Journal of Advanced Research in Education
ISSN 2709-3980
www.paradigmpress.org/jare
Volume 5 Number 3 September 2026

Assessing the Listening Process of Hospitality Management Students: Implications for Industry Readiness

Charles Darwin Samonte[1] & Mark Kevin Astrero[1]

[1] Northeastern College, Santiago City, Isabela, Philippines
Correspondence: Mark Kevin Astrero, Northeastern College, Santiago City, Isabela, Philippines.

doi:10.63593/JARE.2026.09.02

Abstract

Listening, recognized as the most critical communication competency for service quality, remains unfamiliar as a discrete, multi-stage domain in the hospitality education sector. In this respect, this paper sought to ascertain the level of listening process achievement of BSHM students at a private college in the Philippines. The research was facilitated by the use of a questionnaire with 50 items designed with reference to the five stages of listening developed by DeVito. The data collected from the research were analyzed with the help of the Jamovi package. It was established that there was a generally High level of listening among students (M = 3.59, SD = 0.58; α = .98). In addition, female students had higher scores in receiving, understanding, and responding ($p < .05$; small effects), but, most importantly, academic performance could be regarded as a predicator of the level of listening (η^2p = .04–.06).

Keywords: listening process, hospitality management education, communication competence, DeVito's five-stage model, academic performance, service readiness

1. Introduction

Hospitality can be labeled as a people-driven market, meaning that value is created essentially in real time through interaction between guests and frontline workers: the efficiency of this process depends on how well workers can listen. Listening appears among the most important communicative skills in studies of hospitality and tourism management graduates conducted by industry employers (Bagon et al, 2023). Brownell (1994) also indicates that listening is considered the most important communication competence by hotel managers, whose skills evolve with their career growth. Despite its acknowledged significance, listening is seldom presented in hospitality studies but is integrated into general communication skills courses that focus mainly on speaking and writing (Deale & Lee, 2021; Villadiego et al., 2023).

In the context of the Philippines BSHM specifically, this discrepancy is important since students would be required to heed and carry out vocal instructions from their authorities, comprehend requests from visitors who might have an accent or talk in a foreign language, and be able to recall a lot of service standards without having their instructions written down. The curriculum, while recognizing the importance of

listening in general communication, does not view it as an ability that can be identified and developed in a focused way and thus risks producing students who know how to talk and communicate well but have no idea how to listen, which is arguably the crucial part of communication when it comes to satisfying clients and avoiding mistakes.

This imbalance is significant for the simple reason that listening is not a single action; rather, it is an aggregate of stages in the process of listening, some proficient, others not. According to DeVito (2000), listening consists of five stages that progress through a four-step process: comprehension (receiving the information), understanding (what is implied by it), remembering (keeping the information in mind), evaluating (what it costs), and responding (giving feedback). Brownell's HURIER model of hearing, understanding, remembering, interpreting, evaluating, and responding was developed on the basis of empirical studies of hotel managers, pointing thus again to the natural development of the idea that listening may consist of stages in the field of hospitality (Brownell, 1994). Thus, evaluating students according to such a model gives an operational advantage over evaluation tests based on the principles of subjective estimation of communication competence, as it indicates not only the degree of listening ratio of the students but also their proficiency in each of the five stages of listening.

There are two more factors in the Philippine context. First, in the Philippines, BSHM courses usually include participants from different regions who speak various languages; the impact of this diversity on listening comprehension is an important issue but needs to be explored further when developing the curriculum. Second, the use of smartphones in classes has recently been associated with a decline in students' engagement and retention of lectures and failure in their studies (Agostini & Petrucco, 2023; Pew Research Center, 2024; Rutgers University, 2026), which refers to the receiving component that is described in DeVito's model and discussing the subject matter of the tool that is applied in the present research.

Based on these knowledge gaps, this study pursues five objectives:

1) to explore demographic features of BSHM participants;
2) to assess how well the listening process was performed overall and by stage;
3) to examine sex-, age-, first language-, and academic achievement-related differences in the listening process;
4) to find out how the listening process affects academic achievement;
5) to check whether the stages of the listening process have predictive power in relation to academic success.

