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ABSTRACT

There has been a tremendous increase in student enrolment on hospitality management programmes in recent years. However, industry practitioners consistently complain about shortage of skilled staff in the hospitality industry. This study sought to examine factors that influence undergraduate hospitality students’ choice of careers in the hospitality industry in Ghana. The study was informed by the social cognitive learning theory, social cognitive career theory and self-theories, and followed the pragmatist research philosophy. Employing a sequential explanatory mixed methods strategy, both questionnaires and interview guides were used for data collection. A sample size of 1,341 undergraduate hospitality students was taken from different public traditional and technical universities across the country, using a multi-stage sampling method. The study found, among other things, that students had neither positive nor negative perceptions about careers in the hospitality industry. Also, students differed in their perceptions about careers in the industry based on some socio-demographic and social characteristics. Intention to operate own hospitality business and peer influence were among the best predictors of students’ choice of hospitality careers. It was concluded that, students intend to choose careers in the hospitality industry because they desire to operate own hospitality businesses. It was further recommended that university authorities and hospitality departments should provide the needed support services for students to appreciate careers in the hospitality industry.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Background to the Study

Globally, the tourism and hospitality industry provides employment to millions of people. The industry is said to be one of the largest employing industries in the world. It employs about 10 percent of the global workforce (World Travel and Tourism Council, 2018). According to the World Travel and Tourism Council (2017), the sector contributed USD 7.6 trillion (10.2%) of the world’s Gross Domestic Product (GDP) in 2016. The tourism and hospitality industry has contributed immensely to the GDP of most countries, including Ghana. The total contribution of the travel and tourism sector in 2016 was USD 2,967.1 million, signifying a 7.1% contribution to Ghana’s GDP (WTTC, 2017). With regard to tax revenue, the sector generated USD 194 million in 2010 and this figure is also expected to rise to USD 1.3 billion by 2027 (Ministry of Tourism [MoT], 2013). The industry first received national attention in the 1990’s and has since received an appreciable support from successive governments (Akyeampong, 2007).

Although the hospitality industry dates back to the earliest times of inn keeping, the introduction of higher learning programmes in this field is a relatively recent phenomenon, as compared to other fields like medicine, arts and engineering (Chang & Tse, 2015; Cooper, Shepherd, & Westlake, 1996). However, there has been an increase in the number of both government and private owned tertiary institutions that offer programmes in the hospitality discipline (Robinson, Ruhanen, & Breakey, 2015). In Ghana, for example, out of the 13 public and traditional universities, eight offer programmes in tourism
and hospitality and its allied fields. Also, all the eight public technical universities in the country offer programmes in hospitality management. Additionally, there are also numerous private tertiary institutions offering programmes in hospitality and tourism in the country.

With regard to enrolment, there has been an increase in the number of students enrolling on the hospitality programme. For instance, the number of undergraduate freshmen and women who enrolled to pursue hospitality programmes in some eight universities in the country rose from 858 to 1,568, from the 2015/2016 to 2017/2018 academic year, as indicated in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of University</th>
<th>2015/2016</th>
<th>2016/2017</th>
<th>2017/2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accra Technical University</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamale Technical University</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Coast Technical University</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Cape Coast</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunyani Technical University</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takoradi Technical University</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Education-Kumasi campus</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kumasi Technical University</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>858</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,102</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,568</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage of Increment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>28.44</strong></td>
<td><strong>42.28</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, Anthony (2018)
This signifies a 82.75% increase in enrolment within the said period. The implication of this is that the increased numbers of students enrolled on hospitality programmes are expected to find jobs in the various career openings within the industry.

During the launch of the second National Tourism and Hospitality Exhibition Conference and Career Fair (NATHAFEST, 2015), the president of Ghana Hoteliers Association bemoaned the unavailability of trained professionals in the hospitality industry despite the high number of hospitality graduates being churned out by the country’s universities. The president of the association further highlighted the negative effects of this phenomenon on the growth of the industry (Acquaye, 2015).

Unfortunately, studies have shown that most hospitality graduates do not want to choose careers in the industry or leave shortly after entering the industry (Blomme, Van Rheede, & Tromp, 2009; Mohammed & Rashid, 2016; Richardson & Butler, 2012; Walsh & Taylor, 2007; Wan, Wong, & Kong, 2014). This development might be because careers in the industry are characterised by high employee turnover, high attrition rates, irregular working hours which affect family life, poor work security, poor progression, low status, high physical demand (Birdir, as cited in Roney & Öztin, 2007; Richardson & Butler, 2012; Roney & Öztin, 2007; Wan et al., 2014) among others. Careers in the industry have also been perceived to be interesting, challenging, never boring, offering opportunity to meet new people, always on the move and rewarding as well (Barron & Maxwell, 1993). These differences in perception about careers in the industry have been said to vary among
students based on students’ academic level, status and exposure to industry experience (Chan, Chan, & Qu, 2002).

According to Sullivan and Baruch (2009), career is an individual’s work-related experiences, both within and without an organisation. These experiences create a distinct pattern across the life of the person. Career has evolved from the stage of being solely a choice of understanding self, competencies and having knowledge of its requirements (Parson, 1909) through various stages to being a series of a person’s work-related experiences for the most part of his/her life (Sullivan & Baruch, 2009). A career is further concluded to be the unfolding sequence of an individual’s work-related experiences over a period of time (Arnold & Cohen, 2008; Arthur, Khapova, & Wilderom, 2005).

There are numerous career opportunities in the hospitality industry. These include employment opportunities in hotels, restaurants, transport catering, events management and hospitality education as well as various entrepreneurial activities. Undergraduate students are employed as food and beverage supervisors or managers, housekeeping supervisors, kitchen supervisors or managers, matrons and domestic bursars in many different segments of the industry.

Students’ choice of careers is influenced by various factors, either personal or environmental (Bandura, 1986; Lent, Brown, & Hackett, 2000; Shumba & Naong, 2012). The factors influencing choice of careers may also be classified as intrinsic, extrinsic, and interpersonal (Beyon, Kelleen & Kishor, 1998; Carpenter & Foster, 1977). Career is influenced by various complex factors composed of individual, organisational and social structures.
These factors may also be grouped as micro-individual, meso-institutional and relational, macro-structural (Özbilgin, Küskü, & Erdoğmuş, 2005). Also, the various factors influencing career choice may also be put in specific areas such as interest, ability, parental or family influence, peer influence, experience, and job security.

Factors influencing choice of career can also be grouped into social and structural influences. Social factors include role models, peers, media, and parents. Structural influencers are composed of institutional support such as leadership and counselling, access to technology, among others (Ahuja, as cited in Lawer, 2015). Furthermore, factors influencing choice of career may be conveniently grouped under personal and environmental factors. For example, Korir and Wafula (2012) grouped factors influencing students’ choice of careers into personal, environmental and opportunity factors. Various combinations of these groupings have been used in different studies. Thus, students’ choices of hospitality careers are influenced by both personal and environmental factors. As concluded by Lent, Brown, and Hackett (2000) and Sullivan and Baruch (2009), career is influenced by both contextual and personal factors.

Personal factors are conceptualised as those factors that are unique to the student. They include variables like age, sex, marital status, academic level, competence, and personality. Environmental factors, on the other hand, comprise those factors within the social, economic, and academic environments of the student. The social cognitive career theory underscores the influencing roles that the myriad personal and environmental factors have on students’ choice of careers. Bandura (1986) also commented in his social
cognitive learning theory that decisions and behaviours are modelled from the interaction between self and environment. According to Lent, Brown, and Hackett (1994), environmental factors play vital roles in the choices people make when it comes to careers. In their view, these factors either support or hinder the choice of career. Examples of environmental factors include influence from family and friends, social life, issues of remuneration, university support services, student location, and opportunities available for hospitality careers.

Students’ perceptions of hospitality career could be positive, negative or neutral. For instance, hospitality students have negatively perceived careers in the industry to be characterised by low wages (Neequaye & Amoo, 2014; Richardson & Butler, 2012), poor work environment (Bellamy, 2010), boredom and poor work hours (Selçuk, Erdoğan, & Güllüce, 2013). Students have also endorsed the industry to provide opportunity for career development (Neequaye & Amoo, 2014). When students’ perception of the industry is negative, it can negatively affect their choice of hospitality careers and vice versa. Perceptions are shaped by experiences, habits, competence, among others. The learning environment which is part of the social environment enhances the perceptions of students in diverse ways, as proposed by the social cognitive learning theory by Bandura (1986). A clear understanding of how these factors influence students’ choice of hospitality careers is, thus, imperative.

However, there are roles universities could play in helping students form the right perceptions about careers within the hospitality industry. These include providing career counselling, industry linkages, entrepreneurial advice
and well planned and supervised internships. There is evidence from various studies to show that unavailability of these services negatively affects students’ choice of career (Bojuwoye & Mbanjwa, 2006; Kemboi, Kindiki, & Misigo, 2016; Qiu, Dooley, & Palkar, 2017). The social cognitive career theory posits that, among other things, institutional support influences career choice and development. It is, therefore, important for universities to provide these support services, as these will help retain the trained human resources for the industry.

Currently, the hospitality industry in Ghana is seen as operating and performing below its capacity (Frimpong-Bonsu, 2015). This may be partly attributed to lack of qualified personnel to render the services required in the industry (MoT, 2013). Also, hospitality graduates often choose careers in other industries other than the hospitality industry (Qiu et al., 2017; Wong & Liu, 2010). Thus, it is necessary to examine the factors that influence students’ choice of hospitality careers.

**Hospitality Education in Ghana**

The need to train people for the hospitality industry cannot be underestimated, as this is a necessity for the industry to meet its expected standard. Catering is said to be the first tourism/hospitality-related discipline to receive formal education attention (Akyeampong, 2007). At this level, the focus was on the training of operational staff for the hospitality industry through the establishment of vocational and technical schools. The non-tertiary programmes run by these institutions were purposely to equip students with hands-on skills for the industry.
Students who successfully completed these programmes were awarded Intermediate (812/1) and Advanced (812/2) certificates in cookery. With this training, the graduate could work in kitchens as cooks, restaurants as waiters/waitresses and also as room maids in hotels. There was also the National Vocational Training Institute (NVTI) certificate grade one and two, which were lower in categorisation to the intermediate and advanced certificates. There was later the Institutional Management (IM) certificate which students who have successfully completed the above are to enrol onto. With the exception of IM, both state-owned and private institutions still run these certificate courses.

However, a recent addition to the curricula of these non-tertiary programmes is the inclusion of core subjects: English language, Mathematics and Science. This is to make it possible for graduates with these certificates to have easier access to tertiary education, without necessarily attending Senior High School. This development gives better opportunity to vocational school students to further their education either at the university, technical university or polytechnic more easily. In 1991, the Hotel, Catering and Tourism Training Institute (HOTCATT) was established in Accra. Its main focus was to train and enhance the skills of tourism and hospitality staff (operatives). The training was heavily hinged on practical skills acquisition (Akyeampong, 2007). With regard to the hospitality as a tertiary programme, a major boost came after the upgrading of the then technical schools to the status of polytechnics in the early 1990s. This development empowered the polytechnics to now train students with knowledge and skills to occupy middle level management positions (supervisors) in the hospitality industry.
In 2016, through Act 922, six of the polytechnics (Accra, Kumasi, Takoradi, Koforidua, Sunyani and Ho) were again upgraded to technical university status and two others (Cape Coast and Tamale) were later added to the list in 2018. So far, Bolgatanga and Wa Polytechnics are awaiting necessary inputs for upgrade to technical universities. All these technical universities and polytechnics offer programmes in hospitality management, with some awarding Higher National Diploma certificates and others to the level of Bachelor of Technology (B-Tech) degrees, with or without affiliation to other traditional universities.

University of Cape Coast is the first traditional university to start a hospitality management programme in Ghana, although it first started as a tourism programme under the erstwhile Department of Geography and Tourism in 1996. Currently, the department awards degrees in hospitality management from the bachelor to doctorate levels. University of Education-College of Technology (Kumasi campus) also offers programme in hospitality management at the master’s level. Ghana Institute of Management and Public Administration (GIMPA) also offers programmes in hospitality management at the undergraduate level.

A notable difference in the curricula of technical universities and traditional universities is that, whilst the technical universities emphasise practical skills, the traditional universities stress theoretical knowledge. The differences may mean that students from each type of university may have specific place in the industry. However, industrial internships/attachments are expected to make-up for the little practical exposure though with some difficulty (Akyeampong, 2007). Besides the public higher learning
institutions, there are private institutions which also produce graduates with degrees in hospitality management. However, for this study, the focus is on public traditional and technical universities.

**Problem Statement**

Generally, programmes pursued by students at the tertiary level are to prepare them for various careers (Docherty & Fernandez, 2014; Ezeuduji, Chibe & Nyathela, 2017; Mau & Fernandes, 2001; Starkey, Hactchuel, & Tempest, 2004; Wang & Tsai, 2014). However, numerous studies have shown that students have little interest in careers in the hospitality industry (Khan & Krishanamurthy, 2016; Kumar, Singh, Kumar, & Dahiya, 2014; Kusluvan & Kusluvan, 2000; Richardson, 2008, 2010; Richardson & Butler, 2012; Zopiatis & Kyprianou, 2006). This has resulted in the growing shortage of qualified and skilled employees for the industry (International Society of the Hospitality Consultants, 2006; Lu & Adler, 2008; Richardson, 2010).

Although hospitality students are prospective employees of the industry, studies have shown that they tend to have generally poor perceptions of careers in the industry (Blomme et al., 2009; Richardson & Butler, 2012; Wan et al., 2014). It is, however, not clear as to what accounts for such negative perceptions. It is, therefore, important to find out the factors (both personal and environmental) which account for this state of affairs. Also, previous studies were done in other jurisdictions (Kusluvan & Kusluvan, 2000; Richardson & Butler, 2012; Roney & Öztin, 2007). However, the situation could be different in Ghana due to locational and cultural differences, socio-economic conditions, education system, and the extent to which the hospitality industry is developed. Moreover, studies conducted in Ghana in
this regard (e.g. Amissah, Opoku-Mensah, Mensah, & Gammor, 2019; Amoo & Neequaye, 2014) are limiting, as they sampled students from a particular university.

Most studies on students’ choice of hospitality careers basically describe the background characteristics of students and their perceptions of the industry (King & Hang, 2011; Kumar et al., 2014; Richardson & Butler, 2012). These studies did not statistically explain whether there are causal relationships between the background characteristics of students and students’ choice of hospitality industry careers. Additionally, the role of support services in the learning environment and how this supports students’ choice of careers in the hospitality industry has largely been ignored in previous studies.

Furthermore, Wong and Liu (2010) examined the perceptions of hospitality and tourism students at the undergraduate level. The study sought to assess how parental influence predicts career choice intention within the China hospitality industry. They recommended studies to compare the perceptions of students studying at various levels as well as at different colleges or universities. It is against this backdrop that this study seeks to investigate factors influencing the choice of hospitality careers of undergraduate students in Ghana.

**Research Questions**

The study sought to answer the following research questions:

i. How do students perceive careers in the hospitality industry?

ii. What are the differences in perceptions of hospitality careers among different categories of students?
iii. What are the effects of personal and environmental factors on students’ choice of hospitality careers?

**Research Objectives**

The main objective of the study was to examine the factors influencing choice of hospitality careers by undergraduate hospitality students in Ghana. The specific objectives were to:

i. Examine students’ perceptions of careers in the hospitality industry;

ii. Examine the differences in perceptions of hospitality careers by different categories of students;

iii. Analyse the effects of personal factors on students’ choice of hospitality careers;

iv. Analyse the effects of environmental factors on students’ choice of hospitality careers.

**Research Hypotheses:**

\( H_1 \): Gender of student has no significant effect on choice of hospitality career

\( H_2 \): Age of student has no significant effect on choice of hospitality career

\( H_3 \): Religion of student has no significant effect on choice of hospitality career

\( H_4 \): Industry experience has no significant effect on choice of hospitality career

\( H_5 \): Marital status has no significant effect on choice of hospitality careers

\( H_6 \): Academic level has no significant effect on choice of hospitality career

\( H_7 \): Personality trait has no significant effect on choice of hospitality career

\( H_8 \): Type of university has no significant effect on choice of hospitality career

\( H_9 \): Residential location of student has no significant effect on choice of hospitality career
H_{10}: Family influence has no significant effect on choice of hospitality career
H_{11}: Peer influence has no significant effect on choice of hospitality career

Significance of the Study

Like all service industries, the hospitality industry considers a qualified human resource as an indispensable factor of success. Meanwhile, perceptions are the basis for decision-making. The perceptions of students of careers in the hospitality industry will, therefore, be a determining factor in their choice of hospitality careers. The perceptions of students with regard to careers within the industry for which they are being trained are very important (Aksu & Köksal, 2005; Barron & Maxwell, 1993; Roney & Öztin, 2007). This is because students who have positive perceptions of careers in the hospitality are more likely to choose careers in the industry and vice versa. This is because students will generally want to pursue careers they perceive as good and favourable to their needs.

Also, the study will inform both educators and hospitality industry managers about how prospective employees perceive careers in the industry. For educators, those perceptions that are not consistent with the industry may be altered through the use of cognitive dissonance. On the part of industry managers, the findings of the study will enable them to understand and manage the myriad perceptions that students have about the industry, thereby reducing the turnover/attrition rates in the hospitality industry. Besides examining students’ perceptions of hospitality careers, this study also seeks to examine the effects of personal and environmental factors on the choice of hospitality careers by hospitality undergraduate students in Ghana. The study
will, thus, offer an in-depth understanding of what influences students’ choice of careers in the hospitality industry.

Furthermore, the study will help stakeholders in mapping out strategies for increasing students’ interest in hospitality careers in order to address the problem of shortage of skilled labour in the hospitality industry (Acquaye, 2015; ISHC, 2006; Ottenbacher, Gnoth, & Jones, 2006; Wan et al., 2014). This study will further help educators to understand the factors that influence the choice of hospitality careers to enable them offer the needed career guidance and advice.

Ultimately, the study will also contribute to the body of knowledge in the area of students’ career choices in the hospitality industry. This study will attempt to explain, statistically, the effects of students’ personal factors like age, gender, academic level, and many other variables on the choice of hospitality careers. Also, the effect of students’ residential location on their choice of hospitality career will be explored to help fill the knowledge gap on location and career choice. Studies in relation to students’ choice of hospitality careers in Ghana have not fully addressed the possible differences in perceptions of students from different universities based on their type (that is, traditional or technical). This study seeks to examine all these nuances in this regard and provide information that can be generalised across the population of hospitality undergraduate students in the country. The study can also be replicated in other countries to provide a basis for comparison in terms of factors that influence career choice of hospitality students.

Theoretically, the study will also test the vicarious learning principle within the social cognitive learning theory of Bandura (1986). This will
contribute to the discourse on whether hospitality students whose family members and peers are employed in the industry will also want to choose careers in the same industry or not. Again, the study may find evidence to support or refute the assertion that personality traits are determinants of choice of hospitality career within the Ghanaian context. If the latter is the case, then there may be the need to rather propose the incremental view of personality rather than the static personality theory.

**Scope and Delimitation**

The study will sample students from both traditional and technical universities in the northern, middle, and southern zones of Ghana. Though there are a few private universities, they will not be included in the study. Students to be sampled for the study will be those who would have enrolled on the programme during the time of data collection. Also, though there are several factors influencing the choice of hospitality careers, only personal and environmental factors will be considered. Finally, personality will be measured by extraversion/introversion, though there are other personality types and traits. This is because the personality trait literature seems to stress extraversion for the hospitality industry and this assertion will be tested in this study.

**Definition of Terms**

**Personal factors**: These are attributes of a person which are biological, inherent and person-specific. These include variables like, gender, age, academic level, interest, among others.
Environmental factors: These are factors outside a person’s make-up and are found within the physical and external surroundings. It is an amalgamation of social and locational variables.

Attachment/internship: A period of time a student spends with an industry to acquire more practical skills and also be exposed to realities of a chosen field of study.

University/institutional support services: These are academic and non-academic services provided to students by their universities and departments to enhance teaching and learning. They include services like career counselling, planned and supervised internships, industry linkages, career seminars/workshops, among others.

Organisation of Study

The thesis is divided into seven chapters. Chapter One focuses on the background to the study, research problem, research questions, objectives, hypotheses, significance of the study, scope and delimitations, and definition of terms used in the study. Chapter Two presents the various concepts and the theoretical issues underpinning the study. Chapter Three reviews related empirical literature for the topic under study. A conceptual framework guiding the study is also contained in this chapter. Chapter Four explains the research methods adopted for the study. Specific sub-headings here include the study area, study design, sampling techniques, and research instruments. Ethical issues considered as well as data processing and analysis are also contained in Chapter Four. Chapter Five is devoted to findings on undergraduate students’ perceptions of hospitality careers and factors influencing choice of hospitality careers is presented in Chapter Six. The final chapter summarises the main
findings, draws conclusions from the study, highlights the study's contribution to knowledge, makes recommendations, and, finally, suggests areas for further studies.
CHAPTER TWO

CONCEPTUAL AND THEORETICAL REVIEW

Introduction

This chapter provides an overview of concepts and theories underpinning the study. It highlights concepts like the traditional and new career, and personality and personality measurements. Social cognitive learning theory, social cognitive career theory and self-theories are also presented. The chapter further discusses how these theories apply to this study.

Concept of Career

Traditional, Organisational or Conventional Career Concept

Career is, generally, described as a lifelong process of activities related to work (Hall, 2002). It comprises various stages, with each stage having a unique concern and requirements (Greenhaus, Callanan, & Godschalk, 2000). The concept of career was, originally, conceived as a series of related jobs that an employee rises through in an ordered manner (Wilensky, 1960). This central idea of careers was later referred to as the ‘traditional career’, ‘organisational career’ or conventional career. For traditional careers, an employee is seen to be ‘stuck’ in a particular career and he/she rises through the ranks, with time, to the highest level, where prestige and remuneration also increases simultaneously (Ackah & Heaton, 2004).

Again, with traditional career, it is believed that success is measured physically by salary, promotion and its associated prestige and recognition (Gattiker & Larwood, as cited in Agarwala, 2008). It can be concluded that organisational rewards are important in the traditional career setting, as the
success of the employee is tied to the organisation. Also, the typical notion in
this career concept is length of time the employee spends with a particular
organisation. This is because the longer time employees spend with an
organisation, the higher they move up the ladder of salary, prestige and
promotion (Cabrera, 2009). In Ghana, for example, employees may quote the
long years they have worked with a particular organisation with pride.

The relationship between the number of years an employee has spent
with an organisation and how high the employee has climbed the promotional
ladder may be by some form of criteria or not. For instance, some
organisations only promote employees after an interview, examinations,
competence, work output, or a combination of these. Other organisations may
also only consider the years of service to the organisation as the basis for
promotion. Until recently, the traditional career concept has been the basis for
most career researches (Valcour & Ladge, 2008). The change, according to
Sullivan (2010), is as a result of many environmental changes, with employees
seeking personal growth and development being one of such reasons.

New Career Concept

The outlook on the career concept has changed over the years from the
traditional to the new career concept and its orientation. According to Derr
(1986), career orientation is the perception people have about a successful
career. From this explanation, it can be inferred that how one perceives a
career will be based on the orientation he/she has of what a good or bad career
is. The career orientation will then play a vital role in what factors will
influence choice of careers as well as factors that will necessitate career
turnover. Again, from the career orientation definition, a person may be
objectively or subjectively oriented. As mentioned by Briscoe, Hall, &
DeMuth (2006), an objective career-oriented person is more extrinsically
motivated. For example, the focus of an objectively-oriented employee is on
increased salary and status, whilst the working environment and its
conviviality is the focus of the subjective oriented employee.

The ‘new career concept’ is mainly described within the protean and
the boundaryless career spheres. The protean career, as suggested by Hall
(2004), is that career that is predominantly governed by the individual
employee based on his/her personal interest and values. Freedom, adaptability
and growth are the important fundamentals for this career orientation (Hall,
2002). When people feel this way about a career, they may be described as
belonging to the new career concept, as the focus is on the individual
employee rather than the organisation. The description of the protean-oriented
employee has some similarity with the generation Y cohorts who value their
freedom and growth.

