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<td>DBP</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEEWR</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEST</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIISRTE</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBBP</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBP</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDNA</td>
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<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>EL</td>
<td>Experiential Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESOS</td>
<td>Education Services for Overseas Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FWO</td>
<td>Fair Work Ombudsman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FYA</td>
<td>Foundation for Young Australians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIHE</td>
<td>Griffith Institute for Higher Education (Griffith University)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNSDG</td>
<td>Greater Northern Skills Development Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GO8</td>
<td>Group of Eight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>Grade point Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTO</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCPC</td>
<td>Health and Care Professions Council (United Kingdom)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HERDSA</td>
<td>Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australasia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HESA</td>
<td>Higher Education Support Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INQAAHE</td>
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<tr>
<td>IRU</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISC</td>
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<td>ITAB</td>
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<tr>
<td>JCU</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRAS</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSWIT</td>
<td>NSW Institute of Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTIS</td>
<td>National Training Information Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH&amp;S</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLT</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSCE</td>
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<tr>
<td>OTEN</td>
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<tr>
<td>PIRLS</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCA</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCG</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>RN</td>
<td>Registered Nurse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROI</td>
<td>Return On Investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSA</td>
<td>Responsible Service of Alcohol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTO</td>
<td>Registered Training Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCU</td>
<td>Southern Cross University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SME</td>
<td>Small–Medium Enterprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAFE</td>
<td>Technical and Further Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEQSA</td>
<td>Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIMSS</td>
<td>Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH&amp;E</td>
<td>Tourism, Hospitality &amp; Events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE ICE</td>
<td>The International Centre of Excellence in Tourism and Hospitality Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNWTO</td>
<td>United Nations World Tourism Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNSW</td>
<td>University of New South Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UOB</td>
<td>University of Ballarat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UOW</td>
<td>University of Wollongong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>United States Agency for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTS</td>
<td>University of Technology Sydney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWS</td>
<td>University of Western Sydney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VET</td>
<td>Vocational Education and Training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VU  Victoria University
WACE  World Association for Cooperative Education
WEQ  Work Experience Questionnaire
WHS  Work Health & Safety
WIL  Work Integrated Learning
Abstract

Work Integrated Learning (WIL), industry-based experiences and the development of business ready skills in graduates have been a source of major contention between employers and tertiary educators. Dissatisfaction with graduate employability has been elevated within contemporary discussion with particular references made to a lack of general job skills and practical industry-specific competence. Such dissatisfaction transverses disciplinary boundaries and is of heightened concern for the hospitality industry due to the service orientation of the work. Work Integrated Learning is emerging within the auspices of Experiential Learning (EL) theory as a potential means to redress this gap. Research into WIL is currently preliminary and generalised towards traditional disciplines such as teaching, medicine, nursing and engineering to name a few. A standardised framework for effective implementation of WIL is elusive and has led to disparate and assorted adhoc attempts to fit WIL into tertiary curricula.

The investigation focuses specifically on the hospitality sector within NSW tertiary institutions to determine the transferability of benefits experienced from the application of WIL in traditional disciplines to the specific characteristics of service industries. Justification for this research and its timeliness arises through the rapid expansion and demand of hospitality programs, the role of the industry as a significant economic contributor and absence of accreditation standards further perpetuating underemployment of hospitality graduates and associated devaluing of hospitality qualifications. The perspectives of recent graduates, employers and educators were garnered to establish the contribution of WIL to enhancement of hospitality graduate employability and then identify specific aspects of WIL that need to be managed for realisation of benefits and minimisation of negatives. A mixed methodology was employed to triangulate the data, commencing with a quantitative online survey followed by qualitative focus groups. The absence of central email registries and the paucity of hospitality vocational education listings, precluded identification of all members of the total population thus limiting techniques to non-random sampling. The small sample size and non-random sampling methods limited extensive statistical investigations. A larger scale study using random sampling is required to verify these results.
The findings of the study support the existence of the graduate underemployment phenomenon within the NSW hospitality industry. With the majority of the graduate survey respondents residing in the low-income range (25% below $30,000 and a further 50% below $45,000), and 75% without full-time graduate-level employment, this study highlights the difficulty of transitioning hospitality graduates into the industry. Graduates in the focus groups expressed difficulty gaining graduate-level hospitality positions as employers demanded industry and management-level experience. Hospitality qualifications, in particular bachelor’s degrees, were more influential in commencing jobs than for progression, though tempered by the variables of attitude and experience. The survey and focus groups demonstrated the position of WIL in NSW tertiary curricula was frequently in a voluntary capacity.

There was a strong evidence among all the sample groups for the career, social and personal benefits of WIL for graduates. The categories ‘Opportunity to re-evaluate expectations of industry and job prospects’ and ‘Clarify requirements and preparedness of workforce entry’ featured highly in the survey. It was clear from the response to WIL negatives and satisfaction with WIL experiences in the survey, that many WIL programs participated in by respondents were poorly resourced, designed and executed. The foremost challenges to WIL participation were identified as ‘Managing several commitments, i.e. family, study, work, etc., while on work placement’ with limited resources/support for graduates, employers and educators.

The study concluded that graduates who have had experience of WIL in their tertiary studies are more attractive to employers and that extensive and varied contexts of engagement with WIL initiatives will enhance the perceived employability and performance of hospitality graduate employees. The study developed a number of recommendations and guidelines for effective integration of WIL in hospitality tertiary education.

Specific recommendations pertaining to this study are categorised in the following areas: research agenda, educator training needs, institution approach to WIL and WIL resources, and the role of the Federal Government. Key recommendations include the need for an urgent national investigation to be conducted into the value and composition of hospitality degree programs and alignment to hospitality industry
career paths. It is recommended that further research be conducted to review competency standards for hospitality tertiary educators with TAFE, university and other institutes/RTOs mandating currency stipulations for both training skills and industry practice.

The need to establish clear strategic direction, operational tactics and adequate resourcing for WIL became apparent in the course of the research. The creation of a specialised team providing administrative support to educators and increasing autonomy for hospitality departments to adapt programs to the specific conditions of the industry and to evolving industry accreditation standards is highly recommended. Furthermore government intervention is recommended to facilitate and champion the WIL agenda through hospitality industry association collaboration and amalgamation. The positioning of hospitality industry accreditation on the national agenda to ensure quality education standards would facilitate the production of a coherent, comprehensive strategy in hospitality services. For the full list of recommendations refer to section 7.2.
INTRODUCTION

This thesis examines the theoretical contribution of Work Integrated Learning (WIL) to Experiential Learning (EL) within the context of service industries. The investigation focuses specifically on the hospitality sector within New South Wales (NSW) tertiary institutions to determine the transferability of benefits experienced from the application of WIL in traditional disciplines such as nursing, teaching, social work and medicine to the specific characteristics of service industries.

This chapter has been designed to provide a contextual grounding and rationale for the study, commencing with a discussion on the background to the study and nature of the problem. The conceptual framework for the study and objectives of the research are presented, followed by the research questions directing the study and definitions of key terms used in the thesis. The chapter concludes with an outline of the contents of each of the seven chapters in this thesis.

1.1 Background to the Study and Nature of the Problem

Work integrated learning (WIL), industry-based experiences and the development of business ready skills in graduates have been a source of major contention between employers and tertiary educators. Reports by numerous consultancies and quasi-governmental bodies (e.g. AC Neilsen 2000; Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry [ACCI] and Business Council of Australia [BCA] 2002; Business, Industry and Higher Education Collaboration Council [BIHECC] 2007) refer to the existence of a proven gap between graduate attributes and industry expectations. Graduate under/unemployment is increasingly detected within the Australian economy and has been specifically identified as a dilemma for the hospitality field (Breen 2001; Kim 2008). The prolific literature base on learning and education presents mounting evidence in support of WIL to enhance graduate employability (Bates 2005; BIHECC
The fragmented nature of the hospitality industry and varied skill-base requirements are reflected in the absence of a dedicated framework explaining the role of WIL in curricula and literature (Tribe 2002). This assertion stems from the separation of tertiary education in this discipline area between vocational technical providers and the university sector, particularly in Australia. It may be argued that the framework exists at the Technical and Further Education (TAFE) and other college level offerings however, there is a marked absence of any such framework in university offerings of hospitality management. This absent framework in the university sector is evidenced by the lack of an accrediting body which awards ‘competency to practise’ standards existent for other service providers such as nurses, doctors, accountants, teachers and lawyers, among others. Whilst The International Centre of Excellence in Tourism and Hospitality Education (THE ICE), an international self-regulatory body, is attempting to address this gap through providing accreditation to university and college members in Australia and worldwide, membership is highly selective and there are no current plans in Australia to mandate accreditation for all university or other hospitality course providers. Other international accreditation organisations such as the European Foundation for Management Development have also attempted to address this gap. The existing framework is further deficient in a number of respects, adopts a restricted focus on specific forms of learning (vocational/skill based), is applicable to specific institutions only and is also constrained by their scope.

Justification for this research and its timeliness arises through the rapid expansion and demand of hospitality programs. Whilst numerous directories display hundreds of institutions and available courses (AA Education Network 2013; Australian Education Network 2013; Hobsons 2013; The National Education Directory of Australia 2013), national statistics detailing the exact number and extent of hospitality courses in Australia are incomplete. Paucity of statistics is attributed to the voluntary reporting of private vocational education and training (VET) operators; thus published information is largely restricted to government-funded Registered Training Organisations (Harris, Simons & McCarthy 2006). The plethora of offerings and the inability to accurately identify organisations and institutions and the credibility of their offerings is further exacerbated by the conflicting and often inflated claims made by
‘self interested’ website directories (e.g. AA Education Network 2013). Within the scope of Tourism Hospitality and Events (TH&E) degree qualifications the most recent research identifies over 62 separate TH&E degree programs which extends to 84 when TH&E majors within degrees are included (Dredge et al. 2012a). The evolving provider list for degree and other hospitality qualifications is further attributed to the expansion of alternative pathways into higher education, online and distance education delivery, satellite campuses and entrance of non-traditional providers such as industry players (ibid. 2012a).