This study will strive to be methodologically advanced and at the same time practically useful, as its findings will be discussed in relation to the industry.

2. Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

2.1 The Listening Process as a Multi-Stage Construct

Communication research has always made a clear distinction between hearing, the physical process of perceiving sounds, and listening, which requires us to pay attention, process the information we hear, and respond (DeVito, 2000). DeVito's model is based on the principle that we should think about listening as a sequence of processes, and if we cannot succeed at one process, we will fail at the next ones as well: the listener cannot understand a message that he/she has not perceived, and inability to understand the message leads to memory problems, biased evaluations, and incorrect responses. Since the model implies that each stage of the listening process is different behaviorally, it is possible to measure listening processes separately, which is what is being done by the tool used in this research (10 items for each stage, 50 items in total).

An analogous model, known as HURIER, has been devised by Brownell, having been based on observing people in hospitality, as well as business, sectors (Brownell, 1994). The coincidence of a general communications model developed under DeVito and a model specifically for hospitality establishments formulated by Brownell supports the application of the stage-based mechanism in the analysis and evaluation of the listening process, rather than using just one global score of listening level.

2.2 Listening as a Hospitality Service Competency

In the area of research on service recovery, active listening refers to allowing the customer to share their grievance prior to responding and has been

positively demonstrated to result in positive outcomes for customers, including greater satisfaction and tips, as well as an overall sense of being treated with respect. Since service outages are not uncommon in hospitality, the ability of service personnel to hear, comprehend, and respond to the customer's complaint is a clear and visible factor in initiating the service recovery process. Just by itself, this realization gives an additional practical reason to treat listening as a skill which should be evaluated by hospitality schools on purpose instead of taking it for granted that the students possess this skill already.

2.3 Listening and Academic Performance

The connection between listening and academic performance in college students is not well researched but tends to be positive. Eggenberger (2021) showed that the use of an established employability-skills instrument for the measurement of active listening ability has predictive power in the case of low-achieving community college students who they believe to be successful because of their listening skills. At the same time, findings from research in this area are not consistent. The magnitude of the association between listening and academic success does not seem to be especially large, which means that listening is only one factor of academic success among many. Research literature on classroom mobile phone use and its negative correlation with cognitive performance provides complementary evidence to such investigations (Agostini & Petrucco, 2023; Pew Research Center, 2024; Rutgers University, 2026). Since a number of items in the current survey's receiving scale are oriented towards mobile phones and devices, this proves that mobile phone use is potentially connected to the current research problem.

2.4 Communication Skill Gaps Among Hospitality Students

Recent studies from the Philippines and Southeast Asia have yielded similar conclusions about HTM students' oral communication skills, including listening. Specifically, they suggest that the skills often receive only moderate or intermediate ratings, while students tend to indicate in surveys that they are fairly confident in skills such as working with clients (Bagon et al., 2023; Villadiego et al., 2023). Reading-related research has shown that hospitality students also fail to consistently engage in receptive language practices and that their levels of engagement are linked to academic performance. This is further evidence that receptive competencies tend to be developed less than expressive ones in HTM programs (Deale & Lee, 2021). Overall, this body of literature allows the authors of this study to argue that introducing a listening assessment with sophisticated criteria for measuring perceived skills among BSHM students is expected to fill existing gaps and provide relevant inputs into curriculum development processes.

2.5 Measuring Listening: Self-Report Instruments and Their Limitations

There are many reasons why, like the current study, previously conducted significant studies on listening used self-report Likert type instruments instead of real behavior testing: first and foremost is the practical aspect since actual measure approaches (e.g., requiring test participants to remember or paraphrase a recording they hear) require huge expenditures and are pretty much impossible, especially on classroom/programmatic tests; also, while self-report instruments are practical and can be used in some studies in order to distinguish hearing and remembering and understanding the received information, they measure the way a person perceives his/her hearing and are also subject to social desirability bias. This distinction is crucial when interpreting the findings of the present research since a high self-reported level of hearing indicates that students believe that they demonstrate good listening skills all the time, but does not mean that other people will agree with this or that objective assessments (i.e., performance measures) will prove it in the same way. Previous studies indicated that there is no correspondence between self-reported and performance measures of hearing in the majority of studies included in the research process.

