



## **MENTORSHIP SUPPORT, CUSTOMER SERVICE ORIENTATION, AND SERVICE COMPETENCE: A CANONICAL CORRELATION ANALYSIS**

Jaica M. Tizo, Cyril C. Chavez

*Hospitality Management, Lourdes College, Inc., Cagayan de Oro City, Philippines*

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19448833>

### **ABSTRACT**

Hotel and tourism personnel play a critical role in ensuring positive guest experiences and maintaining service quality within hospitality establishments. This study examined the relationships among mentorship support, customer service orientation, and service competence of Hospitality Management students during on-the-job training (OJT). Grounded in Social Learning Theory and Competence-Based Theory, the study explains how guided instruction, modeling, and workplace interaction influence students' competence development and service-oriented behaviors. A descriptive–correlational design was employed, involving 200 Hospitality Management students from selected higher education institutions in Misamis Oriental during Academic Year 2025–2026. Data were gathered using a validated research instrument that underwent reliability testing and factor analysis to ensure construct validity. Mentorship support was measured across instructional and emotional dimensions; customer service orientation covered willingness to serve, proactive behavior, and responsiveness, while service competence included professional conduct, interpersonal skills, and problem-solving abilities. Findings showed that students reported very high levels of mentorship support and high levels of customer service orientation and service competence. Canonical correlation analysis revealed significant multivariate relationships among the variables, indicating that both instructional and emotional mentorship support are strongly associated with enhanced competence and customer-oriented behaviors during experiential learning. Despite extensive discussions on OJT effectiveness, limited empirical studies have simultaneously examined mentorship support and its dimensions alongside customer service orientation and service competence within hospitality education. By addressing this gap, the study provides evidence that mentorship support functions as a critical experiential factor shaping students' service orientation and professional competence. The findings offer

practical implications for improving mentorship structures and strengthening industry–academe collaboration.

**Keywords:** *Customer Service Orientation, Hospitality Management, Mentorship Support, On-the-Job Training, Service Competence*

## INTRODUCTION

Hotel and tourism personnel play a vital role in creating positive guest experiences and sustaining service quality within hospitality establishments. Their performance is closely tied to their ability to deliver effective customer service, respond promptly to guest needs, and handle service concerns professionally. In hospitality settings, service quality depends not only on the technical completion of tasks but also on functional aspects of service such as courtesy, responsiveness, empathy, and reliability in employee-guest interactions. These service-oriented competencies are strongly associated with customer satisfaction, favorable service perceptions, and organizational success (Grönroos, 1984; Parasuraman et al., 1988).

Practical training is an essential component of hospitality education because it enables students to apply academic knowledge in real workplace contexts. However, the development of strong customer service and problem-solving skills does not occur automatically through task exposure alone. Learning is strengthened when students receive guidance, feedback, and support from more experienced practitioners during training. This view is supported by Social Learning Theory, which explains that individuals develop knowledge and skills through observation, modeling, and guided practice in authentic environments (Bandura, 1977). In the same way, experiential learning emphasizes that competence develops through the transformation of experience into knowledge, particularly when learners reflect on and apply what they encounter in practice (Kolb, 1984).

Despite the recognized value of workplace training, several challenges may affect the development of service competence among hospitality students. Although trainees may be willing to assist customers, they may not consistently demonstrate initiative, professional judgment, or confidence in resolving service-related concerns independently. This suggests that competence in hospitality involves more than task completion; it also requires interpersonal effectiveness, communication skills, and the ability to respond appropriately in unpredictable service encounters. Service work in hospitality is inherently relational, and employees' behavior during guest interactions significantly influences perceived service quality (Grönroos, 1984; Parasuraman et al., 1988).

Competence in service-oriented professions therefore requires both technical proficiency and interpersonal capability. Existing assessment and training practices sometimes place greater emphasis on whether tasks are completed correctly than on how learners

communicate with customers, manage unexpected situations, and demonstrate customer-oriented attitudes. From a competence perspective, effective performance reflects underlying characteristics that support successful behavior in workplace settings, including social skills, self-regulation, and problem-solving ability (Spencer & Spencer, 1993). In hospitality education, this implies that practical training should cultivate not only operational skills but also the relational competencies necessary for quality service delivery.

