract helps define the relationship that forms between an employee and employer by outlining the perceived obligations each party has to one another. While not all expectations are obligations in the psychological contract, failing to uphold these obligations and violating the psychological contract could result in negative consequences in the workplace. The hospitality industry has its own set of unique characteristics that illustrate the work environment, and undergraduate hospitality students will be an area of future research in these topics.

Psychological Contract

A psychological contract can exist between any two parties. For the purpose of this study, the psychological contract will refer to the contract created in the employee-employer relationship. When an individual joins an organization, that individual has a specific set of personal needs, which should be satisfied by the organization (Wanous, 1977). The psychological contract will help define and outline what those needs will be. Research centered on psychological contracts has changed the landscape in which many view the employee-employer relationship. Research has historically focused on the consequences of psychological contract violations (Bal & Smit, 2012; Coyle-Shapiro & Kessler, 2000; Kotter, 1973; Lester & Kickul, 2001; Robinson & Rousseau, 1994; Rousseau, 1990). Antecedents and the formation of the psychological contract are less known and researched.

Transactional and Relational Contracts

There are two types of psychological contracts: transactional and relational (MacNeil, 1985; Rousseau, 1990). The transactional contract is based on monetizable (financial) exchanges. Extrinsic rewards are valued in this contract. Rousseau (1990) describes competitive

wages and short-term commitments to be characteristics of transactional contracts. An example

of this contract is the hours worked by an employee in exchange for a salary provided by the

employer. Transactional obligations include high pay, performance-based pay, job training, and

development given by the employer in exchange for the employee's obligations to work

overtime, participate in extra-role activities, and provide ample notice if they decide to leave the

company (Herriot, Manning, & Kidd, 1997; Rousseau, 1990).

Rousseau (1990) describes that relational contracts are based on both monetizable

(financial) and nonmonetizable (relationship or personable) exchanges. Intrinsic rewards are

valued in this contract. These contracts are observed when companies hire employees for entry-

level positions and those employees are developed and grow with the company over time. Many

times these firms are service-oriented (Rousseau, 1990). Relational obligations include job

advancement (promotion), job security, and support given by the employer in exchange for the

employee's organizational loyalty, extra-role behaviors, transfer opportunities within the

company, and agreement to work for the company for a minimum length of time (Herriot et. al.,

1997; Rousseau, 1990). MacNeil (1985) argued the need to see past the transactional portion of

the contract and focus on the relational contract for long-term sustainability of employment.

Attributes of the Psychological Contract

There are multiple ways to define the psychological contract. Kotter (1973) suggests the

psychological contract is an implicit agreement between an individual and his organization that

identifies what each expects to give and receive from each other. Tomprou and Nikolaou (2011)

define it as the sense-making process that includes a combination of promises exchanged

between a new employee and agents of the organization from the perspective of the new

employer during her first days in the new organization. Rousseau (1990) states that

psychological contracts are simply the beliefs of an individual regarding reciprocal obligations. Such definitions list a key component of the psychological contract: obligations between two parties. Examples of obligations are, when a new employee joins an organization, he or she expects to receive certain benefits from the organization (such as salary, promotion, training, positive work environment) in return for that employee's obligations to the organization (such as his or her time, loyalty to the organization, communication ability) (Kotter, 1973). These obligations will be influenced by the "building blocks" of the psychological contract: schemas, promises, and mutuality (Rousseau, 2001).

Schemas

A schema can be defined as a cognitive structure that represents knowledge about a specific concept or defined stimulus (Fiske & Taylor, 1984; Taylor & Crocker, 1981). Schemata allow us to process information regarding our surrounding environment, and help to select which items to attend to, which information to absorb about said items, and to either store that information for later consideration, or to use it as a basis for action (Taylor & Crocker, 1981).

Taylor and Crocker (1981) provide a visual way to view schemas, referred to as a "pyramidal structure". Information is organized hierarchically, placing more abstract or general information at the top of the pyramid. The more specific examples of instances or examples of schema are at the lowest level of the pyramid (Taylor & Crocker, 1981). This supports Fiske and Taylor's (1984) suggestion that people simplify reality by focusing on the more specific items (lowest level of pyramid) than the general idea (top of pyramid).

Schemas can serve as a basis for which an individual evaluates different experiences. Because schemata are formed from past experiences and similar events (Fiske & Taylor, 1984;

Taylor & Crocker, 1981), the perceiver will compare current stimuli against the past experiences (Taylor & Crocker, 1981). Rousseau (2001) relates schemata to the workplace environment. She suggests that prior beliefs based on training in one's discipline or workplace conditions in place during one's time of hire are factors that can shape an employee's schema.

Promises

A promise can be "a declaration assuring that one will or will not do something; a vow" or "indication of something favorable to come; expectation" as defined by *The American Heritage College Dictionary* (2002, p. 1115). As stated by Rousseau (2001), two types of promises exist: those that originate from words, either written or spoken, and those that originate from actions. Those originating from actions may include either discrete behaviors or repeated practices.

Promises originating from speech are only as good as the communication between the sender and receiver (Rousseau, 2001). In order for verbal communication to be effective, Orbell, van de Kragt, and Dawes (1988) list conditions that must exist: the promisor must intend to commit one's self to the promise, the promisor must have the competence to fulfill the commitment, and a specific recipient of the promise must exist. Also, the promise must encompass a future act within the promisor's control, the recipient must want the promisor to fulfill the promise, the promise would not otherwise happen without the promisor's initiation, and verbal phrases that are traditionally understood are used to create the obligation (Orbell, van de Kragt, & Dawes, 1988).

It can be suggested that the most important aspect of a speech promise is the context in which it is made (Rousseau, 2001). Context helps explain the surrounding conditions of a situation that give it meaning. An important feature of context is whether promise-making is to

be expected in a situation (Rousseau, 2001). Recruitment, socialization, and other repeated specific actions in the workplace could be seen as instances where promise-making is expected (Rousseau, 2001).

Promises that are not spoken or written, but rather interpreted via a collection of indirect and non-verbal sources, are considered action promises. These sources could stem from observations and interactions within the workplace, but could also be human resource management practices, such as training and recruiting policies, incentive systems, and performance reviews. An example of how an incentive program is promissory in nature is if an employee is rewarded for excellent performance, other employees may examine what that employee did to receive such a reward, and evaluate what they could have done differently to receive such a reward (Rousseau, 2001).

The primary component of the psychological contract may be the promises made between the two parties (Tomprou & Nikolaou, 2011). Promises can involve negotiation between the two parties and help both parties be in mutual agreement about the obligations between them (Tomprou & Nikolaou, 2011). No matter the type of promise, promises manifest trust between persons by providing information that those persons would not have otherwise noted about the other's intentions (Rousseau, 2001).

Mutuality

Mutuality suggests that parties share the same meaning or beliefs regarding their obligations to each other (Rousseau, 2001). As with schemas, perceived agreement is held "in the eye of the beholder". An employee may perceive an obligation from the organization as one condition, when an agent of the organization may carry out that obligation in a different manner,

11

suggesting that the parties discuss the expectations and obligations in order to increase the

mutual understanding between the parties (Kotter, 1973).

Perceived agreement is not the only factor necessary to create mutuality. Other factors

that promote mutuality are: shared information, unbiased accuracy, having the power to request

favorable terms of the obligation, and having the ability to accept or reject the terms of the

obligation. The more information that is shared between parties, the more likely each party will

receive all important information. Accuracy is enhanced when both parties are familiar with

each other and/or share previous experiences in comparable situation. Power differences,

especially in a hierarchal society, will weaken mutuality if individuals do not have the ability to

request certain terms in the agreement that would favor them. Finally, individuals need to have

the power to accept or reject the obligations if mutuality is to exist (Rousseau, 2001).

These obligations and expectations are idiosyncratic to the individual holding them,

meaning each person, whether an employee or agent of the organization, will possess a different

view of what the psychological contract should entail. Each individual will have a different

schema, different perceived promises, and different perceived mutuality about those obligations.

However, the main problem underlying the creation of the psychological contract when

examining schema, promises, and mutuality is the degree to which agreement (mutuality) is

created between the employee and the organization (Rousseau, 2001).

Content of the Psychological Contract

Research has begun to identify reoccurring themes that produce the content of the

psychological contract, but no two studies have measured the same independent or dependent

variables to provide agreed upon content of the psychological contract. Moreover, most research

is quantitative and limits the respondents to a priori obligations of the psychological contract,

instead of respondents providing the obligations. However, two independent, in-depth

qualitative studies were conducted in the 1990s to investigate the content of the psychological

contract and revealed similar organizational obligations.

The first study was conducted by Robinson and Rousseau (1994). This research was the

second half of a longitudinal study of Master of Business Administration alumni in the United

States (Rousseau, 1990). Robinson and Rousseau (1994) collected 215 usable questionnaires

from the alumni (128 had also answered the first questionnaire in the first half of the study). Of

those usable questionnaires, 209 were used for the qualitative analyses regarding the nature of

psychological contract violations. These respondents answered the question "Has or had your

employer ever failed to meet the obligation(s) that were promised you?" One hundred and

twenty-three responded that a violation had occurred and gave many examples of experiences

where their employer had failed to meet the promised obligation(s). These responses were

categorized by two coders with high interrater reliability. The results generated the 10 following

categories of violation:

- Training/development – Lack of training; training was not as promised

- Compensation – Inconsistencies between pay, benefits, and bonuses that were
  promised and what was received

- Promotion – Promised schedule of advancement and promotion was not realized

- Nature of job – Recruiter misrepresented the nature of the job or department

- Job security – Promised degree of job security was not upheld

- Feedback – Inadequate feedback and reviews compared to what was promised

- Management of change – Employees were never asked for input or informed of
  changes taking place

- Responsibility – Employees given less responsibility/challenge than promised

- People – Recruiter misrepresented the type of employees at the organization in terms of expertise, reputation, or work style

- Other – Unfulfilled obligations by employer that do not fit into the above categories

In the second study, Herriot et al. (1997) studied two populations in the United Kingdom to explore the content of the psychological contract with a representative sample of the workforce. The convenience sample included 368 respondents, half in the employee group and half in the organization group, consisting only of managers. The aim of the study was not to give a priori perceived obligations between employees and organizations, but allow respondents to identify their own perceived obligations. Therefore, the researchers asked open-ended questions using the critical incident technique in order to uncover these obligations. Respondents were asked to identify an instance in which an employee or organization acted beyond or below what might reasonably be expected in that situation.

The questions asked of each group yielded in 1,026 incidents. Through thematic content analysis, 12 organizational obligations towards employees were identified, which are as follows:

- Training – Provide adequate orientation and training

- Fairness – Ensure fairness of hiring, employee appraisal, promotion, and termination

- Needs – Allow for time off to accommodate personal or family needs

- Consult – Communicate or discuss with employees in matters which affect them

- Discretion – Allow for autonomy and freedom in how they do their job

- Humanity – Be supportive towards employees and be socially responsible

14

- Recognition – Reward or recognize for loyalty to organization or special contribution

- Environment – Provide a safe and pleasant work environment

- Justice – Fairness in all application of rules and disciplinary procedures

- Pay – Market value and consistent across the organization

- Benefits – Fairness and consistency of the benefit systems

- Security – Provide any job security that the organization can

There are several categories of obligations that are similar between these two studies. In fact, seven of the 10 categories from Robinson and Rousseau (1994) can be found in eight of the 12 categories from Herriot et al. (1997). These can be identified as training/development, promotion/fairness, how change is managed/consult, responsibility/discretion, people/humanity, compensation/pay/benefits, and job security/security (Herriot, et al., 1997; Robinson & Rousseau, 1994).

