Factors Affecting Employment Intention and Student Satisfaction in Accounting Internship: A Case of International Private University

This research aims to examine the relationship between accounting student-interns evaluation, their supervisor evaluation and student satisfaction toward internship, and employment intention. Questionnaires were used to collect data from 98 accounting student-interns and 98 of their supervisors. The collected data was analyzed in terms of Cronbach’s alpha coefficient analysis, factor analysis, composite reliability, average variance extracted, and multiple regression analysis. The results reveal that (1) student evaluation is significantly related to student satisfaction toward the internship program but not to employment intention and (2) supervisor evaluation is significantly related to employment intention but not to student satisfaction toward internship.
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Introduction

The decrease in hiring CPAs in USA is due to the use of modern technology (AICPA, 2018), whereas the higher unemployment rate in some Southeast Asian countries is due to the high number of university enrollees that do not match the needs of industry (Tan & French-Arnold, 2012). The COVID-19 pandemic that resulted in massive layoffs (ILO Monitor, 2020) and the impact it may have on graduates in 2020 (Boonlert, 2020), and the demand of the employers for the quality and skills of entry-level positions, will greatly affect the employability of accounting graduates.

In a competitive environment, new accounting graduates face onerous challenges in meeting the employers’ demands based on knowledge, skills, and qualifications, especially in getting employed. From the viewpoint of employers, many studies revealed that they required new graduates to possess several skills that include a comprehensive knowledge in the discipline that underlies the job plus the commitment to continuous learning and training (Asonitou, 2015; Atanasovski, Trpeska, & Lazarevska, 2018). In addition to the aforementioned skills, employers are looking for graduates who have flexibility and adaptability to deal with changes (Oliver, Whelan, Hunt, & Hammer, 2011), logical and analytical skills, critical problem-solving and synthetic skills, creativity, innovativeness (Shamsuddin, Ibrahim, Ghazali, & Zain, 2015), interpersonal skills, effective communication skills (Ismail, 2013), and tech savvy including knowledge of software packages (Marr, 2020).

Internship is of crucial importance in preparing accounting students for the real world of business. Practical experiences are needed to give students first-hand proficiencies/capabilities in developing their knowledge which cannot be learned inside the classrooms (Warinda, 2013). Through internship, student-interns are able to improve some of their soft skills, acquire new skills from experienced accounting professionals, and increase their chance of being employed. In addition, student-interns are able to understand and comprehend clearly what is taught in the classrooms, and also apply the theories and principles they learned in universities to actual work.

Finally, student-interns can decide what career paths they should pursue after graduation. Internship becomes a gateway for the graduates to gain actual work experience before finding a permanent job. Liu (2012) discovered that 194 accounting students placed with 14 local firms in South China were quite satisfied with the arrangements and learning effects of what they called "Cooperative Accounting Education," or internship, and that the culture of the CPA firms had an influence on the effectiveness of the internship. In addition, employers’ satisfaction with accounting internships in Big-4 and non-Big-4 accounting firms (Sawani, Abdillah, Ramat, Noyem, & Sirat, 2016) revealed that most employers were satisfied with the trainees’ performance in relation to job competency. Trainees were
responsible and complied with working requirements, although many trainees faced problems particularly in communicating their ideas and preparing technical reports.

The National Qualification Framework of Thailand (OHEC, 2006) laid out some guidelines on the qualification of bachelor’s degree graduates. One of the purposes of setting these guidelines is to set standards for all bachelor’s degree graduates that will qualify themselves for employability. These guidelines are the five domains as follows: (1) Ethical and moral development, (2) Knowledge, (3) Cognitive skills, (4) Interpersonal skills and responsibility, and (5) Analytical and communication skills. The bachelor’s graduates must demonstrate a high level of ethical behavior and professional issues, must possess a comprehensive, coherent and systematic body of knowledge, cognitive skills, interpersonal skills, and ability to communicate effectively. Finding placement in the real-world of business is very competitive. To be able to compete with other aspiring job applicants, a graduate must be able to probe complex problems and come out with creative solutions. Furthermore, a graduate must be able to use appropriate mathematical and statistical techniques in analyzing and solving complex problems and must be able to use the most appropriate methods or techniques for communicating the results to diverse audiences.