2.6 Demographic Correlates of Listening

Research has shown conflicting results regarding sex-based differences in listening abilities and associated skills such as reading and language skills. Some studies concluded that females perform better when it comes to language-related activities, while other studies could not establish any differences after filtering out other confounding factors (Villadiego et al., 2023). Research on the impact of first language or mother tongue on listening disposition in multilingual settings is scarce, and there are very

few studies of this kind other than the ones related to English as a foreign language. This research provides new evidence on both issues by focusing on a specific population – the Philippine BSHM representative sample, which consists of speakers of different languages, i.e., Filipino, Iloco, Visaya, English, and other local languages.

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Design

The researcher employed a quantitative, descriptive-correlational, cross-sectional survey method in this research study. Descriptive statistics were used to indicate the degree, while correlational and comparative statistics explored the association between the two variables. There was no experimental manipulation; causative inference does not follow from the correlation results.

3.2 Respondents and Sampling

The sample included 314 officially enrolled BSHM students in Northeastern College, a private higher education institution in the Philippines, who volunteered to participate from late July to early August 2026 during the data collection period. In this study, the sampling method that was employed was convenience sampling. A survey link was disseminated to all current BSHM students, and responses were captured only from those who expressed their willingness to participate. As a result, it created a non-probability sample, which should be used with caution when generalizing findings.

3.3 Research Instrument

In this study, listening was assessed by means of a questionnaire consisting of 50 questions divided into five subscales as per DeVito's (2000) stages of listening - Receiving/Attending, Understanding, Remembering, Evaluating, and Responding. This questionnaire was developed by the researcher, and the responses were obtained by using a five-point Likert scale ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree," with higher scores indicating higher levels of listening.

Additionally, a demographic section was included comprising sex, age group, mother-tongue of family, and academic achievement.

The instrument's content coverage has been constructed so that it can be compared on a one-to-one basis to DeVito's (2000) ability stages; for instance, Receiving/Attending refers to the concept of focus on the event, and clarity of the event instead of distractions caused by devices used for communication; Understanding concerns grasping the meanings, both literal and figurative; Remembering refers to remembering the most important facts and directions; Evaluating refers to distinguishing facts from opinions, and assessing credibility of the message source; and Responding is about verbal and nonverbal feedback.

3.4 Data Gathering Procedure and Ethical Considerations

The survey was taken online. Participation was voluntary, and communication, along with any personal information other than contact email for administrative purposes, was anonymous, since the email was taken off at the time of analysis and is not included in this paper. Participants were informed in advance about the purpose of the research, and their knowledge about it implies their acceptance of the conditions.

3.5 Statistical Treatment

The data analysis was conducted using Jamovi, an open-source platform for statistics based on R, using the analytical methods implemented in the JMV analysis modules (Şahin & Aybek, 2020). The demographic characteristics were summarized using descriptive statistics. The mean and standard deviation were used to obtain the indexes of the listening process with reference to a five-point range, i.e., (4.20-5.00 = Very High; 3.40-4.19 = High; 2.60-3.39 = Moderate; 1.80-2.59 = Low; 1.00-1.79 = Very Low). The internal consistency of all subscales and of the tool was obtained by Cronbach's alpha. The recommended approach for interpretation is that while using the alpha value with 95% confidence intervals, one must treat the alpha value as evidence of internal consistency.

The Shapiro-Wilk test was utilized to evaluate the normality of subscale distributions; with the sample size of 314 individuals, the Central Limit Theorem was applied so that parametric methods could be used despite the finding of significant deviation from normality. Testing for differences due to gender was performed using independent-samples t tests, with Levene's test being used to determine which version of t-test to use, while Cohen's d was reported. Age group, language background, and academic performance group differences were evaluated using one-way ANOVA with eta-squared as a measure of effect size and Tukey's HSD being

employed for post hoc tests if the omnibus result was significant; associations among five listening dimensions were evaluated using Pearson r; association between listening level and academic performance group (treated as ordinal) was measured using Spearman's rho. Finally, a multiple linear regression analysis was performed to check whether five listening dimensions entered into the regression together have a significant effect on academic performance. The statistical significance level was set at $\alpha = 0.05$ for all conducted tests.