Consequences of the Psychological Contract

If there is a violation in the psychological contract, consequences can occur in the workplace. These correlations increase and decrease based on the number of mutual obligations between the employee and organization (Kotter, 1973). If there are more mutual obligations between the two parties, job satisfaction and productivity will be higher from the employee. If a mutual understanding of these obligations cannot be met, the employee-employer relationship may be damaged, leading to the aforementioned consequences of the psychological contract violation (Kotter, 1973). It has been found that the majority of employees perceive a violation of their psychological contract by their organization at some point during their employment (Coyle-Shapiro & Kessler, 2000; Robinson & Rousseau, 1994).

15

Negative consequences that may occur when an employee perceives a contract violation include loss of employee trust and job satisfaction, increased intent to turnover and actual turnover, decreased organizational commitment, and decreased job performance (Lester, Turnley, Bloodgood, & Bolino, 2002; Robinson & Rousseau, 1994; Suazo, Turnley, & Mai-Dalton, 2005). While the majority of research has focused on the consequences of a psychological contract violation, there is a paucity of research related to the actual causes of the violations. Morrison and Robinson (1997) and Robinson and Morrison (2000) aim to explain the root causes of these violations.

Root causes of a psychological contract violation: Reneging and incongruence

The examples in which a psychological contract can be perceived as violated are numerous, but the origins can be narrowed down to two causes: reneging and incongruence (Morrison & Robinson, 1997; Robinson & Morrison, 2000). Reneging is when an organization's obligation to an employee is not met and the agents of that organization knowingly recognize this failure. Reneging will occur when the organization is either unwilling or unable to fulfill that obligation (Morrison & Robinson, 1997). If an organization is unable to fulfill the promises made to an employee, it may be due to unforeseen circumstances. Even if the promises were made in good faith, they can be reneged due to changing internal or external environments, or an unexpected change in available resources within the company (Morrison & Robinson, 1997, Rousseau, 2001).

The unwillingness to fulfill a promise may occur because the organization does not want to fulfill the promise. The agents of the organization could have made a promise with no intention of upholding that promise, or they no longer intend to fulfill the promise they once intended to keep (Morrison & Robinson, 1997; Rousseau, 2001). No matter which way a

16

promise is reneged, either unable or unwilling, any time an organization reneges on a promise, the integrity of the organization is compromised (Robinson & Rousseau, 1994).

Incongruence occurs when the employee and agents of the organization have different understandings about whether a specific obligation exists and/or the nature of that obligation (Morrison & Robinson, 1997; Robinson & Morrison, 2000). Incongruence can be traced to three primary factors: divergent schemata, complexity of obligations between the two parties, and communication.

Schemata are idiosyncratic to the individual holding them and can vastly differ between individuals. Therefore, two persons can hold conflicting schemata about a given promise. This can cause incongruence because the parties' perceptions and interpretations are likely to be different about the terms of the promise, or whether a promise was even present (Morrison & Robinson, 1997).

The complexity and ambiguity of a promise can change between an employee and the agents of the organization. In the foundation of a promise, the employees and agents may perceive that promise with a particular way of understanding, but that understanding will transform over time as the schemata of that agreement changes (Morrison & Robinson, 1997).

Communication can minimize incongruence (Morrison & Robinson, 1997). Wanous (1977) suggests that communicating realistic job previews by the recruiter of the organization will help reduce incongruence. Also, communication should continue after an employee is hired, even if the original agent of the organization who made the promise is no longer the agent who will fulfill that promise (Morrison & Robinson, 1997).

The Psychological Contract in the Hospitality Industry

Research shows that the expectations of employees in the hospitality industry vary, but there are underlying themes present throughout the literature. When examining the consequences of a psychological contract violation, many variables have been studied.

Walsh and Taylor (2007) examined the importance of five job features that hospitality managers deemed important. These features were challenging work, learning-oriented relationships with managers, learning-oriented relationships with subordinates, learning-oriented relationships with clients, and extrinsic rewards. Managers stated that challenging work and learning-oriented relationships with other managers and subordinates were most important. Aspects of learning-oriented relationships include communication, trust, confidence, "going the extra mile", loyalty, and helping others to improve. The least important factor of the job was extrinsic rewards, such as salary, promotion, job status, perks, and other transactional aspects. This could lead one to believe the relational psychological contract was more important than the transactional psychological contract.

Moderating factors have been studied, such as gender and careerism. Age has also been identified as a moderating factor in the psychological contract (Bal & Smith, 2012; Bloome, et al., 2010; Lub, et al., 2012). Younger employees are more likely to experience a stronger negative reaction to a psychological contract violation than older employees. Younger employees are more likely to leave an organization if they experience a violation in the psychological contract.

Gender has been identified as a moderator in the psychological contract. Men were found to focus on job content as the reason for staying or leaving a job. The clarity of the job description was the most significant indicator for men. However, the more structured and rigid

the job description, the higher the intent to leave was for men. Women had different motivators for staying or leaving a job, including affective commitment, job content, work-family balance, and promotion opportunities (Blomme, et al., 2010).

Careerism can also affect an employee's longevity of employment with a single organization (Kelley-Peterson & George, 2002; Robinson & Rousseau, 1994; Rousseau, 1990). Careerism is considered the actions taken when individuals advance their personal career at the cost of their own integrity (Careerism, n.d.).   The very idea and definition of careerism is contradictory to relational exchanges. Many managers, especially younger managers, who display careerism are using their current position as a "stepping stone" in the pursuit of enhancing their career. These managers view their job at their current organization as a short-term financial gain or the opportunity to gain training available within that company before moving to the next company (Rousseau, 1990).

Students in Hospitality Programs

Students in hospitality management have recently been the subject of research in the area of pre-employment career expectations and/or psychological contracts, but research is limited. While the hospitality industry has a variety of ways to ascertain the industry's expectations of hospitality graduates, researchers should continue examining the attitudes and perceptions of these students due to their importance as potential future managers. These students can provide valuable insight during the hiring process.

In general, students enrolled in a hospitality program have a more positive outlook on the hospitality industry than recent graduates of a hospitality program and industry workers (Barron & Maxwell, 1993; Blomme, Van Rheede, & Tromp, 2009). Specifically, students had more positive beliefs about job content, salary, performance-based pay, and career opportunities than

19

graduates of a hospitality program and industry workers. The chance for more development

opportunities was rated slightly lower for students than graduates, but students rated it higher

than industry workers. The only area students did not rate higher than graduates and industry

workers was work-family balance (Blomme, et al., 2009). Students could be under the

impression that balancing work with family is more difficult than it really is. This idea is

consistent with De Hauw and De Vos's (2010) study stating that Millennial students (born

between 1980 and 2000) are willing to put in more work hours and forgo their social time in

order for their company to succeed. This is also supported by Casado's (1992) findings that

students are willing to work more than 40 hours per week, which means work-life balance could

still be important but students understand this industry may require them to sacrifice some of the

work-life balance aspect.

Jenkins (2001) revealed a specific attitude of undergraduate hospitality students that

should be an area of focus. The study included 138 undergraduates in two hospitality

management programs in the Netherlands and the United Kingdom. The two programs differed

slightly in curriculum, with the Netherlands program focusing mainly on hotel management, and

the United Kingdom program focusing on all sectors of hospitality management. Jenkins found

that the more undergraduate students were exposed to the hospitality industry, the less likely they

were to look for a job in the industry. As the students progressed through their program, fourth-

year students were less likely to seek a position in the hospitality industry than first-year

students.

This negative attitude of older students from Jenkins (2001) is consistent with the overall

findings of the study conducted by Barron and Maxwell (1993). This study included a survey

completed by 507 newly enrolled undergraduate students and 482 older undergraduate students

who had completed required workplace experience. The results found that the new students had notably more positive perceptions of the hospitality industry than older students. Older students who had completed some work experience thought hourly staff was treated poorly, little or no training is offered in the hospitality industry, the hospitality industry is not financially rewarding, companies put profit before employees, total dedication of an employee's time is required in this industry, and the efforts put forth by an employee outweigh the rewards received. The only positive statement both new and older students agree upon is they perceive the hospitality industry will provide growth with many career opportunities (Barron & Maxwell, 1993).

Kelley-Peterson and George (2002) compared the importance of 50 different work practices among recent graduates employed in the hospitality industry and hospitality managers who oversee recent graduates. Overall, both groups rated the importance of relational practices higher than transactional practices. A clear job description and timely pay of wages were the only two transactional practices in their top 10 list. The remaining top 10 practices related to relational practices included respect from the boss, career development, fair treatment, respect from colleagues, personal development, interesting work, professional development, and commitment to equality.

When comparing the workplace expectations among recent graduates to the expectations that hospitality managers have, graduates focused on short-term interests rather than long-term interests (Kelley-Peterson & George, 2002). Recent graduates rated on-the-job training, timely pay of wages, safe and healthy working conditions, and overtime pay as their top four expectations. These preferences point towards the transactional practices of a company. The relational practices of respect, personal development, and fair treatment were rated as lower importance for recent graduates. Managers expected recent graduates to place a higher emphasis

on personal and career development and respect. The manager's expectations of recent graduates are consistent with the relational practices discussed by Rousseau (1989) (Kelley-Peterson & George, 2002). However, the recent graduates do confirm the research that young employees are more focused on the transactional practices (Lub, et al., 2012)

Understanding the psychological contract of undergraduate hospitality students by identifying pre-entry career expectations will help educators and industry professionals find ways to avoid the consequences of a psychological contract violation. If avoiding these psychological contract violations is possible, job satisfaction could increase, productivity and employee morale in the workplace could increase, and intent to leave could decrease. This could be accomplished by educators and industry recruiters painting a realistic picture of the career ahead for the students. The first steps, though, are to identify the expectations, weigh the relative importance, and determine if there are mediating factors to these expectations.

Chapter 3 - Methodology

Study Sample

The population for this study included undergraduate hospitality students in 4-year universities in the United States. The students were required to be enrolled in a bachelor-seeking degree-granting program in Hospitality Management, or a similarly named program.

The population is estimated at 20,130 students (Education News, 2010). In order to achieve a 95% confidence level with 5% sampling error, 377 usable surveys were needed (Dillman, 2007). The target sample was selected using random sampling of various universities in the United States that have a Hospitality Management, or similarly named, program.

Research Design

A quantitative research approach was used. The format consisted of an electronic survey. An electronic survey allowed the researcher to obtain data from a large sample population in a short amount of time. To obtain a higher response rate, the students were incentivized with a random drawing of four $50 iTunes gift cards.

Research Instrument

The survey was adapted from a validated instrument developed by Lester and Kickul (2001), which included 38 items that participants indicated were promises their organizations made to them. Sample items included trust and respect, retirement benefits, meaningful work, consideration for employees' needs, and flexible work schedule. Based on a five-point Likert-type rating scale (1="not at all important"; 5="extremely important), participants were asked to indicate the level of importance they ascribed to each item.

The final survey for this study consisted of two sections. The first section was comprised of 43 items. Of the 43 individual items, 30 were generated from the survey by Lester and Kickul (2001). Four items were generated from past research by Lub, et al. (2012). These items were opportunities to transfer within the company, opportunities to adapt work schedule to family obligations, a mentor to encourage personal and professional growth, and more responsibilities and tasks if current tasks were performed well. Three items were generated from a past survey by Kelley-Peterson and George (2002). These items were opportunity to make job decisions, having a clear job description, and training. The remaining six items were based on anecdotal evidence. The items were measured by two five-point Likert-type rating scales. The first scale measured expectations (1="strongly disagree"; 5="strongly agree"). The second scale measured importance (-2="not at all important"; 2="extremely important").