A study into the evolution of Australian hospitality university programs, and specifically within the University of Queensland, documents progression of hospitality degree programs since the inaugural courses in 1974 (Breakey & Craig-Smith 2007). From their origins in technical food and catering knowledge, hospitality degrees have developed a more vocational and business-centred focus with a tendency to be combined with tourism studies. The rapid expansion and demand for courses and institutions offering hospitality degrees has contributed to variances in program philosophies and approaches with course duration, course title, composition of core and elective units and role of work experience subject to constant revision (ibid. 2007). The centrality of hospitality in degree programs now ranges from hospitality-focused programs, combined hospitality and business programs and general business degrees where hospitality is offered as a major. As examined later in this chapter, the general business format is becoming increasingly prevalent in the university sector, with hospitality being assimilated within business faculties a result of university consolidation policies (ibid. 2007). The work of Dredge et al. (2012c) in mapping the Australian TH&E undergraduate degree curricula primarily within the University sector, confirmed prevalence of strong business orientations with a focus on providing generic foundation units in the early stages and TH&E units in the later stages of the degree programs. This study also found a balance between the proportions of TH&E subject matter to generic business subjects within the degree programs (Dredge et al. 2012c). The removal of compulsory internships has further been observed within university hospitality degrees based on historical findings that the vast majority of students were already engaged in paid hospitality employment (Breakey & Craig-Smith 2007). It appears this does not stand true of current cohorts on account of varying generational factors discussed at length latter in this section. The Dredge et al.
(2012c) study further established that despite the rise in recognition and discussion of WIL the number of WIL offerings within Australian TH&E degree programs were minimal.

Further justification for this research is based on the role of the industry as a significant economic contributor to Gross National Product (GNP) and Gross Domestic Product (GDP) (ABS 2012) which must be taken into consideration when examining the attractiveness of Australia as a destination for tourism. Other factors that play into this include broader questions of skill-based migration, revenues through educational service provisions, estimated as $16.3 billion in 2010–2011 with a high of $18.6 billion in 2009–2010 (Australian Education International 2012) and the hospitality services offered to international students and, more recently, the vexed question of sustainable population growth in Australia. These issues received prominent attention when a review of private institutions occurred in 2009 following revelations of ‘shonky’ educational institutions entering the marketplace and operating visa rorting schemes (Commonwealth of Australia 2010; Craig 2010, Gilmore & O’Malley 2009). Growth in demand for international student educational services within Australia, accommodating ‘228,119 students in 2002’ rising to ‘491,565 students in 2009’ (Commonwealth of Australia 2010, p. iii), is increasing pressures on industry capacity and ability to govern education standards and build a strong reputation for education services. A federal government investigation was commissioned in 2009 to review the Education Services for Overseas Students (ESOS) Act 2000, and recommendations of the review are currently informing revision of Department of Immigration and Citizenship rules regarding permanent residency, standards for education providers and criteria needed to accomplish this (ibid. 2010). Although international student enrolments have been subject to a slight decline in recent years, on account of global financial uncertainty, the strong Australian dollar, global competition and poor quality of former providers, it still represents a highly profitable market (Australian Education International 2012).

Recent publications reiterate the need for research of this nature with the work of Richardson (2009) exploring the prevalence of hospitality graduates being ‘unused and unappreciated’. Richardson (2009) asserts that when poorly managed, work experience contributes to development of negative attitudes towards a career in the
industry. The importance of managing work experience as a positive learning instrument is well documented (Bates 2008; Beard 1995; Cooper, Orrell & Bowden 2010; Cranmer 2006; Henry, Mitchell & Young 2001; McLennan & Keating 2008; Raelin 2008). Richardson (2009) argues the case for investigating effectiveness of work experience, highlighting the need to curb the trend of hospitality graduates leaving the industry or failing to enter. In concert with the International Society of Hospitality Consultants (2007) and House of Representatives Standing Committee on Employment, Workplace Relations and Workforce Participation (2007), the view is that attracting and retaining qualified workers constitutes one of the biggest issues for the industry. The concern being that this problem will become exacerbated if the predictions of extensive growth in hospitality demand over the next decade are realised. In 2006 the National Tourism Investment Strategy Consultative Group (Commonwealth of Australia 2006, p. 63), indicated, ‘There is a current skill shortage of approximately 7,000 positions and a forecast of an additional deficit up to 15,000 positions per year’. This paper also identifies industry dissatisfaction with the current training product. ‘A systematic effort has been made to match formal training as close as possible to industry requirements, but in the recent Tourism Skills Survey only 30% of tourism employers believed graduates had gained skills appropriate to employer needs’ (ibid. 2006, p. 63). The most recent data in 2011 indicated, ‘The industry currently has a 9% vacancy rate, equivalent to some 35,800 jobs Australia-wide. Without intervention this shortage of workers is forecast to increase to 56,000 workers by 2015’ (Deloitte Access Economics [DAE] 2011). The DAE report further identified current labour force pressures on industry comprising ‘recruitment difficulties (57%), skills deficiencies (50%) and retention difficulties (46%)’ (ibid. 2011, p. 27).

Factors influencing skills shortages specifically in the Australian tourism and hospitality industry are outlined in Figure 1.1 below. These factors, including low pay, unusual hours and poor career structures, represent significant challenges for the industry in light of economic circumstances. Another compounding factor to the current national skills shortage, and with universal implications for human resource practices and education design, is the generational variances in the Australian labour force. Numerous researchers document the disparities between previous generations and the characteristics of Generation Y (born between 1980–1994) and Millennials (1995+), who have emerged amidst a fast-paced, technologically advanced and mobile
economic climate significantly altering expectations of normality held by their predecessors (Barron, Maxwell, Broadbridge & Ogden 2007; Martin 2005; McCrindle & Wolfinger 2010; Shaw & Fairhurst 2008). Compared to their stable, strong work ethic and loyal counterparts, Gen Y is renowned for their desire for work–life balance, which is in striking contrast to the long, unsocial hours and hard work associated with hospitality. Gen Y are identified as:

- Self reliant and independent;
- Techno-savvy;
- Have an urgent sense of immediacy;
- Entrepreneurial;
- Want increasing responsibility;
- Have a ‘get off my back’ attitude;
- Seek flexibility; and
- Have adopted the free agency attitude (Martin 2005, pp. 39–44).

**Figure 1.1: Factors Influencing Skills Shortages in the Australian Tourism and Hospitality Industry**

The conceptual differences of Gen Y, who are readily described in the literature as ‘high maintenance’, also extend to being team oriented and interested in the pursuit of learning and personal development. Employers must understand the Gen Y psyche to identify how to attract suitable employees, ensure good job fit with alignment of expectations and organisation objectives and tailor management styles to their needs. Furthermore, the field of education must refine and adapt pedagogy to reflect the characteristics and diverse learning styles of Gen Y whilst also accommodating needs of mature age students and those re-entering or changing fields of work. Generational factors were further proven to be significant to leadership style of industry managers,
with older generations suggested as having more ‘advanced moral development’ leading to more ethical decision making compared to the younger Generation Y, ‘in favour of a purely economic, or self-interested imperative’ (Minett, Yaman & Denizci 2009, p. 24).

Richardson (2009) provides very salient points especially pertaining to the nature of the hospitality industry as fragmented and not being equipped to deal with these factors. Investigations into the utilisation of university students by hospitality organisations found employers to view students as free, casual labour. The lack of career planning and exposure of hospitality students limited to frontline positions perpetuated negative views towards pursuit of a hospitality career and increased the potential leakage of hospitality graduates into other fields (Richardson 2009).

Justification for this thesis is offered in the contributions of a comprehensive overview of the state of hospitality education across sectors in Australia and it goes further to provide an integrated framework, directions and benchmarking on attributes required for work-ready graduates. These aspects are currently non-existent in the Australian context and there is a lack of an integrated overall picture. The dynamic nature of the framework, while providing a comprehensive flow chart of how progress may be made from basic- to high-level skills and attributes, leaves flexibility to accommodate for changing circumstances and the evolution of hospitality services. An example of this ‘flow’ and professionalisation could be a student learning basic cookery techniques whilst studying food technology or hospitality operations at high school. The student would then progress to more formal training and education in hospitality at TAFE or a similar vocational college and finally entering a university program where the focus would be on melding this vocational expertise with managerial, social and other business skills and knowledge. While opponents of this proposal may argue that such systems already exist in articulation agreements, anecdotal evidence suggests that in the absence of any mandatory rules, articulation agreements appear both fluid and competitive especially in the university sector. This competitiveness is driven more by the desire to have ‘bums on seats’ than any particularly well thought out system of assessing prior learning or qualifications. In the absence of a national framework, it means that this ad hoc system will continue, as will the continued gripes about the lack of preparedness of graduates to be job ready. Additionally, this lack of standardisation
means that competitiveness between organisations drives marketing hype and informed decision making for potential graduates remains a nightmare. This was highlighted in earlier references and observations regarding the gap between education and work-ready graduates.

The scope of the thesis and definitional issues become a consideration as a vast array of nomenclature exists in product offerings, for example, hospitality, tourism, services, recreation, sport, events, leisure, etc. The scope of this thesis is limited to those students who choose dedicated hospitality programs as opposed to those who use employment in hospitality as a transient phase on their way to another career. For purposes of clarification, the hospitality and tourism industries are seen to be interrelated, with hospitality services generally forming part of the tourism product. Tourism however is not limited to hospitality and extends to cover issues such as destination management, environmental audits and transit routes that go beyond the focus of this study (Inkson & Minnaert 2012; Leiper 2004; Weaver 2010). With this in mind the term tourism is often used interchangeably with hospitality, as part of an interrelated system and industry.

Another aspect that needs examination is the rise in popularity and awareness of hospitality, particularly food-related components engendered by the plethora of food-based shows on Australian TV (The Cook and the Chef, Food Safari, Feast India, Poh’s Kitchen, Nigella Lawson) wine and food special events (Food and Wine Show, Tasting Australia, Noosa Food and Wine Festival) celebrity chefs (Jamie Oliver, Gordon Ramsay, Kylie Kwong, Rick Stein, Ian Hewitson) and reality shows (My Kitchen Rules, MasterChef, Conviction Kitchen). The broad reach of this ‘awareness’ has resulted in more sophisticated and demanding consumers but industry providers have not kept pace with equally savvy employees.

This next section will serve to provide background to the Australian education system, introduction to the characteristics of service industries and provide a description of the hospitality field.
1.2 Overview of the Australian Education System

The Australian education system has been subject to extensive criticism in recent times within the media and political realms attributed to the absence of a nationally standardised system. Concerns are in relation to the perceived current inability to maintain education standards and likely impacts on the nation’s knowledge capital, employability of graduates and consequent economic performance and competitiveness (Bradley et al. 2008; DEEWR 2010; Hager & Holland 2006; Karmel 2004). During the early 1990s the federal government established the Australian National Training Authority (ANTA) to devise a national education strategy and reduce bureaucracy by culling the number of training advisory panels and boards (Karmel 2004). In efforts to further centralise decision making the allocated responsibilities and functions performed by ANTA were later transferred to the Department of Education, Science and Training (DEST), which was then reconfigured as the Department of Education, Employment and Workplace Relations (DEEWR 2010) and more recently into the Department of Industry, Innovation, Science, Research and Tertiary Education (DIISRTE 2012). The formation of the Business Industry Higher Education Collaboration Council (BIHECC) further serves to bridge the gap between business/industry and higher education undertaking collaborative projects, conducting research, developing strategies and facilitating access to funds (Commonwealth of Australia 2013). Importantly, whilst universities are affiliated with BIHECC, there appears to be no representation of TAFE and other providers of tertiary education in this body. This may be attributed to the state and federal jurisdictional divide extant in Australia. Yet there are a select few TAFE institutions that are already accredited to award degrees and TAFEs are currently petitioning the federal government to increase this representation, asserting that it will combat the nation’s skills shortage and responds to industry demands (Craig 2010).