4. Results

4.1 Demographic Profile

The demographic profile of the 314 respondents is outlined in Table 1. In this sample, the number of females (62.4%) is greater than that of males, and many of the respondents (57.6%) fall in the 19–21 age group. Most respondents (67.5%) speak Filipino or Tagalog at home, and the rest (32.5%) communicate in Iloco, Visaya, English, and other local dialects. The respondents' academic results are distributed primarily in the 85–89 and 90–100 general average categories (43.6% and 30.3%, respectively), with a very small percentage (3.5%) scoring below 80.

Table 1. Demographic Profile of Respondents

Characteristic	f	%
Sex		
Female	196	62.4
Male	118	37.6
Age Bracket		
16–18	103	32.8
19–21	181	57.6
22 and above	30	9.6
Family's First Language		
Filipino/Tagalog	212	67.5
Iloco	30	9.6
Visaya	29	9.2
English	26	8.3
Other local dialects	17	5.4
Academic Performance (General Average)		
90–100	95	30.3
85–89	137	43.6
80–85	71	22.6
Below 80	11	3.5

4.2 Level of the Listening Process

Table 2 shows the mean score of the listening process as categorized into different dimensions. All five dimensions and the overall composite score fell into the High category, ranging from 3.40 to 4.19, showing that most respondents regarded themselves as practicing the behavior associated with all stages of the process quite frequently, yet not always. The dimension Responding (M = 3.67, SD = 0.67) and the dimension Receiving/Attending (M = 3.66, SD = 0.67) had almost the same rating score as the third dimension Remembering (M = 3.47, SD = 0.63), which had the lowest score among the five dimensions. The difference between the maximum and minimum score, however, did not exceed 0.20 points on the scale.

Table 2. Level of the Listening Process by Dimension

Dimension	k	M	SD	Descriptive Level
Receiving/Attending	10	3.66	0.67	High
Understanding	10	3.55	0.64	High
Remembering	10	3.47	0.63	High
Evaluating	10	3.60	0.66	High
Responding	10	3.67	0.67	High
Overall Listening Process	50	3.59	0.58	High

4.3 Reliability of the Instrument

According to Table 3, internal-consistency estimates were successful in coming up with results greater than the accepted mark of .70. The sub-scale produced α values between .90 and .94 while the overall scale sees α equal to .98. Also, while Taber (2018) warns that very high values of alpha should not be seen as sufficient proof of differentiation in the instrument, we consider this finding alongside the intercorrelation analysis that is discussed below and shows that indeed the five sub-scales do share noticeable variance.

Table 3. Internal Consistency of the Listening Process Subscales

Scale	k	Cronbach's α	95% CI
Receiving/Attending	10	.90	[.88, .92]
Understanding	10	.91	[.90, .93]
Remembering	10	.91	[.90, .93]
Evaluating	10	.94	[.93, .95]
Responding	10	.92	[.91, .94]
Overall Scale	50	.98	[.97, .98]

4.4 Differences by Sex

Independent-samples t-test findings comparing male and female participants are elaborated in Table 4. The results show that female respondents showed much higher levels in the areas of Receiving/Attending, t(312) = -2.04, p = .042, d = -0.24; Understanding, t(312) = -2.07, p = .039, d = -0.24; Responding, t(312) = -2.40, p = .017, d = -0.28; and the Overall composite, t(312) = -2.08, p = .038, d = -0.24. There were no significant differences in Remembering (p = .074) and Evaluating (p = .317). The strength of all vast differences was small.