The second section contained demographic questions including gender, age, number of college credit hours completed, and area of interest in the hospitality industry (lodging, food and beverage, meeting planning, culinary, tourism, and other). If a student selected "other" for area of interest, there was a blank option to type the area of interest. Students were also asked how many years and/or months of work experience they had in the hospitality industry (both in a non-supervisory and supervisory role), how many estimated hours per week they have worked in each non-supervisory or supervisory role, if their school required at least one internship/work experience prior to graduation, and if they were a citizen of the United States. If students were interested in being in the drawing for one of the gift cards, there was a separate section at the end of the survey to enter their email address.

Institutional Review Board

The Kansas State University Institutional Review Board approved the research protocol prior to data collection (Appendix A).

Pilot Test

Two pilot tests were conducted using a convenience sample of undergraduate students enrolled in a Hospitality Management program from a university in the target sample. The researcher administered the initial paper survey (n=22) with 41 items (Appendix B and C).

Necessary changes were made, and the second pilot survey was administered via an electronic survey to a different group of undergraduate hospitality students in the same university (n=23). One change was made to the second pilot survey. Due to low reliability, the change was adding two additional individual items: opportunities to transfer within my company (within departments or other properties) and a mentor to encourage my personal and professional development (Lub, et al., 2012).

There was a section at the end of each pilot survey for students to write comments and suggestions about the survey. Adjustments were made to the final survey based on these data. None of the responses from students in the pilot test were included in the final survey.

Data Collection

Data collection took place via electronic survey. The researcher sent an initial invitation email to 56 randomly selected faculty from a pre-determined list of targeted universities. The invitation requested the participation of their undergraduate hospitality students in the survey (Appendix D). The faculty members were asked to respond whether or not they would allow their students to participate in the study. The participation required the faculty members to send

an electronic survey via email to their undergraduate hospitality students. If a hospitality

program had a complete email distribution list of all undergraduate hospitality students, faculty

members were asked to send the survey via that method. If a hospitality program did not have a

complete email distribution list of all undergraduate hospitality students, the faculty members

were asked to coordinate sending the survey to selected on-campus classes with a high

population of undergraduate hospitality students. Examples of these classes were introductory

classes for new hospitality students, mid-level courses, and capstone/senior-level courses in

efforts to avoid sending the survey multiple times to students enrolled the same classes. The

goal was for each student to receive the survey only once.

The faculty members were contacted via email seven days prior to the targeted data

collection time period. Faculty members were asked to respond to the researcher, stating their

intent to participate in the survey. A follow-up phone call was made three days prior to the

targeted data collection time period for faculty members who had not responded. If the faculty

member declined participation in the survey or did not respond to the researcher, that university

was not included in the final survey distribution. Of the 56 faculty members invited to

participate, 18 volunteered to participate. Each faculty member provided the enrollment in their

programs, totaling 2,899 undergraduate hospitality students.

Seven days after the initial contact with faculty members, the researcher sent the final

electronic survey via email to the 18 faculty members who agreed to participate in the study.

The researcher provided the faculty with an email containing instructions and information about

the survey and the actual link to the survey (Appendix E and F).

The survey was open for 15 days, starting the day the researcher sent the final survey to

participating faculty members. After the first eight days, the researcher sent a follow-up email to

faculty members, requesting they send an email reminder to students who received the survey. One university that participated could not send the survey to its students, but allowed the researcher to post the URL on the program's Facebook page.

Data Analysis

All statistical analysis was conducted using the Statistical Package for Social Science 20.0 (SPSS). The Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficient was used to determine the reliability of the survey instrument.

In analyzing descriptive statistics, the first step included finding the mean and standard deviation of each variable. Frequency distribution was used to describe variables of the demographic section, such as gender, age, number of hours completed during college, and if an internship/work experience was required prior to graduation.

A t-test was administered to compare the means of two variables against a dependent variable. Examples of such independent variables are gender (male/female), whether or not an internship/work experience is required, level of work experience (high/low), and if the student was a citizen of the United States.

An analysis of variance (ANOVA) test was conducted to compare independent variables with more than two answer options against a dependent variable (survey item). Examples of such independent variables are: age, number of college credit hours completed, and industry area of interest.

Factor analysis was conducted to reveal any underlying variables or factors, which revealed relationships between items. The factor analysis separated the survey into a smaller number of factors. If there were no relationships, then further analysis ceased and focus was shifted on comparisons with significant correlation.

Chapter 4 - Undergraduate Hospitality Students' Pre-Entry Career Expectations

Introduction

Psychological Contract

An employee recruited by an organization forms a set of beliefs and obligations, known as the psychological contract. The psychological contract will ultimately shape the relationship between the employee and the organization (Rousseau, 1990). Previous research has focused on the consequences of violating the psychological contract (Bal & Smit, 2012; Coyle-Shapiro & Kessler, 2000; Kotter, 1973; Lester & Kickul, 2001; Robinson & Rousseau, 1994; Rousseau, 1990). However, less is known about the formation of the psychological contract and the antecedents that comprise the psychological contract. This study will add to the literature and discussion of the pre-entry career expectations of undergraduate hospitality students that can aid in the formation of their psychological contract.

The terms psychological contract and pre-entry career expectations are often used interchangeably, but a fine line of distinction exists between them. Pre-entry career expectations differ from psychological contracts in the sense that expectations are general intrinsic beliefs of employment (Rousseau, 1990). In contrast, the psychological contract involves perceived obligations or promises between an employee and employer (Robinson & Rousseau, 1994; Rousseau, 1990). According to Rousseau (1990), not all expectations are obligations, which lead to the distinction of the terms. When violations to the psychological contract occur, it is the psychological contract and its obligations that create a more emotional response of anger and distrust.

Transactional and relational contracts are two types of psychological contracts formed between an employee and employer (MacNeil, 1985; Rousseau, 1990). Transactional contracts are monetizable practices, characterized by highly competitive salaries and short-term commitments between the employee and employer (Rousseau, 1990). Relational contracts are both monetizable (financial) and nonmonetizable (relationship or personal) practices, characterized by loyalty and long-term commitments between the employee and employer (Rousseau, 1990).

There are multiple ways to define the psychological contract. Kotter (1973) suggests the psychological contract is an implicit agreement between an individual and the organization that identifies what each expects to give and receive from each other. Tomprou and Nikolaou (2011) define it as the sense-making process that includes a combination of promises exchanged between a new employee and agents of the organization during the employee's first days in the organization. Rousseau (1990) stated that psychological contracts are simply the beliefs of an individual regarding reciprocal obligations. Such definitions list a key component of the psychological contract: obligations between two parties. These obligations will be influenced by the "building blocks" of the psychological contract: schemas, promises, and mutuality (Rousseau, 2001).

If there is a violation in the psychological contract, consequences can occur in the workplace. Negative consequences that may occur when an employee perceives a contract violation include loss of employee trust and job satisfaction, increased intent to turnover and actual turnover, decreased organizational commitment, and decreased job performance (Lester, Turnley, Bloodgood, & Bolino, 2002; Robinson & Rousseau, 1994; Suazo, Turnley, & Mai-Dalton, 2005). The majority of employees perceive a violation of their psychological contract

29

by their organization at some point during their employment (Coyle-Shapiro & Kessler, 2000; Robinson & Rousseau, 1994). Morrison and Robinson (1997) and Robinson and Morrison (2000) aim to explain the root causes of these violations as incongruence and reneging. Incongruence occurs when the employee and the agents of the organizations have different understandings of the specific obligation in question (Morrison & Robinson, 1997; Robinson & Morrison 2000). Reneging occurs when the organization or agent of the organization is either unwilling or unable to fulfill the obligation (Morrison & Robinson, 1997).

Psychological Contract in the Hospitality Industry

The hospitality industry, as with all industries, has a unique set of characteristics that exemplify the workplace. Research has found that hospitality managers placed importance on challenging work and learning-oriented relationships with other managers and subordinates above rewards. The learning-oriented relationships place value on communication, trust, confidence, loyalty, and helping others improve. The least important factors of the job were extrinsic rewards, such as salary, promotion, job status, and perks (Walsh & Taylor, 2007). Mediating factors of the psychological contract in the hospitality industry have been gender, careerism, and age (Bal & Smith, 2012; Bloome, et al., 2010; Kelley-Peterson & George, 2002; Lub, et al., 2012; Robinson & Rousseau, 1994; Rousseau, 1990).

Research related to psychological contracts and career expectations and undergraduate hospitality students is limited. However, research has found that newer students in the program were more optimistic about the industry than older students (Barron & Maxwell, 1994; Jenkins 2001) and current students had a more positive outlook on the industry than recent hospitality graduates and industry workers (Barron & Maxwell, 1993; Blomme, Van Rheede, & Tromp, 2009). When comparing recent graduates of hospitality programs to hospitality managers as a

30

whole, both groups placed higher importance on relational practices than transactional practices (Kelley-Peterson & George, 2002). However, recent graduates focused more on short-term interests, while hospitality managers focused more on long-term interests (Kelley-Peterson & George, 2002; Lub, et al., 2012).

Understanding the psychological contract of undergraduate hospitality students by identifying pre-entry career expectations will help researchers and industry professionals find ways to avoid the consequences of a psychological contract violation. If avoiding these psychological contract violations is possible, job satisfaction, productivity, and employee morale in the workplace could increase, and intent to leave could decrease. The first steps, though, are to identify the expectations, weigh the relative importance, and determine if there are differences amongst various demographic factors to these expectations.

Methodology

Sample

The population for this study included undergraduate hospitality students seeking a bachelor's degree in Hospitality Management, or a similarly named program, in the United States. The sample population included 2,899 undergraduate hospitality students in 18 universities.

Research Instrument

An electronic survey was adapted from a survey validated by Lester and Kickul (2001). The survey by Lester and Kickul (2001) consisted of 38 items that participants indicated were promises their organizations made to them. Their survey was administered to students who obtained their Master of Business Administration degree in various occupational fields, but did not include the hospitality management field. The items were ranked on a five-point Likert-type

31

rating scale (1="not at all important"; 5="extremely important). The additional items in the survey were generated from past research by Kelley-Peterson and George (2002), Lub, et al. (2012), and anecdotal evidence.

The final survey for this study consisted of two sections. The first section was comprised of 43 items. The 43 items were generated as a modified version of the surveys from Lester and Kickul (2001), Kelley-Peterson and George (2002), Lub, et al. (2012), and anecdotal evidence. The survey was administered in two pilot tests before being finalized. The items were measured by two five-point Likert-type rating scale. The first scale measured students' expectations and the second scale measured importance of the item. The target was to have Cronach's Alpha Reliability Co-Efficient be $\alpha > 0.70$ when separately measuring the reliability of expectations and importance.

The second section contained demographic questions including gender, age, number of college credit hours completed, area of interest in the hospitality industry, total number of years and/or months employed in the industry, average number of hours worked per week in the industry, whether their school required an internship/work experience prior to graduation, and if they were a citizen of the United States. If students were interested in receiving one of four $50 iTunes gift cards for participation, there was a separate section at the end of the survey to enter their email address; maintaining the anonymity of the respondents.