With the boundaryless career, Arthur and Rousseau (as cited in
Enache, Sallan, Simo, & Fernandez, 2011), described it as a career that is not
restricted by or bounded to a single employment setting and that is free from a
traditional career arrangement. It is important to note that employees have
become interested in their quality of life rather than material benefits that they
may derive from the organisation (Hall, as cited in Shockley, Ureksoy,
Rodopman, Poteat, & Dullaghan, 2016). Thus, in boundaryless careers, people
may reject opportunities in the current employment due to personal and family
reasons. For instance, a banking staff may forgo higher salary for better work-
life balance. Researches have, however, reported poor work and family/social work balance with hospitality careers (Wan et al., 2014).

**Holland’s Six Personality Category**

Holland (1997) proposed that people are made up of six personality types and these are Realistic, Investigative, Artistic, Social, Enterprising, and Conventional, commonly referred to as the RIASEC model. Holland also noted that people will always want to be in environments that match their personality. This implies that people will choose career that fit their personality type, as this will make them feel satisfied. Those who have identity for a particular vocation are more likely to stay in such vocation/jobs than their counterparts who do not have or have poor vocational identity.

The differences in personality types are related to the abilities and competencies of an individual. Realistic personality types have practical, productive, and concrete values. These behaviours lead to competencies in the use of machines, tools, and materials. Investigative personality types are associated with analytical or intellectual activities aimed at the documentation of new knowledge and understanding solutions of common problems. Artistic personality type is associated with the acquisition of innovative and creative competencies such as language, art and music. Social types have a preference for activities involving working with people to train or help them. These result in competencies in areas such as teaching and counselling and, probably, hospitality careers. Enterprising types are often attracted to pursuits that require influencing others. These behaviours result in the development of competencies in leadership and entrepreneurship. Lastly, Conventional types are attracted to activities such as data manipulation which result in clerical and
business competencies (Holland, 1997). Holland further stresses that work environments are of these six main types; therefore, people are required to adjust their personality to each work environment.

Studies that adopted Holland’s theory have found that there is a relationship between personality types and hospitality choice of career (Chemeli, 2013; Kemboi et al., 2016; Momberg, 2004; Onoyose & Onoyese, 2009). This may mean that every career has a suitable personality type that is most suitable for it and people who choose such careers must be aware of it. Kemboi et al. (2016), further, observed that a high number of students show a mismatch between personality type and career choice.

**Myers-Brigg Type Indicator**

Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) puts people into 16 personality types based on four dimensions. These four dimensions are based on where people focus their attention and derive their energy from—either from the external world or internal world (Extraversion/Introversion [E/I])—how people take in information (either by sensing or intuition [S/N]), how decisions are made by different people (either by thinking or feeling [T/F]), and how we deal with the world (either by judging or perceiving [J/P]).

For extraverts, they prefer to deal with people and things whilst introverts derive their energy from ideas and information. Those grouped in sensing (S) are those who prefer to deal with facts and seek clarity. Those belonging to the intuition (N) type are described as people preferring to deal with ideas, generate new possibilities and expect things that are not obvious. In decision-making, the thinking (T) type will prefer to make decision using objective logic and analyse issues without emotions, whilst the feeling (F) type
will make decision dwelling on values and self-belief. Finally, those who adopt a lifestyle that is well planned and structured belong to the judgement (J) type and those who are flexible and respond to issues as they arise are in the perception (P) group. A combination of these eight components results in the 16 personality types. For example, one may be an introvert, sensing, thinking and also have a lifestyle fitting the perception type (ISTP). This implies that people will prefer careers that match their personality type so as to be satisfied.

Weber, Lee, & Dennison (2015), Yang, Richard, & Durkin (2016), Jafrani, Zehra, Ali, Mohsin, & Azhar (2017), and Reynolds, Adams, Ferguson, & Leidig (2017) are some studies which have used the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator to identify students personality with respect to their choice of career or programme.

The Big Five Model of Personality

In an effort to categorise people, some researchers have further grouped various personality measurement tools into domains. Larsen and Buss (2008) are one such researchers. Leung and Law (2010) adopted this categorisation of personality perspectives to review personality research in the tourism and hospitality context. This categorization put personality perspective into six domains of Disposal, Biological, Intrapsychic, Cognitive/experimental, Social, and Cultural and adjustment.

According to Leung and Law (2010), the disposal domain consists of the classification system of personality, where identification of the fundamental traits of personality is done. This domain further advocates the consistency of traits in situations. One popular model under this domain is the
Big Five personality traits, commonly called the five factor model (FFM). The FFM groups personality traits into Openness, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Neuroticism (OCEAN). According to Toegel and Barsoux (2012), those who do not fall clearly into any of the characteristics of OCEAN are people who are adaptable and reasonable, but may also be unprincipled and calculating.

Most researchers, according to Noftle, Schnitker, & Robins (2011), used the Big Five model as an approach when studying personality because the model is believed to have a proven construct validity and a good description of personality traits. A review of personality research in the tourism and hospitality context by Leung and Law (2010) showed that, at the time of their study, the Big Five factor model was mostly used by researchers in the tourism and hospitality context. Drosdeck, Osayi, Peterson, Yu, Ellison, & Muscarella, (2015), Kwon & Park (2016), Burke-Smalley & Jones (2017), and Bravidor et al. (2018) have used the Big Five model in studies relating to students personality and choice of career or programme.

Measuring Personality Traits

For this study, personality traits were measured using extraversion/introversion. The reason for the use of this trait is because of its clearness and straightforward nature. Students easily understand what it means to be an introvert or an extrovert and clearly describe themselves along this trait. Also, Holland’s social personality, Mayers-Briggs and the five factor models’ extroversion/ introversion highlight the commonality of this personality. Finally, studies by Kim et al. (2007) and Teng (2008) have also proposed extroversion as the personality for the hospitality industry.
According to Olakitan (2011), extraversion is that personality believed to be more social; extraverts like to be involved in a wide range of activities. This trait is marked by involvement in the external world. People who are extrovert like interacting with other people, are full of energy, “outgoing”, like being identified and known in a group, and they easily communicate with others (outspoken). On the contrary, introverts are the very opposite of the extroverts. They are quiet, less interactive, especially when they meet with people. These characteristics of introverts do not mean they are shy or antisocial but rather they are independent and reserved in social scenarios (Rothmann & Coetzer, 2003).

**Theories Underpinning the Study**

The study is informed by various theories. Propositions from these theories formed the basis for the various objectives and hypotheses of the study. These theories are discussed below:

**Social Cognitive Learning Theory (SCLT)**

This theory was propounded by Bandura in 1986. In his view, learning occurs by observing others. The observation occurs through the interaction between people and their environment. This theory is an advancement of the social learning theory in 1960. SCLT hinges on the tenets that, for learning to occur, one must have observed, experienced and/or interacted with others within the social environment showing similar behaviour. The role of human cognition is a requisite in the modelling of behaviour.

The theory further states that, to model behaviour, the observer must have a model (person) that is competent enough to create the right
reinforcement. The model may be parents, peers, teachers or supervisors. In other words, the behaviour to be imitated must be that which attracts reward. If the activity involved does not yield any reward, the observer will not want to exhibit the behaviour. Another assumption of this theory suggests one may observe behaviour but will not exhibit it at all. Contrasting the view of behaviourists, social cognitive learning theory stresses on cognition which is also an important asset in higher education.

Notable in social cognitive learning theory is the principle of vicarious learning (indirect learning through observation). According to Bandura (1986), vicarious learning is affected by the positive and negative effects of learning and exhibiting behaviour. Friedman and Schustack (2012) further attest that vicarious learning will be affected by the perceptions, external environment, and the inherent qualities of the observer. This may mean that, though a person may be expected to show interest in a particular activity because significant others in the environment are doing so, factors such as the persons’ perceptions may thwart this effort.

The hospitality undergraduate may want to choose careers in the hospitality industry because of peers, parents, and other family members who are pursuing a career in the industry. According to Rosenthal and Zimmerman (1978), with regard to social learning and cognition, successful outcome of an activity will vicariously motivate others (students) to do same. However, when the hospitality student realises that people who work in the industry are negatively affected, they would not want to do same, as they will attach negative attitudes towards careers in the industry.
Also, the theory was originally tested with children. It is important to note that children will behave differently from adults. The theory does not also highlight the differences which may occur in observing and imitating behaviour due to differences in physical features like age and gender, although generally implied. The theory is also said to have not identified the extent to which each variable—personal, environmental, and behavioural factors—affects learning. The theory’s inability to address why a negative experience may not result in a negative behaviour and vice versa is also questioned. To conclude, students’ choice of hospitality careers may be affected by various complex factors, both personal and environmental.

**Social Cognitive Career Theory (SCCT)**

The social cognitive career theory (SCCT) was developed by Lent, Brown, & Hackett (1994). This theory applies the social cognitive theory of Bandura (1986) to education, career development, and success. Self-efficacy beliefs, outcome expectations, and goals are some of the primary variables in this theory, which are also cognitive-person in nature. According to Lent et al. (2000), these variables interact with some environmental variables of the individual to further mould career development.

Since the inception of the theory, most studies on it have focused on the cognitive variables (self-efficacy, outcome expectations and goals) in isolation from the environmental variables (Lent et al., 2000, p.36). The environmental factors include those that support or deter the choice of career. However, career supports within the environment may not necessarily promote students’ choice of career. Similarly, the presence of career barriers may not deter some students from choosing careers.
Support within the environment ranges from financial to non-financial. In which ever form the support may come, students’ awareness of these and how easy it is to access them may be helpful in influencing their choice of career. Examples of supports within the educational environment include networking opportunities (linking students to industry, recommending students to employers), searching for places for internships for students, and offering advice on sources of funds for entrepreneurial activities in the industry.

For this study, institutional or departmental supports available within the learning environment would be explored and their relationship to students’ choice of hospitality careers probed. It is, however, assumed that the availability of these supports to students will improve their choice of careers in the hospitality industry.

**Self-Theories**

Self-theories are theories of personality. The term is attributed to Carl Rogers (1959), who believed everyone can achieve whatever he/she wishes to achieve in life. Self-theorists may hold an entity or incremental view. To the entity theorists, personality is fixed and unchangeable. Contrary to this view is the incremental theorists who assert that personality is malleable, since it can be modified or changed through effort.

Dweck (2000) proposed that personality and intelligence can be modified and, further, empirically proved it with a study of school children mainly on their intelligence. The theory adopts the incrementalist view. Incremental theorists advocate that personality changes based on the situation at hand and the mind-set of the individual. Dweck further added that the static or changing nature of one’s personality would be informed by the mind-
set of the individual. This implies that someone may be an introvert in one instance and an extrovert in another.

The relationship between personality and career has long been established. The common assertion is that a certain personality is best for a certain job (Bravidor, Loy, Krüger, & Scharf, 2018; Drosdeck et al., 2015; Vedel, 2016). For careers in the hospitality industry, for example, extraversion has been proposed as the best personality trait (Grobelna, 2015; Teng, 2008). For this study, the incremental view of personality is adopted. The researcher proposes that the personality of the undergraduate students may not affect their choice of hospitality career, but rather, their mind-set and perceptions about careers in the industry may affect their choice of hospitality career. This means that, whether an introvert or an extrovert, one may want to work in the industry. The willingness to work in the industry will be based on the mind-set of the person. Moreover, there are both front and back of house sections within any hospitality business and employees may best fit for each section based on their personality.

If a student, therefore, is determined to choose a career in the hospitality industry, he/she would rather modify or change the personality to suit the industry and, more importantly, the specific requirements of the segment of the industry that the student finds himself/herself. This further narrows the point that any person of any personality can choose career in the hospitality industry, so long as he/she is determined to work in the industry.
Chapter Summary

The chapter presented the concepts and theoretical foundations of the study. Firstly, it discussed the two main career concepts: the traditional and the new. The main distinction between the two concepts was highlighted. Although most writers seem to promote the new career concept, the relevance of the traditional career concept cannot be ignored. The chapter further presented some personality concepts, of Holland’s Six Personality, Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) and The Big Five model of personality were explained with their relevance to the topic under study mentioned. The common feature of these personality concepts was the extraversion (social)/introversion personality. This then informed the inclusion of this personality trait in the framework.

Also, various theories underpinning the study, such as Bandura’s social cognitive learning theory (which proposes the role of cognition in every learning situation) and the vicarious learning principle were discussed. Again, social cognitive career theory (Lent et al., 1994) was discussed, with emphasis on institutional supports within the academic environment and how these supports are expected to influence choice of careers. Finally, the incremental theorist view of self was advocated in the study. The incremental theory proposes that personality is modified or changed to suit a given situation. The researcher further argued that personality may not be static, as suggested by some authors, but rather, modification of personality may be done to suit a chosen career based on cognition.
CHAPTER THREE
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter presents an overview of related empirical literature on the topic under investigation. It presents literature on students’ perceptions of careers in the hospitality industry. It also highlights differences in perceptions of careers in the hospitality industry among different groups of students. The effect of personal and environmental factors on choice of careers in the industry is also discussed. Finally, a conceptual framework is proposed to guide the study, based on theories and reviewed empirical literature.

Students’ Perceptions of Hospitality Careers

Perceptions are the views people form about issues through the use of their senses. Perceptions have been argued to mean reality whilst others believe perceptions may change when people encounter the real situation. Whichever side one belongs to on the argument divide, perceptions are, nonetheless, important in choice-making. These perceptions are normally formed when one encounters a situation. Perceptions may also be formed based on social interactions (what we hear others say) as well as an individual’s personal characteristics. For example, males may have negative perceptions about a particular type of career based on their gender, and this may differ from females. The role of social cognitive learning theory (vicarious learning) is fundamental in these perceptions people form.
Industry Experience and Perception

Differences in perception of students with regard to careers in the hospitality industry have long been documented. For instance, Kelley-Patterson and George (2001) reported differences in the perception of students with industry experience and those without industry experience. Also, Lee (2007) asserts that students exposed to industry-based learning had better understanding and more realistic expectation from the industry. Again, Barron, Maxwell, Broadbridge, & Ogden (2007) conducted a qualitative study in the United Kingdom to examine the career experiences and general perceptions of 25 hospitality undergraduate students. Respondents in their study have all had some form of industry experience.

Barron et al. (2007) reported positive perceptions such as exciting and interesting experiences with careers in the industry. However, the students generally perceived careers in the hospitality industry to be characterised by low salary, long working hours which hinder social life and high insecurity. These perceptions of the students were compared with the general characteristics of Generation Ys. Barron et al. are among the few studies that employed a qualitative method of data collection (focus group discussions) to study this phenomenon. One means by which students gain industry experience is internship/attachment.

In a recent study in Turkey, Turanlıgil & Altıntaş (2018) sampled 204 students in Anadolu University and analysed their perceptions and expectations of the industry. The findings reported, among other things, that there were generally no statistically significant differences in the perceptions of students with industry experience and those without industry experience. It
was also evident from the findings that majority (79.20%) of the students acquired industry experience from hotels.

**Academic Level and Perception**

The perceptions students have of careers in the industry have been reported to differ based on academic level. Generally, freshmen and women have been reported to have a more positive perception of careers within the industry, as compared to continuing students (sophomores, juniors, and seniors). Barron & Maxwell (1993), for instance, reported that students in their first year have a somewhat better perception of careers in the industry, as compared to continuing students and those who have experienced work life in the industry. In another instance, Getz (1994) conducted a longitudinal study in Scotland and reported that, over 14 years, students have become more negative in their perceptions of careers in the industry. Earlier, West & Jameson (1990) established the negativity that students studying hospitality develop for the industry through contact with jobs of the industry either as they progress through the academic levels or when employed in the industry.

It is important to note that the perceptions students hold about the industry may be unrealistic (Chen, Chu, & Wu, 2000), and this may affect their perceptions about careers in the industry. This is because, if these unrealistic expectations are not met, students or graduates can become disappointed and, hence, have negative feelings towards careers in the industry. These negative thoughts may be modified or changed through interaction on career issues with educators or career counsellors within the learning environment.
Positive, Negative and Neutral Perceptions of Careers in the Hospitality Industry

Kusluvan & Kusluvan (2000) reported that students perceived careers in the industry to be stressful, characterised by hours of long work, poor working environment, unfair promotion practices, coupled with low remuneration, among others. Similarly, Birdir (as cited in Roney & Oztin, 2007) also bemoaned the poor salary of careers within the industry. In Malaysia, Richardson & Butler (2012) reported that undergraduate hospitality and tourism students perceived careers in the industry to offer low wages, have poor work-life balance, and poor staff and manager relationship. These negative perceptions made students to prefer careers in other industries other than the industry they have been trained for. This is due to the belief that other industries offer higher remuneration than they could ever receive in the hospitality industry. The industry is also stigmatised as providing poor professional standards within the hospitality industry (Gu, Kavanaugh, & Cong, 2007). Richardson and Butler (2012) further concluded that students perceived the industry to offer contrary factors, as compared to the factors they will consider in a career.

Generally, there are reports of varying perceptions of students towards the hospitality industry. Alananzeh (2014) reported that 82% of students studying hotel management, and food and beverage service in the Aqaba Economic Zone of Jordan wished to work in the industry after graduation. This willingness to work in the industry may be attributed to the positive perceptions that they hold about careers in the industry. Lu and Adler (2007) investigated the career goals and expectations of Chinese hospitality students.
A description of the background characteristics of the students showed that about 65% of the students ended up pursuing tourism and hospitality programme because of their low entrance exams grades. However, 68% of the respondents had plans to take up careers in the tourism industry. The commonest reason cited by these students for wanting to work in the industry was the readily available opportunities for employment and career development. This means that most students in this study perceived the tourism industry to offer career opportunities and development. Again, although almost 32% of these students did not want to join careers in the hospitality and tourism industry due to lack of personal interest, an appreciable 20% also believed they do not have the personality for careers in the industry. Meanwhile, students in another study perceived careers in the industry to be enjoyable (Brown, Arendt, & Bosselman, 2014).

In another study, Grobelna (2017) surveyed Polish and Spanish students, in a quest to investigate their perceptions of job-related motivators when choosing careers in the tourism and hospitality industry. In general, the findings showed that tourism and hospitality careers do not provide the factors that these students consider acceptable in a career. The study sampled one institution from each country and this was identified by the author as a limitation in the study, because such findings cannot be generalised to mean the overall perceptions of students about the industry in both countries. Wen, Lueng Li, & Kwon (2018), in another study, reported in China that students perceived compensation and promotion opportunities in the industry as being below what they expect in a career.
More so, Selçuk, Erdoğan, & Güllüce (2013) confirmed that students from Atatürk University in Turkey perceived the industry to offer jobs which are not interesting (63%). Also, students (80%) perceived the industry to have poor working hours which do not conform to regular lifestyle. For these and other negative reasons, more than half of the student respondents in this study concluded that it is a big mistake to be involved in tourism as a career preference. Again, Selçuk et al. (2013) reported that students observed that people who work in the industry are seen by the society as being waiting staff with an insufficient salary in relation to workload. Furthermore, 63% of the students affirmed that careers in the industry are characterised by no further professional training when needed.

Roney & Ötzin (2007) had findings which showed that, in general, students were indifferent or neutral in their perception towards the industry in Turkey, although some students perceived the industry will afford them the opportunity to meet new people and, probably, network. Birdir (as cited in Roney & Ötzin, 2007) reported that, in Turkey, some students perceived non-availability of quality tourism education, coupled with poor salary, as a deterrent to taking a career in the industry. Although students may have poor expectations from the industry, students found to have willingly chosen the hospitality programme were more willing and, therefore, wanted to choose careers in the industry after graduation (Aksu & Köksal, 2005). Again, in Turkey, Turanligil and Altintaş (2018) reported negative perceptions among tourism and hotel management students. Poor treatment by the industry players to these students, especially during internship, was identified as a probable cause of this negative perception.
One study of great relevance to the present study was by Neequaye & Armoo (2014), which sought to find out factors used by Ghanaian students in determining career options in the tourism and hospitality industry. The findings showed that students were not sure that careers in the industry are secured, readily available and with adequate workload. However, as revealed by the study, most students strongly perceived the industry to provide personal career development. It was, further, reported that students perceived salary levels in the hospitality industry to be meagre, as compared to careers in other industries, although students’ perception about the meagre salary was the least of the factors influencing their perception about the industry. This finding is striking because, in a developing country like Ghana, one would expect monetary reward for work done to be of great importance. However, students in Neequaye and Armoo’s study may have rated salary the least factor influencing their choice of career because most of them are being provided for by their parents or guardians and, therefore, might not acknowledge the importance of remuneration at this stage of their lives.

Another study that has a bearing to the present study is one by Amissah et al. (2019). In that study, the authors sought to explore students’ perceptions of careers in the hospitality and tourism industry in Ghana. The study, however, sampled 441 students from the hospitality and tourism department of the University of Cape Coast, which they further stressed limited the generalisation of the findings from the study across the population of hospitality and tourism students in Ghana. Findings from Amissah et al. showed that students perceived careers in the industry as unfavourable, as only 33% of these students intended to choose careers in the industry after
graduation. The study further reported that female students perceived careers in the hospitality and tourism industry favourably than their male counterparts, as a significant difference was recorded with gender and perception of careers in the industry. The study also identified a non-significant difference in perceptions of students based on industry work experience.

From the above literature, it is evident that most studies have reported negative perceptions from students with regard to careers within the hospitality industry. The negative perception is irrespective of country: China, Malaysia, Scotland, Turkey, Ghana, among others. Also, the literature highlighted negative perceptions like poor remuneration, promotion practices, work and social life balance, work overload, staff-manager relationship, among others. However, some studies reported positive perceptions among students. The positive perceptions had to do with availability of career development, opportunity to meet new people, and readily available jobs. Furthermore, some of the studies have reported neutral (neither positive nor negative) perceptions of students towards careers in the industry. It may be concluded that negative perceptions of hospitality careers may result in low or no interest in careers whilst positive perceptions may mean high interest and choice of hospitality careers.

**Personal Factors and Choice of Hospitality Careers**

Personal characteristics are very vital in shaping the choices that people make. These characteristics may also influence the perception people form about issues. People form perceptions about issues based on certain personal factors. In this study, personal factors include sex, age, marital status, academic level, personality, among others. The conceptual framework guiding
the study proposes some connections between these personal factors and students’ choice of hospitality career.

**Gender, Religion, Interest, Personality-fit, and Choice of Careers**

Studies within the hospitality industry as well as other fields have reported some unique personal factors of students and have proffered some relationships between these factors and choice of career. It is worth noting that most of these studies did not statistically prove that there are relationships between these factors and choice of hospitality careers. For instance, Korir & Wafula (2012), examining the personal factors that influence career choice of undergraduate hospitality students in Kenya, looked at it from the perspectives of interest, gender and family tradition. The findings revealed that gender had no influence on choice of career in the hospitality industry. However, personal interest in the industry was found to be an influencing factor of choice of hospitality careers. In another study, Magableh (as cited in Alananzeh, 2014) pointed out that, religion (Islamic) prevented women from serving alcoholic beverages. Also, late night shift, which is very common in the industry, also discouraged women from working in the hospitality and tourism industry, though they had the best chance of being employed in the industry.

The influence of gender on the choice of career is not unique to the hospitality industry. With a sample size of 191, Igbinedion (2011) reported that there were differences in the factors that influence males’ and females’ choice of secretaryship studies. Again, a study by Agarwala (2008), of students of Management in Business Administration in India, showed differences in gender with respect to influencing factors of career choice. Also, financial reward was the most important factor of influence for males.
whilst for females, it was the fifth important factor for career choice in management.

Again, Wu, Low, Tan, Łopèz, & Liaw (2015) conducted a systematic review of factors influencing career choice in the field of healthcare between 2002 and 2013. The outcome showed that gender was one of the top four factors which influenced choice of career within the healthcare sector. Similarly, a study in United Kingdom by Smith, Lambert, & Goldacre (2015) showed that a financial prospect was less important to females than to males, with regard to factors influencing junior doctors’ choice of future specialty. The study further concluded that younger doctors prefer a balance in their life as well as their personal fulfilment. Again, a meta-analytical review by Su & Rounds (2015) confirmed that gender differences exist in interest, with males favouring engineering careers and females advancing towards careers in the social sciences and medical services.