Table 4. Independent-Samples t-Test for Listening Dimensions by Sex

Dimension	Male M (SD)	Female M (SD)	t(312)	p	Cohen's d
Receiving/Attending	3.56 (0.74)	3.72 (0.62)	-2.04	.042*	-0.24
Understanding	3.45 (0.70)	3.61 (0.59)	-2.07	.039*	-0.24
Remembering	3.39 (0.70)	3.52 (0.58)	-1.79	.074	-0.21
Evaluating	3.55 (0.69)	3.62 (0.63)	-1.00	.317	-0.12
Responding	3.55 (0.71)	3.74 (0.64)	-2.40	.017*	-0.28
Overall Listening Process	3.50 (0.63)	3.64 (0.55)	-2.08	.038*	-0.24

4.5 Differences by Age Bracket, First Language, and Academic Performance

Table 5 presents the findings from one-way ANOVA for the remaining three grouping variables. It showed no statistically significant difference regarding listening levels based on age bracket (all p > .47) or family language (all

p > .20). In contrast, academic bracket showed meaningful statistical differences in all four dimensions as well as for the composite score using small to moderate effect sizes (η^2p = .04 to .06).

Table 5. One-Way ANOVA Results for Listening Dimensions by Age Bracket, First Language, and Academic Performance

Dimension	F (Age)	p	F (Language)	p	F (Acad. Perf.)	p	η^2p (Acad. Perf.)
Receiving/Attending	0.66	.517	0.21	.931	5.09	.002**	.047
Understanding	0.70	.497	1.31	.265	5.63	.001**	.052
Remembering	0.75	.475	0.54	.707	6.53	<.001**	.059
Evaluating	0.10	.901	1.43	.223	5.21	.002**	.048
Responding	0.01	.986	1.49	.206	4.47	.004**	.041
Overall Listening Process	0.32	.730	0.99	.413	6.55	<.001**	.060

*Note. df(Age) = 2, 311; df(Language) = 4, 309; df(Academic Performance) = 3, 310. ** p < .01.*

According to Tukey's HSD post-hoc analysis for the overall listening process by academic performance level, students from the 90-100 category (M = 3.79) performed better than students in the 85-89 category (M = 3.51, p = .001), students from the 80-85 range (M = 3.51, p = .010), and students from the below-80s category (M = 3.28, p = .024). All other pair-wise comparisons failed to yield significance, including that between the 80-85 and 85-89 groups (p = .999) and comparisons involving below-80s group and the two bottom brackets, (p > .56 for both cases). The overall trend that characterizes the situation, i.e. the top-performing group being distinguished among the rest, has been identified when comparing all the dimensions mentioned above.

4.6 Relationships Among the Listening Dimensions and with Academic Performance

The data provided in Table 6 show that there is a strong positive correlation between the five listening dimensions, with correlation coefficients ranging from .68 to .82 and p-values lower than .001. This implies that students who performed well on one dimension also performed well on other dimensions of listening. The overall high alpha mentioned earlier suggests that the instrument measures a generic listening competence, in addition to providing data on five independent dimensions of listening.

Table 6. Intercorrelation Matrix Among the Five Listening Dimensions (Pearson r)

Dimension	1	2	3	4	5
1. Receiving/Attending	—				
2. Understanding	.81	—			
3. Remembering	.73	.75	—		
4. Evaluating	.68	.75	.76	—	
5. Responding	.73	.74	.75	.82	—

Note. All correlations significant at p < .001.

The Spearman correlations between the listening dimensions and the level of academic performance were positive and statistically significant but were of a small value: Receiving/Attending, ϱ = .15, p = .010; Understanding, ϱ = .19, p = .001; Remembering, ϱ = .25, p < .001; Evaluating, ϱ = .19, p = .001; Responding, ϱ = .19, p = .001; Overall listening process, ϱ = .21, p < .001. Remembering had the strongest relationship with academic performance among the dimensions.

4.7 Predicting Academic Performance from the Listening Dimensions

A multiple linear regression analysis aimed to identify whether all five dimensions of listening, when taken simultaneously, could give rise to an effect on learning (which was converted into a numerical figure). The general model was significant but explained a little variance (R^2 = 0.06, adjusted R^2 = 0.04, F (5, 308) = 3.89, p = 0.002). Despite that, it appears that none of the dimensions on their own could demonstrate a significant impact on learning at the .05 level. In contrast, other dimensions are controlled for (see Table 7), including Remembering, which had the biggest coefficient, b = 1.46. Testing five predictors led to the conclusion that multicollinearity is present between the listening dimensions, since they explain 46%-67% of their variance among one another (r^2 = $.68^2$ - $.82^2$). Therefore, the model cannot tell which predictor contributes to learning.