The survey was pilot tested by two separate hospitality classes at a university with a hospitality management program. The first class took a paper survey with 41 items ranking expectations and importance, and demographic questions. After data analysis, the second pilot test was conducted online. Due to low reliability, two additional questions were added to the

second pilot test: a mentor to encourage personal and professional growth, and opportunities to transfer within my company (Lub, et al., 2012)

Data Collection

Data collection took place via electronic survey. An initial email invitation was sent to 56 randomly selected faculty members from a pre-determined list of targeted universities. The invitation requested their undergraduate hospitality students' participation in the survey. The participation required the faculty members to send an electronic survey via email to their undergraduate hospitality students. Faculty members who agreed to participate either sent the electronic survey to their students via a distribution list of all undergraduate hospitality students or to selected on-campus courses with a high population of undergraduate hospitality students if they did not maintain an email distribution list.

The first email invitation was sent to faculty members seven days prior to the start of data collection. A follow-up phone call was made four days later to faculty members who had not responded. Of the 56 faculty members invited to participate, 18 volunteered to participate. Each faculty member provided the enrollment in their programs, totaling 2,899 undergraduate hospitality students.

Seven days after the initial contact with faculty members, the researcher sent the final electronic survey via email to the 18 faculty members who agreed to participate in the study. The survey was open for 15 days, starting the day the researcher sent the final survey to participating faculty members. After the first eight days, a follow-up email was sent to faculty members, requesting they send an email reminder to students who received the survey. One university that participated could not send the survey to its students, but allowed the researcher to post the URL on the program's Facebook page.

Results and Discussion

A total of 225 responses were collected from the 2,899 possible responses. Of those 225 responses, 151 were usable completed surveys. This was a response rate of 5.2%. However, only 146 responses were used in data analysis because they met the criteria of being an undergraduate student seeking a bachelor's degree in Hospitality Management, yielding a final response rate of 5.0%. The average completion time for the survey was nine minutes.

The reliability of the final study was very high. The Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficient for ranking expectations was $\alpha = 0.961$. The Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficient for ranking importance was $\alpha = 0.933$.

Profile of Respondents

The majority of respondents were female (90.4%). The age of the students was distributed somewhat consistently between those 19 to 22 years of age, with the largest group being the 19 year olds (21.2%) Most students were United States citizens (95.2%) and planned to work in the convention, meetings, and events area (41.7%) (Table 1).

Respondents' Work Experience

Students were asked whether their program requires an internship or work experience prior to graduation. The majority of students (96.6%) indicated an internship or work experience is required.

On average, students have worked two years and five months in a non-supervisory role, and eight months in a supervisory role. Students averaged 1,168 total hours of overall work experience. The majority of students expected to work for a company two (35.6%) or three (30.8%) years before being promoted, with an average of 2.5 years.

Table 1. Respondents' Demographic Characteristics (n=146)

	N	%[a]
Gender		
Male	14	9.6
Female	132	90.4
Age		
18	8	5.4
19	31	21.2
20	27	18.5
21	26	17.8
22	21	14.4
23	16	11.0
24+	16	11.0
College credits completed to date		
0-30	21	14.5
31-60	30	20.5
61-90	38	26.0
91 or more	57	39.0
Citizen of the United States		
Yes	139	95.2
No	6	4.1
Area of interest in Hospitality Management		
Food and beverage	23	15.8
Lodging	36	24.7
Convention, meetings, and events	61	41.7
Culinary	4	2.7
Tourism	9	6.2
Other	11	7.5
Intent of working in the hospitality industry		
I do not plan to work in this industry	2	1.4
Very Unlikely	0	0.0
Unlikely	3	2.1
Somewhat Unlikely	0	0.0
Undecided	5	3.4
Somewhat Likely	11	7.5
Likely	19	13.0
Very Likely	106	72.6

[a] Responses may not total 100% due to missing data

Career Expectations

The means and standard deviations were calculated for each item of the survey. On a scale of (1) strongly disagree to (5) strongly agree, students ranked a safe work environment (4.8 ± 0.5) and trust and respect (4.8 ± 0.6) as their top expectations, with training (4.7 ± 0.6), open and honest communication (4.7 ± 0.6), and fair treatment (4.7 ± 0.6) ranked closely behind (Table 2). The lowest ranked expectations were tuition reimbursement for job-related college credits (3.5 ± 1.1), a work schedule with no more than a 40-hour workweek (3.4 ± 1.1), and a work schedule with limited nights and weekends (3.4 ± 1.1). All expectation items measured as neutral (3.0) or higher.

Included in Table 2 are the levels of importance for each individual item. On a scale of (-2) unimportant to (2) very important, the respondents indicated that a safe work environment (1.8 ± 0.4) and open and honest communication (1.8 ± 0.5) were the most important individual items, followed by trust and respect (1.7 ± 0.5), training when they start their job (1.7 ± 0.5), fair treatment (1.7 ± 0.5), and job security (1.7 ± 0.5). The least important individual items were tuition reimbursement for college courses related to their job (0.5 ± 1.1), a schedule with a 40-hour work week (0.5 ± 1.1), and a schedule with limited nights and weekends (0.5 ± 1.1).

The composite score of each individual item (Table 2) takes into account both levels of expectation and importance. This is done by multiplying the mean of the expectation by the mean of importance for every respondent. The composite scores indicate which individual items, on average, are the most important expectations overall. The range of possible scores is between 10 (highest) and -10 (lowest). If a negative composite score was achieved, this means the individual item had an importance level below zero (-2 = unimportant, -1 = of little importance). The individual items with the highest composite scores were a safe work

Table 2. Means and Total Composite Scores for Expectations and Importance (n=146)

	Mean ± SD		
	Expectation[a]	Importance[b]	Composite Score Expectation & Importance[c]
A safe work environment	4.8 ± 0.5	1.8 ± 0.4	8.7 ± 2.5
Trust and respect	4.8 ± 0.6	1.7 ± 0.5	8.4 ± 3.0
Training when I start a job	4.7 ± 0.6	1.7 ± 0.5	8.2 ± 2.9
Open and honest communication	4.7 ± 0.6	1.8 ± 0.5	8.4 ± 2.7
Fair treatment	4.7 ± 0.6	1.7 ± 0.5	8.2 ± 2.8
Enough resources to do my job	4.6 ± 0.6	1.6 ± 0.5	7.8 ± 3.0
Adequate equipment for me to perform my job	4.6 ± 0.6	1.6 ± 0.6	7.4 ± 3.2
Clear goals and direction for my job	4.6 ± 0.6	1.6 ± 0.5	7.8 ± 3.0
A clear job description	4.6 ± 0.6	1.6 ± 0.5	7.5 ± 3.5
Equal employment opportunity for all employees	4.6 ± 0.7	1.5 ± 0.7	7.2 ± 3.5
Competent upper management	4.6 ± 0.6	1.6 ± 0.5	7.7 ± 3.0
Support from upper management	4.5 ± 0.6	1.6 ± 0.6	7.2 ± 3.1
Opportunities for personal growth	4.5 ± 0.6	1.6 ± 0.6	7.4 ± 3.1
Opportunities to develop new skills	4.5 ± 0.6	1.5 ± 0.6	7.0 ± 3.2
Job security	4.5 ± 0.7	1.7 ± 0.6	7.7 ± 3.1
A salary competitive with my work experience and education	4.5 ± 0.7	1.5 ± 0.6	7.1 ± 3.3
Cooperation and support from co-workers	4.5 ± 0.6	1.5 ± 0.6	7.0 ± 3.1
An orientation when I start with the organization	4.5 ± 0.8	1.3 ± 0.8	6.4 ± 4.0
Continual professional training	4.5 ± 0.7	1.5 ± 0.6	6.6 ± 3.3
Health care benefits	4.5 ± 0.7	1.6 ± 0.6	7.2 ± 3.2

Table 2. Means and Total Composite Scores for Expectations and Importance (n=146)

	Mean ± SD		
	Expectation[a]	Importance[b]	Composite Score Expectation & Importance[c]
Constructive feedback on my performance	4.4 ± 0.7	1.5 ± 0.6	6.8 ± 3.2
The opportunity to participate when making decisions that affect my job	4.4 ± 0.7	1.4 ± 0.6	6.5 ± 3.2
Meaningful work to do at my job	4.4 ± 0.7	1.4 ± 0.7	6.5 ± 3.4
Challenging and interesting work	4.4 ± 0.6	1.3 ± 0.6	6.1 ± 3.3
Consideration of my personal and family needs	4.4 ± 0.7	1.5 ± 0.6	6.8 ± 3.2
Freedom to be creative with my job	4.4 ± 0.7	1.3 ± 0.8	6.2 ± 3.9
Competent co-workers	4.4 ± 0.8	1.5 ± 0.6	6.7 ± 3.4
Retirement benefits	4.3 ± 0.8	1.4 ± 0.7	6.5 ± 3.5
More responsibilities and tasks if I perform my current tasks well	4.3 ± 0.7	1.2 ± 0.8	5.4 ± 3.8
Opportunities to transfer within my company (within departments or other properties)	4.2 ± 0.8	1.1 ± 0.8	5.2 ± 4.0
Recognition for my accomplishments	4.2 ± 0.7	1.2 ± 0.7	5.3 ± 3.5
Opportunities to adapt my work schedule to my family obligations	4.2 ± 0.9	1.4 ± 0.7	6.1 ± 3.7
Pay and bonuses related to my personal performance	4.2 ± 0.8	1.2 ± 0.8	5.5 ± 3.8
The opportunity to make my own decisions about my job	4.1 ± 0.8	1.2 ± 0.7	5.1 ± 3.5
My days off at my request when making schedules	4.0 ± 0.9	1.2 ± 0.7	5.1 ± 3.5
Vacation benefits	4.0 ± 0.9	1.0 ± 0.9	4.5 ± 4.1
A promotion within the first 3 years of working with the company	4.0 ± 0.8	0.9 ± 0.8	4.2 ± 3.8

Table 2. Means and Total Composite Scores for Expectations and Importance (n=146)

	Mean ± SD		
	Expectation[a]	Importance[b]	Composite Score Expectation & Importance[c]
A mentor to encourage my personal and professional growth	4.0 ± 0.9	1.0 ± 0.9	4.4 ± 4.0
A flexible work schedule	3.9 ± 0.9	1.0 ± 0.8	4.4 ± 3.5
Yearly salary increase	3.9 ± 0.8	0.9 ± 0.8	4.0 ± 3.7
Tuition reimbursement for any college credit course I take related to my job	3.5 ± 1.1	0.5 ± 1.1	2.4 ± 4.2
A work schedule with no more than a 40-hour work week	3.4 ± 1.1	0.5 ± 1.1	2.5 ± 4.1
A work schedule limited in nights and weekends	3.4 ± 1.1	0.5 ± 1.1	2.5 ± 4.3

[a] Scale values for Expectations range from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (5)
[b] Scale values for Importance range from Unimportant (-2) to Very Important (2)
[c] Composite score represents the mean of the expectation multiplied by the importance of each individual item

environment (8.7), trust and respect (8.4), open and honest communication (8.4), training when they first start a job (8.2), and fair treatment (8.2). These items were the only items with composite scores above 8.0. The items with the lowest composite scores were tuition reimbursement for college courses related to their job (2.4), a schedule with a 40-hour work week (2.5), and a schedule with limited nights and weekends (2.5) and were the only items ranked below a 4.0. There were no negative composite scores.

Independent t-tests

Independent sample t-tests were used to determine if significant differences existed in mean scores between gender, United States' citizenship, and work experience. There were no

significant differences found between the 43 individual items and whether the student was a citizen of the United States or not.

