How to improve the problem of hotel manpower shortage in the COVID-19 epidemic environment? Exploring the effectiveness of the hotel practice training system
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Abstract
This study aimed to examine the role of effective employee training in the sustainable growth and corporate social responsibility of hotels during the postpandemic period. An initial respondent pool was selected using purposive sampling, and 280 questionnaires were finally obtained by snowball sampling from September 2019 to February 2020. The sample was analyzed using basic statistical tests, the Pearson correlation coefficient, and multivariate regression. We then interpreted the sample data through consultation with scholars and practitioners in hotel management. Finally, the data were analyzed using multivariate verification. The results indicated that China Binhai Hotel could not foster consistent employee enthusiasm and fulfill its corporate social responsibilities during the postpandemic period due to deficiencies in its human resources training, employee benefit, job rotation, and incentive systems. We suggest for hotels to promote corporate culture, improve the system of promotion, increase employee benefits, and adjust the workplace environment and equipment provided to employees. These will improve employee attitudes toward hotel management, improve work efficiency, increase retention, and solve the problem of personnel shortage during the postpandemic period.
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Introduction
Under the trend of globalization, in order to achieve sustainable development, it is the current trend of enterprise management to strengthen social responsibility to achieve sustainable development goals while operating profits and maintaining basic consumption costs (Androniceanu 2019).

Hotel sustainability refers to getting paid for providing accommodation and catering services for tourists, assisting the government to promote the tourism industry, promoting local economic development, and achieving a win–win situation (Androniceanu 2019; Singh and Misra 2021). However, fulfilling internal and external responsibilities will be key to the hotel’s move toward sustainable operations.

Corporate social responsibility (CSR) is increasingly important in the context of globalization (Androniceanu 2019). Hotel sustainability refers to a for-profit model that also involves promoting the tourism industry and local economic development to achieve a win–win situation among stakeholders (Androniceanu 2019; Singh and Misra 2021). For the hotel, the key to achieving sustainable operations lies in fulfilling internal and external responsibilities.

CSR involves responsibility to stakeholders. Externally, it refers to the interaction with society; internally, it refers to the relationship with employees (Singh and Misra 2021). To fulfill operational needs, companies recruit local residents to serve the company (Wu 2017). To achieve stable development, the company must treat its employees fairly and provide them with a safe and worry-free working environment.
By improving the quality of life for employees and their families, the company fosters employee loyalty, thereby increasing company visibility, attracting consumers, increasing the company’s return on total assets (Chi et al. 2016), and promoting local development. The essence of CSR is a win–win approach that also meets public expectations by stabilizing the development of enterprises and communities, providing employment opportunities for residents, and improving local quality of life (Wu 2017; Uduji and Okolo, 2019).

China has a coastline spanning 18,000 km. This area boasts favorable geographical conditions and abundant marine resources, which have proved suitable for developing coastal tourism activities (Zhang 2016). Since 1978, tourism has developed into a key pillar of China’s emerging economy (Li 2019b; Qiu 2008). In response to the development and demand of the tourism industry, the total number of global chain and independent hotels grew steadily to 1.5% from 2015 to 2019, reaching 866,900 (Shenzhen Qianzhan Information Co., Ltd., 2020). Coastal hotels are popular among consumers due to the geographical advantages of coastal towns, specifically developed land, sea, and air transportation infrastructure; abundant water resources; and ecological diversity (Wu 2021). Therefore, the demand for coastal hotels has increased, with great potential for industrial development.

China attracted approximately 5.539 billion domestic and foreign tourists in 2018, and domestic tourism investment exceeded US$700 billion; by 2019, a total of 10,667 star-rated hotels had been built and 2 million grassroots employees were recruited to provide tourism services (Ministry of Culture and Tourism of the People’s Republic of China, 2018; Gao 2007). That same year, tourism revenue reached US$93 million, accounting for 11.4% of China’s annual gross domestic product (Tang 2019); moreover, the marine economy revenue totaled 2.23 million US dollars. At that time, Chinese seaside hotels promoted local tourism development.

Tourism has become a key industry in China in recent years, and it has driven the economy of coastal cities by promoting business opportunities for the local hotel industry. However, for coastal hotels to achieve sustainable development goals, they must acquire sufficient human resources (HR; Chi et al. 2016), maintain a high quality of service (Shenzhen Qianzhan Information Co., Ltd. 2020), and have a stable revenue stream (Wu 2021). Due to changes in the global tourism model, hotels in China have been unable to meet these goals. The high demand for tourism labor force coupled with the unwillingness of young people to enter the industry (Body and Hogg 2019) has resulted in a shortage of hotel personnel (Hotel Industry Research Center, Zhongrui Hotel Management College 2018).

To solve this problem, the government has established vocational schools to assist in talent cultivation, producing approximately 3.81 million graduates each year (Ministry of Education of China 2020) and contributing to industrial development. The hotel industry has also taken an active role in the cultivation of talent by collaborating with academic institutions in an industry–university cooperative model. As part of our outreach, we visited school campuses to connect with third-year students. Then, during the students’ fourth year, we provided internship opportunities to prepare them for entering the workforce. Our goal was to match hotels with corresponding technical and vocational schools and prepare students to enter the industry prior to graduation (Yunfei and Qin, 2019). We aimed to scout for talent, assist companies in communicating with students (Leonchuk and Gray 2019), and provide students with jobs to develop their skills. Ultimately, we wanted to end the current personnel shortage by ensuring that hotels have a pool of candidates to fill basic operational roles (Hotel Industry Research Center, Zhongrui Hotel Management College 2018; Leonchuk and Gray 2019; Ministry of Education of China, 2020). We believed that the university internship system was a good strategy to solve the shortage of hotel personnel.