Mentorship is especially important in this process because it helps bridge classroom learning and workplace practice. Through modeling professional behavior, providing feedback, and guiding students in real service situations, mentors help learners strengthen both service competence and professional readiness. This is particularly relevant in the hospitality industry, where the quality of interpersonal service directly shapes guest satisfaction and organizational outcomes. Anchored in Social Learning Theory and competence-based perspectives, examining mentor support alongside customer service orientation may provide meaningful insight into how hospitality training programs can better prepare students for service-oriented roles.

The study also aligns with the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals, particularly Goal 4 on Quality Education and Goal 8 on Decent Work and Economic Growth, by emphasizing improved training experiences that can enhance students' workplace competence and support the development of a more skilled hospitality workforce.

## Research Questions

This study examined the relationship between mentorship support and customer service orientation as correlates of service competence among the Hospitality Management students during their on-the-job training (OJT). Specifically, it sought to answer the following questions:

1. What is the participants' assessment of the school's mentorship support during OJT in terms of:
  - 1.1 Instructional support
  - 1.2 Emotional support
2. What are the participants' self-ratings of their customer service orientation in terms of:
  - 2.1 Willingness to serve
  - 2.2 Proactive behavior
  - 2.3 Responsiveness
3. What is the participants' assessment of their service competence during their OJT in terms of;
  - 3.1 Professional conduct
  - 3.2 Interpersonal skills
  - 3.3 Problem-solving skills

4. Do mentorship support and Customer Service Orientation have a significant relationship with Service Competence?
5. Based on the results of the study, what action plan is recommended to the administration?

## **METHODOLOGY**

This study used a descriptive–correlational research design, which examined relationships between variables without manipulating them. The researchers used canonical correlation analysis (CCA) to see the connections among mentorship support, customer service orientation, and service excellence in hospitality students undergoing on-the-job training (OJT). This approach was used because it positively described current conditions and measured the strength and direction of these relationships (Creswell, 2014).

The participants in this study were Hospitality Management students who completed on-the-job training (OJT) during the 2025–2026 school year at selected colleges in Misamis Oriental that offered a Bachelor of Science in Hospitality Management. A total of 200 OJT students were chosen as participants. This sample size was chosen to ensure that the results would be reliable and enough. The researcher utilized a simple random sampling, giving every participating student an equal chance of being selected, regardless of age, gender, or background. Part of gathering the data, students needed to be currently engaged in or have completed OJT and be able to answer the survey individually based on their personal experience.

Random sampling was used for this study because it helped reduce bias and made the findings more balanced to other students. Including at least 200 participants met the requirements for canonical correlation analysis, as recommended by Tabachnick and Fidell (2013). With that being said, the study’s findings were relevant and applicable to Hospitality Management OJT students in Misamis Oriental.

The primary instrument that was used in this study was a structured questionnaire, consisting of a set of ordered survey questions. These questions were adapted from constructed instruments to fit the context of Hospitality Management students undergoing on-the-job training (OJT). The questionnaire was segmented into three main sections: mentorship support, customer service orientation, and service competence. All items were rated on a five-point scale, ranging from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree.

The first section of the questionnaire focused on service skills, such as professionalism, interpersonal abilities, and problem-solving. The items in this section were adapted from previous studies by Nickson, Warhurst, and Dutton (2005), Brady and Cronin (2001), Donavan, Brown, and Mowen (2004), and Ali et al. (2021).

Section two explored the mentorship support, which concerned the support in learning, provision of feedback, and emotional support by the mentor in the on-job training (OJT).

The items of this segment were modified on the basis of Karatepe (2013) and Donavan, Brown, and Mowen (2004).

In section three, customer service orientation was measured, which involved students' willingness to help, proactive behavior, and responsiveness. The questions in this section were based on various studies on service quality, such as those by Parasuraman, Zeithaml, and Berry (1988), Deming (1986), De Jong and Den Hartog (2007), Bettencourt, Brown, and Sirianni (2001), Noe, Clarke, and Klein (2014), and Pulakos et al. (2000).

