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**ABSTRACT**

Internships is one of the most important part for the students. They can integrate classroom knowledge and theory with practical application and skills developed in professional settings. Moreover, the students can get some benefits when seeking a career path post-graduation. Airline Business Students of International College, Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University, has to be interned students in a role of Ground Service Agent in Airline Industry. To be success in internship period, the lecturers should train and provide all the knowledge in all aspects to prepare the students before going in the real work place. There are many issues to be considered in the courses of training the students and it is not possible to train all issues at the same time. Accordingly, the issues need to be ranked and train in consecutive manner.

In this paper, use a risk matrix as a methodology to rank the issues. The methodology is divided in to two steps. The first step is using the questionnaire to the senior airline staffs to determine the issues to be considered for training. The second step is scoring performed based on a risk matrix. The total score for the same issue is determined from all senior staff responses. Finally, the scores for all issues from all senior staffs are compared and ranked. The issues with high risk-based scores are then proposed to be considered first for the training course of Ground Service Agent Internship.
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**INTRODUCTION**

Internship programs enable students to apply classroom theory to a real-world work experience. It also develops students’ maturity by strengthening resourcefulness, problem-solving skills, self-confidence, self-discipline and sense of responsibility. Moreover, students can improve job opportunities after graduation by giving students valuable work experience and contact with potential future employers.

Training an Airline Business Students of International College, Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University, who has to be interned students in a role of Ground Service Agent in Airline Industry, is an important issue to help the students to prepare prior to doing an internship by providing resources, guidelines, and support to assist students in applying to companies of their choice in the Airline industry. For examples, competency of people who provide service is a deciding factor in choosing low-cost airlines [1]. Regarding the large numbers of training course, the lecturers are not able to train all the courses to the students due to many reasons for example time and budget limitation. From these reasons, the courses needed to be ranked.

This work introduces a systematic methodology of prioritizing courses of interest. The methodology employs risk as a measure of importance. The assessment of the risk magnitude is carried out by supervisor in the training areas. A scoring table for risk determination is also proposed.

After this introduction section, the proposed methodology will be next described. The clarification of the methodology is done by means of illustrative example. Concluding remarks are given at the end.

**PROPOSED METHODOLOGY**

The courses to be offered are selected from the supervisors in the Airline Industry. The role of supervisor selection plays an important role in reliable design [2]. The supervisors must belong to the organization, not the outsiders because the latters are not in the organization operation and environment. The supervisors are expected to have long experiences in the relevant areas to be improved. Each supervisor is given with the so-called risk assessment table (see Table 1).

Table 1: Risk Assessment Table

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Course | Level of Use Frequency  (F)  (1-10: 1 for never and 10 for always) | Level of Severity  (if not offered)  (S)  (1-10: 1 for minimum and 10 for maximum) | Risk = F x S |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

The Risk Assessment Table comprises of Course, Level of Use Frequency (F), Level of Severity (S), and Risk. The selection process is in the form of interview, and only a specific numbers of courses are required from the supervisors. The selected courses can be different from each supervisor. The courses from all supervisors are collected and put in the Risk Assessment Table. It is emphasized that all courses are considered. Every supervisor is then given with a Risk Assessment Table which contains the same course titles.

Then each supervisor fills in the Risk Assessment Table for the columns of Level of Use Frequency and Level of Severity while the last column of Risk is obtained from computation. It is noted that the column Level of Use Frequency defines the frequency of the real operation corresponding to the course and the column Level of Severity signifies the level of negative effects if the workers are not competent enough in that operation. The Risk is defined as the product between the Level of Use Frequency and the Level of Severity. This definition is in accordance with [3]. The respective Risk scores are summed up from all supervisors. Finally, all courses are ranked according to their scores from maximum to minimum ones. The courses with higher scores will be selected as first priorities to be offered in students training program.

Next section illustrates example of the proposed methodology.

**ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLE**

The example shows the selection of training courses for Airline Ground Staff Agent. Suppose there are three supervisors, namely A, B, and C. Each supervisor is interviewed to specify 5 courses that he/she considered important. The following are the example courses from the respective supervisors:

Supervisor A:

1. Ticketing

2. Check-in

3. Weight Control Balance

4. Boarding Gate

5. Handling of Irregularity Situation

Supervisor B:

1. Reservation

2. Handling of Irregularity Situation

3. Ticketing

4. Handling Difficulty passengers

5. Baggage Handling Service

Supervisor C:

1. Check-in

2. Boarding Gate

3. Baggage Handling Service

4. Handling of Irregularity Situation

5. Handling Difficulty passengers

It should be noted that there are some repeated course titles from all Supervisors from these selecting interview above. All course titles will be put into the Risk Assessment Table (see Table 2). There are altogether 8 courses from all 3 Supervisors.

Table 2: Risk Assessment Table with elicited course titles.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Course | Level of Use Frequency  (F)  (1-10: 1 for never and 10 for always) | Level of Severity  (if not offered)  (S)  (1-10: 1 for minimum and 10 for maximum) | Risk = F x S |
| 1. Baggage Handling Service |  |  |  |
| 2. Handling Difficulty Passengers |  |  |  |
| 3. Handling of Irregularity Situation |  |  |  |
| 4. Boarding Gate |  |  |  |
| 5. Check-in |  |  |  |
| 6. Ticketing |  |  |  |
| 7. Reservation |  |  |  |
| 8. Weight Control Balance |  |  |  |

The Risk Assessment Table with selected course titles as shown in Table 2 is then distributed to each supervisor. The supervisors are requested to fill in the table. The exemplified results are given in Table 3 to Table 5 below.