Only one item had a significant difference between genders. On average, fair treatment was found to be the only significant difference between men (M = 4.3 ± 0.8) and women (M = 4.7 ± 0.6). This is a medium-sized effect of $r = 42.75$. However, while this finding was significantly different, it may not have practical significance because the respondents were primarily female (90.4%). The findings of the other 42 items were not significant.

The t-test that yielded the most significant differences was amount of work experience. On average, students have worked 1,168 hours. Therefore, students were divided into two categories, those with high experience (≥1,168 hours) and those with low experience (<1,168 hours). As shown on Table 3, students who have worked more than 1,168 hours in the hospitality industry have higher expectations of trust and respect, a flexible work schedule, tuition reimbursement, and enough resources to do their job. The other 39 individual items did not have significant differences.

Table 3. Comparison of Work Experience and Expectations

| | Work Experience Mean ± Standard Deviation | | | |
	Less Experience <1168 hours (n=98)	More Experience ≥1168 hours (n=48)	t	Sig.
Trust and respect	4.7 ± 0.7	4.9 ± 0.3	1.915	0.005*
A flexible work schedule	3.9 ± 1.0	4.0 ± 0.7	0.928	0.034*
Tuition reimbursement for any college credit course I take related to my job	3.4 ± 1.2	3.7 ± 0.9	1.978	0.035*
Enough resources to do my job	4.6 ± 0.6	4.7 ± 0.5	1.517	0.037*

*$p < 0.05$

An additional t-test was run to compare students with no work experience to those who indicated they had some level of work experience. The only item that revealed to have a significant difference was days off at their request when making the schedule. Students with no work experience placed a higher expectation on receiving their days off than students who have work experience.

One-Way ANOVA

Individual one-way ANOVA tests were used to determine significant differences among individual items and age, area of interest in the hospitality industry, and number of college credits completed to date. Neither age nor area of interest had significant differences among the individual items.

The number of college credits completed is the variable with the most significant differences. Seven of the 43 individual items had significant differences. Table 4 provides these seven individual items.

When analyzed, a flexible work schedule was significantly different ($F(3, 144) = 2.774$, $p = 0.044$) and enough resources to do my job were found to be significantly different ($F(3, 143) = 3.331$, $p = 0.021$) between freshmen and sophomores. The comparison of competitive salary ($F(3, 144) = 3.791$, $p = 0.012$) revealed significant differences between freshmen and sophomores, sophomores and juniors, and sophomores and seniors. It was also revealed that job security ($F(3, 143) = 2.962$, $p = 0.034$) was significantly different between freshmen and sophomores.

Table 4. ANOVA Post-Hoc Comparison of College Credits Completed and Expectations

	Mean ± Standard Deviation					
	0-30 credits[b] (n=21)	31-60 credits[b] (n=30)	61-90 credits[b] (n=38)	91+ credits[b] (n=57)	F Value[a]	P value
Continual professional training	4.9 ± 0.3^x	4.2 ± 0.9^y	4.4 ± 0.6^y	$4.5 \pm 0.8^{x,y}$	4.65	0.004
A flexible work schedule	4.3 ± 0.7^x	3.6 ± 1.0^y	$3.9 \pm 0.8^{x,y}$	$4.0 \pm 1.0^{x,y}$	2.77	0.044
Enough resources to do my job	4.9 ± 0.4^x	4.4 ± 0.9^y	$4.7 \pm 0.5^{x,y}$	$4.7 \pm 0.5^{x,y}$	3.33	0.021
A salary competitive with my work experience and education	4.7 ± 0.5^x	4.1 ± 0.9^y	4.6 ± 0.6^x	4.6 ± 0.8^x	3.79	0.012
Adequate equipment for me to perform my job	4.8 ± 0.5^x	4.3 ± 0.8^y	$4.6 \pm 0.6^{x,y,z}$	$4.7 \pm 0.4^{x,z}$	3.58	0.016
Job security	4.8 ± 0.4^x	4.3 ± 1.0^y	$4.4 \pm 0.7^{x,y}$	$4.6 \pm 0.6^{x,y}$	2.96	0.034
Freedom to be creative with my job	$4.5 \pm 0.7^{x,y}$	4.0 ± 0.9^x	$4.3 \pm 0.6^{x,y}$	4.5 ± 0.6^y	3.33	0.022

Notes. Means with different superscripts (x, y) differed significantly by Tukey's post hoc test, $p < 0.05$
Scale values range from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (5)
[a] Results from ANOVA
[b] Class identification: 0-30 credits (freshman), 31-60 credits (sophomores), 61-90 credits (juniors), 91+ credits(seniors)

Factor Analysis

Factor analysis was conducted, but no clear common underlying themes existed within the given analysis. Seven factors were produced, but while the reliability of each factor was high for five of the factors (two factors contained only one individual item each), the researcher did not identify distinct themes that seemed logical to report.

Discussion and Implications

The primary objectives of this study were to explore undergraduate hospitality students' pre-entry career expectations, and examine if those expectations differed based on various demographic variables.

Overall means of expectations revealed that students expect their future employers to provide them with a safe work environment, trust and respect, training when they first start their job, open and honest communication, and fair treatment. The means of these items were all 4.7 or above, with relatively small standard deviations. In contrast, students put little expectation on a flexible work schedule, yearly salary increases, tuition reimbursement for any job-related college credit courses, a work schedule with no more than a 40-hour work week, or a work schedule limited in nights and weekends. All of these items had a mean of 3.9 or less, which were the only individual items with means under 4.0.

When ranking the importance of the individual items, it was revealed that students placed the highest importance on a safe work environment, open and honest communication, trust and respect, training when they first start, fair treatment, and job security. All of these items averaged a mean of 1.7 or above. The lowest ranked items were tuition reimbursement, work schedule with no more than 40 hours and limited in nights and weekends, yearly salary increase, and promotion within the first three years. All of these items averaged a mean of 0.9 or less. The five items with the lowest levels of importance were similar to the lowest expectations, except one item, which was a flexible work schedule. This item was not ranked as low as an importance scale. It was replaced with yearly salary increase.

The items with the highest overall composite scores had composite scores of 8.2 or above. A high composite score means the item is both a high expectation and has high importance with the students. These items were a safe work environment, trust and respect, open

43

and honest communication, training when they start their job, and fair treatment. The items with the lowest composite score were tuition reimbursement, a work schedule with no more than 40 hours, and a work schedule with limited nights and weekends. These items had scores of 2.5 or below. In fact, the item with the next lowest score was 4.0, meaning that these three items were undoubtedly not expected by or important to the students.

Past research has found different motivators between men and women that would be reasons for staying or leaving a job (Blomme, et al. 2010). While this study did not ask that specific question about motivators, this study examined whether expectations differed between genders. Only one item was found to have significant difference as an expectation, which was fair treatment. Women had a greater expectation of fair treatment than men. Fair treatment in the workplace could cover many topics, but in recent years there has been a decrease in the overall gap of salary between men and women in all industries. Between 1979 and 2011, the salary for women who have bachelor's degrees has risen by 30.8%, while the salary for men with bachelor's degrees has risen by only 16.3%. Overall, as of 2011, women earn 82.2% of what men earn, up from 62.3% in 1979 (U.S. Department of Labor, 2012). Past research has shown that the number of career moves and number of management positions in the lodging sector has been fewer for women than men, which may serve as a disadvantage for women who strive to be general managers (Blayney & Blotnicky, 2010). Men who have had more career moves and more management positions tended to work in larger hotels with more services and amenities, while women worked in the smaller, less sophisticated properties. Chuang (2010) found that female undergraduate hospitality students are more sensitive to perceived gender-based career barriers than their male counterparts. Examples of such perceived barriers are: limited career choices, sexual harassment, and not being taken seriously at work.

According to the data, students are expecting to work nights, weekends, and more than 40 hours per week due to those items having low expectation and importance levels. Students seem to be aware of the realistic time and scheduling demands of working in the hospitality industry. These results are consistent with findings from Casado (2002) and De Hauw and De Vos (2010). This could be because most of the students indicated their programs require an internship or work experience, and the students averaged 1,168 hours of experience.

The demographic variable that provides the most differences is number of college credits completed to date, which helps identify whether students were freshmen, sophomores, juniors, or seniors. It appears that students who had completed 0-30 college credits (freshmen) are more optimistic than their older schoolmates. This finding is consistent with Barron and Maxwell (1993) and Jenkins (2001) who found that newer students are more optimistic about the hospitality industry than older students. Newer students may have a more positive outlook because they may have limited work experience and/or may not have taken many core courses in their hospitality program, but rather more of the non-hospitality, general education requirements of their curriculum.

Implications

The overall findings of this study reveal that students are putting more emphasis on the actual facility of the workplace, along with the way they are treated in the workplace. However, there are few differences in individual items when comparing the expectations within the various demographic variables, which present the idea that the undergraduate hospitality students generally have similar expectations of the hospitality industry.

Hospitality educators appear to be doing an excellent job when shaping students' expectations for a career in hospitality management. The additional internships and work

experience required in these programs ensures that students gain real world experience they may not learn in the classroom. Hospitality educators should continue their progress with classroom lectures and projects, and provide opportunities for students to hear industry professionals speak about their current working conditions in the industry.

Because the research reveals that newer students (0-30 credit hours) have different expectations than upper classmen (31+ credit hours), newer students in the program may be taking non-hospitality general education requirements and fewer hospitality courses, which could lead to their more optimistic view of the industry. Educators should require freshmen and new students to enroll in introductory or orientation courses within their first semester to begin the flow of information of characteristics of the hospitality industry. Requiring these courses may begin setting the foundation of what the hospitality industry is like and what students should expect as they are searching for work to fulfill their internship or work experience requirements.

On the other hand, hospitality recruiters may gain more than educators from this study. There are certain expectations that hospitality recruiters do not need to focus on, due to the low levels of expectation and importance to students. The work schedule, in particular, is not an item in which students are concerned. Students understand they will work nights, weekends, and more than 40 hours per week, and their schedule may not be very flexible. This finding confirms De Hauw and De Vos's (2010) and Casado's (1992) findings that students are willing to work more than 40 hours per week and forgo social aspects time in order to succeed in a company. The expectations recruiters should focus on are components of the job itself and the company's facility. Students want a safe work environment and enough resources and equipment to perform their jobs. They expect training when they start their job and expect the opportunity to develop new skills. Clear job descriptions and clear goals and directions for their jobs have also been

found important. All of these can be given to students in the form of realistic job previews during the recruitment process, as suggested by Wanous (1977). Recruiters should communicate to students what their job will realistically be like, discussing various topics such as the work environment and facility, co-workers, company culture, and other unique features of that company.

Although limited by data with 90.4% of respondents being female, gender does not seem to be a make a difference among expectations, except for fair treatment, on which females placed a higher level of expectation. Recruiters may focus their recruiting efforts to highlight this expectation to females if their company has a female in charge of the organization, or the same number of female managers as male managers.

Industry recruiters may also want to understand the expectations of students who have a high level of work experience. They place more emphasis on trust and respect, a flexible work schedule, tuition reimbursement if they take a college course related to their job, and enough resources to do their job. Some of these items can be offered as a sign of loyalty. For example, the longer a student works for a company, the more seniority they gain and may have a more flexible schedule a few years in the future. Or the tuition reimbursement is a special perk if the student can enhance himself / herself and the company at the same time.

Each hospitality program and company will have its own set of unique characteristics. The key to the future will be to align those characteristics with these expectations, or understand where the gap may be and work to overcome that gap so the students will go on to become successful hospitality managers.

Limitations and Future Research

A limitation of this study was the timing of the electronic survey distribution. The electronic survey was distributed to undergraduate students during the last two to three weeks of the semester prior to summer break. Future research with undergraduate students should be done towards the beginning of the school year or semester/trimester.