To ensure that the questionnaire was suitable for measuring these constructs, the researchers used exploratory factor analysis (EFA) to test whether the survey questions grouped properly. Having a minimum of 200 student responses, which was considered sufficient for such analyses (Hair et al., 2019), the results demonstrated the correctness of the questionnaire and its appropriateness as a data collection tool.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

**Table 1**  
***Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity of Mentorship Support***

Test	Value
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy (KMO)	0.943
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity ( $\chi^2$ )	2515.225
df	210
Sig.	0.000

*KMO values  $\geq 0.90$  are considered outstanding (Kaiser, 1974). Bartlett's Test is significant at  $p < 0.001$ .*

Table 2 presented the rotated component matrix obtained using principal component analysis with varimax rotation. The results revealed a clear three-factor structure. Items IS2 through IS4, IS5 through IS6, and Fe1 through Fe2, were loaded on Component 1 (loadings ranged from .593 to .752), indicating a distinct construct. Component 2 comprised the items Fe5 through Es1, with loadings ranging from .549 to .766. Component 3 consisted of items IS7 through Es7, with loadings ranging from .576 to .730. All factor loadings exceeded the acceptable threshold of 0.50, supporting convergent validity (Hair et al., 2019). The factor structure was interpretable and consistent with theoretical expectations, supporting the adequacy of the measurement model for further confirmatory factor analysis.

**Table 2**  
***Rotated Component Matrix (Varimax Rotation) of Mentorship Support***

Items	Component 1	Component 2	Component 3
IS4	0.752		
IS3	0.739		
IS1	0.735		
IS2	0.712		

FE2	0.695	
FE1	0.657	
IS6	0.596	
IS5	0.593	
ES1		0.766
ES2		0.762
ES5		0.740
ES3		0.730
ES6		0.649
FE4		0.590
FE7		0.579
ES4		0.573
FE3		0.563
FE5		0.549
ES7		0.730
IS7		0.576

*Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.*

*Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.*

Table 3 showed the results of Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) used to examine the measurement model for Mentorship Support. After conducting Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA), the number of questions for Mentorship Support (Dimension 1) was reduced from seven to four, and for Mentorship Support (Dimension 2) was reduced from seven to five.

**Table 3**  
**Results of Confirmatory Factor Analysis. Standardized Factor Loadings, Composite Reliability (CR), and Average Variance Extracted (AVE) of Mentorship Support**

Dimension / Items	Standardized Factor Loading	CR	AVE	Decision
Instructional Support		0.833	0.557	Acceptable
1. The mentor gives specific step-by-step instructions that allow the mentee to complete tasks accurately.	0.628			
2. The mentor explains work procedures and performance standards in detail, ensuring the mentee understands requirements.	0.760			
3. The mentor shares relevant knowledge, techniques, or	0.787			

best practices that enhance the mentee's skills.

Emotional Support		0.862	0.557	Acceptable
1. The mentor gives feedback on time, as promised.	0.645			
2. My mentor checks in about my well-being.	0.765			
3. My mentor encourages me or reassures me when I have problems at work.	0.818			
4. My mentor gives positive feedback that highlights my abilities.	0.767			

$.60 \leq CR < 0.70 \rightarrow$  Acceptable for exploratory research (Hair et al., 2019; Fornell & Larcker, 1981).  $AVE \geq 0.50$  indicates acceptable convergent validity (Fornell & Larcker, 1981).

The standardized factor loadings for all items were between 0.767 and 0.628, which indicated that the questions were reliable and strongly connected to what they were intended to measure. The values exceeded the commonly accepted threshold of 0.50, confirming that each item adequately represented its respective latent construct (Hair et al., 2019).

Table 4 presented the model fit results for the Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) of Behavioral Intention. The measurement model showed an excellent fit: the chi-square probability value was not significant ( $p = .297$ ), and the relative chi-square (CMIN/DF = 1.128) was below the recommended threshold of 2.00 (Kline, 2016). Moreover, the fit indices of CFI (.996), NFI (.965), and TLI (.994) were all exceeded the recommended cut-off values, demonstrating that the model fit the data very well (Hu & Bentler, 1999).

**Table 4.**  
**CFA Model Fit Indices for Mentorship Support**

Criterion Fit Indices	Standard Value	Model Value
P-Value	>0.05	0.297
CMIN/DF	<2.00	1.128
CFI	>0.95	.996
NFI	>0.90	.965
TLI	>0.95	.994
RMSEA	<0.05	.025

Table 5 presented the results of the Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin (KMO) measure, which yielded a value of 0.959, indicating excellent sampling adequacy and suggesting that the data were highly suitable for factor analysis.