As explored in detail within the literature review (Chapter 2), in the last decade research had been commissioned to investigate stakeholder perspectives on graduate employability. This was followed by extensive reviews on the education product culminating in recommendations to improve the Australian education system. Two such reports are the Review of Australian Higher Education (Bradley et al. 2008) and
Transforming Australia’s Higher Education System (Commonwealth of Australia 2009). These reports rigorously evaluated the Australian education system, advocating improvement to the quality and accessibility of education as the solution to delivering a skilled, adaptive and internationally competitive workforce. To overcome the current skills shortage and to anticipate and meet future demands in a rapidly evolving and complex economic climate, the reports further established the need to increase the proportion of Australia’s population with degree qualifications. The necessity of improvement of the quality of graduates, overcoming system inequality toward disadvantaged groups, unacceptably high staff to student ratios, lack of funds constraining educational institutions and an overall update of the system to accommodate diverse student body characteristics were also flagged as areas of concern (Bradley et al. 2008; Commonwealth of Australia 2009). The message that change must occur at a national policy/strategy level for suitable change to occur resonates in these and similar reports on Australia’s education system. This stance was further supported by a position paper published by the peak body Universities Australia (2008) calling for funding of a national internship scheme in recognition of the inherent value of practical and theoretical integration in curricula and enhancement of graduate employability. In 2008, the ACCI also released a policy review that declared a loss of confidence in Australia’s education system on behalf of member organisations. In the absence of progress Milburn (2010) reports employers still strongly support a national internship scheme.

Primed with this intelligence, the federal Labour government (2007–2013) had embarked upon an ‘Education Revolution’ in attempts to enhance school infrastructure, centralise decision making and provide a national curricula to offer all students, regardless of circumstance or locale, an equitable, transparent and comparable education product/experience (DEEWR 2010). This resulted in a standardised system of grading school performance contained on the My School website. A similar website for the university sector, My University, provides access to information and aids comparison of Australia’s higher education providers. These changes, while not operational yet in the tertiary sectors, clearly signalled the intent to extend the reviews and the ‘Education Revolution’ up the line. Importantly, the implications of the 2013 change of federal government for education funding and advancement are yet to be identified. Christopher Pyne, the Minister for Education in
the newly elected government, has reported federal coalition government priorities for broader consultation processes, increased empowerment for states, territories and educational institutions, higher standards for teacher training and a review into the impact of the ‘demand driven system’ on education quality (Pyne 2013). This thesis will not be addressing these issues any further as the government is still very much in its infancy. A discussion of the implementations to date is found in the following paragraphs.

The Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority (ACARA) is working with stakeholders to develop an Australian primary and high school curricula that is world class (ACARA 2012). Anticipated implementation of the first four curricula (English, Mathematics, Science and History) was to occur in 2011 with all subject areas to be eventually standardised. Implementation of the new curricula was however, left to the authority of each state and territory with NSW electing to commence the national curricula in 2014 (ibid. 2012). The essence of this reform agenda is to address the aforementioned limitations of the current education system in Australia, provide students with common literacy levels across the country and to foster lifelong learning and student engagement within society and the workforce.

The Gonski Review (Gonski et al. 2011), a comprehensive funding review for the Australian education system, has further heightened urgency to address identified system deficiencies. The report attributed a ‘broken system’ to the decline of student performance and Australia’s international standing, further noting the disparity of education quality influenced by socio-economic status, geographical remoteness and indigenous background. The report documents numerous recommendations pertaining to a transparent, fair, financially sustainable and effective system. Subsequent international studies strengthen arguments for change and effective management of education funds, with Australia’s position falling or stagnating compared to global standards. Results of The Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) and the Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS) revealed a substantial number of Australian students not meeting intermediate benchmarks whilst other countries demonstrated improvements in performance and rankings (ACER 2012). These studies further illustrated that shortages of school resources negatively impact Australian student performance (ibid. 2012).
A change in the dispersal of financial support for families saw the Education Tax Refund replaced by a Schoolkids Bonus in January 2013, thereby removing requirements for submitting school expense receipts for tax reimbursement. The allocation for primary students was $410 and for high school students $820 (Commonwealth of Australia 2012a) with no support available for tertiary students. In efforts to enhance skills of the Australian labour market, and in line with policy changes to allow minors to leave high school after year 10 on the condition of securing a trade apprenticeship, the federal government introduced funding schemes for trades’ apprenticeships and establishing the Trade Training Centres in School Program (DEEWR 2012). To date there is no comparable financial support available for university students. In fact, despite the mounting evidence drawing attention to resource deficiencies within the tertiary education sector, federal government proposals leading up to the election supported redistribution of funds away from tertiary and into secondary education. There was a rush to sign education deals between the federal and state and territory governments in the lead up to the 2013 election campaign aligned to the Gonski initiative incorporating funding propositions, such as eliminating discounts for students paying upfront, capping tax concessions and increasing TAFE fees. Education policies were a major campaign platform at the recent federal election.

Within the domain of the Australian tertiary education system, the progression of new fields of study are being met with new qualifications from various tertiary institutions (universities, TAFE, private colleges), and a plethora of national and international industry, educational, and government bodies have also been established specifically to enhance collaboration in the ‘Education Revolution’ (DEEWR 2010). Documented expectations assigned to universities have changed over the past few decades, with a focus on improving links between education and industry, to produce job-ready candidates with sufficient relevant work experience on graduation. Concurrently there is also recognition of the increasing limitations to such ideals within budgetary constraints, competition from other tertiary institutions and with increasing class sizes (McGill & Beaty 1995; Bradley et al. 2008). The ability for industry to actually provide supervised, meaningful work is a concern that has been raised by both students and industry groups. An example of this is the explosion in medical schools and students
who are faced with graduating but not capable of practising, as they have been unable to find internships (Fox & Arnold 2008).

In November 2011, the Office for Learning and Teaching (OLT) was established with $58.9 million in government funding over four years to enhance education quality (learning and teaching) in Australia (Commonwealth of Australia 2012b). The OLT provides grants for research, works on strategic issues for the higher education sector, celebrates teaching excellence, disseminates resources, encourages collaboration and facilitates networking (ibid. 2012b). The Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA) was also established in 2011, as the independent national regulator of higher education (Commonwealth of Australia 2012c). TEQSA performs a dual role ‘ensuring that higher education providers meet minimum standards, as well as promoting best practice’ (ibid. 2012c). To remain registered, education providers must conform to the threshold standards, namely: ‘Provider Registration Standards; Provider Category Standards; Provider Course Accreditation Standards; and Qualification Standards’ (ibid. 2012c). These standards are currently under review by TEQSA’s advisory body, the Higher Education Standards Panel. The implication of these reviews for hospitality degree qualifications is expected to be significant considering the diversity of course providers and pathways into higher education and the variance in program content and delivery (Dredge et al. 2012b).

Another interesting development for the WIL agenda occurred in February 2014 with the signing of a ‘Statement of Intent’ by key signatories: Universities Australia, Business Council of Australia, Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry, Australian Industry Group and Australian Collaborative Education Network Limited (BCA 2014). In recognition of the value WIL presents to all disciplines, the signatories document a commitment to collaborate in:

- Establishing a profile and baseline of what happens now and what works
- Drawing on the resources and expertise that already exist, and developing them further
- Identifying, promoting and disseminating best practice
- Facilitating university business partnerships through WIL and making it easier for participants - employers, educators and students - to find and work with the right people
- Assisting our members to identify opportunities for increased scale, breadth and quality of WIL placements
• Advocating for the research, scholarship and development of the evidence base to improve WIL effectiveness and outcomes for participants
• Identifying and addressing Impediments to these objectives
• Better informing students of opportunities through WIL
• Assessing our progress, identifying what remains to be done, and reporting on it (BCA 2014).

With the realm of WIL initiatives situated within a ‘workplace’ setting, it is necessary to explore the implications of Australian workplace legislation on the design and implementation of WIL within tertiary curricula. The Fair Work Act 2009 stipulates requirements for fair and productive workplace relations to further the national economic and social inclusion agenda. Under this legislation:

- a vocational placement is a working arrangement where all of the following apply:
  - the worker is not paid a wage
  - it is a requirement of an Australian based education or training course
  - it is authorised under a law or administrative arrangement of the Commonwealth, a State or Territory (Commonwealth of Australia 2011).

In addition to vocational placement, if work experience and volunteering are also unpaid and of a largely observational capacity then the student is not covered by the legislation. Apprenticeships and traineeships on the other hand constitute an employment contract with students remunerated for their contribution to business outcomes. There are strict guidelines, pay and conditions determined by the National Employment Standards to protect the interests of students (ibid. 2011).

The lack of clarity and meaning and the use of ambiguous terminology in exemptions for ‘vocational placements’ within the Fair Work Act, the legislative framework for workplace relations in Australia, have fuelled criticism by government, industry and academic stakeholders in recent years (Stewart & Owens 2013). In 2012 the Office of the Fair Work Ombudsman (FWO) commissioned further research into Australia’s ‘free labour’ market concerned with uncovering the range, nature and prevalence of unpaid internship arrangements, and exploring legal entitlements and complexities surrounding unpaid interns under relevant labour legislation, concentrating on non-altruistic and extracurricular forms of unpaid work experience (ibid. 2013). Internationally, governments are still grappling with the legalities of unpaid internships with attempts to clarify terminology, establish guidelines and regulate unpaid work experience relating to limiting durations, clarifying training components,
tripartite contracts, establishing government subsidies for host employers, and advertisement of internships on government websites (OECD 2013; Stewart & Owens 2013). Recommendations of the FWO report included:

- better define unpaid work experience
- expand guidance and education activities
- conduct targeted campaigns in key industries
- instigate legal action before relevant courts where appropriate
- improve liaison with relevant government agencies
- initiate comprehensive engagement with key stakeholders representing employers and employees, with an emphasis on vulnerable workers (young people and migrant workers) (ACEN 2013b).