The important outcomes of the internship program are student satisfaction and employment intention (Abdullah, Alsagoff, Ramlan, & Sabran, 2014). Student satisfaction reflects proper management in handling the internship program by both the university and the company. Thus, universities and companies can identify problems and improve their internship programs through student satisfaction. For employment intention, this outcome is the ultimate goal of all participants in the program since student-interns are able to increase the chance of employability and companies can hire the right person with the required skills (Shoenfelt, Stone, & Kottke, 2013). These two outcomes can be achieved through the skills acquired by the students and those achievement are evaluated by students and supervisors. Various literature shows that there were studies conducted on the employability skills of accounting graduates (Asonitou, 2015; Lim, Lee, Yap, & Ling, 2016) and on employer satisfaction (Shamsuddin, et al., 2015; Suwani, et al., 2016). However, only a few studies have been conducted on student evaluation (Warinda, 2013) and employment intention, especially in an internship context (Fuchadzhi, 2016).

Thus, the research question of this study is “how do student and supervisor evaluations affect student satisfaction and employment intention?” The research objectives are as follows: (1) to examine the relationship between student evaluation and student satisfaction, employment intention; (2) to examine the relationship between supervisor evaluation and student satisfaction, and employment intention.

Literature Review

Dependent variable: Employment Intention

The employment ability of college graduates has normally been the focus of university concern. The university emphasizes the actual operation of specialization in curriculum design in order to increase students' adaptation to the workplace, and the internship is designed to satisfy this requirement. Thus, employment intention is the ultimate goal of the internship program. This study defines employment intention as the intention of the prospective employers in employing the student-interns after they graduate. In general, employability was perceived as a shared responsibility by both employees and employers with employees, including newly graduates, being more concerned with their employability and the potential employers attempting to fill the position within the company with employees having the required knowledge and skills (Clarke & Patrickson, 2008). Based on Kruss (2004)’s study, private sector executives advocated for a relationship between higher
education and the job market, expecting higher education to equip graduates with abilities that will make them employable.

Previous studies have shown that students with internship experience were perceived as more employable (Beck & Hamil, 2008; Baert, Neyt, Siedler, Tobback, & Verhaest, 2021; Gault, Leach, & Duey, 2010; Moghaddam, 2011). The study of Beck and Hamil (2008) on 250 accounting students participating in an eight-week internship in Singapore, indicated that the students perceived that what they had learned would benefit them in their future career, that the internship had prepared them for their first employment and that it also increased their chance of being employed. Moreover, they also found that students who joined internships were more likely to obtain job offers before graduation than students who did not join internships. Gault, Leach, and Duey (2010) found that the companies would employ their current interns and also be willing to employ future interns from the same university. They also found that the majority of those companies showed a high willingness to employ interns over non-interns and even were more likely to pay higher starting salaries to high performing interns. Moghaddam (2011), examining a total of 561 students in the United States, suggested that the possibility of receiving permanent job offers as a result of an internship program was a significant and anticipated reward for students. According to the experimental study conducted by Baert et al. (2021) sending fictitious but realistic resumes of Flemish university students showed that students with internship experience had a better chance of getting a job interview than students with no prior internship experience.

**Dependent variable:** Student Satisfaction toward the internship

Student satisfaction has been defined as a dynamic process that requires clear and effective actions as a result of an institution listening to its students (Kane, Williams, & Cappuccini-Ansfield, 2008; Student satisfaction, 2011). Based on this definition, the underlying concept is basically how the student subjectively regards the quality of learning and experiences (Weerasinghe & Fernando, 2017) obtained by them during their educational studies. This definition may also be extrapolated towards student-interns’ views regarding an internship program, as an internship has been said to actively apply scholarly theoretical learning into actual practice (Lam & Ching, 2007) through guided supervision. As students are at the stage of starting their internship placement, they may already have preconceived expectations or ideas of what their internship period would entail. These notions impact how they view their work period upon completion of being an intern in an actual work environment and their level of satisfaction (Lam & Ching, 2007). Thus, this study defines student satisfaction toward the internship as a set of psychological attitudes of student-interns towards their work achievement and a work environment. Studies found that student-interns’ satisfaction levels were affected by the physical environment of their job (Cheong, Yahya, Shen & Yen, 2014), the importance of the work assigned (Ramlı, Surbaini, Kadir, & Abidin, 2013), and the recognition and feedback of supervisors (Liu, 2012). This is in addition to an intern’s ability to apply theoretical knowledge to the assigned work to accomplish goals and has the capacity of being an active work member through expression of their ideas during their work placement (Cheong, et al., 2014). Research was conducted on students at the University of Wollongong in Australia to determine their level of satisfaction with their internship experience (Cord, Bowrey & Clemens, 2010). The university had implemented a route of study called the Commerce Internship Program in 2008. This study plan required those who have been placed into internship programs to fill in “daily e-logs” and “reflective journals” to elucidate on the common trends found during interns’ work periods. The “reflective journals” are six questions worded in such a way as to make the responder use an analytical thought process while answering. These answers, being of a subjective nature, can be used to determine the level of satisfaction that student-interns obtain upon completion of the internship program.
**Independent variable:** Student Evaluation on internship