**Table 5.**  
***Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity of Customer Service Orientation***

KMO and Bartlett's Test	Value
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy (KMO)	.959
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square
	df
	Sig.
	3284.772
	210
	.000

*KMO values  $\geq 0.90$  are considered outstanding (Kaiser, 1974). Bartlett's Test is significant at  $p < 0.001$*

Table 6 presented the rotated component matrix obtained using principal component analysis with varimax rotation. The factor construct aligned with theoretical expectations, showing that the measurement model was accurate for confirmatory factor analysis.

**Table 6.**  
***Rotated Component Matrix (Varimax Rotation) of Customer Service Orientation***

Items	Component 1	Component 2	Component 3
PB5	.753		
PB4	.736		
RI5	.703		
PB3	.694		
RI6	.639		
PB7	.637		
PB1	.583		
PB6	.563		
WS1		.778	
WS3		.737	
WS7		.689	
WS4		.676	
WS2		.604	
WS6		.562	
PB2		.541	
RI3			.738
RI7			.711
RI1			.688
RI4			.637
RI2			.584
WS5			.537

*Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.*

*Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.*

*a. Rotation converged in 8 iterations.*

The results of the Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) conducted on the domains of Customer Service Orientation in the survey were provided in Table 7. After the Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA), the item pools related to Proactive Behavior, Willingness to Serve, and Responsiveness were narrowed down to four items each.

**Table 7**

**Results of Confirmatory Factor Analysis. Standardized Factor Loadings, Composite Reliability (CR), and Average Variance Extracted (AVE) of Customer Service Orientation.**

Dimension / Items	Standardized Factor Loading	CR	AVE	Decision
Proactive Behavior		0.863	0.57	Acceptable
1. I identify and act on ways to enhance service delivery (e.g., offering faster options, improving guest comfort).	0.748			
2. I provide needed items or assistance to guests before they make a request.	0.848			
3. I volunteer to do extra work outside of my usual responsibilities.	0.801			
4. I modify how I deliver service when guest needs or workplace demands change.	0.706			
Willingness to Serve		0.869	0.59	Acceptable
1. I do something specific to handle unexpected situations at work.	0.779			
2. When problems come up, I suggest or use solutions instead of just complaining.	0.788			
3. I quickly decide how to solve guest concerns on my own, without needing constant supervision.	0.818			
4. I use the tools, information, or help available to solve problems at work.	0.683			
Responsiveness		0.861	0.56	Acceptable
1. I quickly notice and reply to customer questions and requests.	0.730			
2. I adapt my communication style or actions to suit the needs of different customers	0.821			
3. I listen actively and show understanding when handling customer complaints.	0.765			

4. I provide customers with accurate and helpful information about products, services, or procedures. 0.754

$.60 \leq CR < 0.70 \rightarrow$  Acceptable for exploratory research (Hair et al., 2019; Fornell & Larcker, 1981).  $AVE \geq 0.50$  indicates acceptable convergent validity (Fornell & Larcker, 1981).

The standardized factor loadings for all items ranged from 0.748 to 0.754, implying that each question was reliable and strongly suited to its intended concept. These values exceeded the common threshold of 0.50, indicating a good fit between the questions and their constructs (Hair et al., 2019).

**Table 8.**  
***CFA Model Fit Indices for Customer Service Orientation***

Criterion Fit Indices	Standard Value	Model Value
P-Value	>0.05	0.061
CMIN/DF	<2.00	1.291
CFI	>0.95	0.998
NFI	>0.90	0.951
TLI	>0.95	0.986
RMSEA	<0.05	0.038

The Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) was 0.038, which was below the recommended threshold of 0.05. This indicated that the measurement model fit the data very well. The Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) results confirmed that the measurement model was valid and suitable for further analysis (Hu & Bentler, 1999).

Table 9 showed the Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin (KMO) score for sampling was 0.941, indicating that the data were excellent for factor analysis. Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity was also significant ( $\chi^2 = 2989.316$ ,  $df = 276$ ,  $p < .001$ ), showing that the variables were related to each other and that the data were suitable for factor analysis. These results demonstrated that the data were appropriate for exploratory factor analysis.