Within the hospitality industry, however, Selçuk, Ergoğan and Güllüce (2013) reported no difference in perceptions/expectations of male and female students. Also, Alananzeh (2014) explored factors that influenced students’ choice of tourism and hospitality management in colleges in Jordan. Sampling students specifically from two universities from Aqaba Economic Zone, the author found that more than half of the respondents had no related industry experience, whilst 38% of the students have had some industry experience. Also, majority were positive of choosing careers in the industry after completion. In a related study, Selçuk et al. (2013) reported no significant difference between those students who completed a tourism/vocational high school and those who did not. A one way analysis of
variance (ANOVA) in this same study showed differences in academic level of students, with respect to expectations from careers in the industry. Again, like previous researches, freshmen had a more positive view of careers in the industry, as compared to other levels. Also, the views of those students who had some information about careers in the industry were more positive than those who did not.

Qiu et al. (2017), whilst assessing factors that influenced the career choice of hotel management students in Guangzhou, China, reported that students, predominantly, made their own career choice. Also, support from family, with respect to choice of career, was also ranked highly. Qiu et al. reported a general non-existent difference between males and females, with respect to factors influencing choice of career, although forceful parents, family business, information provided, and self-operation of hospitality business recorded high scores for males than females. The study, further, proposed the need to use a systems approach when studying factors influencing students’ career choices, where all stakeholders will be considered. These stakeholders, according to Qiu et al., should include students, parents, the industry, learning institutions, and many other socio-environmental factors.

Chuang, Goh, Stout, & Dellaman-Jenkins (2007), using Chi-square test, reported from a study in the Ohio that there were differences in students’ gender and preferred hospitality segment for career. Although both genders preferred the food and beverage segment above all others (28% for female and 48.5% for males), males showed higher preference than females. This particular finding is in sharp contrast to what was reported by Robinson et al.
(2015). Chuang et al. believed that industry experience, internship, and practicum may positively influence students’ stay in the hospitality industry. Furthermore, students who perceived they had the requisite competencies for the industry were more certain of staying in the hospitality industry. Chuang et al., further, identified differences in gender with respect to career choice commitment with the industry. This finding propelled them to agree with the notion that career is a gendered construct. Moreover, students in Chuang et al.’s study reported willingness to choose careers in the industry after graduation.

Having the personal attributes of a career has been identified by some studies as a factor in career choice. A study by Zopiatis, Theocharous, & Constanti (2016), in an attempt to examine adult vocational decision, career satisfaction, and future intention, reported that, among other things, job-person fit is one of the factors associated with students’ intention to stay in the industry. Also, Wen et al. (2018) identified industry-person congeniality as a significant influencing factor of students’ career decision in China. In Ghana, Neequaye and Amoo (2014) also had findings to suggest that having personality fit for careers in the industry was an indicator for hospitality careers option among students.

**Industry Experience (Internship) and Choice of Career**

Gaining experience for the career for which students are being trained may play a pivotal role in increasing their choice in such careers as well as offering them opportunity to network with possible future employers (Wan et al., 2014). One means of acquiring experience in the industry for students is through internship or attachment. Internships may be paid or unpaid, although
the unpaid internship is the commonest form of internship in Ghana. Internship has become an integral part of the hospitality programme worldwide (Seyitoğlu & Yirik, 2014) and it has proved to have enormous benefits. According to Framaki (2018), internship is beneficial to the hospitality programme as it is to the student. It helps students experience the realistic industry to which they are being prepared for. A well planned internship is to help increase students’ appreciation for the industry. When this experience is negative, students may form negative perceptions towards the industry (Framaki, 2018), which will negatively affect choice of career.

Most studies have reported a positive relationship between well planned internship and career choice among hospitality students. For instance, Kim, McCleary, & Kaufman (2010) noted a strong positive relationship between work experience and career choice. Similarly, Hertzman, Mareo, & Wiener (2015) sampled students from three universities in the United States and reported findings which showed that students who have experienced work in the hospitality industry have significantly developed plans for hospitality careers than those who have not. In Norway, Dagsland, Mykletun, and Einarsen (2017) highlighted the positive beliefs that adolescents have about hospitality careers. They further identified that the hospitality career experiences of these adolescents constituted one of the significant predictors of career choice. In agreement, Wen et al. (2018) also reported work experiences as one of the strong influencing factors with regard to students’ intention to join the hospitality career among three-year and four-year hospitality programme students in China.
The above studies provide evidence for the positive relationship between the work experiences that students have and their subsequent choice of hospitality careers. However, it is important to note that these experiences might have been positive, therefore the positive link to career choice. For the experience to be positive, there is the need for a well-planned work experience as well as a cordial relationship between the industry and the academic institution. As reported by Walsh, Chang, & Tse (2015), students who are satisfied with their internship have good intention of choosing careers in the hospitality industry.

On the contrary, Koc, Sedat, Ulukoy, Kilic, & Toptas (2014), in a study in Turkey, explored the views of tourism and hospitality students after internship. The findings showed that only 18.3% of the students wish to work in the industry whilst a large proportion of these students wish to work in different areas of the industry, as compared to their original intention. The authors lament the wastage of financial resources for the internship programme.

**Academic Level, Interest and Choice of Career**

Fresh and continuing students have been found to have different perceptions towards career in the industry; freshmen and women seem to have positive image of the industry than continuing students (Barron & Maxwell, 1993). Furthermore, experiencing the industry played a role in the negative perceptions formed by students about the industry (Kozak & Kizilirmak, 2001; Kim & Park, 2013). However, Robinson et al. (2015) had contradictory findings in Australia, which showed that, after internship, students rather
aligned their aspirations to working in different segments of the industry rather than neglecting the industry.

Roney & Öztin (2007) conducted a study in Turkey purposely to examine the perceptions of undergraduate tourism students in some three universities. A profile of the respondents showed that, though most of the students had no relative and friend working in the industry, they still had interest and were willing to work in the industry. This finding is in congruence with that of Korir & Wafula (2012) in Kenya. Though the studies were conducted at completely different geographical areas and also in different years, both groups of students rated interest as the most important factor for choosing careers in the hospitality industry.

Furthermore, Roney and Öztin (2007) posited that their respondents have had some practical work experience in the industry and that might have engendered their interest in careers within the industry. This assertion, further, opposes the general assumption that, when students experience the hospitality industry, their views tend to become more negative. In that same study, differences between male and female students with regard to how they perceived the industry was found not to be significantly different. Significant differences were, however, found to exist between students from different universities in Turkey, as reported by Roney & Öztin. Students from a particular university were seen to have a significantly positive perception towards the industry and various reasons may be assigned to this. The reasons may include students’ personal factors, nature of teaching and learning, and other environmental factors which the study did not investigate.
In a study in Ghana, Neequaye and Armoo (2014) reported differences in sex and the factor of industry-person congeniality. Specifically, females were found to be strongly influenced by their personal compatibility to careers in the industry than their male counterparts. Ahmed, Sharif, & Ahmad (2017) also researched into factors that influenced students’ career choices in Karachi, Pakistan. Using a structured questionnaire for data collection, the authors found interest in subject area as the most dominant factor influencing the choice of career within a field. The study which was quantitative, however, used a convenience sampling technique to administer 145 questionnaires.

**Personality Traits and Choice of Career**

As part of personal factors affecting students’ choice of hospitality careers, personality is one of the variables to be measured. Personality is a unique characteristic of a person. As ascertained by Carver & Scheir (2008), these characteristics do not change over a significant period of time. Personality trait is said to be the consistent patterns in the way individuals behave, feel and think (Cervone & Pervin, as cited in Leung & Law, 2010). Personality traits are also considered stable and affect a person’s behaviour at work (Gerber, Huber, Doherty, Dowling, Raso & Ha, 2011). Albert, Mania, Bergesio, & Bogetto (2006) described personality as a set of emotional and behavioural characteristics that surround and assist a person in his or her daily life. It, therefore, affects every aspect of an individual’s life. Carver and Scheir (2008), further, postulate that two people cannot have the same personality; however, there are some commonalities in the way people behave and this then allows for some categorisation to be made. In effect, people can, then, be
categorised into various personality traits due to the dominant similarities in their behaviour, feeling, and thinking.

There is overwhelming evidence that the right personality is necessary in every career. Lu and Adler (2009) affirmed that there is a relationship between personality, career choice, and success. According to Chemeli (2013) and Kemboi et al. (2016), wrong personality type in wrong career will result in dissatisfaction, poor performance, and, subsequently, quitting that career. Where a weaker relationship between personality and career choice is reported, other factors have been blamed for this. Korir & Wafula (2012) conducted a study in Moi University, considering the factors that influence career choice of Hospitality students in that university. The study basically put influencing factors of career choice into personal and environmental factors and opportunities. The study considered personal factors on the basis of personality only and an expected relationship between personality and career choice was argued for.

Supporting the need for career personality, Carliss (2005) affirmed that work output will be more productive when staff possesses characteristics that fit a profession. Quinter & Edwards (2011) also reported, among other things, the match of personality and professional career being an essential factor in career pathway. Yeung & Leung (2007) also posited that personality affects how people behave and this behaviour, subsequently, affects the way guests feel when interacting with staff in hospitality industry during service delivery.

With respect to the specific type of personality for the hospitality industry, Teng (2008) sought to assess the effects of personality traits and attitudes on student uptake in hospitality employment in Taiwan. The findings
showed that extraversion is a significant predictor of students’ attitude towards the hospitality industry. In another study, Kim, Shin, & Umbreit (2007) identified an agreeable extraversion trait as being suitable for the hospitality industry. Grobelna (2015) also asserted that extroverts are more satisfied with careers in the hospitality industry. McCaulley & Martin (1995) had earlier commented that people belonging to the extraversion category seem to like careers where there is much talk, action, and having social contact with others, something very common with the service industry in which the hospitality segment belongs. In other industries, other personality traits have been reported. For example, in Brazil, Capretz (2008), reported that software engineers were mostly introverts when compared to the general population.

It is, however, important to note that, in the course of life, depending on situations that people encounter, they then form certain aspects of their character through these interactions (Chemeli, 2013). This assertion then suggests that, though every career has the required personality trait, people willing to stay in such careers will modify their behaviours (personality) and attitude to fit into that career (Pavesic & Brymer, 1990). This assertion falls into the domain of the incremental theorists.

Incremental theorists assert that personality changes over time based on the situation at hand. This study adopts the theoretical stance of the incremental theorists and presumes that students will modify their personality traits to suit hospitality careers if only they wish to work in the industry (Dweck, 2000). With this assumption, the underlying factors for staying in the industry are interest, willingness, and commitment (Chen, Shen, & Gosling, 2018). Therefore, personality traits may not affect students’ choice of career.
The present study will be one of the few studies that have defined personality trait as a changing factor and if evidence is found from this study to support this assertion, then, the proposition that personality is fixed in terms of careers may need to be revisited.

**Environmental Factors and Choice of Hospitality Careers**

People live in an environment and they interact with various features or factors within their environment. As part of the interaction, human beings influence or are influenced by the various features and factors in their environment (Relph, as cited in Fekadu, 2014). The factors within the environment are in the form of social, financial, support services, and other factors. The influencing effects of these factors may exert varying degrees of weight on people, depending on the person involved.

**Social Factors and Career Choice**

People live in societies and are affected either negatively or positively by outcomes of their social interaction within the society. The hospitality student interacts with both the university and the home social environment, and the interactions may influence their choice of hospitality career. Studies have reported influence of parents, relatives, peers, and teachers as sources of social influence on career choice.

**Parents and Choice of Career**

The relationship between parent and child has been identified as a source of influence on a students' choice of hospitality career. Hewitt (2010) asserted that students are influenced by parents when it comes to choosing careers, as a favourable career may be proposed by the parent to the child.
Ikonen, Leinonen, Asikainen, & Hirvonen (2018) also made the point that parents are particular in making their wards continue in their line of business. Shumba and Naong (2012) reported that family member was the highest factor that influenced students’ choice of career. Ayiah-Mensah et al. (2014), further, noted the high connection between parents/relatives’ occupation to students’ choice of vocational and technical programme and, therefore, career. The study was conducted in two technical vocational institutions in Ghana (Takoradi and Ho Technical Universities). In all, the study highlighted some important factors that affect career choice of technical and vocational students in the study area. These were job security, gender and close family relations, and financial and societal influence. In agreement, Lawer (2015) reported parents, especially fathers, as a source of influence for students’ career aspirations.

With regard to the specific parent that influences career choice, there seems to be some skewedness towards the father. For example, Alananzeh (2014) statistically proved that occupation of parent (both father and mother) affected choice of hospitality specialization of students. However, the influence of father’s profession was stronger than occupation of mother ($p = 0.00, 0.03$ respectively). On the same issue of parental influence on choice, Selcuk et al. (2013), on the contrary, reported no significant difference between students whose relatives work in the industry and those who do not have relatives working in the industry. This particular finding contradicts the positive emphasis of social cognitive learning theory which posits that having relatives in a particular profession may be expected to influence the decision of other family members. However, as stated in this same theory, if the family
members within the industry do not have anything in terms of reward to show from their profession in the industry, others may not want to also go into such careers. In other words, if there is no positive reward, behaviour will not be vicariously learnt.

Meanwhile, Agarwala (2008) investigated factors that influence the career choice of fresh students of Management in Business Administration (MBA) in India. Besides competencies, father was the most important person who influences career choice of MBA students. However, friends were the second major career choice influencer for males whilst mother was the second for females. Shumba & Naong (2012), similarly, reported fathers influencing the career choice of medical students in South Africa. It is noticeable that these careers (MBA & Medicine) are often male-dominated and, therefore, this may have reflected in the significant person influencing the students’ choice. However, in the case of hospitality and tourism, a mixture of undergraduate students from both programmes may have influenced the findings of the father being the most influencing parent. In this study however, only hospitality students would be sampled and this may affect the influencing parent of the career choice (if found so). This may be the case, as hospitality programmes and careers are often female-dominated, therefore the influencing parent.

Peers and Choice of Career

Studies have also mentioned the role of peers as a source of influence (negatively or positively) to hospitality career choice within the social environment. For example, Stuart cited in Shumba & Naong (2012) found peers to positively or negatively affect choice of careers mainly by their
attitude. Earlier, Galotti & Kozberg (as cited in Ayiah-Mensah et al., 2014), had pointed out that influence from others narrowly influence students’ choice of subject majors that led to their career choices. However, Neequaye & Armoo (2014) had findings which showed that less than half of students in their study were not influenced by people within their family and social circles to take up jobs within the hospitality industry. In the case of Bojuwoye & Mbanjwa (2006), peers did not affect choice of career.

Meanwhile, Ahuja (as cited in Lawer, 2015) attested to the fact that there are social and structural influences of career choice. Social factors were defined to include role models, peers, media, and parents. Structural influencers composed of institutional support such as leaders and counsellors, access to technology, among others. However, young people were said to be influenced mostly by social factors. This might be the fact that students at the undergraduate level are usually young and socialise more and, therefore, are attached to the social environment more than older people.

**Financial Remuneration and Career Choice**

Being interested and internally motivated are some important factors that motivate people to do the work they do. However, working without economic benefits (wages/ salary) may not be interesting. According to Cavus, Geri, & Turgunbayeva (2015), a career is viewed by most people as a basis for a better standard of living. However, fewer studies have reported students’ interest in monetary factors as an influence of choice of hospitality career. Neequaye & Amoo (2014) identified salary as the least important factor to hospitality students’ in a university in Ghana.
Abrahams, Jano, & Lill (2015) reported, among other things, that anticipated benefits to be derived from a career with reference to personal growth and promotions to high level in an organisation were important factors that influenced career choice. Maxwell, Ogden, and Broadbridge (2010) mentioned that hospitality and tourism undergraduate students identified good pay, happy work environment, promotion, and stable job as some factors they consider in a career. Similarly, Xu (2013), identified salary and promotion as some important career factors to students. However, financial outcome and opportunities in the future in relation to the job was of little importance to students in some Karachi universities in Pakistan (Ahmed et al., 2017).

**University Support Services and Choice of Career**

Support services available in universities are in the form of career information, career counselling and guidance, industry and university linkages among others. As noted by the SCCT (Lent et al., 1994), the roles of these support services are to make students more aware of various careers and to help them make informed decisions about industry. Favourable choice of career has been documented to be influenced by support services within the educational environment. The importance of these support services may help increase the number of students making decisive decisions about the industry positively.

Maraya (2011) asserted that students will suffer indecision if they have conflicting advice from different sources of which some may be wrong. Also, Kemboi et al. (2016) believe students become career wayward because universities do not provide sound career information to them. In most cases, this information is not available at all. As opined by Ahuja (as cited in Lawer,
2015), institutional support services are part of structural influencing factors within institutions. Bojuwoye and Mbanjwa (2006) reported that tertiary students become negatively informed by various factors, including lack of career information and counselling service.

Also, Qiu et al. (2017), further, identified five factors that influence students’ choice of the hotel industry in Guangzhou city of China. These included, among other things, career guidance, support from parents, and external consultation. Chuang & Dellmann-Jenkins (2010), in a study to investigate the career decision-making and intention of hospitality undergraduate students, reported that majority of the students cited their course lecturers as the main source of influence in their intention to choose careers in the industry. These studies (Ahuja, as cited in Lawer, 2015; Bojuwoye & Mbanjwa, 2006; Chuang & Dellmann-Jenkins, 2010; Qiu et al., 2017) have mentioned various services which, when available or absent, had positively influenced or deterred students with respect to choosing hospitality careers. Abrahams et al., (2015), further, bemoaned the variably slight change in the availability of career counselling services in a university and the country (South Africa) as a whole.

The role of the lecturer as a model for students to look up to within the university environment makes them the best source of career information. Lee, Lee, & Dopson (2019) identified faculty and professors as the most influencing group on students’ career decisions. Therefore, how well the lecturer informs students about the realities of the hospitality industry and career will prepare students adequately as well as give them realistic expectation from careers within the industry. This will help reduce the
disappointment that students usually experience when they encounter careers within the industry.

**Location and Choice of Career**

Residential location may have a role to play in choice of career; where we live has an effect on us and relationally on our choice. For example, if a student resides in an area within the country where the hospitality industry is highly developed, that student may have a positive perception about the industry than that student who is located in an area where the industry is poorly developed. Also, university location may also contribute to students’ choice of career, in that, even if students come from areas in the country where the hospitality industry is poorly developed and they find themselves in universities where the industry is highly developed, they may become positively influenced to choose careers within the industry.

**Conceptual Framework for the Study**

A conceptual framework was developed from the theories guiding the study and the variables these theories propose. Personal factors, as shown on the framework, consist of both biological and person-specific variables. These variables include age, sex, marital status, personality traits, among others. Environmental factors, on the other hand, are those factors which exist in a persons’ social and general academic environment. The variables included here are type of university and its location. The social factors are composed of influences from friends and family and lecturers. For instance, parents, other relatives, and role models may play influential roles in the life of the
undergraduate student and all these people, according to the social cognitive learning theory (Bandura, 1986), influence their choices.

According to social cognitive career theory (Lent et al., 1994), apart from personal and contextual factors influencing choice of career, certain support factors within the environment may promote or hinder the choice people make with regard to career. For this study, supports within the academic environment were probed, with their possible effect on students’ choice of hospitality career explored.

Also, perceptions are important in choice-making. Perceptions that students have about hospitality careers will affect their decision to choose careers in the industry or not. Perceptions are shaped by experience and also by various interactions in the social environment. The framework, further, proposes a dual relationship between personal factors and environmental factors. This means that a mixture of these factors may influence choice of hospitality careers. Personal and environmental factors could affect students’ perception and, subsequently, their choice of hospitality career.

The framework also shows a direct effect of personal factors and environmental factors on choice of hospitality careers. For example, gender, age, religion, and other variables may directly affect students’ choice of careers in the industry; these relationships were tested by various hypotheses. Also, these personal and environmental variables will affect the perceptions formed about careers in the industry.
For example, the older the student (age), the more likely they are to avoid careers in the hospitality industry; this is because they may perceive the industry to be labour intensive and, therefore, more suitable for younger people.
Chapter Summary

This chapter discussed empirical literature on students’ perceptions of hospitality careers. It also presented literature on personal and environmental factors that influenced choice of careers. Students’ perceptions of hospitality careers were reported to have been shaped by industry experience by which internship was the most common means to acquire industry experience. There were more findings from studies showing that students’ perceptions became negative as they experienced careers within the hospitality industry. Also, academic level of students was also found to be negatively correlated to career perceptions in that freshmen and women had favourable perceptions of careers in the industry, as compared to sophomores, juniors, and seniors. However, on the whole, studies had reported positive, negative, and neutral perceptions of hospitality careers. The negative perceptions most frequently mentioned by the literature include poor salary, and poor family and social life balance.

With regard to personal factors and career choice, gender, religion, interest, and personality were reported, in some cases, to have affected career choice, although interest had been reported as the most important personal factor affecting career choice. In the case of environmental factors and choice of hospitality careers, parents and peers were reported to have affected students’ choice of career. Whereas remuneration was generally considered to be low in hospitality careers, it did not affect students’ choice of hospitality careers. Finally, institutional support services and location were discussed in relation to the possible effects that these may have on students’ choice of career.
A conceptual framework was proposed at the end of this chapter, which showed the possible relationships among the various concepts and variables, as informed by the theories underpinning the study as well as the empirical evidence available from the literature.
CHAPTER FOUR
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter describes the methods that were employed for data collection and analysis. It further describes the research paradigm and study design that guided the study as well as the study area, data and sources, target population, sample size and sampling procedure. Data collection instruments, fieldwork challenges, ethical considerations and analytical tools to be used are also highlighted in this chapter.

Research Paradigm/Approach

This study was guided by the pragmatist research paradigm. The pragmatist worldview takes into account both the positivist/post-positivist and interpretive paradigms. To the positivist, reality can be observed, measured and predicted. This paradigm supports the assertion that the truth is out there and is independent of human consciousness. What is real is, therefore, defined same by all. However, the post-positivists vary from the positivists in that they believe there is no absolute truth as purported by the positivists; to them, the truth is a probability. They believe scientists create knowledge which changes with time; in other words, what is true today might not be true tomorrow. Ponterotto (2005) suggests that positivism deals with theory verification whilst post-positivism seeks to falsify theories.

On the contrary, interpretivists posit that reality is in the minds of people and what is true is socially constructed based on interaction. Reality, to this group of people, is subjective and is defined differently by the individuals
involved (Sarantakos, 2012). Also, positivists/post-positivists emphasise quantitative measurements whilst interpretivists rely on qualitative measurement techniques.

Pragmatism, therefore, focuses on the research problem rather than the research methods. It gives the researcher the freedom to mix both quantitative and qualitative assumptions in a research (Creswell, 2009). This approach will address the research problem under investigation. In this study, both probability and non-probability methods would be used in the sampling procedure, data collection, and presentation of findings.

To employ a mixed method is to combine both qualitative and quantitative inquiry approaches in a study. According to Creswell & Clark (2007), using a mixed method is more than simply collecting and analysing qualitative and quantitative data. It also involves the use of both approaches together, so that the overall strength of the study is greater than either qualitative or quantitative research.

Specifically, the study employed the sequential mixed methods approach. According to Creswell (2009), sequential mixed methods procedures are those in which the researcher expands on the findings of one method with another. Simply, this means that a study may be initiated using a quantitative data collection and analysis, then followed up with a qualitative data collection and analysis or vice versa. If the former is the case, large samples are used to begin with and fewer cases subsequently. For this study, sequential explanatory mixed methods strategy adopted, because, quantitative data was collected first using a survey questionnaire, after which interviews
were held with students who were purposively sampled. The interview offered further explanations to issues which arose from the questionnaire survey.

Study Design

Explanatory research is a form of research that aims at explaining social systems, relations or social events, by providing information about the structure and the nature of a phenomenon (Sarantakos, 2012). Explanatory research further seeks to connect different variables to give efficient understanding of a phenomenon. This study was explanatory in design, because it aimed at explaining the connections between the various variables that influence undergraduate students’ choice of careers in the hospitality industry. It sought to explain what factors affect students’ choice of hospitality careers. Further, it sought to unearth the cause and effect of various personal and environmental factors to choice of hospitality careers by students.

Figure 2 summarises the research design employed and how the different approaches were combined in the study. The study, sequentially, mixed the quantitative and qualitative methods to explain the factors that influence choice of career. Public traditional and technical universities were purposively sampled from the three zones of the country: northern, middle, and southern. Stratified random sampling was, further, adopted to select undergraduate students from the various academic levels in the hospitality departments of the universities.
Figure 2: Summary of Study Design

Source: Author’s construct (2018)
As depicted in Figure 2, a questionnaire was developed for the collection of quantitative data. The data was analysed and findings from the quantitative data were used to develop an interview guide to collect qualitative data. Qualitative data was then analysed and interpretation of the findings from both data was done.