However, our survey results indicated that, despite industry–university cooperation, the labor shortage had not been resolved for several reasons. First, the general qualifications for working at hotels have been lowered, but the entry requirements for management positions remained high. Second, work hours were irregular and the work was physically demanding. Third, the personnel shortage resulted in an even heavier burden for existing employees. Fourth, training was monotonous and ineffective. Fifth, students’ majors and skills were not applicable to the job. Sixth, companies were unwilling to employ professionals. Seventh, companies were unwilling to retain interns. Eighth, salaries were low and promotions were slow. Ninth, low retention was common for middle management and service personnel. Tenth, staff turnover was high. Finally, there is a lack of uniformity between the power and responsibility of senior management (Yunfei and Qin, 2019).

Further complicating the issue, as of April 21, 2022, more than 503 million people had COVID-19 in 199 countries around the world (Taiwan Ministry of Health and Welfare 2022). This pandemic devastated the global tourism industry, making tourists unwilling to travel (Foo et al. 2020a, b; Hsu et al. 2020) and tightening the job market in the tourism industry. The physical and mental well-being of many individuals have been affected by the pandemic (Foo et al. 2020a, b), resulting in resignations and exacerbating the shortage of personnel. Therefore, this research primarily aimed to understand the perspectives of university interns, explore the personnel gap in coastal hotels (Yunfei and Qin 2019), determine the key factors driving brain drain, and construct an evidence-based hotel talent training system.
Some scholars have suggested that findings on job satisfaction and employee loyalty can help pinpoint the problems that lead to personnel shortage and high turnover rates (Gupta and Mikkilineni 2018). When employee loyalty and corporate identity are high, employees are willing to actively assist the company in solving problems and achieving operational goals (Farrukh et al., 2017). Furthermore, high levels of job satisfaction can improve work efficiency and increase employees’ willingness to remain with the company (Awad and Alhashemi 2012). Therefore, the feedback of interns regarding job satisfaction and loyalty can provide helpful information.

Research on employee satisfaction and loyalty has been conducted from different perspectives (Abdullah et al. 2011; Al-Refaie 2015; Amin et al. 2017; Said et al. 2020). Post-pandemic research has focused primarily on hotel operations management (Baum and Hai 2020; Dube et al. 2021; Hao et al. 2020; Jiang and Wen 2020). Few studies have explored personnel shortages from the perspective of employee satisfaction and loyalty (Sahubari et al. 2020), and even fewer studies have explored the effectiveness of CSR within hotel companies (Wang et al. 2020; Wong and Kim 2020; Agarwal 2020; Parker 2020). Furthermore, mixed methods have seldom been used in studies on new interns (Jiang and Wen 2020). Island hotels have rarely been used as a case study to analyze the influence of CSR on the sustainability of hotel operations. Therefore, we believe that by examining the HR training system from the perspective of hotel interns, we can better understand the effectiveness of hotel companies in promoting CSR. We also analyzed the key factors for the sustainable development of hotel enterprises. The results of this study will guide hotel operators to make appropriate adjustments to the HR management system, fulfill their CSR, and create conditions for sustainable development regardless of the state of the industry in the future.

Human resource management and corporate social responsibility

The purpose of HR management is to realize organizational strategies and goals through the proper utilization of HR and to mediate disputes between employees and the company (Čančer and Šarotar Žižek 2017). HR management measures are used to recruit local talent; train, utilize, and retain employees; increase employee productivity; reduce costs; improve work quality; enhance the organization’s competitive advantage; and foster employees’ adaptability within the organization (Wu 2017). Through these measures, an organization’s productivity is maximized and the commitment to CSR is maintained despite internal and external pressures on the organization.

HR management in the hospitality industry must implement initiatives that help the organization achieve and maintain a competitive advantage (Friedman 2007). Although the main target of implementation is personnel, the impact of HR decisions extend to the entire organization and impact the organization’s CSR to internal and external parties (Wu et al. 2010). HR management moderates the behaviors, attitudes, performance, policies, practices, and systems of organization members (Noe et al. 2003) to ensure that employees’ efforts, organizational performance, and market competitiveness complement each other and facilitate growth (Marlow 2006). A hotel that understands the company–employee relationship and adjusts management methods accordingly (Huemann et al. 2007) can fulfill its CSR and strengthen its competitive advantage, thus achieving sustainable operations. Examining the hotel HR system from an employee perspective can help us to understand the status of the corporate HR training system and further explore how well the company is fulfilling its CSR obligations.

The importance of employee loyalty to human resources management in marina hotels

Grassroots employees are the cornerstone of enterprise development (Yee et al., 2010). In the hotel industry, grassroots employees are the frontline workers who interact with consumers, provide tourists with high-quality services, and arouse feelings of consumer satisfaction (Li 2019a). Employees are the key factor in improving consumers’ willingness to make repeat purchases, and they indirectly form the corporate image. Qualified employees are eager to join good companies, per the law of supply and demand (Yukongdi and Shrestha 2020). A company can only achieve sustainable development if it cultivates loyalty among its employees. Group coherence or identification with an enterprise constitutes an attitude that can be thought of as loyalty. Loyalty is the key factor that affects an employee’s choice to remain with an organization. Employees who are loyal to a company are more efficient and actively assist the company in solving operational challenges, helping the company to successfully complete its operational goals (Foster et al. 2008). Therefore, the main factors affecting business growth and sustainability are how companies retain employees, meet personnel requirements, and increase employee loyalty (Farrukh et al. 2019). If a hotel wants to improve its operational effectiveness, accomplish corporate goals, and retain employees, then increasing employee loyalty is essential (Allen and Grisaffe 2001). However, because every individual and work environment is unique, there is
The importance of job satisfaction to human resources management in marina hotels

Job satisfaction is reflected in the difference between the actual pay of employees and their expected pay in a given work environment. It reflects the employee’s overall attitude toward their occupational scope, their work environment, and the benefits obtained from working at the company (Liu et al. 2019; Seashore and Taber 2001). Employees with high job satisfaction are loyal and effective, whereas employees with low job satisfaction can be damaging to the organization (Cumby and Alexander 1998; Foo et al. 2020a).