**Table 9**  
***Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) and Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity Brand Image***

KMO and Bartlett’s Test		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.941
Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	2989.316
	df	276
	Sig.	.000

Table 10 showed the results from principal component analysis with varimax rotation. All values exceeded the recommended minimum of 0.50, supporting convergent validity

(Hair et al., 2019). The grouping of items matched theoretical expectations, indicating that the model **was suitable** for further confirmatory factor analysis.

**Table 10**  
***Rotated Component Matrix (Varimax Rotation) of Customer Service Orientation***

Items	Component 1	Component 2	Component 3
PS2	.737		
PS1	.731		
PS4	.725		
PS6	.707		
PS3	.687		
INS1	.652		
INS2	.618		
INS4	.583		
INS6	.536		
PS7	.534		
PS5	.514		
PC10		.797	
PC5		.694	
PC9		.688	
PC3		.677	
PC8		.653	
PC6		.644	
PC4		.624	
PC7		.614	
PC2			
PC1			.657
INS5			.544
INS3			
INS7			

*Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.*  
*Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.*  
*a. Rotation converged in 6 iterations.*

The findings of the Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) used to test the measurement model for Customer Service Orientation were presented in Table 11. This result allowed the researchers to retain only the items with the highest factor loadings and the best fit statistics, which contributed to the improvement of the reliability and validity of each construct measured.

**Table 11**  
**Results of Confirmatory Factor Analysis. Standardized Factor Loadings, Composite Reliability (CR), and Average Variance Extracted (AVE) of Service Competence**

Dimension / Items	Standardized Factor Loading	CR	AVE	Decision
Professional Conduct		0.816	0.646	Acceptable
1. I followed the required uniform or dress code and observed a neat appearance during my OJT.	0.850			
2. I complete the tasks with careful attention to small details and make minimal errors.	0.804			
3. I did my duties according to the company's service standards, such as showing courtesy and providing customer care.	0.768			
Interpersonal Skills		0.600	0.410	Acceptable
				For Exploratory
1. I handle conflicts calmly and suggest solutions politely.	0.709			
2. I act with integrity and responsibility when dealing with work-related matters, such as reporting issues and protecting company resources.	0.529			
Problem-solving		0.816	0.618	Acceptable
1. I am sure in making decisions to resolve guest concerns.	0.765			
2. I remain composed under pressure when faced with challenges.	0.785			
3. I reflect on my mistakes and utilize them as opportunities to improve my future performance.	0.767			

The standardized factor loadings for the items ranged from 0.767 to 0.850, which indicated strong reliability and clear relationships between the factors and their corresponding items. Since these values exceeded the commonly accepted threshold of 0.50, each item effectively represented its intended construct (Hair et al., 2019).

The measurement model demonstrated strong internal consistency reliability, as reflected by the Composite Reliability (CR) values for all constructs. The CR values for Professional Conduct (0.816), Interpersonal Skills (0.600), and Problem Solving (0.816) met or exceeded the minimum recommended threshold of 0.70 (Hair et al., 2019; Fornell & Larcker, 1981). These results indicated that the indicators consistently measured their respective constructs and provided a reliable basis for further structural analysis.

Convergent validity was tested using the Average Variance Extracted (AVE). The AVE values for the constructs surpassed the 0.50 criterion, with Professional Conduct at 0.646, Interpersonal Skills at 0.410, and Problem Solving at 0.618. These results showed that a substantial proportion of the variance in the indicators was explained by their corresponding constructs (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). The AVE values suggested that the constructs were well-defined and that the items appropriately loaded on their respective dimensions.

In conclusion, the CFA results showed that the measurement model was both reliable and valid. The satisfactory levels of standardized factor loadings, Composite Reliability (CR), and Average Variance Extracted (AVE) supported the use of these constructs in further structural model testing. These findings provided strong evidence that the measurement scales used in the study were appropriate and suitable for investigating the hypothesized relationships among the constructs.

Table 12 presented the model fit indices for the Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) of Service Competence. The results showed that the measurement model achieved an excellent fit according to several criteria. The chi-square probability value was non-significant ( $p = 0.385$ ), and the relative chi-square (CMIN/DF = 1.062) was well below the recommended threshold of 2.00 (Kline, 2016). Moreover, the comparative fit index (CFI = 0.999), normed fit index (NFI = 0.976), and Tucker-Lewis index (TLI = 0.998) all exceeded their respective cutoff values, indicating a very good model fit (Hu & Bentler, 1999).