**Study Area**

The study was conducted in Ghana; the country was subdivided into the northern, middle, and southern zones. The northern zone of Ghana consists of the Upper East, Upper West and Northern Regions. This area covers a geographic space of 97,702km, and has 17.15 percent of Ghana’s population (Ghana Statistical Service [GSS], 2019). As compared to the other zones, the northern zone has less hospitality businesses despite being the largest zone. The area also has public tertiary institutions that run tourism and hospitality programmes. These institutions are University for Development Studies (UDS), Tamale Technical University and Bolgatanga Polytechnic.

The Ashanti and Brong-Ahafo Regions make up the middle zone of Ghana. Kumasi and Sunyani are the regional capitals of the Ashanti and Brong-Ahafo Regions respectively. This zone covers a total space of 63,946km and accounts for 28.76% of Ghana’s population. There are much more hospitality businesses in this zone, as compared to the Northern zone. There are also numerous public and private tertiary institutions in the area. Notable among the higher learning institutions are: The Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology (KNUST), Kumasi Technical University, University of Education-Kumasi Campus, University of Energy
and Natural Resources, and Sunyani Technical University. Figure 3, shows the three zones of the country.

Figure 3: Map of Study Area
Source: Cartography Unit, Department of Geography and Regional Planning, University of Cape coast (2018)
Of all the zones, the southern zone has the highest number of regions. Together, the Greater Accra, Eastern, Western, Central and Volta Regions cover a land mass of 76,905km and have 54.1 percent of Ghana’s population. This zone has the most hospitality businesses and tertiary institutions. The zone is endowed with higher institutions like the University of Ghana, Accra Technical University, Ghana Institute of Management and Public Administration (GIMPA), Koforidua Technical University, Ho Technical University, University of Cape Coast (UCC), Cape Coast Technical University, among others. Figure 3 also shows the various zones of the country and the universities selected from these zones.

Data and Sources

This study used primary data. Primary data was collected from hospitality students in the universities. The primary data was collected through the use of self-administered questionnaires and interviews. Secondary information was also used, mainly accessed from the hospitality departments of the universities in the form of registered students’ lists. Information from books, journals and the internet were also sought for the study.

Target Population

The study targeted undergraduate hospitality students in tertiary institutions offering hospitality programmes in Ghana. In all, seven academic institutions running hospitality programmes at the time of data collection were purposively selected: one from the northern zone, two from the middle zone, and four from the southern zone. The differences in the number of universities selected from each zone were a representation of the distribution of the
universities; the southern zone had higher numbers of universities than the middle and northern zones. Specifically, the northern zone has the least number of universities offering the hospitality programme.

The universities purposively targeted were Tamale Technical University from the north, Sunyani Technical University and University of Education-Kumasi campus from the middle zone, and University of Cape Coast, Accra Technical University, Ho Technical University and Takoradi Technical University from the south. All undergraduate students enrolled on the hospitality programme at the time of data collection were targeted. However, those selected through a stratified random sampling procedure were the ones who participated in the data collection exercise.

**Sampling Procedures and Sample Size**

To arrive at a sample size, both probability and non-probability sampling methods were employed. Firstly, a list of all public universities offering hospitality programmes in Ghana was developed. These institutions were, then, grouped under the three regional zones based on their location. Purposive sampling method was, then, employed to select both traditional and technical universities from each zone. The selection of the universities was based on the criterion that the university have been offering the hospitality programme for five years or more. Also, regional location of the various university types was also considered as a basis for selection. Table 2 illustrates the sampling procedure and sample size.
Table 2: Summary of Sampling Procedure and Sample Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zones</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>50% of Population</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northern</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamale Technical University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 100</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>0.5 of 240</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 200</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>0.5 of 225</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 300</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>0.5 of 116</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>0.5 of 581</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Edu.-Kumasi Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 100</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0.5 of 180</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 200</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0.5 of 82</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 300</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>0.5 of 88</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 400</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>0.5 of 96</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>0.5 of 446</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunyani Technical University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 100</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>0.5 of 210</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 200</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>0.5 of 154</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 300</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0.5 of 87</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 400</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0.5 of 62</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>0.5 of 513</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Southern</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Cape Coast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 100</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.5 of 65</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 200</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0.5 of 56</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>47</th>
<th>0.5 of 47</th>
<th>24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.5 of 27</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>0.5 of 195</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ho Technical University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>85</th>
<th>0.5 of 85</th>
<th>43</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0.5 of 91</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>0.5 of 85</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.5 of 31</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>0.5 of 292</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accra Technical University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>228</th>
<th>0.5 of 228</th>
<th>114</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>0.5 of 309</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>0.5 of 202</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.5 of 18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>0.5 of 757</td>
<td>378</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Takoradi Technical University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>212</th>
<th>0.5 of 212</th>
<th>106</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>0.5 of 160</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>0.5 of 163</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.5 of 21</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>0.5 of 556</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Grand  | 3,340| 0.5 of 3340| 1,671|

In the northern zone, for example, Tamale Technical University was selected, as it was the only public technical university in the area that offers the hospitality programme as at the time of data collection.

In the middle zone, there were three public traditional universities and two technical universities which offer the hospitality management programme. One traditional and one technical university were purposively selected in each region; these were University of Education - Kumasi campus and Sunyani Technical University. In the southern zone, there were five public technical universities and two public traditional universities, all offering the hospitality programme. Purposively, one traditional university and other three technical universities were selected. The universities selected were those that have offered the hospitality programme for at least five years and have churned out graduates who are working in the industry. The selection of universities from the southern zone, was also done bearing in mind the regional dispersion of the universities.

Stratified random sampling technique was used to sample students from each academic level (levels 100-400). Fifty percent of students in each level were selected. Fifty percent of the students at each level enabled a good representation of students’ views of careers in the industry and also a strong basis of the factors that influence students’ choice of hospitality careers. Also, 50% allocation ensured representation of students from each academic level based on numbers available at each level. Again, a recent study by Amissah et al., (2019) in Ghana, showed that, less than half of the students enrolled on the hospitality programme intend to choose careers in the industry. Sampling 50% of these students will ensure a better representation of students’ views on the
subject under investigation. Class lists of students at each level were used, where the lottery method was used to randomly select half of the students. The total sample size for the study was 1,671.

Respondents for interview were purposively sampled from the sample of respondents who completed the questionnaires. Purposive sampling of interviewees made it possible to represent students from the various locations, of different background characteristics as well as varied social backgrounds. Thirty students were targeted across the sampled universities. Specifically, 15 students were targeted from the southern zone, 9 from the middle zone, and 6 from the northern zone. More students were selected from the southern zone because that zone had the most hospitality students.

The select 30 students for the interviews, students who handed over completed questionnaires in the classrooms, were informed that there will be a follow up interview session and that interested students should give their phone numbers to the researcher or field assistants in interested. During the process of taking students’ phone numbers, basic background questions were asked. The questions included; religion of student, academic level, whether student had had industry experience, family ownership of hospitality business, residential location, and whether student has intentions to choose hospitality careers. The researcher then used the background information from these students to purposively select 30 students for interviews.

Data Collection Instruments

Questionnaire

A questionnaire was one of the primary tools for data collection. Questionnaire was the most appropriate data collection tool, as undergraduate
students could fluently read and understand the English language. The questionnaire was also self-administered by the researcher with the help of field assistants. The questionnaire was divided into four parts. Part A required undergraduate students to show their extent of agreement to statements on perceptions of careers in the hospitality industry on a five-point Likert scale (1-5), where 1- strongly disagree, 2- disagree, 3- neutral, 4-agree, 5- strongly agree. The statements on perceptions of careers in the hospitality industry were negatively worded, which means that agreeing to a statement denotes a negative perception. Thus, a low mean denotes positive perception.

Part B required respondents to give a ‘yes’ or ‘no’ answer to some reasons why they will choose hospitality careers. Questions included in part A and B of the questionnaire were adapted from Kusluvan and Kusluvan (2000), and Richardson and Butler (2012). Some of the statements were re-worded to make them simpler for students to understand and also to fit the Ghanaian context.

Statements which measured respondents’ personality traits were contained in Part C of the questionnaire. Part C, basically, sought to measure students’ personality traits, using extraversion/introversion traits again on a five-point Likert scale (1-5, strongly disagree to strongly agree). The trait measurement scale was adopted from the International Personality Item Pool (IPIP). Extraversion was measured by the 10 items (without their reverse) developed by Goldberg et al. (2006). The reverse of extraversion traits was not included, as low (less than half) mean scores denote introversion. Part D required respondents to respond to questions on their socio-demographic
characteristics, university characteristics as well as some career-specific questions.

The questionnaire had both open-ended and closed-ended questions, although the closed-ended questions dominated. The open-ended questions were intended to give students the opportunity to express their views on reasons for some answers which have not been captured by the literature and the questionnaire (see Appendix B).

Interview Guide

An interview guide was also used to collect further information on the issues that needed further probing and clarification from the quantitative data. The interviews were conducted after quantitative data had been collected and analysed. The interview guide was in two parts: Part A collected information on the socio-demographic and other background characteristics of interviewees, whilst the second part had questions that probed the specific issues from the quantitative analysis that required further explanations. Socio-demographic information contained in the interview guide include academic level of students, age (specific or range), whether students have industry experience or not, duration of experience, and religion. Part B, specifically, asked questions about how students’ perceptions of hospitality careers encourage or discourage them about careers in the industry, what support services are provided by their respective universities and how effective these services are, and what other services they think must be provided to make students more interested in hospitality careers, experiences that may have strengthened or weakened students’ choice of careers in the industry, among others (see Appendix C).
Data Collection Procedure

Pre-Testing of Instrument

The main fieldwork was preceded by pre-testing of the instrument on the 24th of September, 2018 in two universities in the Central and Greater Accra Regions (Cape Coast Technical University and GIMPA). The two universities selected for pre-test were in different regions and also, one was a traditional university and the other, a technical university. The questionnaires were self-administered to students randomly. Fifty students were targeted in each university. In Cape Coast Technical University, all 50 questionnaires were administered. However, in GIMPA, students were reluctant to fill in the questionnaire. Only 26 questionnaires were returned. In all, 76 questionnaires were returned, out of which 50 were found to be fit for use.

The pre-testing offered the researcher the opportunity to change the arrangement of some questions and also re-word others. Also, the pre-testing helped the researcher to anticipate the possible problem of partly completed questionnaire with respect to the student population; this was because, out of the 76 questionnaires distributed, 26 were found to be unusable because they were incomplete. The Cronbach’s Alpha of the scales used in the questionnaire was tested to ensure the scales were reliable. Specifically, the perception scale and the personality trait scale were both reliable, with a Cronbach’s Alpha of 0.84 and 0.83 respectively.

Fieldwork

The main field work started on the 22nd of November, 2018. Because of the wide geographical space to be covered in this research, field assistants were contacted and recruited from the various university campuses. The field
assistants were mainly teaching assistants from the selected universities. In all, seven field assistants were contacted through the help of lecturers in the universities. Five of the assistants were in the hospitality departments whilst two were from other departments within the selected universities. A sample questionnaire was given to each field assistant and further discussions were done with the field assistants with respect to the purpose of the exercise. Further explanations were given to the assistants with regard to the possible challenges to be encountered and how to address them.

Also, because there was the need of class lists from the various hospitality departments, an introductory letter from the Department of Hospitality and Tourism Management, UCC (DHTM-UCC) was taken and sent to the various Heads of Departments and lecturers who requested for it. Out of the seven universities selected, class lists were obtained from four hospitality departments within the various universities. The lists were, then, used in the randomisation of students for the administering of the questionnaire. For the three universities where the class lists were not released, a census approach was adopted.

There was constant communication between the researcher and the field assistants throughout the period of data collection. This was to keep the researcher abreast with the challenges being encountered and to enable her to suggest best ways of addressing them. In all, the quantitative data collection process lasted for almost eight weeks (22nd November, 2018 to 16th January, 2019).

Qualitative data collection started after the analysis of the quantitative data; specifically, telephone interview with students started on the 20th of
February, 2019 and lasted for about two weeks (20th February to 8th March, 2019). Students who were purposively selected were called on phone after they willingly gave out their phone numbers. They were made aware that the interviews would be recorded for further transcribing and theming. Interviewees were also informed that they can discontinue with the interview and also refuse to answer some questions if they so wish.

Interview with the 19 students was done only by the researcher. Originally, 30 students were targeted for the interview, but only 19 students made time for the exercise. Averagely, an interview lasted for 18 minutes, 53 seconds with each interviewee.

Fieldwork Challenges

Fieldwork was not without challenges. One major challenge encountered was the difficulty in getting a list of students from the various hospitality departments. In all, three of the departments did not release their students’ lists despite the provision of an introductory letter from the DHTM-UCC as well as an assurance that the list would be used for academic purposes only and will be treated confidentially. For those three universities, a census approach was adopted. Also, students who asked that they be allowed to send the questionnaire home or be given some time to complete them either did not return it or brought it back partly completed. More so, with the aim of collecting randomised data, some selected students from the students’ lists who were handed the questionnaire said they were not interested, or took them, filled in some portions and left other parts unfilled, increasing the number of unusable questionnaires.
Finally, at a particular university, level 400 students were not available. As explained by the department, students at this level spend the first semester off-campus. More so, although some students willingly gave their telephone numbers for interviews later on, some never made time for the interview.

In spite of all the challenges, 1,341 of the questionnaires were found to be suitable for quantitative analysis. The response rate, therefore, was 80.25% for quantitative data. For the interview, 19 out of the 30 targeted students actually took part in the exercise, signalling a response rate of 63.30%.

Data Processing and Analysis

Completed questionnaires were received at different times from different universities. Each questionnaire was checked by the researcher to ensure that the questionnaire was correctly completed and important information provided.

The quantitative data collected were coded into Statistical Product for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 21. Factor analysis was used to reduce the perception statements, after which descriptive analysis was done on the background characteristics of respondents. T-test and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) were employed to examine the differences and similarities among the various groups of students with respect to perceptions of hospitality careers. Binary logistic regression was employed to analyse the data to explain the effects of the various factors on students’ choice of hospitality careers.

Qualitative data from telephone interviews with students were manually transcribed and grouped under themes to further explain findings from the quantitative analysis. Content analysis was employed to analyse
qualitative data. A deductive coding approach was used; predetermined codes guided the interviews with students. This was possible because, quantitative data had already been analysed. Specific issues from the quantitative analysis were the basis for the interviews. Examples of themes which emerged from the quantitative data for interviews included, ‘perceived opportunity to meet people’, ‘perceived stress with careers’, ‘industry experience’, ‘location and career choice’, ‘job availability’ among others.

**Ethical Issues**

The ethical implication of every research is very important and how this is addressed in any research is worth mentioning. This research took into account the ethical principles of right of entry, informed consent, anonymity, and confidentiality. Right of entry into the various universities was sought particularly from the Heads of Departments and lecturers of the selected universities. This was necessary, as the lecturers were required to introduce the researcher/field assistants to the students and entreated them to wait for some minutes after their lectures to fill in the questionnaires.

Neuman (2007) posits that researchers must not compel people into participating in a research. Participation must be voluntary at all times. Informed consent was sought from respondents, with the reason for the research explicitly explained before handing over a questionnaire for completion. After making known the purpose of the research, respondents who declined to participate were not coerced in any way to do so.

Closely related to the ethical principle of informed consent is the principle of anonymity. By this, the privacy of the respondents is protected and the anonymity of their identity is ensured. The respondents were also not
required to include their names and phone numbers on the questionnaire. The respondents were not required to return the questionnaire in any particular order. They were required to hand over the questionnaire to their class representatives for onward submission to the researcher or field assistants.

According to Neuman (2007), even if a researcher is not able to guarantee anonymity, he/she should always protect participants’ confidentiality. Respondents were assured of the confidentiality of whatever information they gave. They were further assured that the information they provided will not be given to other people, especially those outside the academic domain and the use of the information will be solely restricted to academic work. No names and location addresses were required from students. This was to make it impossible for any information to be ascribed to a particular student.

**Chapter Summary**

The chapter described the study area which was grouped into the northern, middle, and southern zones of Ghana. The study was guided by the pragmatism research paradigm. Data were sourced from both primary and secondary sources. Primary data were sourced from undergraduate hospitality students through the use of a structured questionnaire and, later, an interview guide. Population for the study comprised undergraduate students from the various public traditional and technical universities. Through the use of a multistage sampling technique, seven universities were sampled: one from the northern zone, two from the middle zone, and four from the southern zone.

Fifty percent of students in the selected universities were targeted, with an estimated sample size of 1,671. The actual response rate achieved was
80.25% (1,341). The major challenge encountered was the unwillingness of some hospitality departments to make available students’ list for random sampling. Frequencies, percentages, and means were used to describe the data. Also, factor analysis was used to reduce the 24 perception statements to 15. T-test, one way Anova and binary logistic regression were used to further analyse the data to achieve the stated objectives. Interviews with students were further used to explain some quantitative findings.
CHAPTER FIVE

STUDENTS’ PERCEPTIONS OF CAREERS IN THE HOSPITALITY INDUSTRY

Introduction

This chapter presents the results and discussion of findings on students’ perceptions of careers in the hospitality industry. The chapter begins with a description of socio-demographic characteristics as well as other background characteristics of respondents. It further presents results on the dimensions of perceptions of careers in the hospitality industry. Finally, differences in perceptions of the various categories of students are discussed.

Socio-Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

Respondents were dominated by females (92.20%) and this reflects the proportion of females to males enrolled in hospitality programmes across the country. Generally, there are more females enrolled on hospitality programmes in Ghana, compared to their male counterparts. In percentages, males are in a minority of less than 10% of students in hospitality programmes in the country (Fieldwork, 2018). Respondents were also mostly between the ages 20-29 years (66.50%), a relatively youthful population. Christians (82.90%) were in the majority and most students (89%) were single. Although students were sampled across all academic levels, freshmen and women made up the largest number of respondents (46.40%), whilst seniors were in the least (7.30%).
Table 3: Socio-Demographic Characteristics of Respondents (N = 1341)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>7.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1237</td>
<td>92.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 20</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>66.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>6.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 and above</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>1112</td>
<td>82.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>17.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>1202</td>
<td>89.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>10.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>46.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>21.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>24.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>7.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of University</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>20.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>1067</td>
<td>79.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also, students from the technical universities (79.60%) dominated and this is because there are more public technical universities offering hospitality programmes than there are public traditional universities in the country (Table 3).

**Students’ Mode of Admission into University**

Students are admitted into universities through various means established by these universities. These include direct, matured, post-diploma, and conditional admissions. Different modes of entry have different requirements for admission.

![Mode of Admission into University](https://erl.ucc.edu.gh/jspui)

**Figure 4: Mode of Admission into University**

Source: Field Survey, Anthony (2019)

From Figure 4, it is evident that 962 (71.70%) of the students were admitted directly from senior high schools, 250 (18.60%) as matured applicants and 116 (8.70%) as post-diploma students.
Choice of Hospitality Programme

Parents, teachers, and other family members influence students’ choice of programme. This they do through the advice they give to students on choice of programme. Sometimes, parents and guardians impose the choice of programme on their children. In Figure 5, 96% of students claimed they voluntarily chose the hospitality programme as against 4% who were made to choose the programme against their will.

Figure 5: Choice of Hospitality Programme
Source: Field Survey, Anthony (2019)

Residential Location of Respondents

Respondents in this study were residing in different parts of the country. However, more than half (53%) were resident in the southern zone of the country. Those residing in the southern zone which consisted of Volta, Western, Central and Greater Accra were more because the zone has about 50% of the national population (GSS, 2019) and it also has more universities than any other zone in the country (Figure 6).
Industry Experience of Respondents

Majority of respondents in this study had some work experience in the hospitality industry. Seventy percent (70%) of the respondents had had experience in the industry through internship (48.60%) or full time employment (31%). This implies that internship, as alluded to by Framaki (2018), is one of the readily available means by which students gain industry experience. Some of the students (31.60%) had attained industry experience, working in the hotel segment. Similarly, Turanligil & Altintaş (2018) found that about 79% of tourism and hotel management students had gained industry experience in the hotel segment in Turkey. The hotel segment could attract more students because of the many other distinct activities performed in this segment of the industry.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality industry experience</td>
<td>1340</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>70.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td></td>
<td>939</td>
<td>70.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inexperienced</td>
<td></td>
<td>402</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means of experience acquisition</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>48.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internship</td>
<td></td>
<td>456</td>
<td>48.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time employment</td>
<td></td>
<td>291</td>
<td>31.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time employment</td>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
<td>9.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary- work</td>
<td></td>
<td>92</td>
<td>9.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segment of industry experienced</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>32.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td></td>
<td>297</td>
<td>32.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td></td>
<td>204</td>
<td>21.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>9.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td></td>
<td>169</td>
<td>18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catering</td>
<td></td>
<td>97</td>
<td>10.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than one segment</td>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>8.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating of industry experience</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>48.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
<td>457</td>
<td>48.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td></td>
<td>338</td>
<td>36.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td>127</td>
<td>13.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Also, about 45% of the students who had had some industry experience had done so for less than 6 months, with those having industry experience for 5 years or more being the least (6.90%). Students were, generally, satisfied with the exposure they had in the industry. As indicated in Table 4, only 1.70% of students rated their experience as poor.

**Family and Friends’ Association with the Hospitality Industry**

The social cognitive learning theory affirms that people are affected by others within their social environment. Family and friends are one of the vital components within the social environment. Also, the vicarious learning principle within the SCLT implies that students could be influenced by the involvement of family and friends in careers within the hospitality industry. From Table 5, 65% of the students did not have relatives employed in the various segments of the industry. On the contrary, 34.70% had relatives working in the industry.
### Table 5: Family and Friends’ Association with the Hospitality Industry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family member(s) employed</strong> in hospitality industry</td>
<td>1341</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family member(s) employed</td>
<td>465</td>
<td></td>
<td>34.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No family member employed</td>
<td>876</td>
<td></td>
<td>65.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specific family member employed</strong></td>
<td>465</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siblings</td>
<td>147</td>
<td></td>
<td>31.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aunt/ Uncle</td>
<td>138</td>
<td></td>
<td>29.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse/ in-laws</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family member ownership of hospitality business</strong></td>
<td>1340</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family member ownership</td>
<td>364</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No family member ownership</td>
<td>976</td>
<td></td>
<td>72.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friends pursuing hospitality career</strong></td>
<td>1341</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend pursuing hospitality career</td>
<td>901</td>
<td></td>
<td>67.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No friend pursuing hospitality career</td>
<td>440</td>
<td></td>
<td>32.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, Anthony (2019)

Out of the 465 students with relatives associated with the industry, 364 had family members who own hospitality businesses, whilst more than half (67.20%) of the students had friends employed in the industry.
Industry Segment Preferred by Respondents

Of the many segments of the hospitality industry, 35.50% of the students preferred to work in hotels and 20.60% preferred to work in restaurants. Also, more than half (55.30%) of the students cited passion as the main reason for preferring a particular segment. On the contrary, only 2.20% of the students identified good salary as the reason for preferring a particular segment of the industry. Moreover, less than 1% of the students mentioned the availability of family business as the reason for their preference of a particular segment within the industry.