Timely to this study, the Fair Work Commission announced an increase to the Junior Apprenticeship award structure (calculated as a percentage of the adult rate) for the first time in 40 years in August 2013, though it only applied to prospective apprentices and was accompanied by expressions of fears from the ACCI for increased employer costs leading to fewer apprenticeship opportunities (ABC 2013a).

It is important to clarify at this stage that the framework proposed is not to standardise the offerings of all forms of tertiary education into one schema, as each has a divergent purpose and focus, i.e. high school, tertiary (TAFE/university). Whilst traditionally university implied the adoption of theoretical approaches and TAFE/colleges adopted a practical approach, there is a major fallacy about this simplistic and erroneous belief (Fuller & Chalmers 1999). A more acceptable analogy would be that university focuses on analytical skills and career development as well as research and knowledge development, while on the other hand, TAFE is focused on application and necessary immediate technical skills for job performance e.g. cutting an onion. However, there is a progressive blurring of these lines, with some universities providing very rigorous work-based internships mandatory to their courses, some TAFEs moving into awarding degrees and through the establishment of University trade schools and partnerships with TAFEs and colleges (TAFE NSW 2012). Akin to a long- versus short-term award, where TAFE offers certificates for courses that range from a couple of hours to several years, expectations at university level are for a minimum of three years of study to achieve a basic qualification. TAFEs and colleges further offer an extensive range of courses, with many having a narrow focus to attaining competency
in a specific part of the industry, e.g. wine skills, food safety, barista, accommodation. This is in contrast to universities where most position hospitality as a specialisation or narrow range of courses within the business and management field. Tertiary institutions differ on account of course objectives, however, commonalities are in the form of primary outcomes, namely student learning and employability of students. They all serve as teaching facilities; thus the concept of WIL in efforts to improve student learning and employability prospects has application for each. Furthermore, there is growing awareness of the movement of students transferring between institutions and completing qualifications from both university and TAFE/colleges (NCVER 2010). The competency-based model employed at TAFE is also gaining currency among employers and has always had currency in service sector industries where vocational ability is the lynchpin to employment (e.g. the ability to insert a cannula in a patient for a nurse). As universities move into vocational sector discipline areas, they are increasingly beginning to recognise that simply requiring, or expecting, students to gain employment and ‘educate’ themselves, is insufficient to have job- and career-ready employees for industry—a period of WIL becomes essential in what is already a highly competitive marketplace e.g. services.

1.3 WIL in Australian Tertiary Institutions

Due to the primitive and complex nature of WIL research, there is no conclusive best practice for WIL in tertiary curricula. Currently a number of Australian and international studies are underway investigating aspects of WIL, including assessing impacts of WIL, WIL frameworks, evaluation models and WIL leadership frameworks. This section features a synthesis of Australian tertiary institution approaches to WIL pedagogy articulated through strategic priorities, WIL and similar engagement strategies, course composition and demonstrated through resources available within each institution and the design of WIL in curricula. Consideration was extended to the date of the source and to bias that may be inherent in institute publications. Table 1.1 provides a snapshot of the number of WIL hours, position of WIL in the curriculum and types of WIL in a selection of Australian hospitality and other discipline course providers. It is beyond the scope of this thesis to complete a
full analysis of all WIL programs within all Australian Tertiary Institutions thus the focus is limited to the key players in the Hospitality Tertiary Education market. It was found that some of Australia’s leading Universities progressive in WIL do not offer a hospitality course, so inclusion of these institutions in the other discipline category was designed to contribute to transferability of WIL intelligence to Hospitality. For the full list of Australian hospitality tertiary providers see Appendix 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>No. of Hospitality WIL Hours</th>
<th>Position of WIL in Hospitality Curriculum</th>
<th>Types of WIL in Institution</th>
<th>Types of WIL at Institution (Sourced from institute website)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victoria University</td>
<td>1 year (40 weeks) full time</td>
<td>Mandatory with other voluntary opportunities</td>
<td>Placements, internships, professional development program, industry projects, volunteering, problem-based learning, case studies, scenarios, talks, colloquies</td>
<td>Mandatory with other voluntary opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtin University</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Mandatory with other voluntary opportunities</td>
<td>Internship, work experience, field trips, guest speakers and industry engagement</td>
<td>Internship, work experience, field trips, guest speakers and industry engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Cross University (SCU)</td>
<td>3-6 week block of work experience</td>
<td>Mandatory with other voluntary opportunities</td>
<td>Professional placement is positioned in the final session.</td>
<td>Professional placement is positioned in the final session.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hotel School in Sydney (SCU)</td>
<td>Six-month internship</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>Internship is positioned at start of year 2</td>
<td>Internship is positioned at start of year 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Technology Sydney (UTS)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>Mandatory industry project for tourism and events students.</td>
<td>Mandatory industry project for tourism and events students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wollongong (UOW)</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>Most voluntary initiatives with mandatory research-based project</td>
<td>Most voluntary initiatives with mandatory research-based project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Ballarat (UOB)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>Complete industry project and an internship in capstone year.</td>
<td>Complete industry project and an internship in capstone year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flinders University</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>Mandatory industry placement and industry-linked research. Field work and site visits in each year level.</td>
<td>Mandatory industry placement and industry-linked research. Field work and site visits in each year level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Griffith University</td>
<td>150 hours</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>Voluntary WIL available</td>
<td>Voluntary WIL available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.1: Snapshot of WIL in a selection of Australian Tertiary Institutions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>No. of Hospitality WIL Hours</th>
<th>Position of WIL in Hospitality Curriculum</th>
<th>Types of WIL at Institution (Sourced from institute website)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of Western Sydney (UWS)</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Mandatory and voluntary options</td>
<td>Cooperative education, traineeships, service learning, practicums, clinical experience, work experience, placements, internships, engaged units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Cook University (JCU)</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Professional experience as an elective</td>
<td>Practicum, internship programs, fieldwork, clinical placements, vacation work, service learning, international service learning, simulations, sandwich course, volunteer work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Queensland</td>
<td>Industry placement (40hours)</td>
<td>Mandatory WIL, multiple types</td>
<td>Industry placement, student industry projects, field visits and site evaluations, guest lectures, shadowing program, immersion project, consultancy project, student abroad and exchange opportunities, internship program, international study tours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond University</td>
<td>400 hours industry experience</td>
<td>Mandatory industry experience with voluntary internship and work experience opportunities</td>
<td>Practicum placements, internships, pro bono and other types of work experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Blue College of Hospitality Management</td>
<td>200 hours each in second and third years</td>
<td>Mandatory industry placement</td>
<td>Industry experience, placements, guest lectures, internships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Mountains International Hotel Management School</td>
<td>1200 hours: 600 hours in each, year 1 and year 2</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>Simulations, industry placements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Cordon Bleu Australia</td>
<td>12 months experience, 6 months in each, year 1 and year 2</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>Professional placement, simulations, professional practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International College of Management Sydney</td>
<td>Nine months of industry training</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>Simulations, work experience, practice labs, industry placement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International College of Hotel Management</td>
<td>Minimum of 1500 hours of undergraduate industry placement</td>
<td>Mandatory: two industry placements Voluntary: two industry placements</td>
<td>Industry placements, work-based projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAFE NSW</td>
<td>Varies according to level and type of qualification</td>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>Work experience, simulations, service periods, work placement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions</td>
<td>No. of WIL Hours</td>
<td>Position of WIL in Hospitality Curriculum</td>
<td>Types of WIL at Institution (Sourced from institute website)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Macquarie University                 | 3 credit point unit: minimum 30 hours  
6 credit point unit: minimum 60 hours | Inserting a participation unit as a core requirement for all degree courses through staged implementation. Any year of study. | Internships, practicums, field trips with a partnership component, community service and learning, community development and/or research projects |
| University of New South Wales (UNSW) | Varies           | Voluntary and mandatory, based on select disciplines  
Optional accompaniments to degree programs: Diploma of Professional Practice and GAP.             | Professional placements, practicums, fieldwork, industrial training, cooperative education, field education, service learning, international or local internships, volunteering, mentoring and other opportunities |
| University of Sydney                 | Varies           | Mandatory requirement in select fields where clinical practice constitutes a professional entry-level requirement.  
Voluntary WIL opportunities available.                                                | Student exchange programs, internships, cadetships and industry placements, clinical practice |
| Australian National University (ANU)  | Varies           | Mandatory clinical placements and fieldwork for select disciplines                                         | Internships, work experience, research, scholarships, industry/field placement, overseas opportunities, practicum, vacation employment/placement, workplace learning, work shadowing. |
Deduced from examination of the tertiary hospitality course offerings and other course providers in Table 1.1, it appears the university market has jumped on the WIL bandwagon following the TAFE and college example of WIL embedded in curricula. Whilst adopting variations of program titles and engaged learning terminology, all marketing propaganda declared by the various tertiary institutions aims to impart practical experience for improved graduate employability. The extent to which each institution’s WIL doctrine translates into practice and their ability to deliver WIL outcomes is beyond the scope of this study and merits further research, particularly upon conclusion of current strategic plan durations. What can be ascertained is that Australian university institutions have adopted differing approaches to the WIL agenda from the centralised structure of mandatory WIL for all programs with investment in WIL support personnel, to the decentralised structures where WIL initiatives are left to the devices of individual faculties or remain as optional components to degree programs. Eligibility for some of the optional WIL programs offered at these universities is based on Grade Point Average (GPA) and subject to extensive competition. Furthermore, they all differ in terms of WIL duration, types of WIL experiences offered and whether such experience is in a paid capacity. All the tertiary institutions are at differing stages of developing WIL policies and resources. The following sections are based on tertiary institution type to provide further details about specific WIL initiatives and best practices at both an institution and hospitality discipline level.

1.3.1 University Sector
Chief among the university sector offerings in NSW and regarded as being cutting edge is Macquarie University, Sydney. The strategic direction of Macquarie University asserts a ‘commitment to excellence in research, learning and teaching and community engagement’ (Macquarie University 2014). Informed by continuous improvement in education quality and rigour of units and activities, Macquarie University’s curricula renewal incorporates 3 P’s namely People, Planet and PACE. The Professional and Community Engagement (PACE) program is a progressive WIL initiative comprising insertion of a participation unit as a core requirement for all degree courses usually completed in second or third year to improve graduate employability. PACE units have an academic framework which varies based on the disciplinary area to provide an effective orientation for the PACE experience which
involves working with a partner organisation with emphasis on both hard and soft values (ibid 2014). Macquarie University academics presented the program to an ACEN forum in 2011, identifying the following steps to achieving the stated goals: partnership development; curricula change to integrate a wide variety of WIL initiatives (including internships, practicums, field trips with a partnership component, community service and learning, community development and/or research projects); legal issues (ethics, risk); resourcing with two PACE staff in each faculty and an additional six staff in the PACE Hub; and ensuring accessibility for all students (Whiteford & Winchester-Seeto 2011). For further information, refer to Appendix 2.