Table 7. Multiple Linear Regression Predicting Academic Performance from the Five Listening Dimensions

Predictor	b	SE	t	p
(Constant)	80.51	1.82	44.15	<.001
Receiving/Attending	-0.37	0.81	-0.46	.647
Understanding	0.87	0.90	0.97	.335
Remembering	1.46	0.83	1.75	.081
Evaluating	0.00	0.88	0.00	.998
Responding	0.19	0.85	0.22	.826

Note. R^2 = .06, adjusted R^2 = .04, F(5, 308) = 3.89, p = .002. Dependent variable: academic performance, recoded to bracket midpoint (below 80 = 75; 80–85 = 82.5; 85–89 = 87; 90–100 = 95).

5. Discussion

In line with the initial prediction of this research, the role of listening in the opinion of the respondents from BSHM was valued as High, instead of Very High, at every step of the model proposed by DeVito (2000). The fact that this value is below the highest possible category is, in itself, meaningful: the results imply that students correctly identify listening behavior as something positive, even if they do not execute it completely automatically. The lowest rated component, namely Remembering, is consistent with the general principle found in the literature on listening that states that this component is the weakest stage of the listening process since it is reliant on the successful performance of the first two stages (DeVito, 2000); if a student has been distracted or misinterpreted what was said, he/she will not be able to remember the message at this moment. The fact that this component correlates highly with academic success in our sample (ϱ = .25) proves its importance in practice; anything that hampers students' ability to remember what they heard in class can also hinder listening in the workplace.

The minor yet steady women's edge in Receiving/Attending, Comprehending, and Responding resounds a more substantial but inconsistent trend in the literature of gender and listening; indeed, in the works of some authors there is a small female advantage in the tasks involving receptive language while other researchers found no difference in the results after controlling for other factors (Villadiego et al., 2023). Since the corresponding effect sizes were altogether small ($|d| \leq 0.28$), the present findings need to be treated as the tendency relevant at the population level rather than an argument for rendering instruction varying by sex in practical terms; thus, it can be said that even in a mixed class that would be analyzed here the male and female students would exhibit considerable similarity in terms of listening skills.

Overall, the absence of meaningful age or language group differences is a positive discovery for program development. The results indicate that for this population, listening skills (as defined in this context) do not simply depend on age or language background; hence, it is reasonable to conclude that listening programs can be applied equally to learners of different age and linguistic backgrounds. However, caution should be exercised in interpreting this finding since the groups differ significantly in size when it comes to first language (there are 212 speakers

of Filipino/Tagalog, while there are only 17 other local dialect speakers), which makes it more difficult to identify small but significant differences that might exist in some of the others.

The results regarding academic performance came out as the most reliable evidence. It was revealed that every dimension of listening, according to the academic performance level, was significantly different. In each case, it was confirmed that students in the highest category had the highest score. In contrast, those in the other two groups scored lower, with relatively low/medium statistical significance. This proves that the data obtained in this study is consistent with the previous studies of active listening effectiveness among students (Eggenberger, 2021), and the literature related to the relationship between better attention at the classroom and fewer distractions from the devices that led to lower academic performance (such as studies by Agostini & Petrucco, 2023; Pew Research Center, 2024; Rutgers University, 2026), including those seen in the Receiving/Attending subscale (such as questions about device distraction). At the same time, the regression analysis results indicate the need to be careful with the interpretation of the results. Although the regression model used in the study was statistically significant, it explained only 6% of the variance in academic performance, and none of the listening dimensions used in this study affected it independently of other dimensions.

The highest degree of correlation among the five factors is the most feasible explanation. Instead of suggesting that there are five independent predictors, the results support the notion that there is a strong general listening factor related to the weaker indicator of academic achievement. In addition to academic performance, numerous other factors affecting grades, including study habits, past performance, course complexity, and socioeconomic background, are not assessed by the questionnaire. According to Taber's recommendations in the matter of interpreting very high alpha-coefficients, α = .98 is again regarded here as proof of reliability. A re-analytical procedure would clarify whether the data are better represented in a five-factor model or the bi-factorial one (general listening plus specific factors).