Table 6: Industry Segment Preferred by Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preferred segment</td>
<td>1255</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>35.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>20.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>19.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason for selected segment</td>
<td>998</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passion</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>55.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have experience</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>10.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have required training</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>15.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking opportunities</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>11.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family business</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for Selected Department</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passion</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>46.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requisite training</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>7.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requisite knowledge and skills</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>23.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking opportunities</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>15.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, Anthony (2019)

Furthermore, the F&B production and service departments were the two most preferred departments by (67.10%) students. In a similar study, Chuang et al. (2007) reported that most American students prefer to work in the food and beverage department of the industry above all others. Also, having the right knowledge and skills for the job in a chosen department (23.60%) was the second reason advanced by students for their preference for a department (Table 6).
Students’ Expectations of Careers in the Industry

Expectations play an important role in the acceptance of reality. People have expectations of every situation they are yet to encounter. These expectations may be realistic or unrealistic, met or unmet. When expectations are not met, it leads to disappointments. These disappointments occur because students have high expectations of the hospitality industry (Turanligil & Altintaş, 2018).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expectation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entry level position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower level (operational)</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>6.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle level (supervisory)</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>40.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top level (managerial)</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>52.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of entry level salary (Ghs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1,000</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>6.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-1,500</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>22.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500-2,000</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>21.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 2,000</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, Anthony (2019)

From Table 7, more than half of the respondents (52.80%) in this study expected to enter the industry at top managerial level and 50% wished for a salary above GH¢2000.00, an expectation that is not realistic in the Ghanaian hospitality industry.
Personality Trait of Respondents

Personality traits are commonly grouped into the introvert-extrovert continuum. Introverts are said to like spending time with self rather in social situations (Goldberg et al., 2006). Out of the 1339 valid responses on the IPIP scale, most of the respondents (89.25%) perceived themselves to be extroverts, with a little above 10% being introverts (Table 8).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality trait</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introvert</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>10.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrovert</td>
<td>1195</td>
<td>89.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Field Survey, Anthony (2019)

Profile of Interviewees

Interviewees consisted of four males and 15 females who were predominantly (74%) Christians. Three of the respondents, representing 16% were below 20 years, nine (47%) were between 20-25 years and seven (37%) were above 25 years. About two-thirds of the interviewees (74%) had experienced career life in the industry. More than half (74%) of them were students from technical universities, with the rest (26%) being students from traditional universities. Also, 16 (84%) were singles whilst three (16%) were married. Twenty-six percent of the interviewees do not intend to choose careers in the industry whilst 74% intend to choose hospitality careers.
Students’ Perceptions of Hospitality Careers Prior to Exploratory Factor Analysis

To measure students’ perception about careers in the hospitality industry, 24-item perception statements were used. Using a five-point Likert scale of strongly disagree to strongly agree, all perception questions were negatively worded. In this way, a low mean represents a disagreement to the statements describing perceptions about careers in the hospitality industry. This generally means that a low mean denotes a positive perception whilst a higher mean implies a negative perception. The scale used was also tested for its reliability. The Cronbach’s Alpha of the scale (0.87) revealed that, the scale was a good one to have effectively measured students’ perceptions of careers in the hospitality. Appendix A shows all the 24 perception statements with their respective means and standard deviations.

Dimensions of Students’ Perceptions of Careers in the Hospitality Industry

Factor analysis was carried out to reduce the 24-item perception statements that students responded to. This analysis also ensured the grouping of the perceptions under strongly correlated constructs. Principal component analysis (PCA) was employed with varimax rotation, which resulted in the reduction of the 24 items to 15. The Kaiser Meyer Olkin (KMO) test of sample adequacy was 0.92, with a Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity of 7191.01 (p = 0.00).
### Table 9: Dimensions of Students’ Perceptions of Careers in the Hospitality Industry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Loadings</th>
<th>Eigen values</th>
<th>% of variance explained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I</strong></td>
<td><strong>Career attractiveness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limited opportunity to meet</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor networking opportunity</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Offers uninteresting experiences</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>6.87</td>
<td>29.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of opportunity for further education</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor career development</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limited use of academic knowledge and skills</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II</strong></td>
<td><strong>Career Prestige/mobility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difficulty of movement to other careers</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low intellectual challenge</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low entry positions for graduates</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>12.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not prestigious</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III</strong></td>
<td><strong>Nature of career</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low remuneration</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stressful</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low regard by society</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>8.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Offers less time for family</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Offers less time for social life</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total variance explained</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KMO = 0.922; Bartlett’s test of Sphericity: 7191.01;  p = 0.00
The 15 perception items generated from the factor analysis were grouped under three constructs. These were: career attractiveness, career prestige/mobility, and nature of careers in the hospitality industry. Career attractiveness was measured by the following items with their respective factor loadings: limited opportunity to meet new people (0.72), poor networking opportunities (0.70), uninteresting experiences (0.62), poor career development (0.61), lack of opportunity for further education (0.54), and limited use of academic knowledge and skills (0.51). Career prestige/mobility consisted of items like difficulty of movement to other careers, career of low intellectual challenge, low entry positions for graduate and a career that is not prestigious. The factor loadings of these perceptions ranged from 0.50 to 0.69.

Finally, items like low remuneration (0.61), stressful career (0.69), low regard of career by society (0.51), careers that offer less time for family life (0.56), and social life (0.51) were grouped under nature of career. In all, the variables explained 50.32% of students’ perceptions of careers in the hospitality industry. Career attractiveness (Factor I) explained 29.14% of students’ perceptions of careers in the hospitality industry. Career prestige/mobility (Factor II) also explained 12.55% whilst nature of career (Factor III) explained 8.63% of students’ perceptions of hospitality careers (Table 9).

Under the career attractiveness construct (Factor I), perception of limited opportunity to meet people had the highest factor loading (0.72). This was followed by perception of poor networking opportunity in hospitality careers (0.70). Limited use of academic knowledge and skills had the least factor loading (0.51) under Factor I. Low entry positions for graduates (0.69) and difficulty of movement to other careers (0.63) were the two perceptions
that had the highest loading under Factor II (career prestige/mobility). For Factor III, stressful careers (0.69) and low remuneration paid for careers (0.61) in the industry were the perceptions that were highly loaded under the nature of career construct.

Undergraduate Students’ Perceptions of Careers in the Hospitality Industry

People’s perceptions about careers could be influenced by a number of factors. These perceptions may be positive or negative. Perceptions can also change based on exposure to reality or through social interactions. This notwithstanding, perceptions are important in decision-making. The first objective of the study was to examine students’ perceptions of careers in the hospitality industry. A five-point Likert scale was used to collect data on students’ perceptions about careers in the industry. The scale ranged from 1- strongly disagree to 5- strongly agree. All the perception statements were negatively worded. This meant that a disagreement to these statements denote a positive perception, whilst an agreement to the statements signify a negative perception.

Results from Table 10 indicate that hospitality undergraduate students in Ghana were generally indifferent about careers in the hospitality industry, with an overall mean of 2.69 and a standard deviation of 1.33. This implies that the students were neither positive nor negative in their perception about careers in the industry. Similarly, Roney & Ötzin (2007) reported indifferent perceptions of students about careers in the industry in Turkey. On the contrary, Turanligil & Altintaş (2018) and Amissah et al. (2019) found that hospitality and tourism students in Anadolu University and University of Cape
Coast in Turkey and Ghana respectively had negative perceptions about careers in the industry.

However, Barron et al. (2007) reported positive perceptions of careers in the hospitality industry by students in United Kingdom. It can also be noted that the above studies with contrary findings to this did not represent the general students’ perception of careers in the industry in those countries.

Also, students disagreed that careers in the industry are not attractive (category mean = 2.18). Students were of the view that careers in the industry are attractive and offered the opportunity to meet new people (mean = 2.01), apply academic knowledge and skills (mean = 2.14), develop their careers (mean = 2.17), further their education (mean = 2.19), network with others (mean = 2.30), and be exposed to interesting experiences (mean = 2.25).

Moreover, as indicated in Table 10, students were neutral in their responses about the prestige/mobility features of careers in the industry (category mean = 2.74). Students neither agreed nor disagreed that there are difficulties in moving from hospitality careers to other careers (mean = 2.52). Students were also indifferent about the prestige of careers in the industry (mean = 2.65). This view about prestige was probably dependent on the class or grade of hospitality facility in which one was employed. This is because careers in the industry have been tagged as being of a servitude nature (Selçuk et al., 2013), which makes people feel ashamed of working in especially small-sized establishments. Students were also not sure whether the entry positions for graduates in the industry was low (mean = 3.04). Meanwhile, there is anecdotal evidence that career placement in the industry is based on one’s ability and experience rather than academic qualifications.
Furthermore, students were indifferent to most of the items relating to the nature of careers in the hospitality industry (category mean = 3.16). They were neutral in their responses about the remuneration (mean = 3.00), time available for family (mean = 3.31), and social life (mean = 3.02). They, however, agreed that careers in the industry are stressful (mean = 3.62). Richardson and Butler (2012), however, reported negative perceptions among students in Malaysia about the nature of hospitality careers, in general. It can be observed from Table 10 that most students disagreed to the assertion that there is limited opportunity to meet new people in the industry, as indicated by a lowest mean of 2.01, whilst they generally agreed that careers in the industry are stressful in nature (mean = 3.62).

Students were certain that pursuing careers in the industry provide the opportunity to meet new people. Similarly, Roney & Ötzin (2007) reported that students in Turkey perceived careers in the hospitality industry to provide good opportunity to meet new people all the time. Students were, however, convinced that careers in the industry were stressful (mean = 3.62). Studies by Kusluvan & Kusluvan (2000), Richardson & Butler (2012), and Selcuk et al. (2013) had also shown that students had negative perceptions about the nature of careers in the hospitality industry. Students in this study, however, were indifferent about the nature of careers in the hospitality industry (category mean = 3.16).

In Table 10, percentages of students’ disagreement and agreement to the negatively worded perception statements are also presented. The scale of five (which were: strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, and strongly
agree) are presented. Neutral perceptions were necessary to allow students who neither disagree nor agree to perception statements to choose.

As presented in Table 10, about 40% and 27% of the students strongly disagreed and disagreed to the negative statements measuring the attractiveness of careers in the industry respectively. This means that more than half of the students perceived careers in the industry to be attractive, as also shown by a mean of 2.18. Approximately 7% of the students agreed that careers in the industry are not attractive, but less than 14% of the students neither agreed nor disagreed to this statement. Also, 47% of students either strongly disagreed or disagreed that careers in the industry are not mobile/prestigious; however, a little above 30% of the students were in agreement that careers in the industry are low in prestige/mobility.

Table 10 further indicates that 47% of students perceived careers in the industry to be poor in nature. Forty-two percent of students were of the view that careers in the industry offer poor salary whilst 41% of the students strongly disagreed or disagreed. Furthermore, most students (61.60%) perceived careers in the industry to be stressful, as compared to 21% of students who thought otherwise. The overall total shows that about 50% of students perceived careers in the industry positively. A further description of students’ agreement/disagreement to each perception statement in percentages and means is presented in Table 10.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% (n)</td>
<td>% (n)</td>
<td>% (n)</td>
<td>% (n)</td>
<td>% (n)</td>
<td>% (n)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Career attractiveness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited opportunity to meet people</td>
<td>49.90</td>
<td>23.70</td>
<td>10.40</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor networking opportunity</td>
<td>34.60</td>
<td>28.90</td>
<td>15.40</td>
<td>13.90</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offers uninteresting experiences</td>
<td>37.20</td>
<td>28.60</td>
<td>14.40</td>
<td>11.70</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of opportunity for further education</td>
<td>42.20</td>
<td>25.60</td>
<td>12.10</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td>8.90</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor career development</td>
<td>37.40</td>
<td>30.10</td>
<td>16.20</td>
<td>10.70</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited use of academic knowledge and skills</td>
<td>43.30</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category total</strong></td>
<td><strong>40.77</strong></td>
<td><strong>27.32</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.28</strong></td>
<td><strong>10.85</strong></td>
<td><strong>7.78</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.18</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.28</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prestige /mobility of career</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty of movement to other careers</td>
<td>25.70</td>
<td>29.90</td>
<td>20.40</td>
<td>14.90</td>
<td>9.10</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of career</th>
<th>19.20 (257)</th>
<th>28.10 (376)</th>
<th>21.30 (285)</th>
<th>20.10 (270)</th>
<th>11.30 (152)</th>
<th>2.76</th>
<th>1.28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low entry positions for graduates</td>
<td>19.80 (265)</td>
<td>19.10 (256)</td>
<td>18.90 (254)</td>
<td>21.40 (287)</td>
<td>20.80 (279)</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not prestigious career</td>
<td>22.30 (299)</td>
<td>24.70 (331)</td>
<td>28.50 (382)</td>
<td>15.10 (202)</td>
<td>9.50 (127)</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category total</td>
<td>21.75</td>
<td>25.45</td>
<td>22.28</td>
<td>17.88</td>
<td>12.68</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nature of career

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of career</th>
<th>22.80 (306)</th>
<th>18.20 (244)</th>
<th>17 (228)</th>
<th>20.10 (269)</th>
<th>21.90 (294)</th>
<th>3.00</th>
<th>1.47</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low remuneration</td>
<td>9.90 (133)</td>
<td>11.20 (150)</td>
<td>17.40 (233)</td>
<td>29.80 (399)</td>
<td>31.80 (426)</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stressful</td>
<td>26.70 (358)</td>
<td>19.20 (258)</td>
<td>15.60 (209)</td>
<td>19.20 (258)</td>
<td>19.20 (258)</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low regard by society</td>
<td>15.30 (205)</td>
<td>15.90 (213)</td>
<td>17 (228)</td>
<td>26.40 (354)</td>
<td>25.40 (341)</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offers less time for family life</td>
<td>17.70 (237)</td>
<td>21.60 (290)</td>
<td>19.20 (257)</td>
<td>24.50 (328)</td>
<td>17.10 (229)</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offers less time for social life</td>
<td>18.48</td>
<td>17.20</td>
<td>17.22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23.08</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23.32</td>
<td>17.59</td>
<td>17.58</td>
<td>14.51</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One issue that had the most favourable perception from students was the opportunity to meet new people. This means that students were of the opinion that careers in the hospitality industry provided good opportunities for friendship and networking. Similarly, interviewees indicated that meeting new people in the industry provides lots of opportunities. Students who had experienced careers in the industry had memories of the opportunities that they had because of the people they met in the industry. For example, a 38-year old level 400 male student, with five years work experience in the industry, described careers in the industry as:

.... Having their own peculiar problems, but believe me, they provide so many opportunities. Careers in the industry provide good links and tips when well managed. I was a manager and sometimes a receptionist in a hotel, during that time I had a lot of contacts and connections, some of which are still available to me today.

....after my Higher National Diploma, I was employed in a restaurant, the salary was not so good, but I met a lot of people during that time and I had good tips. There were times I hardly used my salary. I also had the opportunity to link friends and family members to some of these people for some other reasons outside my work (A female, level 400 student with less than 2 years work experience).

....careers in the industry are good. You are always mobile, get to know a lot of things, you get trendy and more importantly you get connections with many important people from many places and
cultures, not to mention the tips (A level 300 female student with less than 1 year work experience).

Students’ Perceptions of the Nature of Careers in the Industry

From Table 10, students were indifferent about the nature of careers in the hospitality industry (category mean = 3.16), although they had negative perceptions about the stressful nature of careers in the industry (mean = 3.62). From interviews with students, there seem to be some variations in the responses of students about the nature of careers in the industry, as compared to the quantitative data gathered from students. From the interviews, students perceived careers in the industry to be stressful, inflexible, and unrewarding. The differences in the perception of interviewees and the general survey respondents can be attributed to the fact that most of the interviewees were continuing students. There is evidence from previous studies that the longer students pursue the hospitality programme, the more negative their perceptions become (Kozak & Kizilirmak, 2001; Kim & Park, 2013).

Some students perceived that careers in the industry are inflexible and stressful, which results in the reduction of the time available for family. These students mentioned that the inflexibility of hospitality careers is an issue of concern to them. They said:

....careers in the industry are inflexible and hard, it provide less time for other important activities ....; for instance, you will have to spend all your time at work if you are on afternoon shift, you will close very late, and the night shifts.... if you have children who will take care of them? As for family people, I feel sorry for them (23 year old, level 400 female student).
Careers in the industry is time consuming, the pay is not also very good; .... so it will be difficult for you to pay other people to help you with household chores whilst you are busy working (25 year old, level 400, female student).

....careers in the hospitality industry are good, but, the sometimes unattractive salary compared to the stressful careers do not match at all (29 year old, level 300 student).

Hospitality careers are stressful, inflexible, time consuming, as for the shift system I detest it.... I think careers in the industry do not just match with my time.... (21 year old level 300 female student)

Furthermore, some students who perceived the negative nature of careers in the industry seem to have some hesitations about the effect this has, especially, on family and social life. According to a 38 year old level 400 male student:

....it is true that careers in the industry affect time for social and family life. When I was first employed in the industry I used to feel sad that, whilst my friends were having fun during weekends and holidays, I am at work; however with time I overcame it. The people I actually worry for are the females who are married and have children.... I will never allow my wife to work in the hospitality industry.

There are so many challenges in the industry,... I really wonder what will happen to me when I marry and am still working at a level where I
will still have to work late and during weekends as well..... (27 year old, level 300 female student).

....I heard careers in the industry do not support family life, that is why there are more younger people than older people working in the industry (A 21 year old, level 200, female student).

Also, a 25 year old level 400 female student who had reservations about the nature of hospitality careers mentioned that:

_Hm, as for this industry,... there are so many negative things happening and no body seem to check it out, its stressful, inflexible....., the managers do not respect us, they talk to us anyhow and also cheat us in the salary they pay; as if there are no laws in Ghana regulating how much people should be paid. When I talk about these experiences, ‘I feel pain’...._

Interviews with students further revealed that, for some of them, their negative perceptions about hospitality careers do not lessen their love for the industry. Reasons cited by these students include determination and focus on achieving desired goals.

_Careers in the industry are stressful, but it’s ok, there is also the fun and many other positive things,... these characteristics about the industry do not discourage me (A 27 year old, level 400 female student)._
....every career has its own unique features, the hospitality industry has got its own, but this will not be a reason why I wouldn’t use the knowledge and skills I have acquired in school (25 year old, level 400, female student).

.... I know careers in the industry are inflexible, very pressing, but that is what it is, if you get used to it is no longer a problem, and to me what I want to do is far bigger that these challenges; so I will still work in the industry (30 year old, level 400, male student).

An 18 year old level 200 female student also said:

I agree the industry can be difficult at times, but these negative things do not affect my decision to be in careers in the industry.

Differences in Perceptions of Hospitality Careers among Different Categories of Students

Factors that influence peoples’ perceptions are varied. They include biological and social factors, although the social environment has been identified as the most common source of perception formation (Ahuja, as cited in Lawer, 2015; Bandura, 1986). Perceptions have been reported to vary extensively among different categories of students. These include differences based on academic level (Barron & Maxwell, 1993), industry experience (Kelley-Petterson & George, 2001; Kim & Park, 2013), among others.

The second objective of the study sought to examine the differences in perceptions of hospitality careers among different categories of students. To achieve this objective, independent t-test and one way ANOVA were employed. Where the independent variables had a dichotomous response, a t-
test statistic was used to analyse the differences in perceptions. In cases where the independent variable had more than two responses, the one way ANOVA was used. Students were categorised based on their socio-demographic characteristics, industry exposure, and social characteristics.

**Differences in Perceptions of Hospitality Careers by Socio-Demographic Characteristics**

From Table 11, it can be concluded that males and females do not differ in their perceptions about careers in the hospitality industry, although males were generally more indifferent (total mean = 2.72) than females (total mean = 2.69). Specifically, males and females disagreed to the negatively worded statements measuring the attractiveness of careers in the industry. This means that both males and females perceived careers in the industry to be attractive. They were neutral in their responses about the prestige/mobility of careers in the industry (mean = 2.80, 2.74), as well as the nature of careers in the industry (mean = 3.14, 3.16 for males and females respectively).

However, there were significant differences in perceptions about hospitality careers between Christians (total mean = 2.72) and Muslims (total mean = 2.47) at $p \leq 0.05$. As further indicated in Table 11, Muslims generally disagreed (total mean = 2.47) to the negative statements describing careers in the industry, but Christians were indifferent (total mean = 2.72). This means that Muslims had a positive perception about careers in the industry, whilst Christians were indifferent in their perceptions of careers in the industry. Muslims may have had a positive perception about careers in the industry because, generally, fewer Muslims, especially females, pursue careers in the industry in Ghana, due to their religious beliefs about certain foods, alcohol
which are often handled by employees in the industry as well as the odd service hours. Therefore, these few Muslims should have a positive predisposition towards careers in the industry before deciding to pursue such careers.

Christian and Muslim students were, however, not different in their perception about the attractiveness of careers in the industry (p = 0.75). They were both neutral about the prestige/mobility and nature of careers in the industry, although the difference in perception was significantly different between the two groups of students (p = 0.04 and 0.00 respectively).

Table 11: Differences in Perceptions of Hospitality Careers by Socio-Demographic Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Career attractiveness</th>
<th>Career Prestige/mobility</th>
<th>Nature of career</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1237</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean diff.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. value</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>1112</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean diff.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P value</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>1202</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean diff.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P value</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personality trait</th>
<th>Introvert</th>
<th>Extrovert</th>
<th>Mean diff.</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>144</td>
<td>1195</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age (years)</th>
<th>&lt; 30</th>
<th>≥ 30</th>
<th>Mean diff.</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1227</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic level</th>
<th>Freshmen/women</th>
<th>Continuing students</th>
<th>Mean diff.</th>
<th>P value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>622</td>
<td>719</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Scale: 1: Strongly disagree, 2: Disagree, 3: Neutral, 4: Agree, 5: Strongly agree  $(p ≤ 0.05)$
Source: Field Survey, Anthony (2019)

For example, Christians had a more neutral response to the prestige/mobility (mean = 2.77) and nature of careers in the industry (mean = 3.22) than Muslims (mean = 2.64, 2.58).

Findings from the study further pointed to significant differences in the perceptions of singles and married $(p = 0.00)$ about careers in the industry. Except for perceptions about attractiveness of careers in the industry, all other perceptions among students based on their marital status were significantly different. For instance, students who were married were more neutral in how they perceived careers in the industry (total mean = 2.86), when compared to single students (total mean = 2.67). The nature of careers in the industry (mean
diff. = 0.22, p = 0.01) had the highest mean difference. Those married had reported family life conflict issues with careers in the industry (Richardson & Butler, 2012), especially for females (Magableh, as cited in Alananzeh, 2014), and this is likely to be one of the reasons accounting for the difference among the single and married in this study.

Table 11, further, shows that there are differences in how extroverts and introverts perceive careers in the industry. Generally, both categories of students were neutral in their perceptions about careers in the industry. However, introverts had a less neutral response (total mean = 2.53) than extroverts (total mean = 2.71). Although Kim et al. (2007), Teng (2008), and Grobelna (2015) had proposed extraversion traits as the required personality for careers in the industry, with reference to perception of the two groups of students, introverts had a favourable perception about careers in the industry than extroverts. This finding may mean that the assertion that extraversion is the suitable trait for the industry must be reconsidered based on the incrementalist self-theory. According to the incrementalists, personality could be modified to suit a particular career. This finding of introverts perceiving careers in the industry favourably than extroverts could also mean that perception does not always affect career choice.

More so, there were variations in perceptions of students from the different age categories with respect to careers in the industry. Respondents were re-grouped into two different age categories: those below age 30 years and those 30 years and above. It can be observed from Table 11 that there was a significant difference in the perceptions about careers in the industry between the two student groups. Students below age 30 years had a favourable
perception about careers in the industry than those who were 30 years and above (p = 0.00). Specifically, students below 30 years disagreed that careers in the industry are not attractive, but students 30 years and above were not sure whether careers in the industry are attractive or not (p = 0.00).

Previously, Barron and Maxwell (1993) reported that freshmen have more positive perceptions about careers in the industry than other year groups. Also, Getz (1994), further, stressed that the longer the time students spend in school and industry, the less positive their perceptions about the industry becomes. This seems to be the case in this study, as freshmen in this study had favourable perceptions about careers in the industry (total mean = 2.60) than continuing students (total mean = 2.77). Both freshmen/women and continuing students perceived careers in the industry to be attractive (mean = 2.08 and 2.26 respectively). They also neither agreed nor disagreed to the prestige/mobility and nature of careers in the industry, although the differences in their perceptions were significant (p = 0.00).

Differences in Perceptions of Hospitality Careers by Students with Industry Experience

Lee (2007) asserted that, when people have industry experience, they have a more realistic perception of and expectations from the hospitality industry. In another finding by Kim and Park (2013), students were reported to have developed negative perceptions about hospitality careers after experiencing work life in the industry.

Previously, Kelley-Patterson & George (2001) had reported differences in perceptions of students who had industry experience and those without industry experience. However, from Table 12, there was, generally, no
significant difference in perceptions of students who had experienced careers in the industry and those who had not (p = 0.20). This finding is in congruence with a finding by Turanligil & Altintaş (2018) in Turkey, where both students with industry experience and those without experience, generally, had similar perceptions of the industry.

Both categories of students only differed significantly in their perceptions about the attractiveness of careers in the industry (p = 0.00). Students with industry experience disagreed more to the perception that careers in the industry are unattractive (mean = 2.22), as compared to those without industry experience (mean = 2.07). The two groups of students were neutral in their responses about the prestige/mobility of careers in the industry as well as the nature of careers in the industry.