Several other universities have also established centralised WIL teams including Victoria University with their Learning in the Workplace and Community (LiWC) program. The creation of LiWC was informed by institute research into industry perceptions on WIL to enlighten partnership development (Jeffries & Milne 2013; Victoria University 2013). To demonstrate commitment to WIL, the program has been integrated into policy frameworks, engagement strategies and is marketed as a distinguishing feature of the university. Similarly, community engagement initiatives are administered at Southern Cross University (SCU) by their Sustainability, Partnerships and Community Engagement (SPaCE) team in accordance with SCU policy (SCU 2013). The appointment of WIL coordinators or departments associated with removing the significant WIL stressors for academic staff requires substantial investment by the institute in the strategic directions for WIL pedagogy.

The University of New South Wales (UNSW) has approached the necessity to improve graduate employability atypically, through optional accompaniments to the degree programs designed to make graduates stand out. UNSW has partnered with industry to develop GAP, the Graduate Advantage Program, an intensive one-week program designed to develop the soft professional skills sought by employers (UNSW 2013). A Diploma of Professional Practice is also offered concurrent to degree programs, providing practical experience through two work placements of a minimum four weeks duration and skills workshops. UNSW encourages student initiative to enhance employability through attending careers expos and promoting UNSW-accredited internships and counselling and clinical psychology placements (ibid. 2013).
In terms of resources and support for academics and professional staff engaged in WIL, UNSW has established the University Network of Work Integrated Learning Educators (WILEd) to facilitate focussed discussions on WIL topics and best practices. Professional Placement Education (PPEd) is a course provided to all UNSW staff responsible for WIL initiatives and is specifically focused on the professional development of academics who are new to WIL.

The course covers six topics:

- Learning
- Teaching
- Supervision
- Assessment
- Feedback
- Evaluation: the assessment task for the course (UNSW 2013).

Positioned as a strategic priority, Flinders University has a strong commitment to WIL, with aims to provide authentic and simulated WIL opportunities as explicit features within discipline programs (Flinders University 2013). The design of WIL programs encompasses three phases, namely: Preparatory, Placement and Retrospective. The differentiating aspects of Flinders University approach to WIL is their award-winning Pre-Place program, a multi-disciplinary online WIL preparation program completed by students prior to commencement in a WIL placement (refer to Appendix 3) (ibid. 2013). This program covers university policy requirements and foundation knowledge in areas such of work health and safety, problem solving and professional attitudes and skills.

Griffith University has developed a Good Practice Guide: WIL: Designing and Implementing WIL Curriculum (GIHE 2009). Commencing with a brief justification for WIL, the document advocates strategies for success, comprising: authentic professional settings to engage students in meaningful workplace activity; reflective learning to focus students’ attention on the integration of theory and practice and application of learning to future practice; integration of a range of university and industry partner support structures (information and communication channels, counselling, inductions, learning support); alignment of ‘learning objectives, workplace activities and assessment to produce effective, relevant, meaningful and intended outcomes for all stakeholders, especially students’ (Biggs 1996); sound
management and monitoring of students’ progress on placement via regular communication, onsite visits, deliberate guided progress reflections and progress reports; effective administration of placements and relationship management with regular partner contact, constant evaluation of risks and maintenance of placement records; and finally, managing the essential elements of the WIL program through establishing minimum administration standards, availability of appropriate and sufficient resources, ensuring quality of the WIL program and learning outcomes are maintained and risk management (GIHE 2009).

University of Western Sydney (UWS) initiatives to provide students with work experience include: the Jobs on Campus program, with UWS negotiating a position as one of three preferred suppliers of staff for UWS facilities, co-op programs providing domestic and international internship opportunities, the UWS Business Administration traineeship and the UWS Career Hub conducting careers expos and enabling students to search for employment opportunities and career resources (UWS 2013).

The formation of University trade schools was observed as a means to provide additional pathways into degree programs as in the case of Victoria and Curtin universities and to enhance graduate employability skills. The University of Ballarat (UOB) differentiates its product offering by operating an Industry Skills Centre providing short- and long-term vocational training courses to supplement the degree programs (UOB 2013).

An observation made during the review of University hospitality tertiary providers since commencement of this PhD in 2009 is the reduction of hospitality degrees and reduced priority of hospitality to a specialisation within Bachelor of Business, Commerce or Marketing programs. Concurrent emerging trends in university and TAFE and VET pathways programs are further eliminating the provision of the hospitality components within universities. This is threatening the future of university Hospitality Departments and potentially stunting the research into hospitality. Interestingly, through a search of current hospitality courses available in NSW, other universities outside of NSW are establishing campuses in Sydney offering hospitality courses (refer to Appendix 1).
One example of the University and TAFE partnerships is the University of Technology Sydney (UTS). UTS offers a Bachelor of Management in Hospitality and Tourism, ‘a pathway program developed in conjunction with TAFE NSW’, with course eligibility requiring completion of:

- either the Advanced Diploma of Hospitality from TAFE NSW, or the Advanced Diploma in Hospitality Management and the Advanced Diploma in Tourism Management from Kenvale College of Tourism and Hospitality Management (UTS 2013).

This program seeks to build on the vocational skills delivered through the TAFE model prior to progressing to higher learning, in place of embedding WIL in the university component of the curriculum. TAFE-integrated hospitality programs are also offered by the University of Wollongong, University of Ballarat, Charles Sturt University and Central Queensland University with the University of Notre Dame requiring completion of an Advanced Diploma of Hospitality and an Advanced Diploma of Events at an RTO to be eligible for their degree program (UOW 2013; UOB 2013; CSU 2013; CQU 2013; University of Notre Dame 2013). The benefits of these pathways programs, as promoted to prospective students, include two qualifications within the duration of a degree program and often the degree components are conducted at the TAFE.

1.3.2 College Sector

In addition to the wide assortment of VET qualifications offered by Australian hotel schools there are a number of degree programs that adopt teaching methods, WIL initiatives and assessments consistent with many of the reviewed universities. William Blue College of Hospitality Management, Blue Mountains International Hotel Management School, Le Cordon Bleu Australia Pty Ltd, International College of Management Sydney and the International College of Hotel Management all have industry placements as a key feature of their degrees ranging between 9–12 months or 1200–1600 hours (Le Cordon Bleu International 2013; ICMS 2013; Blue Mountains International Hotel Management School 2013; ICHM 2013; Think: Colleges Pty Ltd 2013). These private institutes all have dedicated industry placement departments and their placements are generally positioned at the end of the first and second years. With a concerted emphasis on practical learning, another distinguishing feature of these hotel schools is dedicated hospitality teaching facilities for simulations and practical skill development. Marketed as hospitality training specialists offering practical
experience and with strong affiliations to industry, these hotel schools appear to be capitalising on the growing market for hospitality qualifications and digression of universities away from the provision of hospitality-specialised courses. Students do pay a premium for the reputation of graduating from these private hotel schools and the exorbitant student fees provide resources and funds not available to universities.

Several best practice WIL initiatives deduced from reviewing materials published by the hotel school sector include the Practical Learning Centre at the Blue Mountains International Hotel Management School (2013). This centre is a simulated hotel where students live on campus and experience being guest and host. The International College of Management Sydney employs a computer simulation program of front office operations within its curriculum (ICMS 2013). Finally, students at the International College of Hotel Management complete one program and are awarded two degrees, the Bachelor of Business (Hospitality Management) and an additional degree endorsed by the acclaimed Swiss Hotel Association (SHA), the Bachelor of International Hotel Management (SHA) (ICHM 2013).

1.3.3 TAFE Sector
The TAFE NSW education system offers a number of short- and long-term hospitality programs and has in recent times moved into the degree market as evidenced by the pathway university collaborations (TAFE NSW Higher Education 2012). Industry has welcomed this outcome with its more practical focus and operational skill attainment combined with theoretical instruction to create job-ready graduates, perceived as overcoming the deficiencies of the exclusive university hospitality programs. The pathways system receives funding support from the NSW Board of Vocational Education and Training (ibid. 2012). The practical experience offered in the TAFE NSW model for hospitality education is parallel to the hotel school faculties including simulated hospitality facilities, practical skill courses (bar courses, restaurant operations) and compulsory industry currency through work experience tied to assessments. The difference between TAFE and the hotel schools is evident in the low-cost, increased variety of short- and long-term programs, extensive number and location of TAFE institutes and standardised curricula across TAFE institutes.
Service Skills Australia (2013) is a government-funded industry skills council that supports skills development in a range of industries including hospitality, tourism and events. The organisation engages in consultation with RTOs, industry and other stakeholders, to develop and continuously improve nationally recognised training products for delivery within these RTOs (TAFE, private colleges, schools). In 2011, I was invited in the capacity of an industry representative to participate in the Tourism, Hospitality and Events Training Package Review – SIT12 Consultation Workshop, conducted by Service Skills Australia. Analogous gripes within university communities were expressed by TAFE staff, which included the desecration of TAFE courses, limited resources and support for WIL coordination along with concerns for loopholes enabling completion of diploma courses with minimum work experience components. These arguments were replicated in the focus groups discussed in Chapter 5. A series of Practical Placement Guides are now available on the Service Skills Australia website to facilitate specific integration of WIL in hospitality and tourism industries, explaining the pedagogy and relevant terminology, outlining roles and responsibilities of the stakeholders, the nature of work experience and evaluation guidelines and checklists for the developing and maintenance of placement programs and partnerships, including:

- *A Guide for Registered Training Organisations*
- *A Guide for Employers*
- *Student Workbook* (Service Skills Australia 2013).
1.3.4 Industry Sector
In addition to the increasing prevalence of graduate hospitality programs, several large hospitality organisations are further encroaching on the undergraduate hospitality market, including the Crown Melbourne, having established its own Crown College, and Accor Academie (Crown Melbourne Ltd 2013; Accor 2013). Many hospitality employers have further established partnerships with tertiary institutions, e.g. Four Seasons and Blue Mountains International Hotel Management School, Le Cordon Bleu, Adelaide, and The Hotel School Sydney to facilitate networking and recruitment opportunities and the provision of WIL initiatives (Blue Mountains International Hotel Management School 2013; The Hotel School 2013).

The specific content of the graduate-level programs primarily pursued by the prestigious hotel chains represented a strong motivation for this study. Acceptance into such programs is highly competitive and employers generally provide opportunities for graduates to gain work experience in every department as a standard prerequisite for promotion to management ranks. The source of contention is whilst requiring a bachelor’s degree qualification, the coursework oriented components or programs generally cover the same content previously covered in a hospitality degree, as featured in Appendix 4, thereby serving to delay career progression.