The key factors affecting job satisfaction can be understood from several perspectives, such as emotion (Abdullah et al. 2011), the working environment, salary, benefits (Farrukh et al. 2019), and the expectations of the organization (Foy et al. 2019). Strong interpersonal bonds and a positive work environment can alleviate some of the psychological pressure employees face at work (Yao et al., 2019). A robust salary and benefits package can improve the employee’s standard of living (Reynolds 2019), which in turn increases their motivation to work. At a basic level, all employees seek stable employment that can guarantee a normal personal or family life over the long term. Therefore, if employees can satisfy the company’s expectations and receive positive reinforcement, their enthusiasm for work will be enhanced (Shanock et al., 2019). Because the level of job satisfaction affects the enthusiasm and effectiveness of employees, it is crucial to explore the nature of employee satisfaction.

Related to job satisfaction and employee loyalty

Employee loyalty refers to the employee’s commitment to the company. Loyal employees are willing to assist the company in facing challenges, with the understanding that they will be duly rewarded for their efforts (Farrukh et al. 2019; Foster et al. 2008).

However, loyalty is not a panacea. Even if the company makes perfect policies or employees have high loyalty, if the rewards are insufficient to meet employees’ everyday needs or if employees are unable to help the company achieve its operational goals, employee identification with the company declines and senior management loses faith in the company’s employees (Reynolds 2019). Therefore, companies must fulfill their internal CSR and improve their HR management systems (Friedman 2007) to ensure that the actual needs of business operations and employees are being met. This promotes consensus between companies and employees and results in a win–win situation (Marlow 2006). We believe that given the nature of the job at hotels, consensus should be promoted between employees and HR. Accordingly, hypotheses 1 and 2 were proposed: Hotel employees would express consistent perceptions regarding satisfaction with their current job content (H1) and corporate loyalty (H2).

The job scope of interns differs from that of regular employees. Even though job satisfaction affects employee loyalty (Amin et al. 2017), the effect of job satisfaction on job performance is the key to retaining highly efficient employees (Friedman 2007). Therefore, we hypothesized, as hypothesis 3, that attitudes toward job satisfaction and loyalty would have the same effects whether for interns or regular employees.

The factors affecting job satisfaction and loyalty are diverse. Among them, the trust and support of supervisors and fellow employees is the key to establishing loyalty (Bushra et al. 2011), which affects employees’ willingness to stay and their feelings toward their job (Yao et al. 2019). Loyalty refers to the employee’s commitment to the company. Loyal employees are willing to help the company meet challenges in exchange for due rewards (Liu et al. 2019), and employees with high work efficiency earn the company’s trust, which empowers them to actively take on more responsibility. It is tacitly understood that if the company’s expectations are met and work efficiency promoted, the employee is rewarded through improvements in their working environment, salary, and workplace relationships. Therefore, we posited that interns’ satisfaction with their work environment, compensation, identification with the company, and interpersonal relationships influence their loyalty. Thus, hypotheses 4–7 were proposed: Employees’ satisfaction with their working environment (H4), salary (H5), organizational commitment (H6), and interpersonal relationships (H7) have a positive and significant influence on job loyalty.

Manifestations of loyalty (in one’s words or deeds) are rare (Allen and Grisaffe 2001). When a company sees an employee performing well and rewards them accordingly, the employee is more willing to cooperate with the company. Furthermore, when companies give employees autonomy in the workplace and provide avenues for training and promotion, employee trust is likely to be sustained over the long term. This sense of trust motivates employees, leading to higher job satisfaction (Friedman 2007; Huemann et al. 2007; Marlow 2006; Noe et al. 2003; Wu et al. 2010). Therefore, hypotheses 8–9 were proposed: For interns at coastal hotels, level of empowerment (H8) and level of career development (H9) significantly and positively influence job satisfaction.
Research structure

The COVID-19 pandemic has impacted the tourism and hotel industries, particularly the hotel industry along the coast of China. Tourism development requires sufficient personnel, but the hotel industry currently has a large personnel shortage and insufficient recruitment channels. Therefore, industry–university cooperative projects have been used to cultivate talent and supplement personnel (Leonchuk and Gray 2019; Ministry of Education of China 2020). However, studies have found that due to changes in tourism patterns, high labor intensity (Foo et al. 2020a), wage gap (Yunfei and Qin 2019), and other organizational problems, coupled with external factors such as the COVID-19 pandemic, employee turnover has increased, employment willingness has declined, and personnel shortage has been exacerbated. This personnel shortage is an urgent issue that must be addressed.

Studies have proposed several methods for exploring employee satisfaction and loyalty (Kwon et al. 2010). Employee satisfaction can be understood by studying the working environment, salary, organizational commitment, and interpersonal relationships (Allen and Grisaffe 2001; Bushra et al. 2011; Smith et al. 1969; Yukongdi and Shrestha 2020), whereas employee loyalty can be explored by studying the levels of delegation and career development (Abdullah et al. 2011; Farrukh et al. 2019; Reynolds 2019; Yao et al. 2019), which have a mutual influence on each other. This method aids in efforts to analyze and enhance the CSR of island hotels and solve the problem of personnel shortage, as shown in Fig. 1.