It is important to keep in mind the modest 6% variance explained according to the regression results in the greater empirical literature regarding the determinants of academic performance, where individual psychosocial or skill measures, such as listening, also result in a naturally low share of variance, as they are considered together with stronger, more predictive measures like prior grade point average, study time, and class attendance, all of which were not accounted for in this study. Considering the results, they might not be used as null results; on the contrary, the findings show that listening is statistically significant and strongly associated with academic performance in each possible type of analysis, and, at the same time, it should be emphasized that listening cannot be a full explanation for higher academic results for some students over others in BSHM.

6. Theoretical Contribution

The research builds upon DeVito's (2000) 5-stage model of listening, an important concept in general communications education, and applies it to the field of hospitality management education outside North America. It also tests the stage structure against the HURIER model proposed by Brownell (1994) – a model that hospitality management experts specially developed for the specific context of hospitality and restaurant management education. The marked similarities across the five stages found in the Philippine BSHM sample constitute an important theoretical finding in and of themselves – they indicate that the relatively age-old distinctions between stages may be less pronounced among novice hospitality studies students than the model supposes.

There are other theoretical implications regarding the assessment of listening. Based on the correlations' findings, the five stages of DeVito might be viewed as forming a single general factor for a novice hospitality student population. In this case, while the five-stage breakdown will serve primarily as a diagnostic and pedagogical tool — establishing, as results indicate, that Remembering stage is one of the weaker stages worthy of particular attention — much information can be obtained from having a composite score, which allows for achieving great insight regarding the students' listening skills and does not need to rely on separate scores of sub-scales in the course of such statistical analyses as the regression analysis conducted in this research.

7. Practical and Industry Implications

For those teaching hospitality, the most evident

idea is that listening requires a relevant training technique that is systematic rather than ignored in general communication courses. As remembering is the least developed dimension and is most closely linked with academic achievement, methods focusing on retention should be the best approach to helping students learn. Retention involves techniques such as summarizing and taking notes, which are relevant for communicating in the workplace and mastering various skills, such as repeating guest requests and knowing standard operating procedures. As the study found that several points of Receiving/Attending have to do with the problem of the usage of devices and phones that are known for their negative influence on learning achievements, it would be wise to suggest educating students on the issue of the appropriate use of devices in the classroom and when having a conversation with guests.

For industry partners and internship coordinators, it can be inferred from the finding that listening actively increases customer satisfaction and service recovery after a service breakdown (Min et al., 2021) that there may be a rational basis for providing training in listening (not just customer service), especially for workers involved with recovery from service failures. Also, since the research does not indicate that listening abilities vary by age or first language group, industry training based on these findings may not need to consider trainees' demographic variables, which will ease the task of designing training programs for the HR and training divisions of hotels and restaurants.

8. Limitations and Future Research

Several limitations were part of these findings. The sample was taken from a single institution under convenience sampling, thus making it challenging to generalize these findings to other BSHM populations. All of the listening data analyzed is self-reported, thus allowing the possibility of social-desirability bias to influence the results and making it impossible to directly measure listening proficiency (for example, how well a person recalls a specific message verbatim). The findings are a general average on four levels rather than an actual GPA, which makes for less precise measurement overall; more accurate results could be obtained if more sophisticated measures were applied to this analysis.

The cross-sectional design prevents making cause-effect conclusions regarding the relationship between listening and academic performance. In addition, given a strong correlation among five subscales, future research should employ exploratory or confirmatory factor analysis to determine whether a five-factor, bifactor, or one-factor model fits the data best before using this measurement tool for important decision-making purposes. In the future, it would be useful to repeat the study in other institutions, to use performance rather than a self-reported measure of listening, to apply a continuous academic performance variable, and to employ a longitudinal design capable of testing the effect of targeted listening instruction on academic and/or working performance over time. One more opportunity is to combine quantitative information gained in this research with qualitative methods such as focus groups and/or reflective journals that can provide information about particular classroom, home, and part-time work experiences Filipino students associate with listening.