From the preceding findings, further analysis was conducted to ascertain whether differences exist in the perceptions of students based on the means by which they had gained industry experience. For this purpose, students were grouped into two: those who gained industry experience by internship and those who experienced the industry through appointment (employment). Table 12, further, indicates that except for career prestige/mobility, there were variations in perceptions of students depending on how they acquired industry experience. In general terms, there was a significant difference in the perception of students based on how they acquired experience in the industry. Specifically, students who had acquired industry experience through internship were more indifferent in their responses (total mean = 2.80) than students who had experienced the industry by appointment (total mean = 2.65).
Table 12: Differences in Students’ Perceptions of Careers by Industry Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Career attractiveness</th>
<th>Career prestige/mobility</th>
<th>Nature of career mobility</th>
<th>Total Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Industry experience</strong></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inexperience</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean diff.</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p-value</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Means of experience acquisition**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internship</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointment</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean diff.</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P value</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Duration of industry experience**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 1 year</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 1 year</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean diff.</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P value</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: 1: Strongly disagree, 2: Disagree, 3: Neutral, 4: Agree, 5: Strongly agree \((p \leq 0.05)\). Source: Field Survey, Anthony (2019)
The more indifferent standpoint of students who had experienced the careers in the industry through internship can be attributed to the general poor treatment meted out to students on internship. Students on internship are, generally, considered as trainees and are, therefore, made to do all the odd jobs in the industry. More so, it is, generally, believed that the longer a phenomenon is experienced, the more realistic the perception that is formed about that phenomenon. If this assertion holds true, it can be concluded that students who had experienced careers in the industry for one year or more had the most realistic perception about careers in the industry. Referring from Table 12, there were no statistically significant differences in students’ perception with reference to duration of industry experience acquisition. Both categories of students were neither positive nor negative in perception about careers in the industry.

**Students’ Perceptions of Hospitality Careers after Internship**

To find out more about why students who had experienced the industry through internship had a more indifferent perception about careers in the industry (Table 12), students were asked during an interview session to share with the researcher their experiences (if any) during internship. It can be said that some experiences during internship were not positive in the view of some respondents. The negative experiences during internship, these students claimed, affected their perceptions of careers in the industry. According to some students:

*....I had my attachment in a hotel in the Central Region. I go to work every day including weekends...... On several occasions I asked*
permission from the supervisor to allow me take a weekend off for church which he refused. So one weekend after asking him....which he again refused, I decided to absent myself so I can handle some issues during that weekend. The next Monday when I came to work, they told me to go home and that I should not continue with the attachment again, I tried to explain but they wouldn’t listen. I even asked them to sign my log book for me up to the time they are asking me not to come again, they refused. The most annoying part was that they called my school to report me.... (22 year old level 200 female student, from a Technical University).

As a student on internship, I worked hard because I knew my supervisor was required to fill a confidential report about me. ..... during that period of eight weeks, I was expecting to move from department to department.... My first department was in the kitchen, I cut onions and washed plates for like two weeks. ..... In the housekeeping department I scrubbed the toilets and bathrooms; that took another three weeks. I was thinking from the guest rooms I will be taken to the restaurant but no, they took me to the kitchen again and this time aside washing plates and cutting onions, I cleaned their working units. As for me, I have regretted doing this course. (25year old, level 400 female student from a Technical University)

....I was very happy to have the opportunity to experience the things my lecturers have been talking about in class in the industry. I started the attachment in high hopes, I worked hard, but I realised they were
leaving all the dirty work for me to do, I tried not to complain, but gradually my happiness was going down..... they were just parking their responsibilities on me (23 year old level 300 student from a Technical University).

....the internship I had in a hotel in Cape Coast really affected the way I feel about careers in the industry,...although I do not intend to choose careers in the industry. During my internship, the staff in the hotel where just doing things anyhow, when you try to suggest to them some possible ways to do certain things they shut you up and develop some attitude towards you. I wanted to stop the attachment but for a report I had to submit to my school I endured it (22 year old level 200 female student from a Technical University)

Differences in Perceptions of Hospitality Careers among Students with Different Social Characteristics

The role of social interactions within the environment, according to Bandura (1986), is very important in behaviour modelling. Family and friends are important elements in the social environment. Through vicarious learning, family members and friends imitate the choice that others within these groups make. From this background, the study sought to further examine whether family and friends within the social environment of students affects their perceptions of careers in the industry. Evidence from Table 13 indicates that, generally, students did not differ in their perceptions about careers in the industry with regard to family ownership of hospitality business and friends pursuing hospitality careers. However, there were variations in perceptions
about careers in the industry between students with family member in hospitality career and those without family members working in the industry.

Specifically, students who did not have any family member employed in the industry had a more neutral response (mean = 2.78) about the prestige/mobility of careers in the industry than those who had family members employed in the industry (mean = 2.67). Also, students who had family members employed in the industry had a less neutral view about the nature of careers in the industry (mean = 3.01), which resulted in significant difference (p = 0.00) among those with family member employed in the industry and those with no family member employed in the hospitality industry (mean = 3.24).

Although there were no general variations in perceptions between students who had family-owned hospitality businesses and those without family-owned hospitality businesses (p = 0.17), the two groups of students varied significantly in their perceptions about the nature of careers in the industry. Students with no family-owned hospitality business disagreed to the poor nature of careers in the industry (mean = 2.20) whilst those with family hospitality business were indifferent (mean = 3.07).
Table 13: Differences in Perceptions of Hospitality Careers among Students with Different Social Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception Category</th>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Career attractiveness</th>
<th>Career Prestige/mobility</th>
<th>Nature of career</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family member in industry</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family member employed</td>
<td></td>
<td>465</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No family member employed</td>
<td></td>
<td>876</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean diff.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P value</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family ownership of hospitality business</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family ownership</td>
<td></td>
<td>364</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No family ownership</td>
<td></td>
<td>976</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean diff.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P value</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friends in industry</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends in industry</td>
<td></td>
<td>901</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No friends in industry</td>
<td></td>
<td>440</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean diff.</th>
<th>0.14</th>
<th>0.05</th>
<th>0.00</th>
<th>0.07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P value</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Residential location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>2.15*</td>
<td>2.61*</td>
<td>2.84*</td>
<td>2.53*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>2.33*</td>
<td>2.86*</td>
<td>3.29*</td>
<td>2.83*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>2.12*</td>
<td>2.76*</td>
<td>3.25*</td>
<td>2.71*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p-value</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type of university

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>1067</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean diff.</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p-value</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Scale: 1: Strongly disagree, 2: Disagree, 3: Neutral, 4: Agree, 5: Strongly agree. (*: Variables that contributed to significant difference from a post hoc test)

Source: Field Survey, Anthony (2019)

Also, students who had friends employed in the hospitality industry and those with no friends employed in the industry differed in their perceptions with regard to attractiveness of careers in the industry (mean diff. = 0.14, p = 0.01). From the above findings, it can be concluded that undergraduate hospitality students’ perception about careers in the industry is not always modelled by people in their social surroundings, although the social cognitive learning theory proposes so. This could also mean that people may form their perceptions from other sources other than friends and relatives.

People’s perceptions about careers could be affected by the places where they live. Findings from this study, as shown in Table 13, seem to
support this assertion. There were differences in students’ perceptions about careers in the industry based on their residential locations. Generally, students were indifferent in perception about careers in the industry based on residential location. Students residing in the northern zone of the country were the least indifferent about careers in the industry (total mean = 2.53). The northern zone of the country has the least numbers of hospitality businesses in the country (GTA, 2016); therefore, students in this area are more likely to hold these few hospitality businesses in high esteem, thereby resulting in a favourable perception about careers in the industry.

Specifically, students from the different zones disagreed to the negative statements that measured the attractiveness of careers in the industry. In other words, students from the various locations perceived careers in the industry to be attractive. However, students from the southern zone perceived careers in the industry to be most attractive (mean = 2.12). This perception by students in the southern zone can be attributed to the numerous large hospitality businesses in the southern zone of the country. These large businesses with attractive environment could have played a role in the perceptions of students in these locations. Finally, students resident in the northern, middle, and southern zones were indifferent about the nature of careers in the industry, although students in the middle and southern zones were more indifferent than those located in the northern zone. A post hoc test showed that students from the northern, middle, and southern zones all contributed to the significant differences in perceptions about careers in the industry.
Students for the study were sampled from both traditional and technical universities. These two universities, generally, produce graduates for similar levels for the industry. However, there are some differences in the focus of the programmes run by the two types of universities. Traditional universities are more theoretically-focused whilst technical universities are more practical-oriented. The study, therefore, sought to find out whether differences exist in the perceptions of students from the different types of universities.

As evinced in Table 13, there was, generally, no significant variation in the perceptions of students from the traditional and technical universities about careers in the industry (p = 0.11). Although students from the technical universities were less indifferent about careers in the industry, it was only the nature of careers in the industry which, specifically, showed significant variation among students from the two types of university (mean diff. = 0.13, p = 0.03). This means that the differences in programme orientation of the two universities do not affect students’ perceptions of careers in the industry, except for their perceptions on the nature of careers in the industry.

Chapter Summary

Description of the respondents showed that most of the respondents were females, mainly between ages 20-29 years, with majority being Christians and single. Also, more than half of the respondents were resident in the southern zone of Ghana and had some industry experience mainly through internship. The findings also showed that most respondents had intentions to choose careers in the hospitality industry, specifically, within the hotel segment. Passion was identified as the main reason why students wanted to
work in a particular segment. More than half of the respondents wished to enter the industry at managerial level with an entry salary expectation of more than two thousand Ghana Cedis, an expectation the study finds unrealistic, as the industry is known for employing undergraduates at middle and lower levels and then, they work their way to the top levels through experience.

Factor analysis was employed which reduced the 24 items to 15 and explained about 50% of the variance in students’ perceptions of careers in the hospitality industry. The new perception categories were career attractiveness, prestige/mobility of careers, and nature of careers. Students were, generally, indifferent about careers in the industry (overall mean = 2.69). Students were positive about the attractiveness of careers in the industry (category mean = 2.18), but neither agreed nor disagreed with the prestige/mobility of careers in the industry (category mean = 2.74), and nature of careers in the industry (category mean = 3.16).

The findings also indicated that there were, generally, no statistically significant differences in the perceptions of students about careers in the industry based on the following categories: gender, type of university, industry experience, family ownership of hospitality business, industry experience, and friends in hospitality careers. On the contrary, religion, marital status, personality trait, age, academic level, and means by which experience was acquired were found to be, generally, different with respect to students’ perceptions of careers in the industry. T- test and ANOVA were the statistical tools used to achieve this objective.

In specific terms, Christians and Muslims varied significantly in perceptions about the prestige/mobility and nature of careers in the hospitality
industry. Muslims showed favourable perceptions in this regard. Also, with marital status, singles had an overall favourable perception about careers in the industry, with prestige/mobility and nature of careers in the industry being responsible for the differences. With respect to personality trait, prestige/mobility and nature of careers in the industry recorded significant variations in the perceptions of introverts and extroverts. Furthermore, students of the different age categories were very different in perceptions about the attractiveness, prestige/mobility, and nature of careers in the industry.

More so, students of different academic levels (fresh and continuing) and locations varied significantly in perceptions about careers in the industry across all the three categories of perception. Finally, prestige/mobility of careers in the industry was the only perception that was significantly different among students who had experienced careers in the industry either by internship or appointment.
CHAPTER SIX

FACTORS INFLUENCING STUDENTS’ CHOICE OF HOSPITALITY CAREERS

Introduction

This chapter discusses the various factors that influence students’ choice of hospitality careers. The factors are grouped into personal and environmental and the resultant effect of these factors on choice of career is highlighted. Interviews with students on some quantitative findings and support services provided by the universities are also presented.

Students’ Intentions to Choose Careers in the Hospitality Industry

Intentions are the main drivers of decision-making and behaviour. Students’ intention to choose careers in the hospitality industry will be an underpinning reason for certain decisions and actions. An overwhelming majority (94%) of students in this study had intentions of choosing careers in the industry. This finding is similar to the findings of Alananzeh (2014) in Jordan, where majority of the students were reported to have intentions of choosing careers in the hospitality industry after school. It is encouraging to know that hospitality undergraduate students intend to choose careers within the industry. This is because knowledge and skills acquired in school will then be put to use in the hospitality industry, which will result in improved performance (Figure 7).
Effects of Personal Factors on Choice of Hospitality Careers

Factors influencing choice of careers could be either personal or environmental. The study sought to establish the effects of personal and environmental factors on choice of hospitality careers. To achieve this, a binary logistic regression model was used. The personal factors in this study were: gender, age, religion, marital status, voluntarily choice of the hospitality programme, academic level, industry experience, interest in hospitality careers, personality-fit, intentions to operate own hospitality business, and personality traits.

From the conceptual framework of the study, it was proposed that students’ choice of hospitality careers is influenced by personal factors. The use of binary logistic regression enabled the researcher to examine the effect of these factors on choice of career. For this study, personal factors which were the independent variables had different levels of measurement whilst
students’ intention to choose careers in the hospitality industry, the dependent variable, was dichotomous, with either a ‘yes’ or ‘no’ answer. To effectively use the binary logistic regression model, the dependent variable was re-coded into a binary function of ‘0’ and ‘1’, where ‘yes’ was coded as 1 and ‘no’ was coded 0. For ease of explaining the possible predictive power of the model, all independent variables with a ‘yes’ or ‘no’ answer (industry experience, interest, personality fit, and operate own business) were also recoded, where ‘yes’ was recoded 1 and ‘no’ 0.

Table 14 shows that the model’s overall performance was good, as evident from the Omnibus Test of Model Co-efficient. According to Pallant (2010), this test shows the ‘goodness of fit’ of the model. It is, further, proposed that, for the Omnibus Test of Co-efficient to meet this criterion, it should have a value that is highly significant ($p \leq 0.05$). In this case, the value was $p = 0.00$, with a chi-square value of 105.96 ($x^2 = 105.96$) and 15 degrees of freedom (df = 15). To support that the model was good, the Hosmer and Lemeshow test, which Pallant (2010) identified as the most reliable test of the models goodness of fit, is vital. The model, thus, satisfies this assumption, as the value for the Hosmer and Lemeshow test is expected to be greater than 0.05. In this model, the value for this test was 0.49, with a chi-square value of 7.41 ($x^2 = 7.41$) and 8 degrees of freedom (df = 8).

The model predicted 21% of the variance in choice of hospitality career, as indicated by the Negelkerker R-Square (0.21). For a specific predictor variable to significantly influence the choice of hospitality career, it should have a probability value of less or equal to 0.05.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Odds (Exp.B)</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender (ref. Male)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (ref. below 20 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 and above</td>
<td>-0.71</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion (ref. Christian)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moslem</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status (ref. single)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice of programme (ref. involuntary)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic_level(ref. 100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>-0.49</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry Experience (ref. inexperience)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in hosp. careers (ref. No interest)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>17.04</td>
<td>0.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality fit (ref No)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have personality fit</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>0.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operate own business (ref. No intention to own)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to own</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>22.63</td>
<td>0.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality trait (ref. introvert)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrovert</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-0.96</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: p ≤ 0.05, Nagelkerke R Square = 0.21. Hosmer Lemeshow Test: $X^2 = 7.41$, df = 8, p = 0.49 Omnibus Test of Model Coefficients: $X^2 = 105.96$, df = 15, p = 0.00

Source: Field Survey, Anthony (2019)
As evident in Table 14, most of the personal factors did not affect students’ choice of hospitality careers, except interest in hospitality careers, personality fit, and the quest to operate own hospitality business.

From Table 14, the output shows some negative beta ($\beta$) values which indicate an inverse relationship with the dependent variable. This means that an increase in a unit of the independent variable will result in a decrease in the dependent variable. Table 14 also shows the odds ratio (Exp. B), the Wald value and the significance (p value). An independent variable (predictor) which has a corresponding significant value of $p \leq 0.05$ indicates that there is a causal relationship between that variable and the dependent variable.

From Table 14, it can be concluded that gender, age, religion, marital status, voluntary choice of programme, academic level, industry experience, and personality traits of students were not predictors of choice of hospitality career. Various studies within the hospitality industry have revealed that gender is not a determinant of choice of careers in the hospitality industry. For instance, studies by Korir & Wafula (2012), Selcuk et al. (2013), and Qiu et al. (2017) have shown that gender is not a determinant of career choice. It is worth noting that, although these studies were conducted in different countries, namely Kenya, Turkey, and China, the evidence from these studies emphasizes the fact that, within the hospitality industry, gender is not a determinant of career choice. Gender is not a determinant of students’ choice of careers in the hospitality industry probably due to the relatively fewer males enrolling on the programme.

Industry experience is not a significant predictor of career choice for the hospitality undergraduate students in this study (Table 14). This finding is
contrary to the findings by Chuang et al. (2007), Kim et al. (2010), Koc et al. (2014), Hertzman et al. (2015), Einarsen et al. (2017), and Wen et al. (2018), who reported that industry experience is a significant predictor of career choice. In this study, it was evident that industry experience does not influence choice of hospitality career. Industry experience did not affect choice of career in this study because an overwhelming majority of students (94%) have indicated that they will choose careers in the hospitality industry.

Although students who had voluntarily chosen the hospitality programme were twice more likely to choose careers in the industry (odds ratio: 2.06), this was not a significant predictor of career choice ($p = 0.09$). Aksu & Köksal (2005) had reported that students who had willingly chosen hospitality programmes were more willing to choose careers in the hospitality industry. Though voluntary choice of programme was not a significant predictor of career choice at $p \leq 0.05$ critical value, it was, nonetheless, closer to being significant ($p = 0.09$) and could have been significant if the critical value was $p \leq 0.10$. Voluntary choice of programme was not a predictor of students’ choice of hospitality careers probably because students may have chosen the programme voluntarily not being aware of what careers in the industry entails. Also, pressure to further education can also make students choose whatever programme that is available to them though they may not be interested in careers in the chosen disciplines.

Evidence from Table 14 also shows that, generally, academic level was not a predictor of career choice. Specifically, comparing level 100 and level 300 students, one realises that the latter’s choice of careers in the industry reduced by a factor of 0.58. The corresponding $p$-value for level 300 students
(0.07) showed that there was a nearly significant effect of academic level on career choice of students in level 300, when compared to those in level 100. It can also be observed that choices by students in levels 300 and 400 reduced by a factor of 0.58 and 0.61 respectively, although not statistically significant. This finding affirms the general notion that the longer students stay on a programme, the less they become interested in choosing careers in that industry. Students in level 300 and 400 were less inclined to choosing careers in the industry probably because they might have gathered unfavourable information about careers in the hospitality industry.

Specifically, interest in hospitality careers (p = 0.00), personality fit for the various careers in the industry (p = 0.01), and the quest to operate own hospitality business (p = 0.00) were the factors predicting choice of hospitality careers. The binary logistic model shows that, comparing students with interest in hospitality careers to those who did not have interest in hospitality careers, it is evident that the former were more than four times likely to choose careers in the hospitality industry (odds ratio: 4.28). In congruence with this finding, interest was identified as a vital factor in choice of career by students in Pakistan (Ahmed et al., 2017), Kenya (Korir & Wafula, 2012), and Turkey (Roney & Öztin, 2007).

From Table 14, when students who perceived they had the required personality for careers in the industry are compared to those who did not, those who possess the required personality were two times more likely to choose careers in the industry, as indicated by the odds ratio (Exp. B = 2.40). Personality, in this case, referred to physical appearance, body gestures, good communication skills, among others, and this is different from personality
trait. Similar to this finding, Neequaye & Amoo (2014) identified person
close character fit (personality) as the most influential factor of career choice.
Although in this study, personality fit was not the best predictor of choice of
career, it was, nonetheless, one of the predictors of students’ choice of
hospitality careers (p = 0.01). Also, Zopiatis et al. (2016) and Wen et al.
(2018) had reported person industry fit to have strong association with
students’ intentions to stay in hospitality careers.

The findings on the effects of interest (p = 0.00) and personality fit (p
= 0.01) on choice of career further reinforces the propositions in the social
cognitive career theory that personal factors, of which self-belief is an integral
part, affect choice of career. Being interested in a career and the belief that
one has the attributes required for a career are the fundamentals of self-belief.

Furthermore, intention to operate own hospitality business significantly
influenced students’ choice of hospitality careers (p = 0.00). Comparing those
students who intended to start their own hospitality businesses to those who
did not intend to, it was evident from the findings that those who wanted to
operate their own hospitality businesses in the future were almost five times
likely to choose careers in the industry (Odds Ratio [Exp. B] = 4.74). This
finding shows that an increase in the desire to operate own hospitality business
is a predictor of students’ choice of hospitality careers.

Moreover, the hospitality programme makes it easier for students to
develop practical skills in food production and service, skills that students can
easily use after school on their own to establish their own businesses.
Hospitality students have perceived opportunity to establish own jobs as one
of the important features they consider in a career (Amisah et al., 2019).
Finally, the results of the study show that, among personal factors, intention to operate own business was the best predictor of students’ choice of hospitality careers, with a significance level of $p = 0.00$. This was followed by the interest students have in careers within the industry ($p = 0.00$) and the personality fit of students for careers in the industry ($p = 0.01$). It is, however, important to note that, although personality traits have been found to have an effect on choice of career, this might not be the case of hospitality students in Ghana. This is because, from the findings of the study and as evident in Table 14, personality trait was not a significant predictor of students’ choice of hospitality career at the $p \leq 0.05$ significance level.

From the findings on Table 14, seven of the research hypotheses tested in the study with respect to personal factors failed to be rejected. In other words, gender, age, religion, industry experience, marital status, academic level, and personality trait did not influence undergraduate students’ choice of hospitality careers in Ghana (Table 15).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H₁ Gender of student has no significant effect on choice of hospitality career</td>
<td>Fail to Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₂ Age of student has no significant effect on choice of hospitality career</td>
<td>Fail to Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₃ Religion of student has no significant effect on choice of hospitality career</td>
<td>Fail to Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₄ Industry experience has no significant effect on choice of hospitality career</td>
<td>Fail to Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₅ Marital status has no significant effect on choice of hospitality career</td>
<td>Fail to Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₆ Academic level has no significant effect on choice of hospitality career</td>
<td>Fail to Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H₇ Personality trait has no significant effect on choice of hospitality career</td>
<td>Fail to Reject</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: p ≤ 0.05
Source: Field Survey, Anthony (2019)

**Industry Experience and Choice of Career**

Evidence from the interviews conducted with students, further, indicated that, generally, students’ choice of hospitality careers was not influenced by industry experience, although some of those who did not intend to pursue careers in the industry partly attributed their decision to negative experiences in the industry. For example, a 23-year old level 300-student, with less than 1 year industry experience mentioned that:
before coming to school, I worked in a hotel, for about six months, the work environment was bad; the kitchen was poorly ventilated, the closing time for certain shifts was bad, the salary wasn’t too good. However, I thought this was the case because I had only secondary school certificate. But during this time too, when I asked people I know who work in the industry..., the things they say are not different. I also realised it when I went for internship. This is also another reason why I do not want to work in the industry

A 25-year old level 400-student also had a similar experience:

.... I worked for some time after my HND... in the industry, in all, I felt used, considering the conditions that were at my then place of work. I have friends working in the industry and when they still say certain things about their work it discourages me.

Some students do not intend to choose careers in the industry, irrespective of whether they had any work experience in the industry or not. These students claimed that they were either forced to pursue the programme or were misinformed about the hospitality programme and its career prospects. For example, a 20-year old level 200 student who did not have any industry experience and did not want to choose a career in the industry said:

....my uncle forced me to read this programme, I am not interested, but I can’t say anything because he is the one who takes care of me. I know I can easily move to other careers with the hospitality certificate that is why am still on the programme.
I wanted to study a nutrition related programme, and a lecturer advised my parents to let me pursue the hospitality programme because it is related to what I wanted to do, not knowing the nutrition was only a course. I later realised whilst on the programme that it was not what I wanted to do, but I have started and stopping it seemed a little difficult for me..... My interest is not in something like this (22-year old level 200 female student with four months’ industry experience).

I will not choose careers in the hospitality industry....., I am on this programme because of the course I did in Senior High School, after school I will find another area to further which will enable me pursue another career. As for this industry I cannot work there.... (21-year old level 300 female student with 6 months’ industry experience).