Self-evaluation is a procedure to systematically observe, analyze, and value *one’s own* professional action and its results in order to stabilize or improve it (Pineda, 2010). This can take place on an individual or on an organizational level. Self-evaluate means that people explore and evaluate their own professional work. Andrade (2019) studied that self-assessment was used to describe a different range of activities wherein it involves oneself. Brown and Harris (2013) defined self-assessment in the K-16 context as a “descriptive and evaluative act carried out by the student concerning his or her own work and academic abilities” (p. 368). Panadero, Brown, and Strijbos (2016, p.804) defined it as a “wide variety of mechanisms and techniques through which students describe and possibly assign merit or worth to the qualities of their own learning processes and products”. In addition, self-monitoring “refers to the ability to notice our own actions, curiosity to examine the effects of those actions, and willingness to use those observations to improve behavior and thinking in the future” (Epstein Siegel, & Silberman, 2008 p.5). Taken together, these definitions include self-assessment of one’s abilities, processes, and products—everything but the kitchen sink. This broad conception might seem unwieldy, but it works because each object of assessment—competence, process, and product—is subject to the influence of feedback from oneself. Thus, this study defines student evaluation on internship as a self-evaluation of student-interns on required criteria for employability and future career. To ensure the integrity of the accounting profession, the International Federation of Accountants (IFAC) contributes to the development, adoption, and implementation of high-quality international ethics standards for accountants primarily through its support of International Ethics Standards Board for Accountants (IESBA, 2013). IESBA sets up fundamental principles that accountants shall comply with integrity, objectivity, professional competence and due care, confidentiality, and professional behavior. Rufino (2015)’s findings based on intern self-assessment found students determine what is morally right or wrong. Accounting internship institutes a linkage between businesses and educational institutions. With this correlation (Weible, 2010), student knowledge from the classroom can be applied in the real business world, and in return, the business world can see potential candidates in the jobs they are seeking. Dean, Bowrey, and Clements (2010) showed that internship students improve their understanding and application of accounting principles and generic skills through internship programs.

**Independent variable:** Supervisor Evaluation on students-intern

Supervisor evaluation on interns refers to an intern’s performance reviewed by the immediate supervisor in the internship program (cf. Tyskbo, 2020). Previous literatures related to supervisor evaluation, for example, Bilsland, Nagy, and Smith (2014) revealed the results of supervisor evaluations of interns in Vietnam university that they were satisfied with the interns’ employability skills. Henderson, Cawyer, and Watkins (1999) found that supervisor evaluation was perceived as a key factor for psychotherapy training. Teo and Tay (1994) reported that the supervisor evaluated the interns’ performance much lower that the interns’ self-reported.

**Hypotheses Development**

On the supposition that a student’s evaluation relates to their obtaining satisfaction from their period of internship, a study found that positive expectation disconfirmation has a significant direct relationship with overall satisfaction with internship (Neelam, et al., 2019). The study went on to elaborate that when expectations of interns are realistic, the experience obtained matches or exceed preconceived perceptions and results in a higher degree of satisfaction (Neelam, et al., 2019). Other studies support the rationale of intern students’ evaluation affecting their satisfaction from the follow-ups that were made of their respective
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Intern students (Lam & Ching, 2007; Tarmazi, Jumain, Idris, & Tan, 2017) such as several factors being met of the student’s expectations from their intern program: tasks assigned, supervisor support, feedback of performance predicts and show internship satisfaction (To & Lung, 2020). Thus, this study hypothesizes as follow:

H1: Student evaluation is related to student satisfaction.