9. Conclusion

In this study, students pursuing a Bachelor of Science in Hospitality Management exhibited high listening abilities, as measured by DeVito's (2000) five-stage model. Of those five stages, remembering was noted as the weakest stage yet had the highest association with academic success. The findings indicated that respondents' sex had a small impact on three out of the five listening categories. At the same time, age and first language did not significantly influence listening, thus requiring uniform training in all five areas of listening for students studying in the BSHM programs. The results indicated a strong correlation between listening and academic success across the listening categories. However, the minimal value of variance explained shows that listening acts more as one skill than five, which is also why listening does not guarantee academic success. As listening is also connected to customer satisfaction and service recovery according to hospitality studies, the authors therefore suggest that listening should be taught as an independent competency and not developed automatically along with other communication skills.

References

Agostini, D., & Petrucco, C. (2023). Problematic smartphone use and university students' academic performance. *Journal of e-Learning*

and Knowledge Society, 19(2), 55–64. https://doi.org/10.20368/1971-8829/1135747

Bagon, P. M. A., Samillano, J. H., & Tinapay, A. O. (2023). Assessing the competence and skills of hospitality and tourism management students. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Publications, 5*(8), 90–100. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/368476813_Assessing_the_Competence_and_Skills_of_Hospitality_and_Tourism_Management_Students

Brownell, J. (1994). Managerial listening and career development in the hospitality industry. *Journal of the International Listening Association, 8*(1), 91–108. https://doi.org/10.1080/10904018.1994.10499130

DeVito, J. A. (2000). *The elements of public speaking* (7th ed.). Longman.

Deale, C. S., & Lee, S. H. J. (2021). To read or not to read? Exploring the reading habits of hospitality management students. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Education, 34*(1), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1080/10963758.2020.1868317

Eggenberger, A. L. B. (2021). Active listening skills as predictors of success in community college students. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 45*(5), 324–333. https://doi.org/10.1080/10668926.2019.1706667

Min, K. S., Jung, J. M., & Ryu, K. (2021). Listen to their heart: Why does active listening enhance customer satisfaction after a service failure? *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 96*, Article 102956. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2021.102956

Pew Research Center. (2024, June 12). High school teachers say phone distraction in class is a big problem in the U.S. https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2024/06/12/72-percent-of-us-high-school-teachers-say-cellphone-distraction-is-a-major-problem-in-the-classroom/

Rutgers University. (2026, January 16). Cellphone distraction in the classroom can lead to lower grades, Rutgers study finds. https://www.rutgers.edu/news/cellphone-distraction-classroom-can-lead-lower-grades-rutgers-study-finds

Taber, K. S. (2018). The use of Cronbach's alpha when developing and reporting research instruments in science education. *Research in Science Education, 48*(6), 1273–1296. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-016-9602-2

Villadiego, J., et al. (2023). Reading and listening skills of hospitality management students: Inputs to enhancing the English proficiency. *International Journal on Hospitality and Tourism Research, 2*(4). https://www.researchgate.net/publication/380168501_Reading_and_Listening_Skills_of_Hospitality_Management_Students_Inputs_to_Enhancing_the_English_Proficiency

Şahin, M. D., & Aybek, E. C. (2020). Jamovi: An easy to use statistical software for the social scientists. *International Journal of Assessment Tools in Education, 6*(4), 670–692. https://doi.org/10.21449/ijate.661803

Author Profile

Charles Darwin Samonte, MBA, is a faculty member at Northeastern College in Santiago City, Philippines. Holding a Master of Business Administration, his academic expertise focuses on business management, hospitality education, and organizational communication. His research centers on aligning classroom instruction with service industry expectations and evaluating core competencies among business and hospitality students to enhance career readiness and support institutional curriculum development.

Mark Kevin Astrero, MAEd-LL, LPT, is a faculty member at Northeastern College and a PhD student in Rhetoric and Linguistics at St. Paul University Philippines. His research focuses on language assessment, communicative competence, educational measurement, and generative AI in higher education. A prolific scholar, he actively contributes to international peer-reviewed journals, advancing research on language learning and educational leadership in the Cagayan Valley region.