1.4 Collaborative Associations

There are a number of collaborative associations operating in Australia with WIL as a primary or major theme for which Australian tertiary education institutes are members. This section will briefly review the most prevalent collaborative associations with further details and membership featured in Appendix 5.

The IRU (Innovative Research Universities) is a collaborative university network comprising seven member institutions to enhance higher education outcomes in Australia (IRU 2013). Key areas of collaboration include ‘research, teaching and learning, internationalisation and academic staff development’ with advancement of the WIL agenda central to this purpose (ibid. 2013). In addition to ongoing research
into WIL, the IRU has published an assortment of resources to educate industry and employers about WIL, promote the benefits of and assist with industry participation in WIL projects through providing checklists and clarifying roles and responsibilities of host supervisors (refer to Appendix 6). The *Roles and Responsibilities of the Workplace Supervisor* document establishes expectations of industry supervisors whilst providing guidelines on how to achieve aims for a successful partnership (ibid. 2013). These guidelines set out requirements for a *formal agreement* between the university, industry partner and student detailing the *nature of the work placement and standards to be achieved*, *negotiation of work duties and learning goals*, *provision of a workspace and necessary tools* to complete the specified work, *workplace induction*, requirement of workplace supervisors to provide ongoing *supervision, mentoring and constructive feedback*, as well as *assessment of learning achieved* (ibid. 2013). The WIL Checklist commences with a brief introduction to WIL pedagogy and specifically prompts prospective industry partners to become familiar with university policies, culture and subjects to ensure alignment of interests before pursuing a WIL partnership, in addition to stipulating the expected degree of involvement and support available to industry partners and resource requirements for participation (ibid. 2013). These resources have further been tailored to target specific nuances of WIL within disciplines new to WIL including: business, creative arts, information technology and law and member universities have links to these files on their websites (ibid. 2013).

The GO8 (Group of Eight Ltd 2013) is another collaborative organisation, a coalition of eight leading Australian universities, focusing on excellence in research, higher education and community service. Through mobilising the expertise of member universities, the GO8 influences national policies within the Australian higher education sector and collaborates on a diversity of topics and disciplines in the education research agenda (ibid. 2013).

The Association of Australian Hotel Schools (AAHS) connects eight of the private, full fee-paying hotel schools in Australia specialising in hospitality, tourism and event management (AAHS 2013). Membership is conditional on providing ‘a range of full-time hospitality and or tourism courses at AQF Diploma level and above’, with a strong vocational focus committed to professional development of students to meet
demands of industry relating to employability skills, knowledge and attributes and courses must offer an accredited period of work experience (ibid. 2013).

The interests of independent providers of vocational education and training are represented by the Australian Council for Private Education and Training (ACPET 2013). This national association promotes and advances quality in the private tertiary education sector through building international connections, providing cost-effective services to members, benchmarking and information dissemination including through publishing the biannual peer-reviewed *Journal for Private Higher Education* (ibid. 2013).

One of the most interesting associations aligned to the subject of this research is The International Centre of Excellence in Tourism and Hospitality Education (THEICE). Established by the federal government in 2003 to advance hospitality and tourism education, when government funding ended in 2008 it became registered as an independent not-for-profit international accreditation body and is governed by an elected board of directors (THE ICE 2013). THE ICE specialises in tourism, hospitality, events and culinary arts education with their main activities encompassing accreditation, benchmarking and promotion of excellence in education (ibid. 2013). Strong connections with industry validate accredited courses that are aligned with employer expectations and deliver a high-standard employable graduate. Through strategic partnerships with *i-graduate* (international graduate benchmarking service for education institutes) and *i-student group* (online marketing service targeting students), THE ICE assists prospective students to find their ‘best fit’ study options (ibid. 2013). The association disseminates a wealth of resources and development initiatives to member institutes and administers annual benchmarking practices to guarantee excellence of course quality. THE ICE facilitates collaboration and networking of academics on a global scale in the interests of advancing the quality of hospitality and tourism education, inviting leading academics to their International Panel of Experts Forums and Benchmarking Roundtables (ibid. 2013).

The cessation of government funding for a much needed national accreditation system for hospitality and tourism education reinforces the fundamental ignorance and profound barriers to correcting the underlying constraints to hospitality graduate
employability in Australia. This model does still provide inspiration for recommendations. Despite the apparent progressive work of this association, it is relatively unknown in WIL communities. The more notable and accessible associations furthering education quality, whilst not exclusive to hospitality, are the Australian Collaborative Education Network (ACEN) and the National Centre for Vocational Education Research (NCVER) of which the researcher is a member.

ACEN is a dynamic professional association ‘providing strategic leadership for WIL research, scholarship and practice in Australia’ (ACEN 2013a). Engaged in a multitude of research projects, while conducting regular state and national events and acting as a communication channel, ACEN provides extensive resources for its members (comprising both academic and professional staff) and other stakeholders engaged in WIL, such as industry, community and government. The ACEN website features a National WIL Portal promoting WIL opportunities (ibid. 2013a). As the national cooperative WIL association, ACEN is also a member of the World Association for Cooperative Education (WACE), the only global professional organisation dedicated to developing, expanding, branding and advocating for cooperative & work-integrated education programs within industry and educational institutions (WACE 2013).

Focused on the enhancement of vocational training in Australia, NCVER is a not-for-profit company ‘owned by state, territory and federal ministers responsible for training’ and is ‘responsible for collecting, managing, analysing, evaluating and communicating research and statistics about vocational education and training (VET) nationally’ (NCVER 2013). NCVER disseminates research publications and statistics for the Australian VET sector free of charge to all stakeholders with the aim of improving VET policy and practice.

The National Association of Graduate Careers Advisory Services (NAGCAS) ‘is Australia’s peak professional body for career development in the higher and tertiary education sectors’ (NAGCAS 2013). In addition to conducting research, NAGCAS prepares position papers and disseminates information and toolkits for employers, universities and students (ibid. 2013). Six principles were identified in the 2009 NAGCAS/ALTC project Career Development Learning through WIL: Maximising the contribution of work-integrated learning to the student experience:
1. **Flexible partnerships** support effective career development learning
2. Workplace experiences can provide genuine career development learning opportunities for all students. **Multiple experiences** and contexts enrich this learning.
3. Career Development Learning is student centred, and designed to actively **engage students** in the workplace experience.
4. Career development learning supports **quality student centred learning opportunities** across all aspects of students’ lives.
5. Universities encourage students’ career development and workplace learning by supporting their capacity to systematically **reflect, record, and articulate the acquired skills and experience**.
6. **Quality assurance** across the experience contributes to better outcomes (Smith et al. 2009, p. 13).

Established in 2007, Universities Australia is the peak body representing all 39 Australian universities both nationally and internationally (Universities Australia 2013). Universities Australia seeks to support and advance the Australian university sector through facilitating collaboration and access to resources, promoting the welfare of students and staff, increased purchasing power for common goods, investigating problems in the university sector and developing policy positions to influence government (ibid. 2013). One of the significant position papers released by Universities Australia in 2008 related to improving employability of university graduates through a national internship scheme, based on enhancing existing disparate frameworks within the sector. Recognition of widespread collaboration in the sector has yet to be realised despite acknowledgement that active commitment and partnership with industry and the commonwealth, state and territory governments is required (ibid. 2013). The position paper further recommended immediate steps to achieve the National Internship Scheme:

- a more active commitment by the Commonwealth Government in promoting an expansion of internships and work integrated learning;
- commitment by Commonwealth, State and Territory governments to lead by example through expansion of internship opportunities within their own departments and agencies;
- establishment of a joint government/industry/university steering committee to define the scope, structure, mechanisms and costs of such a scheme – either as part of the Council of Australian Governments human capital agenda or as a separate initiative; and
establishment of a National Internships Council to provide advice to the Commonwealth Government on regulatory and tax expenditure setting for work integrated learning (ibid. 2013).

The Higher Education Research and Development Society of Australasia (HERDSA) is a scholarly society promoting the development and quality of higher and tertiary education (HERDSA 2014). Serving to advance policy and practice, HERDSA encourages collaboration, recognises outstanding contributions to education and disseminates research through annual conferences, publications and their international refereed journal Higher Education Research and Development (HERD) (ibid 2014). The latest HERDSA publication of critical importance to the WIL agenda is titled ‘HERDSA Guide: Work Integrated Learning in the Curriculum’ and is a how to guide for WIL (ibid 2014).

The Council for Australasian University Tourism and Hospitality Education (CAUTHE) represents Australian and New Zealand universities conducting research and teaching in the areas of hospitality and tourism (CAUTHE 2013). The pursuit of excellence in hospitality and tourism education is central to the association’s mission and is achieved through lobbying government and industry, encouraging collaboration and facilitating networking. CAUTHE conducts an annual conference and disseminates information through member communications and as the publisher of the Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management (ibid. 2013).

Yet another national professional association for educators is the Australian College of Educators (ACE), which is the only association representing the entire network of educators from preschool to tertiary level (ACE 2013). This not-for-profit association facilitates networking, professional development, discussion of topical issues and disseminates research to its 5500 members (ibid. 2013).

The final association of relevance to this research is the Australasian TAFE Tourism, Hospitality and Events Educators Association (ATTHEEA) and is the TAFE equivalent educator platform for debating quality education in the tourism, hospitality and events industry (ATTHEEA 2013). Membership is available to employees of the TAFE system engaged in teaching, administration or research in the relevant
disciplines and the association serves to facilitate development of training in the sector, educator collaboration and engagement with industry (ibid. 2013).

This section has demonstrated that a number of collaborative organisations exist to promote both higher education outcomes in the broad sense, and specifically the advancement of the WIL agenda, as well as hospitality and tourism education in Australia. Furthermore, an abundance of WIL resources has been produced by these associations with research into topical WIL areas ongoing. With all the publications and resources to date, and wealth of expertise of Australian academics across the tertiary education system, the existence of multiple replica associations is permitting inefficiencies by a failure to employ a centralised inclusive system. Duplication of resources contributes to inefficient use of academic time and funds, which constitutes a key concern particularly for the TAFE and university sectors. Additionally, many academics and institutions are members of multiple associations pursuing the same objectives and research agendas as they struggle to tackle the same WIL challenges. In essence, the siloed nature of the hospitality industry is replicated to an extent by these institutions, despite their espousing the same rhetoric of collaboration for mutual benefit. The researcher does acknowledge the likelihood of institutional pursuit of exclusive strategic alliances as a marketing advantage, particularly THE ICE; however, the more centralised and inclusive collaborations such as ACEN are successful and productive associations that recognise the competitiveness of the tertiary education section whilst celebrating the differences of each member institute.