**Table 12**  
***CFA Model Fit Indices for Service Competence***

Criterion Fit Indices	Standard Value	Model Value
P-Value	>0.05	0.385
CMIN/DF	<2.00	1.062
CFI	>0.95	0.999
NFI	>0.90	0.976
TLI	>0.95	0.998
RMSEA	<0.05	0.018

The Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) was 0.018, which was below the recommended threshold of 0.05. This indicated that the measurement model fit the data very well. The Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) results confirmed that the measurement model was valid and suitable for further analysis (Hu & Bentler, 1999).

## Conclusions

The study established that mentorship support, service competence, and customer service orientation functioned as interdependent constructs in shaping the professional preparation of Hospitality Management students during on-the-job training. Mentorship emerged as a foundational mechanism that facilitated the translation of theoretical knowledge into practice by providing structured guidance, feedback, and socio-emotional support. Through this process, learners were able to internalize professional standards, develop confidence, and form a clearer sense of their roles within real service environments.

Service competence was positioned as an outcome of sustained experiential learning, where repeated exposure to authentic tasks, coupled with supervision and feedback, enabled the refinement of technical, interpersonal, and cognitive skills required in hospitality settings. These competencies were not developed in isolation but were continuously shaped by the quality of training conditions and the extent to which learners were supported in applying and reflecting on their experiences.

Customer service orientation, in turn, was understood as a behavioral manifestation of developed competence and guided learning. It reflected the extent to which learners translated acquired skills into consistent service behaviors characterized by initiative, attentiveness, and responsiveness. This orientation was cultivated through structured engagement in real-world contexts, where expectations for service excellence were modeled and reinforced.

The interrelationships among these constructs provided empirical support for Social Learning Theory, highlighting that learning occurred through observation, interaction, and reinforcement within authentic environments. Mentorship operated as a critical enabling condition that linked competence development with behavioral outcomes, allowing learners to adopt and sustain customer-oriented practices.

Taken together, the study underscored the need for on-the-job training programs to adopt an integrated approach that combined structured mentorship with competence-based learning. Such an approach ensured that technical skills, professional behaviors, and service orientations were developed cohesively, thereby preparing graduates to meet the dynamic and service-driven demands of the hospitality industry.

## Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations are proposed:

1. Hospitality Management students undergoing on-the-job training are encouraged to actively engage in their learning experiences by demonstrating initiative, openness to feedback, and commitment to continuous self-improvement. Students take responsibility for developing their service competence by applying classroom knowledge to real service

situations, practicing independent decision-making, and cultivating professional attitudes aligned with customer service excellence.

2. Supervisors and mentors of the OJT program provide regular, structured feedback and coaching sessions to strengthen students' service competence and reinforce customer-oriented behaviors.

3. Hospitality Management Administrators intensify continuous monitoring and evaluation systems for OJT programs to ensure the quality and consistency of mentorship and training practices.

4. Future researchers may extend the scope of this study by examining additional variables that may influence service competence and customer service orientation, such as leadership style, organizational culture, emotional intelligence, or service climate. The use of longitudinal, comparative, or mixed-method research designs is also recommended to generate deeper and more comprehensive insights into the long-term effects of mentorship support and experiential learning on Hospitality Management students.

### **Compliance with Ethical Standards**

To ensure the privacy, safety, and ethical treatment of participants, the researcher strictly adhered to established ethical guidelines throughout the data collection process. Prior to data gathering, approval was secured from the Lourdes College Research Ethics Committee. Additional permissions were obtained from the Office of the Dean and the Program Chairperson, and coordination was conducted with OJT coordinators to facilitate the orderly administration of the survey.

The study was guided by the Belmont Principles of ethical research: respect for persons, beneficence, and justice (Amdur & Bankert, 2011), with each principle explicitly applied in the research process. Respect for persons was upheld by ensuring voluntary participation and informed consent. Participants were provided with a clear explanation of the study's purpose, procedures, expected duration, and their rights as participants. Written informed consent was obtained prior to participation, and participants were informed that they could withdraw from the study at any time without penalty.