Much research has been studied on factors affecting student satisfaction in internships. For example, Liu (2012) found that learning experiences and firm culture influence interns’ satisfaction. The study by Jaradat (2017) on Jordanian student-interns revealed that interns were satisfied with their experiences and abilities in both personal and professional matters. Fuchadzhi (2016) in his master’s thesis revealed that interns were satisfied with the process of learning on internship, including supervisor support and feedback. Study of Thevanes (2016) of student-interns in the Faculty of Commerce Eastern University, Sri Lanka revealed that employers were highly satisfied with intern’s performance throughout the internship where student-interns were also highly satisfied with the employer who offered them with internships. In addition, Paulin (2008) discovered that feedback and evaluation from supervisors are considered as part of internship qualities and are related to student satisfaction. Thus, this study hypothesizes as follow:

H2: Supervisor evaluation is related to student satisfaction.

Skills and characteristics in new entry-employees suggested to keep up with competitiveness in business in terms of generic skills as against to technical and practical skills (Crebert, 2002). Kavanagh and Drennan (2008) reported that skills according to student expectations are routine accounting and research, while on employers’ part, employers expect analytical/ problem solving, business awareness, oral and written communication, ethical awareness, and professional teamwork and understanding of the interdisciplinary nature of business. In the early findings of Cord, Bowrey, and Clements (2010), their study presented that the common areas of self-development are in the areas of communication, interpersonal, and personal insights skills. Muhamad, Yahya, Shahimi, and Mahzan (2009) revealed that internship attachment has no benefit for students-interns in, but the experience guides them on their career path and improved their knowledge of public accounting. Duignan (2002) found no significant difference between the performance of internship and full-time business undergraduates. He also argues that the skills and competencies that the continuing controversy by the successful internship are not easily transferable into academic performance. At least two studies illustrated that students evaluated their performance higher than those of supervisors in internship (Marks, Haug, & Hu, 2018; Mehrdad, Bigdeli, & Ebrahimi, 2012). Their studies are related to Bremner, (2018), which found that students with higher confidence in their abilities perceive that they would have a chance to be employed. Thus, this study hypothesizes as follow:

H3: Student evaluation is related to employment intention.

Findings of Atanasovski et al. (2018)’s study on students in accounting degree programs in Southeast European Countries revealed that students gave more emphasis to personal skills such as time management, good presentation skills, and confidence while employers valued more oral communication skills, knowledge of foreign languages, ethical attitude, credibility, and commitment to life-long learning. On the other hand, the study conducted by Jackling and Natoli (2015) on the perceptions of internship providers with respect to the employability skills of international graduates of Victoria University in Australia indicated that the internship providers perceived that the most highly developed skill of interns is team skills. The interns failed to show the capacity to be ready to work and assimilate to different cultures, capacity to handle unfamiliar problems and communication skills. Sawani et al. (2016)’s study aimed to identify employers’ satisfaction levels with students’ performance on personality traits, cognitive accounting skills, and knowledge. The
study found that most employers of Big-4 and non-Big-4 accounting firms in Malaysia were satisfied with the trainees’ performance in relation to job competency, responsibility, and compliance with work requirements. In contrast, the study revealed that students faced problems in communicating their ideas and preparing technical accounting reports. Thus, this study hypothesizes as follow:

H4: Supervisor evaluation is related to employment intention.

The developed hypotheses are drawn in the proposed model (see Figure 1).

![Figure 1 The proposed model](image)

**Research Methodology**

**Sample and Data Collection**

In order to test the hypotheses of this study, the questionnaire was developed as a tool to collect data. The target population were accounting students, which numbered approximately 400 students. The accounting interns were drawn purposively from this target population. The number of interns drawn from the population was 98 students (N = 98) and they were assigned to 98 supervisors. The internship lasted for two months. At the end of the internship program, both interns and supervisors answered the questionnaires provided by the Department of Accounting. Table 1 presents a detailed breakdown of sample profiles. The majority are female (77.55%), with mostly Thai nationality (97.96%), and with almost 50:50 for the field of internship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profiles</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>77.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>97.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>97.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Thai (Chinese)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field of Internship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditing</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measurement**

All three constructs were measured with multiple items developed by the Department of Accounting to measure students’ achievement in 5 domains as required by the Office of the Higher Education Commission (OHEC) and have been used for many years, and one construct was measured with a single item. The four constructs are as follows: student evaluation was measured with 29 item measures as well as supervisor evaluation; student
satisfaction was measured with 12 item measures; and employment intention was measured with a single item measure which is “would you employ this trainee to work in your organization?” using 6-Likert scale (1=Absolutely no, 2=No, 3=Probably no, 4=Probably yes, 5=Yes, 6=Absolutely yes).