A second key limitation is that the researcher was unable to email the survey directly to the students. The researcher had to rely on others to distribute the survey, reducing the amount of control the researcher had over the survey. There is no way to guarantee the survey was sent to students as promised by the faculty members. Future research should avoid using a third party to distribute electronic surveys in order to obtain control over survey distribution.

Other limitations are response rate. The response rate was very low. Results could have been more generalizable if the response rate would have been higher. Students may be immune to receiving a large amount of daily emails and may simply delete an email that does not pertain to a class. Future research should aim at finding methods other than emailing surveys to research students in order to obtain a higher response rate. Other forms of electronic survey distribution could be social media (Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn), cell phone applications for smart phones, or text messages.

Response bias is a limitation caused by the self-reporting data. Those who responded may have a different set of expectations and their importance than students who did not respond. Also, the survey was not sent to every student in a 4-year university enrolled in a hospitality management program across the United States. Students attending the universities not surveyed may have different responses. Also, no additional steps were taken to ensure only hospitality management students took the survey other than the initial screening question asking if they are

an undergraduate student majoring in hospitality management. There is a chance that some non-hospitality management students completed the survey. Therefore, the results could be biased.

Finally, this research was exploratory in nature, but provided the respondents with a priori expectations to evaluate. Future research may consider a qualitative approach to explore additional expectations in an attempt to have a more extensive idea of what expectations are truly important to students prior to getting their first post-graduation job.

References

Bal, M. P., & Smit, P. (2012). The older the better! Age-related differences in emotion regulation after psychological contract. *Career Development International, 17*(1), 6-24.

Barron, P., & Maxwell, G. (1993). Hospitality management students' image of the hospitality industry. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 5*(5), v-viii.

Blayney, C., & Blotnicky, K. (2010). The impact of gender on career paths and management capability in the hotel industry in Canada. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism, 9*(3), 233-255.

Blomme, R. J., Van Rheede, A., & Tromp, D. M. (2010). The use of the psychological contract to explain turnover intentions in the hospitality industry: A research study on the impact of gender on the turnover inentions of highly educated employees. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 21*(1), 144-162. doi:10.1080/09585190903466954

Blomme, R. J., Van Rheede, A., & Tromp, D. M. (2009). The hospitality industry: An attractive employer? An exploration of students' and industry workers' perceptions of hospitality as a career field. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Education, 21*(2), 2-14.

Chuang, N. (2010). The impact of gender on hospitality undergraduates' perceived career barriers. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Education, 22*(3), 12-19.

Coyle-Shapiro, J., & Kessler, I. (2000). Consequences of the psychological contract for the employment relationship: A large scale survey. *Journal of Management Studies, 37*(7), 903-903.

Jenkins, A. K. (2001). Making a carrer of it? Hospitality students' future perspectives: An Anglo-Dutch study. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management. 13*(1), 13-20.

Kelley-Patterson, D., & George, C. (2002). Mapping the contract: An exploration of the comparative expectations of graduate employees and human resource managers within the hospitality, leisure and tourism industries in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Services Research, 2*(1), 55-74.

Kotter, J. P. (1973). The psychological contract: Managing the joining-up process. *California Management Review, 15*(3), 91-99.

Lester, S. W., & Kickul, J. (2001). Psychological contracts in the 21st century: What employees
 value most and how well organizations are responding to these expectations. *Human
 Resource Planning, 24*(1), 10-21.

Lester, S. W., Turnley, W. H., Bloodgood, J. M. & Boline, M. C. (2002). Not seeing eye to eye:
 difference in supervisor and subordinate perceptions of and attritbutions for
 psychological contract breach. *Journal of Organizational Behavior. 23*(1), 39-56.

Lub, X., Bijvank, M. N., Bal, P. M., Blomme, R., & Schalk, R. (2012). Different or alike?
 Exploring the psychological contract and commitment of different generations of
 hospitality workers. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management,
 24*(4), 553-573.

MacNeil, I. R. (1985). Relational contract: What we do and do not know. *Wisconsin Law
 Review,* 483-526.

Morrison, E. W., & Robinson, S. L. (1997). When employees feel betrayed: A model of how
 psychological contract violation develops. *The Academy of Management Review, 22*(1),
 226-256.

Robinson, S. L., & Rousseau, D. M. (1994). Violating the psychological contract: Not the
 exception but the norm. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 15*(3), 245-259.

Robinson, S. L., & Morrison, E. W. (2000). The development of psychological contract breach
 and violation: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21*, 525-546.

Rousseau, D. M. (1990). New hire perceptions of their own and their employer's obligations: A
 study of psychological contracts. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 11*(5), 389-400.

Rousseau, D. M. (2001). Schema, promise and mutuality: The building blocks of the
 psychological contract. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 74,*
 511-541.

Suazo, M. M., Turnley, W. H., & Mai-Dalton, R. R. (2005). The role of perceived violation in
 determing employees' reactions to psychlogical contract breach. *Journal of Leadership
 and Organizational Studies. 12*(1), 24-36.

Tomprou, M., & Nikolaou, I. (2011). A model of psychological contract creation upon
 organizational entry. *Career Development International, 16*(4), 342-363.

U.S. Department of Labor, Burea of Labor Statistics. (2012). *Women's earnings, 1979-2011.*
 Retrieved from http://www.bls.gov/opub/ted/2012/ted_20121123.htm

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.

Chapter 5 - Summary and Conclusions

Past research on the psychological contract has focused primarily on the consequences when a psychological contract violation occurs. Less research has focused on the antecedents or formation of the contract, let alone focus on undergraduate hospitality students. Overcoming this dearth of research could lead to understanding the formation of the psychological contract between students and their employer in the hospitality industry. The purpose of this study was to explore the undergraduate hospitality students' pre-entry career expectations and determine the importance of those expectations.

Undergraduate hospitality students from various universities in the United States were surveyed for this study. Faculty members who agreed to participate in this study were sent an electronic survey by the researcher to forward onto the undergraduate students enrolled in their hospitality program. Of the 2,899 students surveyed, 225 responded to the survey, and 146 surveys were usable. The respondents were asked to rate 43 individual items, indicating the level of expectation and importance of each item. Demographic questions were asked at the end of the survey.

Major Findings

Career Expectations

RQ 1. What pre-entry career expectations do undergraduate hospitality students have of the hospitality industry?

This study explored expectations that undergraduate hospitality students may have of the hospitality industry prior to getting their first post-graduation job. Students were asked to indicate their level of agreement (1=strongly disagree; 5=strongly agree) on 43 individual

expectations of their future employer. Results of this study showed that students put a greater expectation on items such as a safe work environment (4.8 ± 0.5), training (4.7 ± 0.6), enough resources (4.6 ± 0.6) and equipment (4.6 ± 0.6) to do their job, clear goals and direction for their job (4.6 ± 0.6), a clear job description (4.6 ± 0.6), and equal employment opportunity for all employees (4.6 ± 0.7). These accounted for seven of the 10 top rated expectations. The other three top exchanges were trust and respect (4.8 ± 0.6), open and honest communication (4.7 ± 0.6), and fair treatment (4.7 ± 0.6).

Students put less emphasis on expecting a flexible work schedule (3.9 ± 0.9), a yearly salary increase (3.9 ± 0.8), tuition reimbursement for college credit courses related to their job (3.5 ± 1.1), or a work schedule with limited nights and weekends (3.4 ± 1.1) and working no more than 40 hours per week (3.4 ± 1.1).

RQ 2. What is the relative importance of various pre-entry career expectations?

When asked to rank the level of importance of each individual item (-2=unimportant, 2=very important), the results of the students' most important items closely mirrored their expectations of hospitality industry. It was found that the most important individual items for the respondents were a safe work environment (1.8 ± 0.4), open and honest communication (1.8 ± 0.5), trust and respect (1.7 ± 0.5), training (1.7 ± 0.5), fair treatment (1.7 ± 0.5), and job security (1.7 ± 0.5). These items were the only items with an importance mean of 1.7 or higher.

The least important individual items were a schedule with no more than a 40-hour work week (0.5 ± 1.1) and limited nights and weekends (0.5 ± 1.1), tuition reimbursement (0.5 ± 1.1), yearly salary increases (0.9 ± 0.8), and a promotion within the first three years of working with the company (0.9 ± 0.8). These are the only individual items with an importance mean of less than 0.9.

Demographic Variables

RQ 3. Do pre-entry career expectations differ based on number of college credit hours completed?

Previous research has found that newer students have different perceptions of the hospitality industry than older students (Barron & Maxwell, 1993). Newer students had more positive perceptions of the hospitality industry than older students. The results of this study support that finding.

There were significant differences found between seven individual items and college credits completed to date. Continual professional training ($p = 0.004$) was significantly different between freshmen and juniors (61 - 90 college credits) and freshmen and seniors (91+ college credits), where freshmen had a higher expectation than juniors and seniors. The expectation of a flexible work schedule ($p = 0.044$) was significantly different between freshmen and sophomores (31 - 60 college credits), with freshmen having a higher expectation. Freshmen had higher means than juniors and seniors when expecting their company to provide them with enough resources to do their job ($p = 0.021$), which was also a finding with a significant difference. Sophomores had a significantly lower mean than the other students when asked if a salary competitive with their work experience and education ($p = 0.012$) was an expectation of their future company. Sophomores also had a significantly lower mean than freshmen and seniors in the expectation that they would have adequate equipment for them to perform their job ($p = 0.016$). Job security ($p = 0.034$) proved to be a significant difference between freshmen and sophomores, giving freshmen a much higher expectation mean than sophomores. Sophomores were also less optimistic than seniors when expecting the freedom to be creative with their job ($p = 0.022$), which was a significant difference.

RQ 4. Do pre-entry career expectations differ among age groups?

There were no significant differences found among the different age groups and the individual expectations. In this study, age was not a contributing factor as much as work experience and number of college credit hours completed.

RQ 5. Do pre-entry career expectations differ between male and female students?

Past research has found that gender can be a mediating factor when examining the psychological contract in the hospitality industry in areas such as job content, clarity of job description, affective commitment, promotion opportunities, and work-family balance (Blomme, et al., 2010). The results of this study do not emulate that study, finding only one significant difference between males and females, which was fair treatment ($p = 0.021$). Females placed a higher expectation on fair treatment than males. However, while this finding is statistically significant, it may not carry practical significance because the vast majority of respondents were female (90.4%). Males and females seemed to be in similar agreement for all other individual items in their levels of expectation from their future employer.

RQ 6. Do pre-entry career expectations differ based on the amount of experience worked in the hospitality industry?

There were four findings with significant differences that suggest expectations differ based on the amount of work experience an undergraduate hospitality student has in the industry. The average number of hours worked per student was 1,168 hours. Students who worked more than 1,168 hours were considered to have high experience, and students who worked less than 1,168 hours were considered to have low work experience. Students who had high experience placed higher expectations on trust and respect ($p = 0.005$), flexible work schedule ($p = 0.034$), tuition reimbursement ($p = 0.035$), and enough resources to do their job ($p = 0.037$).

RQ 7. Do pre-entry career expectations differ between students who have completed an internship/work experience and students who have not completed an internship/work experience?

There was only one significant difference when comparing students who have completed an internship or some level of work experience to student who have not completed an internship and work experience. Students who had not completed work experience placed higher expectation on receiving their days off at their request when making their schedule (p = 0.049). No other individual item revealed a significant difference between the two groups.