Methods

Subjects

For years, the pleasant climate in Fujian Province has attracted many international tourists, resulting in growth in the number of Coastal Region Hotels and a boom in tourism development (Matzler and Renzl 2006). However, the development of China’s tourism industry is a relatively recent phenomenon, and the speed of personnel training has been unable to cope with the demand; moreover, the turnover rate among hotel personnel is high and willingness to stay is low (Hotel Industry Research Center, Zhongrui Hotel Management College 2019; Noe et al. 2003). This indicates flaws in the hotel industry’s internal CSR system and implementation effectiveness. Therefore, the hotel industry is currently cooperating with schools to promote internships for university students with the objective of recruiting fresh university graduates as regular employees. These interns have become one of the main sources of personnel for hotels. This cooperative project is still in its infancy, and more time must pass before its effectiveness can be verified. To understand the degree to which this project has been implemented and uncover the deficiencies, the most realistic method is to examine the perceptions of employees in the field (Ap and Crompton 1998; Widaningsih et al. 2020). Scholars believe that to obtain relevant answers concerning employee loyalty (Yee et al., 2010; Li 2019a; Yukongdi and Shrestha 2020) and job satisfaction (Liu et al. 2019; Seashore and Taber 2001; Cumbey and Alexander 1998; Foo et al. 2020a), the most effective strategy is to ask the employees themselves.

Therefore, in this study, a questionnaire was distributed to participants first through purposive sampling and then through snowball sampling: The participants were hotel trainees in Fujian Province, China. A total of 300 questionnaires were collected, and 20 invalid questionnaires were excluded, resulting in a total of 280 valid questionnaires and a recovery rate of 93.3%. The data were then coded, and the valid questionnaire data were analyzed using the SPSS 22.0 statistical software (IBM Corporation, Armonk, NY, USA) and analyzed for demographic variables, job satisfaction, and loyalty of the hotel trainees using statistical validation. Then, the AMOS 20.0 software (IBM Corporation, Armonk, NY, USA) was used to analyze the relationship between the variables and validate the research model. Pearson correlation coefficient was used to analyze the relationship between
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job satisfaction and corporate loyalty. Focused interviews were conducted to obtain the opinions of experts and scholars with backgrounds in hotel operations, working experiences, or professions, and the manuscript was constructed following a sequence of summarization, organization, and analysis (Gursoy et al. 2002). Finally, the multivariate verification analysis method was used to integrate the information gathered from different participants, the literature, and expert opinions to verify multiple data points and compare the research results (Gursoy et al. 2002; Janesick 2000; Strauss and Corbin 1998) to obtain accurate knowledge and meaning.

**Study procedure and instruments**

From the perspective of hotel trainees, this article examines the hotel talent training system in terms of job satisfaction and loyalty perceptions to understand the effectiveness of hotel enterprises in promoting social responsibility and analyzing the key factors for the sustainable development of hotel enterprises. The research mainly analyzes the results of employee corporate loyalty and job satisfaction in the current COVID-19 infectious environment. It is believed that even in the current pandemic exploring the relationship between job satisfaction and employee loyalty can help find solutions to the manpower shortage in China’s hotel industry, according to the relevant research results (Gursoy et al. 2008; Abdullah et al., 2011; Farrukh et al., 2019; Reynolds 2019; Yao et al. 2019; Tan 2020), inference, and analysis of company loyalty (Abdullah et al. 2011; Farrukh et al. 2019; Reynolds 2019; Yao et al. 2019) is divided into two dimensions, power control and career development, with a total of 6 questions posed. There are 26 questions in total, as shown in Figs. 2 and 3.

Demographic variables include gender (male, female), work department (front desk, catering, guest room, kitchen, other), and work location (local employment internship, non-indigenous employment internship). The 5-point Likert scale ranged from strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree to strongly disagree, with 1–5 points respectively. Job satisfaction referencing (Allen and Grisaffe 2001; Bushra et al. 2011; Smith et al. 1969; Yee et al. 2010) is divided into four dimensions, work environment, salary, organizational commitment, and interpersonal relationship. Company loyalty (Abdullah et al. 2011; Farrukh et al. 2019; Reynolds 2019; Yao et al. 2019) is divided into levels of delegation and development opportunities, as shown in Table 1.

**Information processing and analysis**

Corporations have a social responsibility to stabilize the development of enterprises and communities, provide residents with mutually beneficial employment opportunities, and improve the public’s quality of life (Wu 2017; Uduji and Okolo, 2019). In this study, we employed the novel strategy of exploring the company’s workplace regime from the employees’ perspective to understand whether the company was fulfilling its CSR by providing comprehensive job security. This innovative research method was combined with new theories through the application of grounded theory. We utilized mixed methods, first using quantitative research methods to obtain the opinions of the majority (Galli et al. 2020; Ochieng 2009) and then using qualitative research to obtain more nuanced insights (Berry et al. 2019) that could make up for theoretical shortcomings (Cypress 2018).

In this study, the first step was to eliminate the invalid questionnaires from among the returned responses, code the valid questionnaire data, and use the SPSS 22.0 statistical
software to analyze the data. Then, the CFA test method was used to test the convergent validity of the questionnaire to improve the rigor of the questionnaire tool. The relationship between job satisfaction and corporate loyalty was analyzed using the Pearson correlation coefficient. Focused interviews were then conducted to obtain expert and scholarly opinions regarding the analytical results. These interviewees all had more than 5 years of hotel management or research experience, and we thus considered them to be reliable sources. The study proceeded per the sequence of induction, organization, and analysis (Gursoy et al. 2002). Finally, multivariate analysis was used to integrate the information gathered from different participants, the literature, and expert opinions to verify multiple data points and compare the research results (Gursoy et al. 2002; Janesick 2000; Strauss and Corbin 1998) to obtain an accurate understanding of the phenomenon.

Among the respondents to 280 questionnaires, the majority were women (59.1%) and interns at the catering department (30.9%), front desk (25.5%), guest room department (12.3%), kitchen (4.5%), and other parts of the hotel (26.8%).