**Intention to Operate Own Hospitality Business and Choice of Career**

Evidence from interviews with students also indicated that their intention to own hospitality business was a reason for students’ choice of hospitality careers. A 30-year old level 400 male student from a traditional university said:

...I have interest in starting my own restaurant in the future, because I have realised there is no good food for tourists in my area. I realised this through interactions with guests in our hotel.

Similarly students indicated that their choice of hospitality careers was as a result of a desire to set up their own businesses.
intention to choose hospitality careers is high for me. This is due to my plans to start my own business in the near future; coupled with the fun and interest available in hospitality careers.... (27-year old level 300 female student)

... of course I will choose careers in the industry, mainly because I have the knowledge skills and I want to work on my own and even employ others. Currently I do a lot of pastries and give it out for people to sell for me......, I also take orders and invite my colleagues sometimes to help me (27-year-old level 400 female student).

I have acquired a lot of experience from my mother’s restaurant and the knowledge in school, this will help me start and operate my own hospitality business... Having a business of my own will also allow me make time for myself and family in the future which I wouldn’t get if I work for somebody (23-year-old female level 300 student).

Ease of starting and owning a business in the industry was also a motivating factor to some students who felt confident in choosing careers in the industry. In the view of one female student:

It is far easier to start a small business in this industry than others. I am taking my practical classes seriously because I know if for nothing I can run a small snack bar on my own (20-year-old level 200, female student).
...even as a student now, I take orders and do them for extra money...

In this industry you can do so many things... I can easily operate my own catering business and still do a flexible government work like teaching without any problems (26-year-old level 300 male student).

Interest in Hospitality Careers and Career Choice

Interviews with students also revealed that those who were sure of choosing careers in the industry cited interest and passion as the main reasons.

*I will certainly work in the industry because I have interest in it, nothing will change this decision; not even “better” opportunities in other careers. To me being in the hospitality business is a part of me. There are numerous family members with big hospitality businesses including my parents. I have been working with them for many years. I will change employers but not careers. ....If they do not pay me well and treat me well, I will leave and work with another hospitality employer........ (A 30-year-old male level 400 student with 8 years’ work experience).

*I won’t change my mind in working in the industry. I have interest, experience, knowledge and skills in the industry which can take me far in the industry (38-year-old level 400 male student with 5 years’ work experience).

*I had always wanted to be a matron, it is something I admire a lot and have passion for, though some people say matrons are thieves which sometimes worry me, I will still do it, because I believe I can be
different (35-year-old level 300 male student with no industry experience).

..... careers in the industry have their own challenges and so do other careers, I love and have interest in hospitality careers, .... if I will even do something else, it will be secondary to my hospitality career (25-year-old level 400 female student with 1 year work experience).

Effects of Environmental Factors on Choice of Hospitality Careers

The conceptual framework of the study proposes a possible influence of environmental factors on choice of hospitality careers of students. Specifically, the environmental factors used in this study were family and peer influence, type of university, residential location, and financial remuneration. The fourth objective which sought to examine the effect of environmental factors on choice of hospitality career was analysed using a binary logistic regression model. The dependent variable was measured using a ‘yes’ or ‘no’ answer. The model’s overall performance, as shown by the Omnibus Test of Co-efficient, was good ($X^2 =23.83$, df = 7, $P=0.00$). Also, the Hosmer and Lemeshow Test which measures the reliability of the model was also good ($X^2 =5.41$, df = 8, $P=0.71$). The model predicted 5% of the factors that influence students’ choice of hospitality careers (Negelkerker R square 0.05). Also, interviews with students show that availability of career opportunities in the work environment may be a strong factor for choice of hospitality careers.

As shown in Table 16, not all environmental factors were predictors of choice of hospitality careers. In all, two of the factors were the main predictors of students’ choice of hospitality career. These were residential location of
students and influence of peers employed in the hospitality industry. This means that type of university, availability of family hospitality businesses, family members employed in the industry, and level of remuneration in the industry could not influence students’ choice of hospitality careers.

The influence of family members on students’ choice of career has been reported by different authors. For example, Ikonen et al. (2018), Alananzeh (2014), and Ayia-Mensah et al. (2014) reported a strong relationship between family members’ influence and choice of career. Contrary to these findings, as shown in Table 16, family ownership of hospitality business was not a predictor of career choice for hospitality students in Ghana (p = 0.34). Similar to this finding, Selcuk et al. (2013), found that there were no differences in students’ choice of career based on family members’ association with the industry in Turkey.

Family ownership of hospitality business could not predict students’ choice of career, probably because students may have experienced some negative outcomes from these family businesses. According to the vicarious learning principle in the social cognitive learning theory, people learn from and imitate behaviours with favourable outcomes. Therefore, if students with family hospitality businesses do not experience the things they would consider favourable in a career from these businesses, they would not choose such careers.

Also, residential location had an effect on choice of career (Table 16). Comparing students who reside in the middle zone to those who reside in the northern zone, the findings show that those in the middle zone had an odd ratio less than 1. This means that the career choice of students located in the
middle zone of the country reduced by a factor of 0.39 (2.56) when compared to those in the northern zone. Similarly, comparing students who reside in the northern zone to those in the southern zone shows that choice of careers by those in the southern zones reduced by a factor of 0.49 (2.04), with all factors in the model being constant. It can be observed that location affected the choice of careers of students located in the middle zone the most (p = 0.01), when compared to students located in the southern zone (p = 0.04).

Table 16: Effects of Environmental Factors on Choice of Hospitality Careers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Odds ratio (Exp.B)</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type of university (ref. Traditional)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence (ref. Northern Zone)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>-0.94</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>0.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>-0.71</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>0.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family member(s) employed (ref. No family member employed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family member employed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family member employed</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends in industry (ref. No friends)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends in industry</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>13.97</td>
<td>0.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family ownership of hosp. business (ref. No family ownership)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family ownership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family ownership</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial remuneration (ref. inadequate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>14.12</td>
<td>35.91</td>
<td>0.00*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: p ≤ 0.05, Negelkerke R Square = 0.05. Hosmer Lemeshow Test: X² = 5.41, df = 8, p = 0.71. Omnibus Test of Model Coefficients: X² = 23.83, df = 7, p = 0.00
Source: Field Survey, Anthony (2019)
The finding on the effect of residential location of students on choice of hospitality career is in agreement with the proposition that where we live has effects on our decisions. It is, however, worth mentioning that the levels of development of the hospitality industry in the different zones of the country differ, and this may have been the reason residential location affected students’ choice of career. For instance, the hospitality industry is more developed in the southern and middle zones of the country than the northern zone.

With regard to whether students having friends working in the industry is a predictor of choice of hospitality career, a comparison between those who had friends employed in the industry with those who did not have friends pursuing hospitality careers shows that the former were more than twice likely to choose careers in the industry (odds ratio: 2.40). Friends within the social circles of students are influential in the choice of careers by other students because, as asserted by Ahuja (as cited in Lawer, 2015), young people are influenced by social factors, including friends.

Also, the social cognitive career theory points to the important roles people play within the social environment by influencing others. However, Neequaye & Amoo (2014) found in a study of hospitality and tourism students in Cape Coast, Ghana, that friends did not influence the career choices of the majority of students. This finding is contrary to that of Neequaye & Amoo probably due to the wider scope covered by the present study and also the time frame of both studies. The present study sampled students from across the country and from different universities, and this finding may be more representative of the phenomenon under study.
Finally, from Table 16, adequacy of financial remuneration was not a significant predictor of career choice ($p = 0.34$). In other words, remuneration for work done in the hospitality industry is not an important predictor of hospitality career choice. Students may not have regarded remuneration issues highly because, at this stage of their lives, this might not be an important consideration. It could also be due to the fact that remuneration was of less value to students because they do not know the salary levels in the industry or consider hospitality careers to be adequately remunerated. Contrary to this finding, Maxwell et al. (2010) and Xu (2013) mentioned salary as one of the important factors to students when considering a career. In agreement to this finding of financial remuneration not affecting students’ choice of career, Ahmed et al. (2017) also identified salary as having no influence on students’ choice of career in Karachi, Pakistan.

From the study, the best environmental predictor of students’ choice of hospitality career was peer influence ($p = 0.00$), followed by residential location of students [middle zone ($p = 0.01$), southern zone ($p = 0.04$)]. Again, from the findings of the study, the following hypotheses were rejected: location has no significant effect on career choice and peer influence has no significant effect on career choice. As shown in Table 16, peer influence and residential location had effects on students’ choice of hospitality careers. On the contrary, the study failed to reject the hypotheses that type of university and family influence have no effect on choice of career (Table 17).
Table 17: Summary of Environmental Factor Hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$H_8$ Type of university has no significant effect on choice of hospitality career</td>
<td>Fail to Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_9$ Residential location has no significant effect on choice of hospitality career</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_{10}$ Family influence has no significant effect on choice of hospitality career</td>
<td>Fail to Reject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_{11}$ Peer influence has no significant effect on choice of hospitality career</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $P \leq 0.05$
Source: Field Survey, Anthony (2019)

Residential Location and Choice of Career

Through interviews with students, there seem to be diverse responses as to how location can influence choice of careers. While some students suggested that their residential location was vital to their decision to choose careers in the industry, others had different opinions. Those who said their residential location influenced their choice of career mentioned an already existent family business in a specific location, lots of hospitality businesses in a location, and opportunity to start own hospitality as the underlining reasons. For example,

*My location is important to my choice of career,..., I have family members with businesses around,... there are business contacts also in this area. I perceive this location will support my future hospitality business as well* (30-year-old level 400 male student, resident in the southern zone).
Location is important for my choice, it exposes you to a lot of trends in
the industry, there are lots of hospitality businesses around, I see all
the various categories and class of hotels and even get a feel of how
work life is in these establishments (25-year-old level 400 male
student, resident in the southern zone).

I use to stay in a ‘remote place in the country’, where things were
really slow, but my current location is really helping. I take orders
from time to time and also have a pastry business running all because
of the location (a 27-year-old level 400 student resident in the southern
zone)

However, some students were of the view that location did not inform their
choice of hospitality careers. They identified determination to work in the
industry as the main reason:

....no, location does not play a role in my choice to work in the
industry. This is because, I want to do something and where ever I get
the opportunity to work I will go (18-year-old level 200 female resident
in the southern zone).

My choice of hospitality career is not affected by my location. You see, I
stay at a place where the industry is not very developed, I intend to still
work at places were the career openings are, irrespective of my current
location. (35-year-old level 300 male student resident in the middle
zone).
I do not consider location as an important factor when it comes to career choice, everywhere is Ghana and for me, my intention to work is far greater than location barriers (18-year-old level 100 student resident in the northern zone).

**Influence of Friends on Choice of Career**

To further understand, from the perspective of students, how friends can influence their choice of careers within the industry, interviews were conducted. The results indicate that students differed in their responses, although most of them claimed that friends influenced their intentions to choose or not to choose careers in the industry, either negatively or positively. A 23-year-old level 300 female student emphatically mentioned that she would not choose a career in the industry:

*As I told you earlier, aside the things I experienced in the industry, when my friends who work in the industry confirm that, things are still the same, I even get more discouraged.*

*...friends in the industry play a role in my possible reason of not wanting to work in the industry. They say things sometimes about the work they do that keep me thinking. At times I even get confused with the entire work load they do* (25-year-old level 400 female student).

On the contrary, some respondents who also mentioned that friends positively influenced their intended choice of hospitality careers cited the positive things they see and hear from their friends as the reasons why they will choose hospitality careers. These students mentioned that friends in the
industry seem to be living comfortable lives and also appear attractive in their uniforms as well as other opportunities they believe are available for young people in the industry. Their comments include:

....*partially, friends influence my decision to choose careers in the industry. When I go to visit them at their places of work, their appearance and seeing what they are able to do, especially those in the hotels, I get very impressed* (A 35-year-old level 300 male student).

.....*friends working in the industry, I see they are okay, they are doing well, and they talk about some interesting experiences at their place of work. I believe it will be fun to be in the industry too with my education in the field* (25-year-old level 400 female student).

*I have friends in the industry; there is one who works in a ‘tertiary school’ kitchen as a supervisor. She encourages me all the time to enrol on the programme because there are great chances for young people in the industry especially those with the right knowledge, skills and qualification*.... (A 17-year-old level 100 female student).

**Institutional Support and Choice of Hospitality Careers**

The role played by educational institutions is very important in preparing students for various careers (Docherty & Fernandez, 2014; Ezeuduji et al., 2017). The institutions prepare students to acquire knowledge and skills for careers in the industry. The supports provided by the institutions include career counselling, career seminars, internship placements and supervision, entrepreneurial advice, and industry linkages. Lent et al. (1994), in their social
cognitive career theory, identified support factors which include the quality of education the learner is exposed to and financial support to influence career choice.

In an interview with some students, they indicated that their respective universities and departments provided some support services. All students attested to the availability of some kind of support services from their departments and institutions, with supervised internship being the most popular. However, not all support services expected by students were provided by the institutions. As indicated by Abrahams et al. (2015) and Kemboi et al. (2016), support services have the tendency to increase students’ interest and choice of careers.

Forms of Institutional Support provided by the Universities

Some students expressed some reservations about the support provided by their institutions. According to a 23-year-old level 400 female student:

*Although the lecturers come to check on us during internship, they mostly talk to the industry people and leave us out,.....they do not ask us about how we are being treated.*

A student also lamented a situation where students are left on their own to look for places of internship. In her view,

*....even for internship, we are given letters and we roam and roam and roam looking for a place to have our internship, sometimes, by the time we get a place two weeks is gone and the people in the industry then feel they are doing us a favour. ... it will be better if the institutions can*
get us places so that it will be easier for us (25-year-old, level 400 female student)

Some students said there had been improvements in the organisation of internships in their universities:

*In the past, we looked for places of internship ourselves, but now, they (department) tell us to get the names of the places that we want to have our internship, so that they can call them for us to be placed. Before they started this, we use to struggle for places for attachment, but now it is far better (35-year-old, level 300 male student).*

*I think the department is trying to link us with the industry. They have introduced in-house internship, where groups of students are taken to various hospitality businesses on Fridays….., I think it is good because, it exposes us to the industry (An 18-year-old level 200 female student).*

Some students who identified career seminars as a form of support service by their institutions proposed that these should be frequently organised, as they boost their knowledge on careers within the industry.

*Career seminars are sometimes organised by the student union with support from the department and industry practitioners are invited to give us talks on the various careers in the industry. We are also allowed to ask these industry people questions and I think this is a step in the right direction (A 35-year-old level 300 male student).*
I have only experienced one career seminar, where people from Ghana Tourism Authority were invited to tell us a few things, later we were also sent on a field trip in a ‘small hotel’ where we were taken around the facility. It is fine, but this should be more frequent (A 30-year-old level 400 male student).

Some students also mentioned that they had never participated in career seminars in their departments. According to a 25-year-old level 400 female student:

There are no career seminars and conferences, nothing; I have not seen anything like that during my years on this campus.

Apart from supervised internship, there is nothing more, only classroom teaching and some practicals, that is all we get, no career seminars, .... (29-year-old level 300 female student).

The department does not provide other support services, they don’t bring people from the industry to talk to us about how careers in the industry are like, they don’t also organise workshops for us... (26-year-old level 300 male student)

Generally, students stressed the support of some lecturers in exposing them to various opportunities in the industry and on certain occasions, linking them with people in the industry. Chuang & Dellman-Jenkins (2010) reported that lecturers are a major source of influence on students’ choice of careers. Students in this study mentioned the advice and linkages from lecturers, though this was on a personal basis. Specifically, they mentioned that:
Every now and then, our lecturers say certain things they have experienced some time ago in the industry and advise us on what to do when we find ourselves in the industry. They also encourage us to partake in various cooking competitions whilst in school and even link us up with people they know in the industry (25-year-old level 400 female student).

Some of my lecturers have been doing well by talking to us about the nature of careers in the industry, though based on how open you are with them; recently we had a seminar, and celebrities who have hospitality businesses were invited to talk with us...... After, the seminar, five of my colleagues were linked up with these celebrities and they have been assured of employment after school (A 27-year-old level 400 female student)

The role of lecturers in advising students on hospitality careers was also emphasised by a 23-year-old level 300 female student who said that:

The lecturers help us with some advice. For example when the department has orders, they select some of us to help with cooking and service and also give us important advice for starting our own businesses....., they do not tell the whole class this, may be because it is not a policy.

**Possible Effects of Support Services on Choice of Career**

Various forms of support services have been found to be essential to improving students’ choice of careers (Abrahams et al., 2015; Kemboi et al.,
2016; Lent et al., 1994; Maraya, 2011). Students were asked whether the support services currently provided by their universities and those support services that they expect their universities to provide could influence their decisions to choose hospitality careers. For most of the students, the support services, if rendered to their expectations, can strengthen their choice of hospitality careers. This notwithstanding, three out of the 14 students who intend to choose careers in the industry said that they will still choose careers in the industry whether these services are rendered or not, though they will appreciate it if these services were provided:

"... I am determined to work in the industry, whether my university provides these support services or not, my mind is made up (18-year-old level 200 female student)."

"Support services may not influence my choice of hospitality careers; my most important drive is the focus I have in starting my own business....., fortunately for me, some family members have hospitality businesses for me to learn from (30-year-old level 400 male student)."

Moreover, three out of the five students who initially said they did not intend to choose careers in the industry mentioned that, if their institutions were providing the support services discussed, they were sure it would have helped clear their doubts and poor decisions about careers in the industry.

"If my department was going the extra mile to motivate us, and bring industry players to discuss issues of careers in the industry with us and educate us about the positions at which we will be employed in the"
industry….., I may have changed my decision about not working in the industry. As it is now, they are not doing anything different, apart from the supervised internship which I even have problems with… (22-year-old level 200 female student)

....if the department provides the necessary support services, it can change my mind.... But as it is now, they don’t do anything extra apart from the classroom teaching and some practicals. The practicals are even not frequent...... there is the need for the department to link us with people who have gone through the programme and are doing well so that we learn from them and align our interest to careers in the industry (21-year-old level 300 female student).

My department must endeavour to bring resource people from the various areas where hospitality graduates can be employed. Our lecturers mostly talk about careers in the hotel segment, were we are to be employed as waiters and waitresses, room maids, cooks and many other low level employment.... At times I feel these are the only positions in the industry for the hospitality graduate. I believe if they organise career seminars and workshops we will understand the employment chances in the industry…. (23-year-old level 400 female student).

Furthermore, students proposed possible ways that support services may affect their ultimate choice of hospitality careers.
....after the career seminar with the celebrities, my colleagues started approaching me to teach them how to make certain types of pastries...., some were even asking whether they can be part of the pastry business am operating (27-years-old level 400 female student).

...the decision of the department to help us with places for internship is very good, it will reduce the suffering we go through when looking for a place. More importantly, it will help reduce the bad treatment we receive when we go by ourselves. In the end we will be happy with the industry (35-year-old level 300 male student).

Also, a 30-year-old male student claimed that:

....as for me, my mind is made up; I will work in the industry, but I strongly believe that if our departments frequently organise career seminars and send us to field trips, we will become used to the industry, some people will then want to change their decision and work in the industry.

It is important for our departments to have hospitality businesses on campus so students can acquire more practical skills before going into the industry. When this happens, they will also be able to rub shoulders with those in the industry. This will boost confidence and reduce the embarrassment....., we will then like to work in the industry (38-year-old level 400 male student).
Support Services Expected by Students from Universities/Departments

Students’ views were also sought as to the kinds of support services they expect their institutions to provide. From their responses, it was evident that they expected more support from their universities, especially in the area of practical skills training.

....there should be more practical experience acquisition whilst in school and also more time spent in industry. This is because, the longer you stay in the industry, the more exposure, confidence and trust you gain. When on attachment we spend a maximum of eight weeks and during this period we rotate; no serious person will entrust a serious activity into your hands if they do not really know you and what you can do (25year-old level 400 female student).

A 38-year-old level 400 male student also said;

In fact, the institution needs a hospitality business on campus especially a hotel. All they teach us is the theory with no practicals, it’s all reading ......so we go to the industry and we can’t do much. .... I went on attachment and I was asked if I have seen a key card before, I said no, it was so embarrassing as I could tell them what a key card is, but I haven’t seen one before, let alone know how it is used.

The universities can do more, they have to do more. The differences in what they teach us and what we go to experience is very different. I will suggest that where they cannot handle the practicals, they should bring people from the industry to come and handle that, or better still they should go to the industry and learn and come and teach us. We
get embarrassed if we are not able to do certain basic things whilst on the field. I think the book, book, book is too much (35-year-old level 300 male student).

A 25-year-old level 400 female student also lamented:

As for the practicals we fall short, those people in the industry without certificates are very skilful. We need more of the practicals.... internship period should be extended. When you say you have a certificate and the person without certificate is the one going to train you, then it means these hotels can then decide to pay you so small.

As for the practical skill acquisition, it is non-negotiable; the positions for which we have certificates for do not run vacant often, so our ability to do the practical things in the industry is very important..... so our schools must try to teach the practical skills as much as possible. (23-year-old level 400 female student).

Career Opportunities and Choice of Careers

Very often in life, some opportunities become available to people which may cause a change in intention. One such opportunity is a sudden job vacancy in an industry other than that which one has plans for. To find out how determined students are in their intention to choose careers in the industry, students were asked whether their decisions to choose or not to choose careers in the industry could be altered and what could cause this change in intention. Four out of the five students who initially said they would not choose careers in the industry indicated that, if they had better opportunities, they could change their decisions.
....if it happens that I am employed as the manager, and paid well with more free time for myself, I will change my mind and go for it (23-year-old level 400, female student).

I will be glad if I get the opportunity to work in the hospitality industry were the conditions are better than it is now; quite flexible, less stressful and good pay, then I will reconsider my decision (25-year-old level 400 female student).

Also, 10 out of the 14 students who had the intention of choosing hospitality careers were of the view that, if better career opportunities become available to them in other industries, they may reconsider their decisions. Generally, these students were of the view that not being able to utilise knowledge and skills acquired during years of schooling will be difficult. However, they claimed that, if the opportunities available in other careers are better, then, they may accept such job opportunities. Some of their views include:

....i would really like to work in the industry, but when other employment opportunities come along with better conditions than I can find in the hospitality industry, I will take it.... It will worry me a little, if I wouldn’t be able to put all the knowledge and skills acquired in school to use, hmmm, but if there is a better opportunity, why not?.... (25-year-old level 400 female student).

In as much as I will like to be employed in the industry; If I get the chance to be employed in another industry with better conditions than
I can ever find in the industry, I may take it. (35-year-old level 300 male student).

....well, if the industry is not treating me well and there is another industry that values my knowledge and skills, I will leave the hospitality industry and choose another career; but the one I will be going for should have better offers for me (25-year-old level 300 female student).

Chapter Summary

Effects of personal and environmental factors on choice of hospitality careers were examined using binary logistic regression. Independent variables, beta (B), standard error (SE), odds ratio, wald, and the significant value were presented. For personal factors, three out of the eleven variables were the significant predictors of undergraduate students’ choice of hospitality careers. When students who had interest in hospitality careers were compared to those who did not, the former were more than four times likely to choose careers in the hospitality industry.

Also, students with the personality fit for the industry were two times more likely to choose careers in the industry. Finally, intent to own and operate a hospitality business was also a significant predictor; comparing the two groups of students, it was found that those who intended to own and operate hospitality business were about five times more likely to choose careers in the industry. Although some of the variables had inverse relationship with choice of career, these factors were not significant predictors of students’ choice of hospitality careers.
Also, environmental factors were measured by six variables. Two of the six variables predicted students’ choice of hospitality careers. These were residential location and peer influence. Specifically, evidence from the findings showed that students located in the northern zone, and those residing in the middle and southern zones had their choice of hospitality careers reduced by a factor of 0.39 and 0.49 respectively. Finally, students with friends employed in the industry were more than two times likely to choose careers in the industry. The availability of family business to be managed, among other factors, was not a significant predictor of students’ choice of careers. Interviews with students, further, provided some explanations to the quantitative findings.
CHAPTER SEVEN

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, CONTRIBUTION TO KNOWLEDGE, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This chapter provides a summary of the study. Conclusions drawn from the major findings based on the objectives of the study are also presented in the chapter. The chapter also highlights recommendations based on the findings as well as contributions made to the body of knowledge on factors influencing choice of careers by undergraduate hospitality students. Finally, areas recommended for further research are also presented in this chapter.

Summary of the Study

The main objective of the study was to examine the factors influencing choice of hospitality careers by undergraduate hospitality students in Ghana.