The reasons for using a single item to measure employment intention are as follows: (1) the context is about internships where the supervisors have a chance to work closely with the interns, thus asking one question about their intention to employ the interns is quite clear and they are able to answer it accurately; and (2) many previous studies have verified that a single item measure is as good as multiple item measures if used appropriately (Grapentine, 2001; Bergkvist & Rossiter, 2007; Bergkvist, 2015). The Cronbach’s alpha coefficient analysis, the factor analysis, composite reliability, and average variance extracted, were performed to ensure the reliability and construct validity of the measurements except for employment intention with a single item measure. Table 2 summarizes these results.

Table 2. Descriptive of Measurement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Factor Loadings</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Evaluation (STE)</td>
<td>0.511-0.782</td>
<td>4.104-4.813</td>
<td>0.571-0.914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(α = 0.949, AVE=0.654, CR=0.945)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor Evaluation (SUE)</td>
<td>0.655-0.880</td>
<td>3.615-4.479</td>
<td>0.665-0.898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(α = 0.978, AVE=0.785, CR=0.979)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Satisfaction (SS)</td>
<td>0.587-0.811</td>
<td>4.260-4.677</td>
<td>0.576-0.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(α = 0.909, AVE=0.705, CR=0.923)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: For student and supervisor evaluation: KMO = 0.853; Variance extracted = 56.93; Barlett’s Test of Sphericity are all significant at p value = 0.000
For student satisfaction: KMO = 0.874; Variance extracted = 50.56%; Barlett’s Test of Sphericity are all significant at p value = 0.000

The Cronbach's alpha coefficients of all measurements varied from 0.909 to 0.978, which exceeded the cutoff point of 0.7 (Nunnally, 1978) and illustrated that the items in each measurement had relatively high internal consistency. The factor analysis (Principal Component) was also performed to ensure the unidimensional of the measurements. The factor loadings of all measurements varied from 0.511 to 0.880 and the variances extracted varied from 50.56% to 56.93% illustrated that all variables defined in each measurement loaded on one factor (unidimensional) with an eigenvalue above 1. The KMO and Barlett Test of Sphericity were checked to ensure the sufficiency of data for factor analysis. Satisfactory results were illustrated. The KMO varied from 0.853 to 0.874 with the significant Barlett's test of Sphericity (p value < 0.001) showed that the data were sufficient for the factor analysis. In addition, all constructs exhibited a composite reliability value higher than the cut-off point of 0.80 and also an AVE value higher than the cut-off point of 0.50. Thus, convergent validity was established for all three constructs (Hair, Black, Babin, & Anderson, 2010).

The square root of each average variance extracted in Table 3 (the bold value in diagonal) illustrates the relationship between a construct and its own item measures. As suggested by Fornell and Larcker (1981), the three constructs have no problem of discriminant validity as the square root of the AVE of each construct exceeds the recommended threshold of 0.70 (Chin, 1998) and was higher than the correlation among different constructs. Discriminant validity is also assumed when correlations between constructs are significantly below one (Sweeney & Soutar, 2001), as presented in Table 3.
Table 3. Discriminant Validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Student evaluation</th>
<th>Supervisor evaluation</th>
<th>Student satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student evaluation</td>
<td>0.809</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor evaluation</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>0.886</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student satisfaction</td>
<td>0.800**</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>0.840</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
(1) **correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). *correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
(2) The value on the diagonal is square root AVE.

Data Analysis

Multiple regression analysis was used to test the hypotheses of this study. The results are summarized in Table 4 and also presented in model testing. For H1 and H2, it was hypothesized that student evaluation and supervisor evaluation would be related to student satisfaction. The adjusted R square was 0.633, meaning these two constructs explained 63.3% of the variance of student satisfaction. Of the two hypotheses, only H1 was significant. That is, student evaluation (β=0.805) was significantly related to student satisfaction, where supervisor evaluation (p value=0.667) was not significantly related to student satisfaction. For H3 and H4, it was hypothesized that student evaluation and supervisor evaluation would be related to employment intention. The adjusted R square was 0.108, meaning these two constructs explained 10.8% of the variance of employment intention. Of the two hypotheses, only H4 was significant. That is, supervisor evaluation (β=0.321) was significantly related to employment intention, where student evaluation (p value=0.272) was not significantly related to employment intention.