![Figure 3: Confirmatory factor analysis framework for company loyalty scale](image)

**Table 1** Questionnaire about job satisfaction and company loyalty

| Main part of the questionnaire | Content                                                                 | Numbering |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| Background information         | Gender, age, education level                                             | 1–3       |
| Job satisfaction               | Working environment (C1) facilities and equipment satisfy me; (C2) working atmosphere satisfied me; (C3) reward and punishment system pleases me | 4–6       |
|                                | Salary and benefits (D1) salary system pleases me; (D2) internship income satisfied me; (D3) benefits plan satisfied me; (D4) staff dormitory satisfied me; (D5) staff canteen satisfied me; (D6) bonus/reward system pleases me | 7–12      |
|                                | Company culture (E1) corporate development philosophy pleases me; (E2) employee career planning satisfied me; (E3) job conversion mechanism pleases me | 13–15     |
|                                | Interpersonal relationship (F1) colleagues get along well with me; (F2) I am satisfied with the results of cooperation and collaboration; between; (F3) colleagues I am satisfied with sharing work experience among; (F4) colleagues I am satisfied with the effectiveness of communication between; (F5) supervisor work scheduling and coordination satisfy me | 16–20     |
| Employee loyalty               | Power control (G1) company is willing to fully authorize me to solve the problem; (G2) must be resolved in accordance with the company’s work guidelines; (G3) can use its own methods to solve work problems | 21–23     |
| Expansion capacity             | (J1) has high development opportunities after taking office; (J2) promotion system is good; (J3) has many on-the-job skills training opportunities | 24–26     |
Most interns selected hotels based on the proximity to their place of residence (60%).

**Offending estimate**

As shown in Table 2, we can see that the error variance of this research model is 0.02 to 0.05, and the standardized regression coefficient is 0.75 to 0.96, none of which exceeds 0.96. Then, the relevant testing was carried out to determine whether there is a negative error variance, or the standardized regression coefficient exceeds or is too close to the standard of 1 (Bagozzi and Yi 1988). Therefore, the results have no offending estimate situation, and the overall model can be tested for goodness of fit.

**Measurement mode analysis**

**Verification of convergent validity**

In this study, the convergent validity of the measurement model was tested using the standardized path coefficient, the average variance extracted, and the composite reliability. Generally speaking, the composite reliability needs to be greater than 0.60 (Ayar et al., 2021), and the average variance extracted needs to be greater than 0.50 (Ajzen 1991). As shown in Table 3, for job satisfaction, the values related to the working environment dimension are between 0.76 and 0.90, the values related to the salary and benefits dimension are between 0.53 and 0.75, the values related to the company culture dimension are between 0.66 and 0.89, and values related to interpersonal relationship dimension are between 0.89 and 0.90. As for employee loyalty, the values related to the level of delegation dimension are between 0.80 and 0.83, and the values related to the development opportunities dimension are between 0.83 and 0.84. The composite reliability scores of the four potential variables of job satisfaction, working environment, salary and benefits, company culture, and interpersonal relationships are 0.82, 0.65, 0.79, and 0.86, respectively. The composite reliability scores of the two potential variables of loyalty, levels of delegation and development opportunities, are 0.80 and 0.83, respectively. The composite reliability scores are all greater than 0.60 and the average variance extracted is greater than 0.50, indicating that the model is of good inherent quality and convergent validity.

**Structural model analysis**

For the structural model analysis of this study, the $\chi^2$ test, the ratio of $\chi^2$ to degrees of freedom, GFI, AGFI, RMSEA, CFI, and PCFI are used to carry out relevant analyses (Bagozzi and Yi 1988). After revising the job satisfaction scale model, GFI is 0.91, AGFI is 0.87, RMSEA is 0.07, CFI is 0.97, and PCFI is 0.74. After revising the company loyalty scale model, GFI is 0.98, AGFI is 0.94, RMSEA is 0.07, CFI is 0.97, and PCFI is 0.74. As shown in Table 4, all the fitness indicators meet the model fitting criteria, indicating that the results of this study are acceptable models with good convergent validity and discriminant validity.

**Research result**

**Analysis of the current situation of interns’ job satisfaction and employee loyalty**

The internal social responsibility of the company includes providing proper working conditions, planning and perfecting the human resource management system (Friedman 2007), meeting the needs of actual operation and employees, improving employees’ performance, achieving corporate profitability goals, and further providing employees with job and livelihood security (Marlow 2006). Job satisfaction is one of the effective factors that influence the content of employees’ work. If the content of work,
environment, and gains can be balanced, job satisfaction will be higher (Liu et al., 2019; Seashore and Taber, 2001). Based on the literature, we divided job satisfaction into four dimensions, working environment, salary and benefits, company culture, and interpersonal relationships, and there were 17 relevant questions in total. It was found that the respondents attach importance to salary and benefits (2.9), care least about company culture (2.69), pay more attention to disciplinary rules (2.75), benefits package (2.91), job rotation (2.72), and interaction with colleagues and communication with the boss (2.73), and care less about career planning (2.65), peer cooperation and