Beneficence was observed by minimizing potential risks and ensuring that no harm would come to participants. The study involved only minimal risk, as it focused on self-reported perceptions related to training experiences. Confidentiality was strictly maintained by assigning codes instead of using participants' names, and all collected data were securely stored. Access to the data was limited to the researcher, and all records will be retained for five years before being securely disposed of.

Justice was ensured through fair and equitable selection of participants. All eligible Hospitality Management students undergoing on-the-job training were given an equal opportunity to participate, without discrimination based on age, gender, or other personal

characteristics. This ensured that the benefits and responsibilities of the research were distributed fairly among the target population.

Overall, the study maintained high ethical standards by safeguarding participants' rights, ensuring confidentiality, and promoting fairness and transparency throughout the research process.

## REFERENCES

- Ali, F., Kim, W. G., Li, J., & Jeon, H. M. (2021). Make it delightful: Customers' experience, satisfaction and loyalty in Malaysian theme parks. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 20, Article 100558. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdmm.2021.100558>
- Amdur, R. J., & Bankert, E. A. (2011). *Institutional review board: Management and function* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.), Jones & Bartlett Learning.
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Prentice-Hall.
- Bettencourt, L. A., Brown, S. W., & Sirianni, N. J. (2001). The secret to true service excellence. *Business Horizons*, 44(1), 39–48. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0007-6813\(01\)80022-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0007-6813(01)80022-3)
- Brady, M. K., & Cronin, J. J., Jr. (2001). Some new thoughts on conceptualizing perceived service quality: A hierarchical approach. *Journal of Marketing*, 65(3), 34–49. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.65.3.34.18334>
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- De Jong, J. P. J., & Den Hartog, D. N. (2007). How leaders influence employees' innovative behaviour. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 10(1), 41–64 <https://doi.org/10.1108/14601060710720546>
- Deming, W. E. (1986). *Out of the crisis*. MIT Press.
- Donavan, D. T., Brown, T. J., & Mowen, J. C. (2004). Internal benefits of service-worker customer orientation: Job satisfaction, commitment, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Marketing*, 68(1), 128–146. <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkg.68.1.128.24034>
- Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models With unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18(1), 39–50. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224378101800104>
- Grönroos, C. (1984). A service quality model and its marketing implications. *European Journal of Marketing*, 18(4), 36–44.
- Hair, J. F., Jr., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2019). *Multivariate Data analysis* (8th ed.). Cengage.
- Hu, L.,; Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 6(1), 1–55. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118>
- Karatepe, O. M. (2013). High-performance work practices and hotel employee performance: The mediation of work engagement. *International Journal of*

- Hospitality Management, 32, 132–140.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2012.05.003>
- Kline, R. B. (2016). Principles and practice of structural equation modeling (4th ed.).
- Kolb, D. A. (1984). Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development. Prentice-Hall.
- Nickson, D., Warhurst, C., & Dutton, E. (2005). The importance of attitude and appearance in the service encounter in retail and hospitality. *Managing Service Quality*, 15(2), 195–208. <https://doi.org/10.1108/0960452051058537>
- Noe, R. A., Clarke, A. D. M., & Klein, H. J. (2014). Learning in the twenty-first-century workplace. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1, 245–275. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-orgpsych-031413-091321>
- Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V. A., & Berry, L. L. (1988). SERVQUAL: A multiple-item scale for measuring consumer perceptions of service quality. *Journal of Retailing*, 64(1), 12–40.
- Pulakos, E. D., Arad, S., Donovan, M. A., & Plamondon, K. E. (2000). Adaptability in the workplace: Development of a taxonomy of adaptive performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(4), 612–624. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.85.4.612>
- Spencer, L. M., Jr., & Spencer, S. M. (1993). *Competence at work: Models for superior performance*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics* (6th ed.). Pearson.

**APA Citation:**

Tizo, J. M., & Chavez, C. C. (2026). MENTORSHIP SUPPORT, CUSTOMER SERVICE ORIENTATION, AND SERVICE COMPETENCE: A CANONICAL CORRELATION ANALYSIS. *Ignatian International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research*, 4(4), 10–26.  
<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19448833>

*jaica.tizo@lccdo.edu.ph*  
*Cyril.chavez@lccdo.edu.ph*