A comprehensive, although not exhaustive, list of national and NSW specific hospitality and tourism associations has been included in Appendix 7 to demonstrate the myriad associations often working in isolation to further the interest of hospitality businesses.

At this juncture it would be useful to introduce a detailed discussion of what exactly constitutes service industries and their characteristics, particularly in the Australian context. The work of Zeithaml, Parasuraman and Berry (1990) is especially useful in this regard.
1.5 Service Industries

The purpose of this section is to introduce the reader to the width and breadth of what is considered the ‘service industry’. Providing a brief description of some of the characteristics common to service industries is intended to contextualise Hospitality as a subcategory of the service industry.

The current version of the Australian and New Zealand Standard Industrial Classification (ANZSIC), published by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) in 2006, identifies service industries as namely:

- Electricity, Gas, Water and Waste Services (ANZSIC Division D)
- Construction (ANZSIC Division E)
- Wholesale Trade (ANZSIC Division F)
- Retail Trade (ANZSIC Division G)
- Accommodation and Food Services (ANZSIC Division H)
- Transport, Postal and Warehousing (ANZSIC Division I)
- Information Media and Telecommunications (ANZSIC Division J)
- Financial and Insurance Services (ANZSIC Division K)
- Rental, Hiring and Real Estate Services (ANZSIC Division L)
- Professional, Scientific and Technical Services (ANZSIC Division M)
- Administrative and Support Services (ANZSIC Division N)
- Public Administration and Safety (ANZSIC Division O)
- Education and Training (ANZSIC Division P)
- Health Care and Social Assistance (ANZSIC Division Q)
- Arts and Recreation Services (ANZSIC Division R)
- Other Services (ANZSIC Division S).

The nature of work within service industries is highly practical and people-oriented (Parker 2005). In fact the human element is referred to as inseparable from simultaneous production, exchange and consumption of service products. Quester et al. define a service as ‘a deed performed by one party for another’ (2003, p. 273). In contrast to a tangible good where if rigorous quality controls are in place the good will be identical each time it is purchased, a service is something that is experienced or consumed and human interaction constitutes part of the product. Whilst businesses are able to devote resources to standardise the physical elements of their product, namely uniforms, furniture and logos, it is unreasonable to conceive of standardising human
behaviour. The innate variability of human beings thus leads to heterogeneity of service encounters, with each service delivery constituting a unique experience and thus people management becomes a crucial measure of service quality. Services are further distinguished from goods on account of their perishability (ibid. 2003). The perishable nature of services means they cannot be stored for sale at a later date rather opportunities for service encounters and thus revenue generation are lost in the absence of demand. Additionally, services cannot be resold unlike when a good is returned. Managing supply and demand is difficult as service businesses experience peaks and troughs whilst customers expect consistent service quality on each encounter (Kotler et al. 2004). This highlights the importance of staff training, complaint resolution and waste management. In an age of effortlessness technological replication, business and academia are assigning extensive attention to harnessing people resources as a source of competitive advantage. The ground-breaking work of Zeithaml, Parasuraman and Berry (1990) provides insight into the measurement and management of service quality and remains relevant and routinely employed by contemporary researchers (Cristobal, Flavian & Guinaliu 2007; Kouthouris & Alexandris 2005; Kumar, Kee & Manshor 2009). In efforts to determine the gap between customer perceptions and expectations, the authors developed the Servqual model to assess service quality on the basis of five elementary attributes, namely: reliability, empathy, assurance, responsiveness, and tangibles (Zeithaml, Parasuraman & Berry 1990).

1.6 Hospitality Industry

Definitions of hospitality have always been contentious (Ottenbacher, Harrington & Parsa 2009; Riley, Ladkin & Szivas 2002). For the purpose of this research the work of Slattery (2002), which refutes the commonly accepted three domain notion proposed by Lashley and Morrison (2000), is preferred as it is more all encompassing of the domain of businesses and makes a clear distinction between domestic and commercial hospitality. The commonly cited three domain model (social, private and commercial domains) is inadequate in capturing the complexity with which hospitality provision occurs excluding the industrial, corporate and venue contexts (Slattery 2002). Slattery argues that the domains do not give adequate consideration to the
presence of both designated free-standing hospitality enterprise and cross-over with other industries, with hospitality often a subsidiary component (ibid. 2002). A more inclusive approach espousing four sectors is depicted in Table 1.2 to embrace the vast diversity of hospitality facilities, products and services.

**Figure 1.3: Hospitality Domain Model**

![Figure 1.3: Hospitality Domain Model](image)

Source: Lashley & Morrison (2001)

**Table 1.2: Structure of the Hospitality Industry**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Free-Standing Hospitality Businesses</th>
<th>Hospitality in Leisure Venues</th>
<th>Hospitality in Travel Venues</th>
<th>Subsidised Hospitality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hotels</td>
<td>Casinos</td>
<td>Airports</td>
<td>Workplaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday centres</td>
<td>Bingo clubs</td>
<td>Rail stations</td>
<td>Health care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quasi hotels</td>
<td>Night clubs</td>
<td>Bus stations</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruise ships</td>
<td>Cinemas</td>
<td>Ferry terminals</td>
<td>Military</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-share</td>
<td>Theatres</td>
<td>Aeroplanes</td>
<td>Custodial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bars</td>
<td>Sports stadia</td>
<td>Trains</td>
<td>Retailers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants</td>
<td>Theme parks</td>
<td>Ferries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attraction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health clubs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Though tourism statistics in Australia do not conform to these sector headings, data for the Australian Hospitality Industry is in part captured by four tourism characteristic industries depicted in Table 1.3. Of the 280,088 tourism businesses that operated in Australia in 2012, the largest contributor at 22% was the ‘Cafes, restaurants and take away food services industries’ with the remaining three hospitality related categories accounting for a further 8% of tourism businesses (Tourism Research Australia 2013, p5). The Gross Value Added (GVA) contribution of these four hospitality industries to the Australian economy equates to $13,384,000 and 36% of GVA for the tourism industry (ibid 2013). The Australian hospitality businesses is characterised by a high proportion of small (56%) and medium (15%) sized operations with a further 29% constituting non-employing businesses (sole proprietorship or partnership without employees) (ibid 2013).

Table 1.3 Australian Hospitality Industry Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tourism Characteristic Industries</th>
<th>Number of Businesses ‘000</th>
<th>Number of Employees ‘000</th>
<th>Gross Value Added $ million</th>
<th>Share of Tourism Industry GVA %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>6,499</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cafes, restaurants and take away food services</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>141.1</td>
<td>4,129</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clubs, pubs, taverns and bars</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>2,295</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casinos and other gambling services</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>83.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>246.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,384</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adapted from Tourism Research Australia 2013, p6)

The focus of this thesis is limited to service industries, reflecting the researcher’s background constituting hospitality industry experience and expertise. The deductive nature of the problem and the perceived gap became evident during the course of industry experience and in the process of actually applying for full-time employment on graduation. This stimulated my interest especially when a review revealed little scholarly or rigorous explanations existed as to the reasons for this perceived lack of ‘job readiness’. Further, conversations and questions from long-term industry participants only confirmed the widely reported ‘complaints’ about the lack of
graduates’ preparedness for the world of work but few or no solutions to the issue. The timing of these queries also propitiously coincided with a curricula review of hospitality program offerings and the mandatory inclusions of WIL.

1.7 Theoretical Contribution

A well-known quote from Confucius, 450 BC, reads, ‘Tell me, and I will forget. Show me, and I may remember. Involve me, and I will understand’ (cited in Ethridge & Branscomb [2008], p. 406).

Learning theories have been constantly emerging and evolving within discipline-specific and general literature in attempts to improve the learning process for education. Theories about learning are generally categorised as either behavioural, focusing on observable changes in behaviour, or cognitive, investigating mental processes for how information is absorbed and retained (Kraft 1990). During the last century, Experiential Learning (EL) has dominated discussion. The founding works of Dewey (1938), Lewin (1939) and Piaget (1952), among others, form the building blocks upon which contemporary EL theories have evolved, with the work of Kolb (1984) and Kolb and Kolb (2005) serving to popularise these theories. Though educators, philosophers, psychologists and researchers have all contributed their own interpretations of EL, the essential concept extends beyond the mere application of tools and techniques with experiences as appendages to curricula, towards a philosophy enriching education through integration of experience (Kolb and Kolb 2005). It is imperative to note, however, that not all experiences are educative, thus implications for educators are to ensure experiences foster constructive and continuous learning and are not ‘mis-educative’ (ibid. 2005, p. 205; Beard & Wilson 2013). Six propositions of EL theory are identified as:

1. Learning is best conceived as a process, not in terms of outcomes …
2. All learning is relearning …
3. Learning requires the resolution of conflicts between dialectically opposed modes of adaptation to the world …
4. Learning is a holistic process of adaptation to the world …
5. Learning results from synergetic transactions between the person and the environment …
Deduced from the overarching framework of EL are several concepts and subordinate theories, namely: activity theory, action learning, student engagement, social cognitive theory, understanding of learning styles and learning space, lifelong learning and guided reflection, which will be used in this thesis (Bandura 1989; Beard & Wilson 2013; Ethridge & Branscomb 2009; McGill & Beaty 1995; Kolb 1984; Raelin 2008). The design and inherent flexibility of WIL assimilates the ideas and guidelines of each of these theories within practical pedagogy.

The central premise of WIL is integrating practical, relevant and reflective industry experience within tertiary curricula. In stark contrast to traditional learning theories that espouse learning prior to activity, WIL is aligned with activity theory in acknowledging that individuals learn through the act of doing, through physical, mental and sensory engagement in an activity (Jonassen & Rohrer-Murphy 1999; Morris 2012). Disputing the notion of separation between mind and body heightens understanding of how individuals learn to interpret knowledge by doing. Learning is achieved through active participation in real contextual interactions and interfacing with other human actors; however, the literature also recognises the merit of simulated learning environments (McGill & Beaty 1995; Morris 2012). Importantly individuals must take initiative and responsibility for their learning for transformation to be possible (Eames & Cates 2011; Van Gyn & Grove-White 2011). WIL advocates student engagement within an extensive array of real world, simulated, individual and group experiences conducted within a structured and well-managed framework. Immersion within the act of doing whilst supported by deliberate guided reflection on both an individual and group basis enhances consciousness of lessons learnt with links established between practice and theoretical course content. This adheres to the principles of action learning, with contributions from fellow students and staff adding insight to maximise constructive learning through social consciousness, including learning from the experiences of others (McGill & Beaty 1995; Eames & Cates 2011). Whilst all experiences that provoke reflection and provide subsequent improvements in effectiveness are valued, formalised career specific experience supplemented by relevant theoretical instruction and guided reflection to draw attention to the relationship between these two realms is most desirable for tertiary students (Beard & Wilson 2013; Parker 2005).
WIL is an umbrella term encompassing an extensive assortment of formal and informal, authentic and simulated initiatives available for assimilation within tertiary curricula. Table 1.4 features a range of terminology used to denote WIL or WIL initiatives. The nature, duration and extent of commitment vary extensively facilitating access to and customisation of WIL initiatives within the reach of all tertiary providers.