### Table 3 Scale reliability and average variance extracted

| Perspective                  | Index | Standardized factor loading | Non-standardized factor loading | S.E  | C.R. (t-value) | P     | SMC | C.R  |
|------------------------------|------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|------|----------------|-------|-----|------|
| Job satisfaction scale       |      |                               |                                 |      |                |       |     |      |
| Working environment          | C1   | 0.95                          | 1.00                            |      |                | 0.90  | 0.90| 0.82 |
|                             | C3   | 0.87                          | 0.97                            | 0.05 | 20.15          | ***   | 0.76|      |
| Salary and benefits          | D1   | 0.73                          | 1.00                            |      |                | 0.53  | 0.88| 0.65 |
|                             | D3   | 0.87                          | 1.21                            | 0.10 | 12.46          | ***   | 0.75|      |
|                             | D4   | 0.77                          | 1.00                            | 0.09 | 10.96          | ***   | 0.60|      |
|                             | D5   | 0.85                          | 1.22                            | 0.10 | 11.97          | ***   | 0.72|      |
| Company culture              | E1   | 0.92                          | 1.00                            |      |                | 0.85  | 0.92| 0.79 |
|                             | E2   | 0.94                          | 1.00                            | 0.04 | 24.84          | ***   | 0.89|      |
|                             | E3   | 0.81                          | 0.85                            | 0.05 | 16.64          | ***   | 0.66|      |
| Interpersonal relationship   | F1   | 0.94                          | 1.00                            |      |                | 0.89  | 0.96| 0.86 |
|                             | F2   | 0.95                          | 0.96                            | 0.03 | 29.59          | ***   | 0.90|      |
|                             | F3   | 0.95                          | 0.99                            | 0.03 | 29.97          | ***   | 0.91|      |
|                             | F4   | 0.87                          | 0.84                            | 0.04 | 21.49          | ***   | 0.75|      |
| Employee loyalty scale       | G1   | 0.89                          | 1.00                            |      |                | 0.80  | 0.92| 0.80 |
|                             | G2   | 0.89                          | 0.94                            | 0.05 | 19.39          | ***   | 0.80|      |
|                             | G3   | 0.91                          | 0.93                            | 0.05 | 20.22          | ***   | 0.83|      |
| Promotion flexibility        | J1   | 0.92                          | 1.00                            | 0.05 | 18.72          | ***   | 0.83|      |
|                             | J2   | 0.91                          | 1.00                            | 0.05 |                |       |     |      |

### Table 4 The model fitting of job satisfaction scale

| Fit index | Tolerable range | Modified model | Model fit determination | Fit index |
|-----------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------------|-----------|
| Job satisfaction scale |                      |                |                         |           |
| $\chi^2$ (Chi-square) | The smaller the better | 530.18 | 137.76 | Fit |
| $\chi^2$ and degree of freedom ratio | $<3$ | 4.69 | 2.33 | Fit |
| GFI | $>0.90$ | 0.79 | 0.91 | Fit |
| AGFI | $>0.90$ | 0.71 | 0.87 | Fit |
| RMSEA | $<0.08$ | 0.13 | 0.07 | Fit |
| CFI | $>0.90$ | 0.90 | 0.97 | Fit |
| PCFI | $>0.50$ | 0.75 | 0.74 | Fit |
| Company loyalty scale |                      |                |                         |           |
| $\chi^2$ (Chi-square) | The smaller the better | 39.42 | 9.23 | Acceptable |
| $\chi^2$ and degree of freedom ratio | $<3$ | 4.93 | 2.31 | Fit |
| GFI | $>0.90$ | 0.94 | 0.98 | Fit |
| AGFI | $>0.90$ | 0.86 | 0.94 | Fit |
| RMSEA | $<0.08$ | 0.13 | 0.07 | Fit |
| CFI | $>0.90$ | 0.97 | 0.99 | Fit |
| PCFI | $>0.50$ | 0.52 | 0.40 | Acceptable |
collaboration (2.70), work facilities (2.73), and compensation system (2.82), as shown in Table 5.

If employees feel intense loyalty to the company, this will promote the interaction between supervisors and employees and the company’s trust in and support for subordinates and employees, and further boost the overall operation of the company (Bushra et al. 2011; Farrukh et al. 2019). This will facilitate sustainable business operations and meet the basic costs of maintaining internal corporate social responsibility. According to the literature, employee loyalty is divided into empowerment degrees and development opportunities. The analysis result shows that they attach more importance to the latter (2.86) and care less about the former (2.72). They also expect to obtain the delegation of authority to solve the problem (2.88), get development opportunities after the internship (2.88), and care less about the right to work (2.68) and personnel changes (2.84) as shown in Table 6.

Correlation analysis of interns’ job satisfaction and employee loyalty

High job satisfaction can inspire the loyalty of employees. Employees with loyalty to the company work efficiently. They can be valued by the company, then get rewards, and then increase satisfaction again (Bushra et al. 2011; Farrukh et al. 2019; Foster et al. 2008; Gursoy et al. 2002). Thus, by increasing employee job satisfaction and corporate recognition, job performance can be promoted, which helps hotels to achieve their operational goals (Marlow 2006) and facilitates employees to obtain corporate employment commitments (Wu et al. 2010) so that the internal social responsibility of hotel companies can be fulfilled. Therefore, hypothesis 3 is proposed. According to the analysis results, job satisfaction and company loyalty are highly correlated (0.895, $p < 0.01$), confirming that hypothesis 3 is true. In addition, the better the working environment is, the higher the job loyalty (0.862).

Job satisfaction can be explored from the perspectives of working environment, salary and welfare, corporate culture, and interpersonal relationships, so hypotheses 4–7 are proposed. It can be seen that working environment, salary and benefits, company culture, and interpersonal relationships of job satisfaction significantly impact loyalty ($P < 0.01$), confirming that hypotheses 2–6 are valid. It was also found that the better the planning of workplace facilities (0.805), staff canteen (0.639), job rotation (0.772), and cooperation and collaboration between colleagues (0.785), the stronger the interns’ loyalty to the company, as shown in Fig. 4.