Table 3: Risk Assessment Table from Supervisor A.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Course | Level of Use Frequency  (F)  (1-10: 1 for never and 10 for always) | Level of Severity  (if not offered)  (S)  (1-10: 1 for minimum and 10 for maximum) | Risk = F x S |
| 1. Baggage Handling Service | 3 | 8 | 24 |
| 2. Handling Difficulty Passengers | 7 | 10 | 70 |
| 3. Check-in | 5 | 7 | 35 |
| 4. Boarding Gate | 4 | 4 | 16 |
| 5. Handling of Irregularity Situation | 1 | 8 | 8 |
| 6. Ticketing | 2 | 5 | 10 |
| 7. Reservation | 3 | 6 | 18 |
| 8. Weight Control Balance | 6 | 9 | 54 |

Table 4: Risk Assessment Table from Supervisor B.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Course | Level of Use Frequency  (F)  (1-10: 1 for never and 10 for always) | Level of Severity  (if not offered)  (S)  (1-10: 1 for minimum and 10 for maximum) | Risk = F x S |
| 1. Baggage Handling Service | 1 | 6 | 6 |
| 2. Handling Difficulty Passengers | 10 | 5 | 50 |
| 3. Check-in | 2 | 10 | 20 |
| 4. Boarding Gate | 3 | 5 | 15 |
| 5. Handling of Irregularity Situation | 3 | 9 | 27 |
| 6. Ticketing | 2 | 8 | 16 |
| 7. Reservation | 5 | 4 | 20 |
| 8. Weight Control Balance | 6 | 3 | 18 |

Table 5: Risk Assessment Table from Supervisor C.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Course | Level of Use Frequency  (F)  (1-10: 1 for never and 10 for always) | Level of Severity  (if not offered)  (S)  (1-10: 1 for minimum and 10 for maximum) | Risk = F x S |
| 1. Baggage Handling Service | 8 | 1 | 8 |
| 2. Handling Difficulty Passengers | 3 | 9 | 27 |
| 3. Check-in | 9 | 2 | 18 |
| 4. Boarding Gate | 3 | 8 | 24 |
| 5. Handling of Irregularity Situation | 8 | 7 | 56 |
| 6. Ticketing | 4 | 2 | 8 |
| 7. Reservation | 4 | 3 | 12 |
| 8. Weight Control Balance | 7 | 4 | 28 |

The risk magnitude of each course title is summed up from all 3 Supervisors. The result is given in Table 6.

Table 6: Results from all Supervisors.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Course | Risk Score  (Supervisor A) | Risk Score  (Supervisor B) | Risk Score  (Supervisor C) | Total Risk Scores |
| 1. Baggage Handling Service | 24 | 6 | 8 | 38 |
| 2. Handling Difficulty Passengers | 70 | 50 | 27 | 147 |
| 3. Check-in | 35 | 20 | 18 | 73 |
| 4. Boarding Gate | 16 | 15 | 24 | 55 |
| 5. Handling of Irregularity Situation | 8 | 27 | 56 | 91 |
| 6. Ticketing | 10 | 16 | 8 | 34 |
| 7. Reservation | 18 | 20 | 12 | 50 |
| 8. Weight Control Balance | 54 | 18 | 28 | 100 |

Ranking of courses according to the total Risk Scores yields:

1. Handling Difficulty Passengers

2. Weight Control Balance

3. Handling of Irregularity Situation

4. Check-in

5. Boarding Gate

6. Reservation

7. Baggage Handling Service

8. Ticketing

As a result, the Internship Training should start from Handling Difficulty Passengers, Weight Control Balance, Handling of Irregularity Situation, Check-in Boarding Gate, Reservation, Baggage Handling Service, Ticketing, respectively.

**CONCLUSIONS**

Training an Airline Business Students is an important role to help the students to prepare themselves prior to doing an internship with their selected Airline Industry by providing resources, guidelines, and support to assist students. Regarding the large numbers of training course, the lecturers are not able to train all the courses to the students due to many reasons for example time and budget limitation.

This work introduces a systematic methodology of prioritizing courses of interest. The methodology employs risk as a measure of importance. The assessment of the risk magnitude is carried out by the supervisors in the Ground Service Agent areas. The Risk is defined as the product between the Level of Use Frequency and the Level of Severity. The Level of Use Frequency defines the frequency of the real operation corresponding to the course and the Level of Severity signifies the level of negative effects if the workers are not competent enough in that operation. The courses with higher scores will be selected as first priorities to be offered in the training program. The methodology is realized through the proposed Risk Assessment Table. It is shown that the ranking for selecting key issues in training Airline Business Internship Students of Suan Sunandha Rajabhat University, as a Ground Service Agent in Airline Industrybecomes simplified via such a Risk Assessment Table.
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