Table 4. Hypotheses Testing Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficient</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>p value</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1: Student Evaluation ➔ Student Satisfaction</td>
<td>0.805</td>
<td>12.765</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Support hypothesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2: Supervisor Evaluation ➔ Student Satisfaction</td>
<td>-0.027</td>
<td>-0.432</td>
<td>0.667</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3: Student Evaluation ➔ Employment Intention</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>1.106</td>
<td>0.272</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4: Supervisor Evaluation ➔ Employment Intention</td>
<td>0.321</td>
<td>3.261</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>Support hypothesis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
For H1 & H2: Adjusted R square = 63.3%; F value = 82.976 at p value = 0.000; Durbin-Watson value = 1.754
For H3 & H4: Adjusted R square = 10.8%; F value = 6.721 at p value = 0.002; Durbin-Watson value = 1.660

Figure 2 The model testing
Conclusion and Discussion

This study aims to examine the relationship between accounting student-interns evaluation, their supervisor evaluation and student satisfaction toward internship, and employment intention. The results showed that only student evaluation was related to student satisfaction which was consistent with the previous studies (Denson, Loveday, & Dalton, 2010; Hill & Epps, 2010). Denson et al. (2010), investigating 60,860 student course evaluations representing 2,697 courses in Australia, also confirmed that student evaluation was significantly related to student satisfaction on the courses. Hill and Epps (2010), conducting experimental design by dividing 237 undergraduate accounting students in four different groups, revealed that student evaluation was significantly related to student satisfaction on the courses. Furthermore, this study also found that supervisor evaluation was related to employment intention which is similar to the previous studies (Rigsby, Addy, Herring, & Polledo, 2013; Pop, Swanepoel, & Barkhuizen, 2013). Employing firms place a high value on internship experience, according to Rigsby, Addy, Herring, and Polledo (2013), who surveyed professional employees below the manager level at three Big 4 firms and a large regional CPA firm. Internship experience is useful for students in getting job opportunities whether or not they stay with the internship firm. In addition, based on the work of Pop, Swanepoel, and Barkhuizen (2013), they found that the availability of internship programs was significantly related to the intention to employ graduate interns and also verified by the results of the open-ended questions, as quoted, “Working with the interns on almost a daily basis has afforded me the opportunity to mentor and know them well in the internship program” (p.98).

Unfortunately, this study did not find supervisor evaluation was related to student satisfaction, which was inconsistent with To and Lung (2020)’s study on 161 Chinese students in Macao SAR, which found that supervisor evaluation had direct and significant influence on internship satisfaction. The possible explanation could be that student-interns perceive supervisor evaluation as a standard procedure, not like supervisor support, which could influence student satisfaction directly (Dericks, Thompson, Roberts, & Phua, 2019). This study neither found the relationship between student evaluation and employment intention, which was inconsistent with Bremner’s (2018) study, using a mixed methods approach, drawing samples from alumni of fashion management in the UK, the study discovered that student evaluation, which represents students' confidence in their ability to possess the skills required, was linked to employability. The possible explanation could be that supervisors only focused on student performance during internship but not on their opinion toward employment intentions, as the study by Higdon (2016) stated that there was a missing voice from student-interns in the employability process.

Implication and Limitations

There is scant research on student and supervisor evaluation on student satisfaction and employment intention, especially research that collects data from both sides, making this study unique and exploratory in the field. The value of internship is important, given the mismatch between university teaching and the workplace requirements. Thus, the implications from the results of this study are as follows: (1) for the accounting student-interns; future interns would realize how important the internship is through the employment intention, the skills and practical experience they have received, be able to anticipate what their supervisors expect from them in terms of morals, interpersonal communication, computer skills, and knowledge of the subjects to facilitate the work environment, and be eager to join the internship program in the future; (2) for accounting department and university; they would focus more on the development of curriculum design for practical learning specialty and the design of the internship to meet with the potential employers’
demand in order to increase employment intentions in the future; (3) for potential employers; they would have an opportunity to increase their chance of hiring newly qualified graduates as they have trained these students during the internship, and they would also have an opportunity to pay more attention to the internship program by getting involved in setting the daily activities to meet the objectives of both the interns and the companies.

There were some limitations in this paper. First, this study employed purposive sampling, which implies the results cannot be generalized to other organizations. However, the data was collected from all student-interns and supervisors in the internship program, this probably could have lessened some biases. Second, multiple regression was used to examine the hypotheses where the study could not conclude the causal relationship. This was combined with a small sample size and one construct measured with a single item. Thus, future research should consider examining the relationship using a structural equation model (SEM) to develop the causal relationships among the constructs. Third, this paper only looked at student and supervisor evaluation as determinants; future research should look at other factors, such as internship program quality, to gain a more complete picture.
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