Work performance is the key to the growth of business operations, and it is also the employee’s commitment to the

| Table 5 | Analysis of current job satisfaction |
|---------|-------------------------------------|
| Facet               | Index                          | $M$   | $\sigma$ | Ranking |
| Working environment ($M = 2.77$) | Reward and punishment system | 2.75  | 1.066 | 1       |
|                     | Workplace facilities and equipment | 2.73  | 1.157 | 2       |
| Salary and benefits ($M = 2.90$) | Benefits                  | 2.91  | 0.984 | 1       |
|                     | Staff dorm                   | 2.89  | 0.920 | 2       |
|                     | Staff cafeteria              | 2.87  | 1.018 | 3       |
|                     | Salary system                | 2.82  | 0.975 | 4       |
| Company culture ($M = 2.69$) | Job conversion mechanism   | 2.72  | 0.989 | 1       |
|                     | Development concept          | 2.70  | 1.024 | 2       |
|                     | Staff career planning        | 2.65  | 0.998 | 3       |
| Interpersonal relationship ($M = 2.70$) | Colleagues get along         | 2.73  | 1.278 | 1       |
|                     | Communication with boss      | 2.73  | 1.170 | 2       |
|                     | Sharing work experience among colleagues | 2.70  | 1.257 | 3       |
|                     | Cooperation and collaboration among colleagues | 2.70  | 1.225 | 4       |

| Table 6 | Analysis of the current situation of employee loyalty |
|---------|-------------------------------------|
| Facet               | Index                          | $M$   | $\sigma$ | Ranking |
| Power control ($M = 2.72$) | Solve the problem according to the authorization guidelines | 2.76  | 1.082 | 1       |
|                     | Choose your own working method  | 2.75  | 1.055 | 2       |
|                     | Right to match job position    | 2.68  | 1.154 | 3       |
| Promotion flexibility ($M = 2.86$) | Development opportunities after the internship | 2.88  | 1.024 | 1       |
|                     | Promotion system               | 2.84  | 1.032 | 2       |
company. It is also a kind of trust employers put in employees (Allen and Grisaffe 2001). Strong loyalty urges employees to actively complete tasks and improve effectiveness. Therefore, hypothesis 3 is proposed. The analysis result shows that company loyalty and job satisfaction are significantly correlated (0.895, \( p < 0.01 \)), confirming hypothesis 3. In addition, the higher the level of delegation is, the higher the job satisfaction (0.862).

Furthermore, company loyalty can be discussed from the perspectives of the level of delegation and development opportunities, and employees with different positions have different opinions, so hypotheses 8–9 are proposed. The analysis result shows that the level of delegation and development are significantly correlated with job satisfaction (\( P < 0.01 \)), confirming hypotheses 8–9. In addition, it was found that interns who could choose their own work methods (0.895) to perform tasks had greater job satisfaction and more development opportunities (0.876) after the internship, as shown in Fig. 5.

**Discussion**

**Discussing the effectiveness of corporate social responsibility from employees’ satisfaction with hotel work**

When companies fulfill their internal social responsibility, employees can obtain a stable salary and living security, a more comfortable working environment (2.81), and interact with a quality team (2.73) to develop their potential, they will expect to be promoted (2.72), become more enthusiastic about their work, and receive more benefits (3.05). However, after investing a large amount of money in the construction of hardware facilities, there is an urgent need to make a profit and recover the cost of investment. Even though the tourism industry is highly profitable, hardware and equipment are not easily updated (2.73) and cannot keep up with the industry demand and consumption trend in time. In addition, most hotel jobs are labor-based (2.73), low-skilled, and highly
substitutable (2.65). Unless individuals have sufficient professional skills and qualities (2.65), it is not easy for companies to raise the salary of general hotel staff (2.82).

We believe that, from a company perspective, providing employee wages is a social responsibility. However, from the perspective of employees, wages are only the income from fulfilling the labor contract, guaranteeing the right to work, and meeting the needs of life, which are the social responsibilities of the enterprise. Therefore, the employees believe that the hotel company’s internal human resource management system still has room for improvement in terms of work facilities, salary system, employee training planning, and employment recruitment due to operational and cost considerations. Therefore, hypothesis 1 is not valid.

We believe that business operations are even more challenging in a difficult economic environment. In order to survive the difficult times, the industry should provide perfect human resource management measures, fulfill internal social responsibilities, provide a safe and comfortable working environment for employees, and satisfy their work and living needs to enhance employees’ trust in the labor contract and more proactively help the company achieve its operational goals. Therefore, if the company can improve the talent training system, adjust the benefits, establish a rotation mechanism for work content, and establish a clear system of rewards and penalties, it can improve the inadequacy of the hotel talent training mechanism, maintain the staff’s motivation, and fulfill the internal social responsibility of the company.

Discussion on the effectiveness of corporate social responsibility from the perspective of employee loyalty to hotel companies

Employees with high loyalty can be trusted by the company, enhancing work effectiveness (Friedman 2007). However, in China, hotel employees have low salaries and high turnover rates (Yunfei and Qin 2019) and are insecure in their jobs. Under the pressure of life’s hardships, the general staff has developed aggressive personality traits, only cares about getting a stable income and liberal working conditions (2.76), always cultivates workplace competitiveness and looks for better job opportunities (2.88), and does not pay attention to the role they play in the company at the moment and fulfill their job responsibilities. Furthermore, although companies are aware that if they fulfill their internal social responsibility, they can promote employee cohesion, improve work effectiveness, and achieve operational goals (Friedman 2007; Marlow 2006), and that employee performance is a key factor in operational effectiveness (Noe et al. 2003; Wu 2017), the current human resource management measures of Chinese hoteliers are old-fashioned, and the employment treatment is conservative and fails to meet employment expectations, which leads to more distrust of employees. The reluctance to adjust and delegate work authority (2.68), improve the promotion system for the general staff (2.84), and fulfill internal corporate social responsibility invariably creates a confrontation between enterprises and employees, forming a vicious cycle. Therefore, hypothesis 2 is not valid.