The specific objectives were to:

i. Examine students’ perceptions of careers in the hospitality industry

ii. Examine the differences in perceptions of hospitality careers by different categories of students

iii. Analyse the effects of personal factors on students’ choice of hospitality careers

iv. Analyse the effects of environmental factors on students’ choice of hospitality careers

A conceptual framework was developed to guide the study. The framework proposed the influence of perceptions as well as personal and
environmental factors on choice of hospitality careers. Personal factors comprised age, gender, marital status, academic level, interest, industry experience, intentions to operate own hospitality business, voluntary choice of programme, personality fit, and personality trait. Type of university, residential location of students, family and peer influence, and financial remuneration were the environmental factors. The study was also informed by three major theories. These were social cognitive learning theory, social cognitive career theory, and self-theories.

The study was explanatory in design and employed the sequential explanatory mixed methods strategy to collect and interpret data. The study was guided by the pragmatist research philosophy and adopted both qualitative and quantitative data collection tools (questionnaire and interview guide). Analysis of data also incorporated both quantitative and qualitative techniques. Ghana was sub-divided into three zones: northern, middle, and southern. Universities were purposively selected in each zone. In the northern zone, Tamale Technical University was selected. In the middle, University of Education-Kumasi campus, Sunyani Technical University, and University of Cape Coast, Takoradi Technical University, Ho Technical University, and Accra Technical University were selected from the southern zone. Half of the students at each academic level in each university were randomly sampled for quantitative data. Telephone interviews with 19 students who were purposively sampled provided explanation to same quantitative findings. Frequencies, percentages, means, $t$ test, ANOVA, and binary logistic regression were the main tools used to analyse the quantitative data, whilst qualitative data was content analysed and manually grouped under themes.
Key Findings

Generally, undergraduate students in Ghana had neither positive nor negative perceptions about careers in the hospitality industry. Specifically, students disagreed to the negatively-worded statements relating to the attractiveness of careers in the industry. This implies that students perceived careers in the industry to be attractive. They were, however, neutral in their responses about the prestige/mobility features of careers in the industry as well as the nature of careers in the industry. Students emphatically perceived careers in the industry to provide opportunity to meet new people all the time. They also perceived careers in the industry to be stressful.

Students differed significantly in their perceptions about careers in the industry based on religion, marital status, personality trait, age, academic level, means by which industry experience was acquired, family member employed in industry, and residential location. However, there were no differences in students’ perceptions of careers in the industry with reference to their gender, industry experience, duration of industry experience, family ownership of hospitality business, friends in hospitality industry, and type of university.

Interest in hospitality careers, having the right personality, and intentions to operate own hospitality business were the main personal factors that predicted undergraduate students’ choice of hospitality careers. Comparing students who have interest in hospitality careers to students who lack interest in hospitality careers, I found that the former was about four times more likely to choose careers in the industry. Also, students having the personality for careers in the industry were two times more likely to choose
hospitality careers than those who did not, all other things being constant. Finally, comparing students who intend to operate own hospitality businesses to those without such intentions, the study found that those with intentions to operate own hospitality businesses were almost five times more likely to choose careers in the industry.

The strongest personal factor that predicted students’ choice of hospitality careers was the intention to operate own hospitality business, followed by interest in hospitality careers, and finally, having the personality for careers in the industry. Although factors like age, marital status, and academic level had inverse relationships with choice of careers, these were not significant predictors of students’ choice of hospitality careers.

Residential location and friends employed in the industry were the two environmental factors that significantly predicted students’ choice of hospitality careers. Specifically, comparing students residing in the northern zone to those in the middle zone, it was found that students in the latter category had their choice of hospitality careers reduced by a factor of 0.39. Again, comparing students residing in the northern zone to those in the southern zone, the study revealed that those in the southern zone had their intention to choose hospitality careers reduced by a factor of 0.49. Also, comparing students with friends in the industry to those without friends in hospitality careers, I found that the former was about two times more likely to choose careers in the industry. This study is one of the first to investigate the effects of residential location of students on choice of hospitality careers, by sampling students from the whole country.
Conclusions

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions are drawn:

Generally, students were neutral with regard to their perceptions about careers in the hospitality industry. Sixty-eight percent of undergraduate students perceived careers in the industry to be attractive. About 74% of students perceived careers in the industry to afford the opportunity to meet new people. This implies that there is the need to develop high social skills in students to ensure they make the best out of this opportunity, mainly by managing the relationships formed with the people they meet. On the contrary, 61.60% of the students perceived careers in the industry to be stressful.

Juxtaposing this perception of students about careers in the industry with the new career concept where employees are concerned about their freedom, personal growth, and interest rather the needs of the organisation (Hall, 2002), it can be said that students with the new career orientation will not want to pursue stressful careers in the hospitality industry in the future.

Also, there were statistically significant differences in perceptions of students about hospitality careers based on religion, marital status, personality trait, age, academic level, means by which industry experience was acquired, family influence, and residential location. Muslims had a favourable perception of careers in the industry than Christians. Careers in the industry are characterised by the service of certain foods and alcohol, which the Islamic religion does not accept. This means that most Muslims would not want to choose hospitality programmes and careers. However, the few Muslims who
will want to choose the hospitality programme and careers must have very good perceptions about careers in the industry to want to do so.

Although single and married students were indifferent in their perceptions about careers in the industry, career prestige/mobility and nature of careers were the two perception dimensions that recorded significant variations between the two groups of students. It can be observed from the findings that students who were not married perceived careers in the industry favourably than those who were married. This is because careers in the industry have been perceived as being inflexible, which affects the time available for family life, especially for women (Richardson & Butler, 2012). Similarly, students 30 years and above had a less favourable perception about careers in the industry than students below 30 years. Perceptions of students aged 30 and above and married students are similar. This is the case because students above 30 years are likely to be married, therefore their poor perception about careers in the industry. It can, therefore, be concluded that hospitality careers are perceived less favourably by older and married students because careers in the industry are inflexible, which affects time for family life.

Again, freshmen and women had a favourable perception about careers in the industry than continuing students. Some studies had reported similar findings (e.g., Barron & Maxwell, 1993; Getz, 1994) which conclude that the longer students stay on the hospitality programme, the less positive their perceptions become about careers in the industry. This could be due to the realities that students encounter about careers in the industry during the period of stay on the programme. Among other things, students who had
acquired industry experience by internship had the most indifferent perception about careers in the industry than those who had experienced work life in the industry through other means. Students on internship/attachment are usually over-burdened with all the odd tasks, and this makes them form a poor perception about careers in the industry.

Moreover, students who had family member(s) employed in the industry had a significantly different perception about careers in the industry than students who do not have family member(s) employed in the industry. Specifically, among the two groups of students, perception about nature of careers in the industry had the widest mean difference. It can be concluded that students with family members working in the hospitality industry have become conversant with the nature of careers in the industry, which may have influenced their more favourable perception about careers in the industry than those with no family members working in the industry. More so, students resident in the different zones of the country had significantly different perceptions about careers in the industry. Students in the northern zone had the most favourable perceptions about careers in the industry than those in the middle and southern zones. Those in the northern zone had more favourable perceptions about careers in the industry because there are relatively fewer hospitality businesses in this area, and these few hospitality businesses are regarded highly, although favourable perception may not influence choice of careers.

The conceptual framework which guided the study proposed some influence of personal factors on choice of career. The framework was informed by the social cognitive learning theory (Bandura, 1986), social
cognitive career theory (Lent et al., 1994), and self-theories (Dweck, 2000). Out of the 11 personal factors proposed, interest in hospitality careers, having the personality for careers in the industry, and desire to operate own hospitality business were the three significant predictors of choice of careers. However, the best personal factor that predicted students’ choice of career was the intention to operate own hospitality business. From the findings, students who desire to operate own hospitality business were about five times more likely to choose careers in the hospitality industry. It can, therefore, be concluded that students would like to start hospitality businesses due to the practical skills they acquire during the programme and also the ease of starting some hospitality businesses. It is, therefore, important for particular attention to be given to the practical components of the hospitality programme in both traditional and technical universities.

Having interest in hospitality careers was the second best predictor of career choice for undergraduate hospitality students. Students who had interest in hospitality careers were four times more likely to choose careers in the industry, as compared to students who lacked interest in hospitality careers. Interest predicted students’ choice of career because interest is an important driver of choice. Interest in careers can withstand obstacles, including negative perception. This implies that educators and industry practitioners should engage hospitality students in activities that will increase their interest in hospitality careers. These activities must include field trips, constant exposure to industry trends, and well planned internships.

Personality-fit for careers in the industry also predicted students’ choice of hospitality careers. Students with the personality fit for the industry
were two times more likely to choose careers in the industry. This means that the belief that one has the qualities for an activity is fundamental in choice-making. According to the social cognitive learning theory, self-belief is a personal factor that influences behaviour. From the incremental self-theorists’ point of view, personality can be modified to suit a given situation. The proposition from this theory means that students who perceive they do not have the right personality for careers in the industry can still choose careers in the industry, if only they are willing to learn and exhibit the qualities required for careers in the industry. Therefore, educators must expose students to the personality fit for careers in the industry so that students become aware of them and exhibit them when necessary.

Also, friends within the social environment of students emerged as one of the environmental factors that influenced students’ choice of hospitality careers. Students who had friends pursuing careers in the industry were about two times more likely to choose careers in the industry, as compared to those who had no friends pursuing careers in the industry. Although the vicarious learning principle within the social cognitive learning theory proposes that people will imitate behaviours when others in their environment perform these behaviours, hospitality students’ choice of career is influenced by peers and not family members within the social environment. This can be attributed to the youthful nature of students and the importance they attach to friendship at this stage of their life.

Residential location of students also emerged as a predictor of career choice. The findings showed that, comparing students who reside in the middle zone of the country to those in the northern zone, the formers’ choice
of hospitality career reduced. Again, students residing in the southern zone of the country had a reduction in their choice of hospitality careers when compared to those students who reside in the northern zone. The social cognitive career theory highlights the effects of contextual factors on career development. Residential location which is a contextual factor influenced students’ choice of career. It can be concluded from this finding that the extent to which the hospitality industry has developed in a particular location can affect choice of career. On the contrary, the assumption that the more developed the hospitality industry is in a location, will positively correlate to choice of career was not the case. This is because students in the southern zone, where the industry is most developed, did not have best choice of careers in the industry. The implication of this is that, although residential location influenced choice of careers, it may not be necessarily based on the extent to which the hospitality industry is developed in these locations.

**Contribution to Knowledge**

This study has contributed to the body of knowledge on students’ perceptions of careers in the industry and what factors influence their choice of careers in several ways.

Firstly, the study examined the full range of personal and environmental factors that predict students’ choice of hospitality careers. Statistically, the findings unearthed factors that predict students’ choice of hospitality careers. Also, sampling students from across the country and from both traditional and technical universities makes the findings more representative of the undergraduate hospitality student in Ghana. Neequaye & Amoo (2014) and Amissah et al. (2019) are among the few studies that
investigated students’ perceptions of careers in the industry in Ghana, sampling students from one university. These studies were also quantitative in nature. However, the present study adopted the pragmatist research philosophy which incorporated both quantitative and qualitative approaches. Adopting the sequential explanatory mixed methods strategy helped to provide further explanations to quantitative findings.

Secondly, the social cognitive learning theory (Bandura, 1986) advances that personal, environmental, and behavioural factors affect modelling of behaviour. Self-efficacy and social factors have been the focus of many studies using this theory. This study is one of the first to statistically examine the effect of residential location on choice of hospitality career. Residential location, which is an environmental factor, emerged as one of the factors that affected students’ choice of hospitality careers.

Finally, this study has added valuable knowledge to the literature on students’ perception of careers in the hospitality industry. The study identified three main dimensions of students’ perceptions of careers in the industry (career attractiveness, career prestige/mobility, and nature of career). It further examined differences in students’ perceptions of careers in the industry by socio-demographic, industry experience, and social characteristics.

**Recommendations**

Since the desire to operate own hospitality business emerged as the strongest predictor of students’ choice of hospitality career, it is recommended that educators should endeavour to pay greater attention to entrepreneurial courses which are available in the hospitality curriculum. This way, students will be better positioned with the right information to better start, operate, and
maintain these businesses, which may also result in providing employment opportunities for others. In connection with hospitality businesses which may require huge capital input, it will be important for educators to guide students in accessing funding, either in the form of loans or grants.

Also, through the interviews, students bemoaned the little practical exposure they get when in school. It will, therefore, be beneficial for the various traditional and technical universities/hospitality departments to place much more emphasis on practical skills acquisition by providing the necessary facilities (hotels and restaurants, kitchens) to enable students to experience the realities of careers in the hospitality industry when in school. The practical exposure will also make students confident which could result in their intentions to choose and stay in hospitality careers.

It is also recommended that, the Ministry of Employment and Labour Relations (MELR) in conjunction with the Ministry of Tourism Arts and Culture (MTAC) to ensure policies on staff remuneration in the hospitality industry is enforced.

Moreover, there is the need for stronger collaboration between the universities/department and industry, so as to ensure that students are exposed to what they need to learn when on internship. This will reduce the occurrence of students being left in the hands of industry supervisors who use them for all the odd jobs. It is also very important for industry to generally give students in the industry better work conditions. The reason is that students who intended to choose careers in the industry also said that, when other industries provide better work opportunities than what the hospitality industry offers, they will leave careers in the industry for these other industries.
Finally, most undergraduate students in this study had unrealistic expectations of careers in the industry with regard to the level at which they expect to enter the industry (top level management) as well as salary demands (above Gh¢ 2,000) from the Ghanaian hospitality industry. It is recommended that educators should educate students on the entry levels and salary range for undergraduates when employed in the industry. This is important because, when these high expectations of students are not met, they could become disappointed and leave careers in the industry.

Suggestions for Further Studies

It is suggested that, since this study sampled students from the various universities during a specific time period, there is the need for a longitudinal study to help document changes that are likely to occur as students go through the hospitality programme as well as after completing the programme with regard to their perception of careers in the industry and factors that influence their choice of careers in the industry. It will also be necessary to repeat this study in other countries within the sub-region for comparability of the findings of this study with findings from other countries.
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Students’ Perceptions of Hospitality Careers Prior to Exploratory Factor Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceptions of hospitality careers</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std dev.</th>
<th>Scale reliability (Cronbach’s Alpha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Careers in the industry do not provide high remuneration</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Careers in the industry are stressful</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Careers in the industry are lowly regarded by the society</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are unfair promotional practices in the industry</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Careers in the industry offer limited opportunity to meet new people</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Careers in the industry do not provide good networking opportunities</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Careers in the industry offer less time for family experiences</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The industry does not offer interesting experiences</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Careers in the industry provides less time for social life</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The working environment in the industry is not safe</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is lack of opportunity for further education when working in the industry</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs in the industry are not readily available</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is poor opportunity for career development in the hospitality industry</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The working relationship between managers and employees is generally poor in the industry</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Careers in the industry are not secure</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working in the industry is not intellectually challenging</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Careers in the industry are gender discriminatory</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working in the industry provides poor opportunity to use academic knowledge and skills acquired in school</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Careers in the industry results in difficulty in movement to other careers</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Careers in the industry have low entry positions for graduates</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Careers in the industry are characterised by long and odd working hours</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional standards are poor in the hospitality industry</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Careers in the hospitality industry are characterized by excessive workload</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Careers in the industry are not prestigious</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.72</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.34</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Anthony (2018)
APPENDIX B

Questionnaire

UNIVERSITY OF CAPE COAST
DEPARTMENT OF HOSPITALITY AND TOURISM MANAGEMENT
FACTORS INFLUENCING CHOICE OF HOSPITALITY CAREERS BY
UNDERGRADUATE HOSPITALITY STUDENTS IN GHANA

Dear respondent,

This questionnaire is designed to solicit information on factors that influence undergraduate students’ choice of hospitality careers in Ghana. The information provided is solely for academic purposes and your names are not required. The researcher wishes to assure you of the confidentiality of the information you provide.

I will be very grateful if you could spare some minutes of your time to complete this questionnaire.

For further information, please contact me on phone number 024-4603855 or email me on anthonygrace81@gmail.com.

Thank you.

Part A

On a scale of 1-5 (1-strongly disagree, 2- disagree, 3- neutral, 4- agree, 5- strongly agree), indicate your level of agreement to the following statements with regard to your perception of hospitality careers by ticking [✓] below the right number.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Perceptions of hospitality careers</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Careers in the industry do not provide high remuneration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Careers in the industry are stressful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Careers in the industry are lowly regarded in the society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>There are unfair promotional practices in the industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Careers in the industry offer limited opportunity to meet new people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Careers in the industry does not provide good networking opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Careers in the industry offer less time for family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The industry does not offer interesting experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Careers in the industry provide less time for social life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The working environment in the industry is not safe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>There is lack of opportunity for further education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
when working in the industry

12 Jobs in the industry are not readily available

13 There is poor opportunity for career development in the hospitality industry

14 The working relationship between managers and employees is generally poor in the industry

15 Careers in the industry are not secure

16 Working in the industry is not intellectually challenging

17 Careers in the industry are gender discriminatory

18 Working in the industry provides poor opportunity to use academic knowledge and skills acquired in school

19 Careers in the industry results in difficulty in movement to other careers

20 Careers in the industry have a low entry positions for graduates

21 Careers in the industry are characterised by long and odd working hours

22 Professional standards are poor in the hospitality industry

23 Careers in the hospitality industry are characterized by excessive workload

24 Careers in the industry are not prestigious
PART B
Please indicate your response by ticking [✓] the boxes provided on how the under listed statements apply to you.

I will choose hospitality careers because:

1. I have the interest in working in the industry
   a. Yes [✓]   b. No [  ]

2. My personality is fit the industry
   a. Yes [✓]   b. No [  ]

3. Of my programme of study at the university
   a. Yes [✓]   b. No [  ]

4. Of the grades I obtained in school
   a. Yes [✓]   b. No [  ]

5. There is a family business to be managed
   a. Yes [✓]   b. No [  ]

6. I want to operate my own hospitality business in the future
   a. Yes [✓]   b. No [  ]

7. The financial remuneration in the industry is adequate
   a. Yes [✓]   b. No [  ]
**PART C**

On a scale of 1-5 (1-strongly disagree, 2- disagree, 3- neutral, 4- agree, 5- strongly agree), indicate your level of agreement on how the following statements describe your personality by ticking [✓] below the right number.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I am the life of the party</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I feel comfortable around people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I start conversations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I talk to a lot of different people at gatherings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I don’t mind being the center of attraction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I make friends easily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I take charge of situations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I know how to captivate people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I feel at ease with people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I have the skills of handling social situations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. How would you describe your personality trait?
   a. Introvert (where an introvert is a person who prefers calm and less stimulating environment) [ ]
   b. Extrovert (where an extrovert is a friendly person who enjoys talking to and being with other people) [ ]
PART D
Please indicate your response by ticking [✓] the boxes provided.

1. What is your gender    a. Male [ ]    b. Female [ ]
2. What is your age         a. below 20 [ ] b. 20-29 [ ] c. 30-39 [ ]
     d. 40 and above [ ]
3. What is your religion   a. Christian [ ]    b. Moslem [ ]
     c. Other, please specify…………………………
4. What is your marital status         a. Single [ ] b. Married [ ]
     c. Divorced [ ] d. Widowed [ ]
5. What is the name of your university
     …………………………………………………..
6. What is your academic level   a. 100 [ ] b. 200 [ ] c. 300 [ ]
     d. 400 [ ]
7. By what mode were you admitted into the university
     a. Direct [ ] b. Matured [ ] c. Post diploma [ ]
     d. Other(s) please specify…………………………
8a. Did you choose the hospitality programme by yourself
     a. Yes [ ] b. No [ ]
8b. if no to question 8a., how did you end up reading hospitality :
     …………………………………………………………………………………
     ……………………………………………………………………………
9. Where do you reside
     Name of City/ Town/Village…………………………………….
     Region ………………………………………………….
10. Do you have any hospitality industry experience
     a. Yes [ ] b. No [ ]
     If no to question 10, move to question 16. If yes to question 10, then continue with question 11
11. By what means did you gain the industry experience
     a. Internship [ ] b. Full-time employment [ ]
     c. Part-time employment[ ] d. Voluntary work in the industry [ ]
     e. other(s), please specify …………………
12. Which segment of the industry did you gain the industry experience
     (tick as many as apply)
     a. Hotel [ ] b. Restaurant [ ] c. Hospital [ ] d. School [ ]
     e. Catering [ ] f. Other(s), please specify………………
13. How would you rate your industry experience
     a. Excellent [ ] b. Very good [ ]
     c. Good [ ] d. Poor [ ] e. Very poor [ ]
14. Provide reasons (if any) for your rating in question 12
     ………………………………………………………………………….
15. How long have you worked in the industry
   a. less than 6 months [ ]   b. 6 months- less than 1 year [ ]
   c. 1 -2 years [ ]   d. 3-4 years [ ]   e. 5 years and more [ ]
16. Do you have family relations employed in the industry
   a. Yes [ ]   b. No [ ]
   If no to question 16, skip question 17 and continue with question 18
17. Which specific family relation is employed in the industry
   a. Father [ ]   b. Mother [ ]   c. Siblings [ ]
   d. Aunt/ Uncle [ ]   e. Other(s) please specify …………………
18. Do any of your relatives own a hospitality business
   a. Yes [ ]   b. No [ ]
19. Do you have friends employed in the hospitality industry
   a. Yes [ ]   b. No [ ]
20. Will you choose a career in the hospitality industry
   a. Yes [ ]   b. No [ ]
21. If yes to question 20, which segment of the industry would you prefer to
    work in
   a. Hotel [ ]   b. Restaurant [ ]   c. Hospital [ ]   d. School [ ]
   e. Other(s), please specify……………………………………
22. Why do you want to work in the selected segment
    …………………………………………………………………………………
    …………………………………………………………………………………
    …………………………………………………………………………………
    …………………………………………………………………………………
23. Which department would you like to work in
   a. Housekeeping [ ]   b. food and beverage service [ ]
   c. Reception [ ]   d. Kitchen [ ]
   e. Other(s) ……………………………..
24. Why do you want to work in the selected department
    …………………………………………………………………………………
    …………………………………………………………………………………
    …………………………………………………………………………………
    …………………………………………………………………………………
25. What entry position do you expect to be employed to in the industry  
    a. Lower level (operational) [ ]
    b. Middle level (supervisory) [ ]
    c. Top level (managerial) [ ]
26. What entry salary range do you expect when employed into the industry
    (in Ghana Cedis)
    a. less than 1,000 [ ]  b. 1,000- 1,500 [ ]  c. 1,501- 2,000 [ ]  d. above 2,000 [ ]

Thank you
APPENDIX C

Interview Guide

This interview is a follow up on an earlier questionnaire you filled with respect to a research work, which sought to examine factors influencing hospitality undergraduate students’ choice of hospitality careers in Ghana. You are assured that the confidentiality of the information you will give. For this reason your name is not required. Also this telephone conversation is being recorded; purposely to allow for transcribing later on after the interview. You are free to decline the interview or refuse to answer certain questions if you so wish. Thank you.

1. Is your university a traditional or technical university
2. What is your academic level?
3. How old are you? (specific / range)
4. Do you have industry experience?
5. If yes, what is the duration of the experience?
6. What is your religion?
7. Is there a family hospitality business?
8. Do you have friends employed in the industry?
9. Where do you reside?
10. Do you intend to choose hospitality careers?
11. If yes, is there anything that can cause a change in this decision? If so, would you like to share them with me:
12. If no to question 10, is there anything that can cause a change in this decision? If so, would you like to share them with me:
13. How do you perceive hospitality careers; stressful, inflexible leading to less time for family-life, social life, meeting new people, salary etc.

14. Do these perception(s) play any role in your intention to choose or not to choose hospitality careers?

15. How do these perceptions affect your choice of hospitality careers?

16. Have you had experiences either in school or industry that has weakened or strengthened your decision to choose or not to choose careers in the industry?

17. If so, would like to share them with me?

18. Does your institution (university) provide support services: (Yes/No), and how are these done?
   a. Industry linkages
   b. Career counselling
   c. Industry seminars
   d. Supervised internships
   e. Internship placements
   f. Entrepreneurial advice
   g. Others

19. What other support services do you expect your institution to provide to increase your interest and choice of hospitality careers?

20. How do these support services affect your choice of hospitality careers (if they do)?

Thank you.