Conclusion

A total of 146 surveys from undergraduate hospitality students from various universities in the United States were used for data analysis. The majority of students were female, 19-23 years old, had work experience, were citizens of the United States, but varied in how many college credits they had completed to date and what area of interest they had in the hospitality industry.

Undergraduate hospitality students' top 10 expectations were a safe work environment, trust and respect, training when they start a job, open and honest communication, fair treatment, enough resources to do my job, adequate equipment for me to perform my job, clear goals and objectives for my job, a clear job description, and equal employment opportunity for all employees. Their bottom five expectations were a work schedule with limited nights and weekends, a schedule with no more than a 40-hour work week, tuition reimbursement for college courses taken related to their job, yearly salary increases, and a flexible work schedule. Demographic variables had very little significant difference on expectations, except when it came to student classification (college credit hours completed) and amount of work experience.

Newer students (freshmen) seemed to be more optimistic and place higher levels on expectations than older students. Sophomores seemed to have the lowest levels of expectations among the groups. Students who had worked more than 1,168 hours had higher expectations on a few particular items than students who worked less than 1,168 hours. Age, gender, and area of interest in the hospitality industry had very few, if any, significant differences amongst the expectations.

Implications

The overall findings of this study reveal that students are putting more emphasis on the actual facility of the workplace, along with the way they are treated in the workplace. However, there are few differences in individual items when comparing the expectations within the various demographic variables, which present the idea that the undergraduate hospitality students generally have similar expectations of the hospitality industry.

Hospitality programs and educators appear to be doing an excellent job when shaping students' expectations for a career in hospitality management. The additional required internships and work experience of the programs make students gain that real world work experience they may not learn in the classroom. Hospitality educators should continue their progress with classroom lectures and projects, and provide opportunities for students to hear industry professionals speak to students about their current working conditions in the industry.

On the other hand, hospitality recruiters can gain more than educators from this study. Hospitality recruiters should not focus on certain expectations due to their low expectation and importance levels to students. The work schedule, in particular, is not an item in which students are concerned. Students understand they will work nights and weekends, work more than 40 hours per week, and their schedule may not be very flexible. Therefore, recruiters do not need to

58

worry about talking to students about the work schedule. The expectations recruiters should focus on are components of the job itself and the company's facility. Students want a safe work environment and enough resources and equipment to perform their jobs. They expect training when they start their job and expect the opportunity to develop new skills. Clear job descriptions, goals, and directions for their jobs have also been found important. All of these can be given to students in the form of realistic job previews during the recruitment process, as suggested by Wanous (1977). Recruiters should communicate to students what their job will realistically be like, discussing various topics such as the work environment and facility, co-workers, company culture, and other unique features of that company.

Gender does not seem to make a difference among expectations, except for fair treatment, on which females placed a higher level of expectation. Recruiters may focus their recruiting efforts to highlight this expectation to females if their company has a female in charge of the organization, or the same number of female managers as male managers.

Industry recruiters may also want to understand the expectations of students who have a high level of work experience. They place more emphasis on trust and respect, a flexible work schedule, tuition reimbursement if they take a college course related to their job, and enough resources to do their job. Some of these items can be offered as a sign of loyalty. For example, the longer a student works for a company, the more seniority they gain and may have a more flexible schedule a few years in the future. Or the tuition reimbursement is a special perk if the student can enhance himself / herself and the company at the same time.

Each hospitality program and company will have its own set of unique characteristics. The key to the future will be to align those characteristics with these expectations, or understand

where the gap may be and work to overcome that gap so the students will go on to become successful hospitality managers.

Limitations and Future Research

An important limitation of this study was the timing of the electronic survey distribution. The electronic surveys were distributed to undergraduate students during the last two to three weeks of the semester prior to summer break. This timing was during a period where students are focused on studying for final exams, finishing final projects, or they had recently finished classes and were no longer checking their school email. Future research with undergraduate students should be done towards the beginning of the school year or semester/trimester in order to minimize this limitation.

A second key limitation is that the researcher was unable to email the surveys directly to the students. Success of this study was dependent on whether the faculty members at each university emailed the survey to their students as they had promised. Future research should also avoid using a third party to distribute electronic surveys, unless it is an official marketing research company. Market research companies that have distribution lists of respondents who expect to receive surveys, and are possibly compensated for their participation. Future research should aim at finding methods other than electronic surveys to study students because students could ignore emails that do not pertain directly to a class or are from an unknown individual. Forms of electronic survey distribution could be channeled through social media (Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn), a mobile application for smart phones, or text messages.

Other limitations are response rate and response bias. The response rate was very low. Results could have been more generalizable if the response rate would have been higher. The response bias is caused by the self-reporting data of the survey. Those who responded may have

different levels of expectations and importance than students who did not respond. Also, the survey was not sent to every student in a 4-year university enrolled in a hospitality management program across the United States. Students attending the universities not surveyed may have different responses. Also, no other steps were taken to ensure only hospitality management students took the survey. Only the first question on the survey asked if they are an undergraduate student majoring in hospitality management. There is a chance that some non-hospitality management students completed the survey. Therefore, the results could be biased.

Finally, this research was exploratory in nature, but provided the respondents with a priori expectations to evaluate. This study did not explore additional pre-entry career expectations the students may have of the hospitality industry. Future research may consider a qualitative approach to explore additional expectations in an attempt to have a more extensive idea of what expectations are truly important to students prior to getting their first post-graduation job.

References

Bal, M. P., & Smit, P. (2012). The older the better! Age-related differences in emotion regulation after psychological contract. *Career Development International, 17*(1), 6-24.

Barron, P., & Maxwell, G. (1993). Hospitality management students' image of the hospitality industry. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management, 5*(5), v-viii.

Blayney, C., & Blotnicky, K. (2010). The impact of gender on career paths and management capability in the hotel industry in Canada. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism, 9*(3), 233-255.

Blomme, R. J., Van Rheede, A., & Tromp, D. M. (2010). The use of the psychological contract to explain turnover intentions in the hospitality industry: A research study on the impact of gender on the turnover inentions of highly educated employees. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 21*(1), 144-162. doi:10.1080/09585190903466954

Blomme, R. J., Van Rheede, A., & Tromp, D. M. (2009). The hospitality industry: An attractive employer? An exploration of students' and industry workers' perceptions of hospitality as a career field. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Education, 21*(2), 2-14.

Careerism. (n.d.). In *Merriam-Webster's online dictionary*. Retrieved from http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/careerism

Casado, M. A. (1992). Student expectations of the hospitality industry. *Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly, 33*(4), 80-82.

Chuang, N. (2010). The impact of gender on hospitality undergraduates' perceived career barriers. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Education, 22*(3), 12-19.

Coyle-Shapiro, J., & Kessler, I. (2000). Consequences of the psychological contract for the employment relationship: A large scale survey. *Journal of Management Studies, 37*(7), 903-903.

De Hauw, S., & De Vos, A. (2010). Millennials' career perspectives and psychological contract expectations: Does the recession lead to lowered expectations? *Journal of Business Psychology, 25*, 293-302. doi: 10.1007/s10869-010-9162-9

Dillman, D. A. (2007). *Mail and internet surveys: The tailored design method.* (2nd ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Education News. (2010). Career index. *Hotel Management Schools.* Retrieved from
>   http://www.educationnews.org/career-index/hotel-management-schools/

Fiske, S. T., & Taylor, S. E. (1984). *Social cognition.* Reading, M.A.: Addison-Wesley
>   Publishing Company.

Herriot, P., Manning, W. E. G., & Kidd, J. M. (1997). The content of the psychological contract.
>   *British Journal of Management, 8*, 151-162.

Jenkins, A. K. (2001). Making a carrer of it? Hospitality students' future perspectives: An
>   Anglo-Dutch study. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management.*
>   *13*(1), 13-20.

Kelley-Patterson, D., & George, C. (2002). Mapping the contract: An exploration of the
>   comparative expectations of graduate employees and human resource managers within
>   the hospitality, leisure and tourism industries in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Services*
>   *Research, 2*(1), 55-74.

Kotter, J. P. (1973). The psychological contract: Managing the joining-up process. *California*
>   *Management Review, 15*(3), 91-99.

Lester, S. W., & Kickul, J. (2001). Psychological contracts in the 21st century: What employees
>   value most and how well organizations are responding to these expectations. *Human*
>   *Resource Planning, 24*(1), 10-21.

Lester, S. W., Turnley, W. H., Bloodgood, J. M. & Boline, M. C. (2002). Not seeing eye to eye:
>   difference in supervisor and subordinate perceptions of and attritbutions for
>   psychological contract breach. *Journal of Organizational Behavior. 23*(1), 39-56.

Longman Dictionary of comptemporary english (3rd ed.). (1995). Harlow, England: Longman
>   House.

Lub, X., Bijvank, M. N., Bal, P. M., Blomme, R., & Schalk, R. (2012). Different or alike?
>   Exploring the psychological contract and commitment of different generations of
>   hospitality workers. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management,*
>   *24*(4), 553-573.

MacNeil, I. R. (1985). Relational contract: What we do and do not know. *Wisconsin Law*
>   *Review,* 483-526.

Morrison, E. W., & Robinson, S. L. (1997). When employees feel betrayed: A model of how psychological contract violation develops. *The Academy of Management Review, 22*(1), 226-256.

Orbell, J. M., van de Kragt, A. J. C., & Dawes, R. M. (1988). Explaining discussion-induced coorpration. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54*(5), 811-819.

Robinson, S. L., & Rousseau, D. M. (1994). Violating the psychological contract: Not the exception but the norm. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 15*(3), 245-259.

Robinson, S. L., & Morrison, E. W. (2000). The development of psychological contract breach and violation: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 21*, 525-546.

Rousseau, D. M. (1990). New hire perceptions of their own and their employer's obligations: A study of psychological contracts. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 11*(5), 389-400.

Rousseau, D. M. (2001). Schema, promise and mutuality: The building blocks of the psychological contract. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 74,* 511-541.

Suazo, M. M., Turnley, W. H., & Mai-Dalton, R. R. (2005). The role of perceived violation in determing employees' reactions to psychlogical contract breach. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies. 12*(1), 24-36.

Taylor, S. E. & Crocker, J. (1981). Schematic bases of social information processing. In E. T. Higgins, C. P. Herman, & M. P. Zanna (Eds.), *Social cognition: The Ontario Symposium* (pp. 89-134). Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

The American Heritage college dictionary (4th ed.). (2002). Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Tomprou, M., & Nikolaou, I. (2011). A model of psychological contract creation upon organizational entry. *Career Development International, 16*(4), 342-363.

U.S. Department of Labor, Burea of Labor Statistics. (2012). *Women's earnings, 1979-2011.* Retrieved from http://www.bls.gov/opub/ted/2012/ted_20121123.htm

Walker, J. R. (2013). *Introduction to hospitality.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.

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.

Wanous, J. P. (1977). Organizational entry: Newcomers moving from outside to inside. *Psychological Bulletin*, *84*(4), 601-618.

Appendix A - Institutional Review Board

TO: Kevin Roberts   Proposal Number: 6635
      HMD
      106 Justin Hall

FROM: Rick Scheidt, Chair
      Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects

DATE: 03/19/2013

RE: Proposal Entitled, "An Exploration of Undergraduate Hospitality Students' Pre-Entry Career
      Expectations"

The Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects / Institutional Review Board (IRB) for Kansas State
University has reviewed the proposal identified above and has determined that it is EXEMPT from further
IRB review. This exemption applies only to the proposal - as written – and currently on file with the IRB.
Any change potentially affecting human subjects must be approved by the IRB prior to implementation and
may disqualify the proposal from exemption.