Therefore, if the hotels can establish proper appointment measures for human resources, set clear rules of work and reward and punishment mechanisms, meet the needs of employees in work and life, and further promote the corporate culture and welfare system, it can further strengthen employees’ trust in the company, stabilize their workplace attitudes and behaviors, and help improve their work performance so that the hotels can achieve its operational goals and be willing to adhere to its internal social responsibility to achieve the goal of co-prosperity between the company and its employees.

Discussion on the sustainable development strategy of hotel companies from the relationship between job satisfaction and employee loyalty

The present study concluded that the implementation of internal social responsibility and the establishment of a good human resource management system in hotels could gain employees’ recognition of the company, increase team spirit, promote work performance, and help the company maintain its competitive advantage (Friedman 2007; Marlow 2006; Wu 2017).

We believe, a good working atmosphere and a comfortable working environment can promote employees’ identification with the company, increase their enthusiasm for work, improve efficiency, help the company achieve its operational goals, create more profitable conditions, and increase the willingness of the owners to maintain their internal social responsibility and to further improve HR management measures to reach hotel performance target and move toward the goal of sustainable management. Therefore, job satisfaction and corporate loyalty showed a significant correlation, and hypothesis 3 of this study is valid.

Despite the fact that companies and employees are part of the same group, there are differences in their respective goals and expectations. While the business owner aims to make profits from its operations, the employees expect to obtain resources to feed themselves and improve their quality of life through the shelter of the business, and they work hard for their respective goals. Nevertheless, business operations still need to rely on the general workforce to maintain hotel operations and service needs (Yee et al. 2010). Therefore, creating a safe, comfortable, and highly interactive working environment for employees, providing additional working facilities and meals, and planning a comprehensive application system for workplace job
rotation will enhance employees’ loyalty to the hotel company. However, the strong self-awareness of the younger generation, the gap in generational values, and the low salary level of hotels in China in general (Yunfei and Qin 2019) make the workplace attitude and corporate identification of the newcomers in the current society quite different from those in the past. Without providing employees with an autonomous work style and planning a proper promotion system to satisfy them, it would be impossible to convince them to stay in the hotel business. Therefore, there is a significant correlation between empowerment, advancement and job satisfaction, working environment, salary and benefits, corporate culture, and interpersonal relationship with corporate loyalty, confirming research hypotheses 4–9. The more complete the planning of workplace facilities and equipment, employee canteens, job transition mechanism, and cooperation and collaboration among colleagues, the higher the corporate loyalty. The more complete the work autonomy and promotion channel, the higher the job satisfaction.

We believe, if Chinese hotel companies wish to move toward sustainable development goals and boost corporate performance, they must first improve workplace facilities and staff canteens, establish a sound promotion mechanism, create a harmonious and supportive workplace atmosphere, construct a reasonable work system, and raise salaries in order to gain employees’ recognition of the hotel corporate culture and workplace.

While enterprises should fulfill their social responsibilities, employees themselves need to be aware of workplace ethics and responsibilities. Although this is not the topic of this paper, after all, entrepreneurs and employees are two different roles. The owner is responsible for making profits and losses, paying costs, and providing salaries to employees (Androniceanu 2019; Singh and Misra 2021), while employees are responsible for providing personal labor and skills and exchanging their time and wisdom for equivalent salaries to help hotels achieve their operational goals (Hotel Industry Research Center, Zhongrui Hotel Management College 2018; Leonchuk and Gray 2019; Ministry of Education of China 2020; Yunfei and Qin 2019).

Therefore, we believe that it is reasonable for good talents to expect to be appreciated by the company for better treatment and improved quality of life, but they also need to do their job well in order to be able to negotiate with the company. Successful business owners need good talents to assist in business operations, and good talents depend on the establishment of sound internal social responsibility and continuous improvement of talent training and benefit measures in order to truly fulfill corporate social responsibility, improve corporate performance, and move toward sustainable business goals.

Conclusions and recommendations

At present, hotel owners are unable to maintain staff commitment and establish a sound internal social responsibility system due to inadequate human resource training system and welfare benefits, unclear rotation mechanisms, and reward and punishment system. Therefore, by establishing proper human resource management measures, improving workplace facilities and staff meals, establishing a perfect promotion mechanism, creating a harmonious workplace environment, constructing a reasonable work system, increasing salaries, and strengthening the corporate culture and welfare system promotion mechanism, we can ensure a stable workplace attitude and behavior of employees, improve work performance, enhance corporate commitment, and help Coastal Region Hotels achieve their operational goals, improve performance, fulfill their corporate social responsibility, and move toward sustainable development.

Suggestions for hotel entrepreneurs

The company needs to provide employees with the following: (1) Meet basic life needs. (2) Propose a stable work rotation mechanism. (3) Clarify the promotion path and work guide. (4) Give trust and assist in the proficient business. In this way, the company can obtain the recognition of interns and fulfill its corporate social responsibility.

Suggestions for hotel employees (new employees)

Existing or new employees need to (1) self-improve skills. (2) Increase professional knowledge. (3) Enhance workplace value. (4) Face up to your role in the hotels. The implementation of the above conditions will obtain more work resources and opportunities and gain the trust of the enterprise.

Suggestions for government authorities

The government needs to implement the following: (1) Need to listen to the opinions of labor and management. (2) Assist in obtaining consensus between labor and capital. (3) Put forward measures to stabilize industrial human resources. (4) Reduction or reduction of hotel sales tax. (5) Reduce the income tax for hotel employees. Only in this way can we urge business owners to fulfill their corporate social responsibilities, build a sound hotel industry operation and management mechanism, and stabilize the development of China’s hotel industry.
Research recommendations

From the perspective of different rights relations, obtain their views on related issues and use other analytical methods to confirm or discuss related issues to make up for research deficiencies.
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