Based upon information provided to the IRB, this activity is exempt under the criteria set forth in the
Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects, **45 CFR §46.101, paragraph b, category: 2,
subsection: ii.**

Certain research is exempt from the requirements of HHS/OHRP regulations. A determination that
research is exempt does not imply that investigators have no ethical responsibilities to subjects in such
research; it means only that the regulatory requirements related to IRB review, informed consent, and
assurance of compliance do not apply to the research.

Any unanticipated problems involving risk to subjects or to others must be reported immediately to the
Chair of the Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects, the University Research Compliance
Office, and if the subjects are KSU students, to the Director of the Student Health Center.

Appendix B - Pilot Test Cover Letter

Dear Hospitality Student,

We are conducting a pilot survey to explore the pre-entry career expectations of undergraduate hospitality students. The purpose of this study is to examine the pre-entry career expectations and their relative importance to students. Your participation will provide us feedback regarding the wording, flow, and estimated time to complete the survey. It should only take you ten minutes to complete the survey.

Completing the survey involves no risk to you. Your participation is completely voluntary. There is no penalty for refusing to participate in this survey and you may discontinue participation at any time. Individual responses will be completely anonymous. Your responses will be kept confidential and all data will be reported as group data. You will find the link to the survey below. This link will be available until Thursday, April 18.

https://kstate.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_3wJJlRh7aOyqv2d

Your participation is essential to the success of this study. We truly appreciate your time and assistance. If you have any questions about the study, please contact Dr. Kevin Roberts at (785) 532-2399. If you have any questions about your research subject's rights or about the process of this study, you may contact the University Research Compliance Office at (785) 532-3224.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Dale   Kevin Roberts, PhD
Academic Advisor   Associate Professor
M.S. Graduate Student   Director, Undergraduate Program

Appendix C - Pilot Test Questionnaire

Are you currently an undergraduate student majoring in a degree-seeking Bachelor program in Hospitality Management, or a similarly named program?

    Yes

    No

Please indicate your ranking for the below statements

	I expect my future employer to provide me with….					Importance of this item….				
	Strongly agree	Disagree	Neither	Agree	Strongly agree	Unimportant	Of little important	Neither important nor unimportant	Important	Very important
Trust and resect	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Consideration of my personal and family needs	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Continual professional training	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Yearly salary increase	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
The opportunity to make my own decisions about my job	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
The opportunity to participate when making decisions that affect my job	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
A flexible work schedule	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
An orientation when I start with the organization	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Equal employment opportunity for all employees	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Tuition reimbursement for any college credit course I take related to my job	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Opportunities to transfer within my company (within departments or other properties)	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Recognition for my accomplishments	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
A clear job description	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Training when I start a job	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
A promotion within the first 3 years of working with the company	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Challenging and interesting work	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Enough resources to do my job	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
A work schedule limited in nights and weekends	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•

	I expect my future employer to provide me with….					Importance of this item….				
	Strongly agree	Disagree	Neither	Agree	Strongly agree	Unimportant	Of little important	Neither important nor unimportant	Important	Very important
Opportunities to develop new skills	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
A salary competitive with my work experience and education	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Adequate equipment for me to perform my job	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Cooperation and support from co-workers	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
My days off at my request when making schedules	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Competent upper management	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Meaningful work to do at my job	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Constructive feedback on my performance	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Fair treatment	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Opportunities to adapt my work schedule to my family obligations	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Pay and bonuses related to my personal performance	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
A safe work environment	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Clear goals and direction for my job	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Vacation benefits	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
A mentor to encourage my personal and professional growth	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Job security	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
More responsibilities and tasks if I perform my current tasks well	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Support from upper management	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Freedom to be creative with my job	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Opportunities for personal growth	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Retirement benefits	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Competent co-workers	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
A work schedule with no more than a 40-hour work week	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•

	I expect my future employer to provide me with….					Importance of this item….				
	Strongly agree	Disagree	Neither	Agree	Strongly agree	Unimportant	Of little important	Neither important nor unimportant	Important	Very important
Health care benefits	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•
Open and honest communication	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•	•

Gender

     Male
     Female

What is your age?

     _____

How many college credit hours have you completed to date?

     0-30
     31-60
     61-90
     91 or more

Please rank your intention of working in the hospitality industry.

     I do not plan to work in this industry
     Very unlikely
     Unlikely
     Somewhat Unlikely
     Undecided
     Somewhat Likely
     Likely
     Very Likely

In what area of Hospitality Management do you plan to work?

     Food and Beverage
     Lodging
     Conventions, Meetings, and Events
     Culinary
     Tourism
     Other (please type in your area of interest)

Will you be graduating with your Bachelor's degree in 2013?
  Yes
  No

Have you accepted your first post-graduation position?
  Yes
  No

How many years do you expect to work for a company before being promoted within that same company?
  0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

How many years and/or months have you worked in the hospitality industry in a non-supervisory role? (For example: 2 years and 3 months)
  _____ years _____ months

How many estimated hours have you work per week in a non-supervisory role? (For example: 40)

  _____

How many years and/or months have you worked in the hospitality industry as a supervisor or manager? (For example: 2 years and 3 months)
  _____ years _____ months

How many estimated hours have you work per week as a supervisor of manager? (For example: 40)

  _____

Does your school require an internship or work experience prior to graduation?
  Yes
  No

Are you a citizen of the United States?
  Yes
  No

Were all of the questions worded correctly and understandable?
If no, please indicate any changes needed on the actual questionnaire.
  Yes
  No

Appendix D - Faculty Member Invitation Letter

Dear Faculty Member,

We are conducting a survey to explore the pre-entry career expectations of undergraduate hospitality students. We are requesting your assistance with this study. Would you be willing to send the electronic survey to all students enrolled in your Hospitality program? The ideal method would be to send the survey to all students enrolled in your program via a listserv. If you do not maintain a program listserv with all students' email addresses, the alternative method would be to send the survey to a few large courses that would have students who would be representative of your program.

If you are willing to help distribute the survey to your students, please reply back to this email (rebeccad@k-state.edu) by April 30, 2013. Please include the current enrollment numbers for your program in your email so we can get an accurate count for our sample. If you agree to participate in the survey, you will receive a link to the online survey May 2, 2013.
Sincerely,

Rebecca Dale   Kevin Roberts, PhD
Academic Advisor   Associate Professor
M.S. Graduate Student   Director, Undergraduate Program
Kansas State University   Kansas State University

Appendix E - Final Survey Cover Letter

Dear Hospitality Student,

We are conducting a survey to explore the career expectations of undergraduate hospitality students and their relative importance to students. It should take you **no longer than fifteen minutes** to complete the survey.

Completing the survey involves no risk to you. Your participation is completely voluntary. There is no penalty for refusing to participate in this survey and you may discontinue participation at any time. Individual responses will be completely anonymous. Your responses will be kept confidential and all data will be reported as group data. At the end of completing the survey, you may enter your email address to enter a drawing for **one of four $50 iTunes gift cards**. The email addresses will return separately from your survey responses.

Below is the link to the survey.
https://kstate.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_aWNF0EWGAI2qZq5

Your participation is essential to the success of this study. We truly appreciate your time and assistance. If you have any questions about the study, please contact Rebecca Dale at (785) 532-1660 or Dr. Kevin Roberts at (785) 532-2399. If you have any questions about your research subject's rights or about the process of this study, you may contact the University Research Compliance Office at (785) 532-3224.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Dale   Kevin Roberts, PhD
Academic Advisor   Associate Professor
M.S. Graduate Student   Director, Undergraduate Program

Appendix F - Final Questionnaire

Default Question Block

Are you currently an undergraduate student majoring in a degree-seeking Bachelor program in Hospitality Management, or a similarly named program?

○ Yes

○ No

Please indicate your ranking for the below statements

	I expect my future employer to provide me with…					Importance of this item…				
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither	Agree	Strongly agree	Unimportant	Of little importance	Neither important or unimportant	Important	Very important
Trust and respect	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Consideration of my personal and family needs	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Continual professional training	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Yearly salary increase	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
The opportunity to make my own decisions about my job	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
The opportunity to participate when making decisions that affect my job	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
A flexible work schedule	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
An orientation when I start with the organization	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Equal employment opportunity for all employees	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Tuition reimbursement for any college credit course I take related to my job	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Opportunities to transfer within my company (within departments or other properties)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Please indicate your ranking for the below statements

I expect my future employer to provide me

Importance of this item…

with…

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither	Agree	Strongly agree	Unimportant	Of little importance	Neither important or unimportant	Important	Very important
Recognition for my accomplishments	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎
A clear job description	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎
Training when I start a job	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎
A promotion within the first 3 years of working with the company	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎
Challenging and interesting work	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎
Enough resources to do my job	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎
A work schedule limited in nights and weekends	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎
Opportunities to develop new skills	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎
A salary competitive with my work experience and education	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎
Adequate equipment for me to perform my job	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎
Cooperation and support from co-workers	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎

Please indicate your ranking for the below statements

	I expect my future employer to provide me with…					Importance of this item…				
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither	Agree	Strongly agree	Unimportant	Of little importance	Neither important or unimportant	Important	Very important
My days off at my request when making schedules	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎
Competent upper management	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎
Meaningful work to do at my job	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎
Constructive feedback on my performance	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎
Fair treatment	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎
Opportunities to adapt my work schedule to my family obligations	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎	◎

Pay and

	bonuses related to my personal performance	○	○	○	○	○		○	○	○	○	○
A safe work environment	○	○	○	○	○		○	○	○	○	○
Clear goals and direction for my job	○	○	○	○	○		○	○	○	○	○
Vacation benefits	○	○	○	○	○		○	○	○	○	○
A mentor to encourage my personal and professional growth	○	○	○	○	○		○	○	○	○	○

Please indicate your ranking for the below statements

	I expect my future employer to provide me with…					Importance of this item…				
	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither	Agree	Strongly agree	Unimportant	Of little importance	Neither important or unimportant	Important	Very important
Job security	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
More responsibilities and tasks if I perform my current tasks well	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Support from upper management	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Freedom to be creative with my job	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Opportunities for personal growth	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Retirement benefits	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Competent co-workers	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
A work schedule with no more than a 40-hour work week	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Health care benefits	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
Open and honest communication	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Gender

○ Male

○ Female

What is your age?

[   ]

How many college credits have you completed to date?

○ 0-30

○ 31-60

○ 61-90

○ 91 or more

Click to write the question text

	I do not plan to work in this industry	Very Unlikely	Unlikely	Somewhat Unlikely	Undecided	Somewhat Likely	Likely	Very Likely
Please rank your intention of working in the hospitality industry.	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

In what area of Hospitality Management do you plan to work?

○ Food and Beverage

○ Lodging

○ Conventions, Meetings and Events

○ Culinary

○ Tourism

○ Other

[   ]

Will you be graduating with your Bachelor's degree in 2013?

○ Yes

○ No

Have you accepted your first post-graduation position?

○ Yes

○ No

How many years do you expect to work for a company before being promoted within that same company?

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Years								

How many years and/or months have you worked in the hospitality industry in a non-supervisory role? (For example: 2 years and 3 months)

Years

Months

How many estimated hours have you worked per week in a non-supervisory role?
(For example: 40)

How many years and/or months have you worked in the hospitality industry as a supervisor or manager?
(For example: 2 years and 3 months)

Years

Months

How many estimated hours have you worked per week as a supervisor or manager?
(For example: 40)

Does your school require an internship or work experience prior to graduation?

- Yes
- No

Are you a citizen of the United States?

- Yes
- No