Table 1.4: WIL Terminology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assorted WIL Terminology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practicum, professional practice, internship, workplace learning, work integrated learning, industry-based learning, project-based learning, cooperative education, fieldwork education, service learning, real world learning, university engaged learning, placements, experiential learning, clinical placements, professional placement, work experience, clinical practice, clinical education, doctoral supervision with industry partners, work-based learning, academic service learning, adult learning, androgogy, clinical attachments, clinical experience, competency assessment, corporate business management, employment experience, engaged learning, experiential placements, faculty internships, field placements, industrial experience, industry experience, industry links, industry placement, learning in the workplace, operational performance, practical projects, practical training, practice-based education, practice-based learning, problem-based learning, professional experience, professional learning, sandwich, site visits, structured workplace learning, student employability and volunteering.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Patrick et al. (2008, p. 9)

This inherent flexibility and infinite opportunities of WIL initiatives permits delivery of a multifaceted learning process assimilating various learning methods to complement other components of the curricula. This is achieved through appreciating how individuals differ in response and preference to learning methods, the most common and comprehensive styles being auditory (hearing), visual (seeing) and kinesthetic (doing) (Beard & Wilson 2013; Dunn, Beaudry & Klavas 2002; Mumford 1993; Walo 2000). A multifaceted learning process that comprises a multitude of pedagogy methods to match learning preferences of these distinct styles will improve overall comprehension of lessons by all individuals.

According to Sveiby, after five days, most people remember less than 10 percent of what they heard during a lecture. When activities are used involving seeing and hearing, the retention climbs to about 20 percent. But when trainees learn from doing, they remember 60 to 70 percent of what they practice (1997, cited in Raelin 2008, p. 19).
Recognition of the importance of doing, of attaining practical experience for retention of knowledge and skill development intensifies the justification for assimilating WIL within tertiary education. The case for WIL is strengthened through the centrality of experience within the learning cycle, comprising four stages, namely: experience, diagnosis of patterns in experience, plans for improvement and finally testing this plan through new experience (McGill & Beaty 1995, p. 24). The work of Malone (2008) further contributes through outlining outcomes of EL as featured in Figure 1.4 see below, illustrating how life experience is crucial for childhood development. Whilst there are well-documented arguments as to how adults learn differently to children (Knowles, cited in Williams 2008), the fundamental elements of practice and EL are still found to apply regardless of age (Ethridge & Brancomb 2009).

WIL is also concerned with learning space, the specific context and environment where learning takes place. Whilst academics continue to debate the degree of influence of heredity verses situational traits on individual development, there is increasing acceptance that both have a decisive role in how individuals learn, thus emphasising the necessity to effectively manage the quality of the learning space (Fincham et al. 2007; Lerner 2002). Social cognition theory extends the unidimensional causation of environment or genetics on learning in favour of ‘triadic reciprocal determinism’ (Bandura 1989, p. 2). This model of causation recognises the asymmetrical influences on learning with the interplay of genetic, environment and social elements. Building upon arguments of situated learning theory, a person’s education/learning is a product of their social environment, which includes belief systems, life experiences, family background and relationships, socio-economic status, individual needs and wants and social interactions (Lerner 2002; Lewin 1939; Kolb & Kolb 2005). The actions and behaviours displayed by individuals are a product of social role and status with the composition of a social group eliciting expectations of group members. Individuals within a group provoke power through their behaviour to influence others in the group positively or negatively; ‘people are both products and producers of their environment’ (Bandura 1989, p. 4) and whether such demonstrations of influence are positively or negatively reinforced shapes future behaviour. Advancement in technology further extends the possibilities of social cognition within the education system, progressing from the traditional classroom setting to online networks (Drexler 2010).
Echoing sentiments within the literature that learning is a multifaceted concept, the value of integrating both theory and practice within the learning process equals more than the sum of each part (Fry et al. 2003, cited in Parker 2005). Theory and practice do not constitute isolated learning entities; rather, each plays a vital role and maximises learning potential with theory serving to underline practice. It is through this understanding that assimilation of WIL within tertiary curricula is positioned as a means to enhancing learning potential of students regardless of background, socio-economic status and other demographic characteristics. As depicted in the following conceptual diagram, Figure 1.5, WIL is positioned within the overlap of both spheres, as a means to bridge the gap in graduate employability through integrating both theory and practice.
 Whilst academics acknowledge learning can occur spontaneously (Vygotsky 1978) it is best not to leave such an important process to chance. Following on from the contemporised evolution of graduate attributes and a ‘student centred’ learning approach, the theory of adult learning has turned attention towards scaffolding (Stupans & Owen 2009). Scaffolding refers to the construction of a framework to support progressive learning through the curricula to guide a student’s development from novice through to expert (ibid. 2009). As portrayed by the renowned Miller’s Pyramid in Figure 1.6, the intent of the scaffold is to allow individuals to assume more autonomy and self-regulation as they begin to realise their potential, progressing through the tiers of knows, knows how, shows how and does (Drexler 2010; Jones 2011). This approach to teaching is designed so students associate knowledge with application in practice to demonstrate competency, what a person is capable of doing in a controlled scenario such as work placement, and demonstrate performance indicative of how a person will behave and react in real life contexts, which is the challenge for educators to assess (Stupans & Owens 2009).
Effective scaffolding is defined as commencing with clear objectives, collaborative curricula planning, stakeholder consensus of expectations and criteria, instruction/mentoring and assessment which must cover pre-placement, during-placement and post-placement (Stupans & Owens 2009). Training reflective practice first so students recognise the critical learning moments and do reflection is essential. Through WIL students transcend the knowledge/teaching at tertiary institutes and engage in opportunities to further develop competency learning through experience, learning from experimentation, and demonstrating learning with the potential to perform in a real world/ambiguous setting. The less predictable nature of industry placements when supported by structured and scaffolded programs affords a safety net encouraging learning through experimentation and risk (ibid. 2009).

The role of assessment in experienced based education is an essential element in the learning cycle. The two key purposes of assessment are *summative* to evaluate performance and award certificates of achievement and *formative* to monitor and provide feedback for improved learning (Hodges 2011). Despite the variance in purpose, both forms of assessment arguably should be aligned to support current and future learning, the complexity of WIL makes a direct path to this idea difficult. This is further compounded because literature on WIL assessment is limited and contentious on account of the complexities and variation of WIL initiatives and the absence of longitudinal studies (Mackaway, Winchester-Seeto, Coulson & Harvey...
Some of the challenges identified for assessment of WIL include deciding what aspects of the learning experience to assess, what constitutes evidence of learning, time constraints, large cohorts, determining who is responsible for assessing students, competency of the assessor, consistency of standards and discipline variance precluding a one size fits all approach (Abeysekera 2006; Mackaway, Winchester-Seeto, Coulson & Harvey 2011; McNamara 2013).

The final consideration informing the direction and logistics of the research is identification of the key stakeholders in the WIL process. As part of the ALTC national scoping study into WIL by Patrick et al. (2008, p11), a stakeholder model was developed identifying the primary and secondary stakeholders within the context of WIL in university education. This model has been adapted to encompass all tertiary education institutions in accordance with the focus of this thesis with TAFE and colleges especially prevalent in hospitality education and training (see Figure 1.7).

**Figure 1.7: Conceptual Framework - WIL Stakeholder Model**

Source: Adaptation of Patrick et al. (2008, p. 11)
Whilst there are many secondary stakeholder groups present within the higher education context including government and the community, the three main sample groups the research will target are: students who have recently graduated, employers and tertiary education institutions. Participation in WIL programs involves multiple interactions between these stakeholder groups. The *Tertiary Institute and Student Relationship* (refer to Figure 1.7), encompasses academic preparations and orientation, assessments and debriefing. Institute staff are the facilitators of WIL and perform academic, administration and leadership roles in order to enhance the learning experience for students and must also fulfil duty of care obligations (Patrick et al. 2008). The *Student and Employer Relationship* embodies the employment contract, workplace induction, training, mentoring and assessment in addition to duty of care. The level of preparation and success of the experience can impact on the future involvement of employers in WIL and hence the importance of the final relationship between the *Tertiary Institute and the Employer*. This relationship involves curricula and WIL design, administration and facilitation of WIL programs, staff training and relationship management (Abeysebera 2006; Patrick et al. 2008).

### 1.8 Research Objectives

The objective of the research is to demonstrate the practical implications of WIL to the enhancement of graduate attributes and employability within hospitality and how tertiary institutions including private colleges, TAFE and university are to address effective integration of WIL.

The decision to focus exclusively on NSW was to accommodate the variances in state and federal jurisdictions regarding university, TAFE and colleges. Logistical and practical considerations also informed the methodology and design of the research.

This thesis seeks to examine and transfer knowledge from more mature and progressive service industry sectors with WIL practices well established in them, including the fields of medicine, nursing, teaching and social work, to assess utilisation of WIL in an effort to help ascertain best practice for the hospitality field. It is
anticipated that research recommendations made in this thesis will then be generalisable/transferable to other service industries. The incentive to improve quality of service encounters via means of improved education of service graduates follows on the understanding that service personnel are seen as assets; there are ways to create and achieve unique competitive advantages in service businesses while technology and other tangible elements are more easily replicated (ACCI and BCA 2002). With widespread recognition of the benefits of incorporating WIL within tertiary education (Beard 1995; Cashman & Seifer 2008; Cox & King 2006; Cranmer 2006; Lees 2002; Ricks & Williams 2005), the potential for transfer of these benefits to other service disciplines (e.g. banking, aged care, retail, etc.) serves as an incentive and impetus to this research.

1.9 Research Questions

As established in section 1.1, WIL develops generic graduate attributes and skills (teamwork, communication, leadership, etc.) common to all disciplines of study and work practices. However, it is also important to determine if the discipline-specific attributes in hospitality can be developed through WIL.

The research questions for this study are:

1. Are the benefits of WIL experienced by other industries transferable to hospitality?
   a. YES (How?), NO (Why not?)
2. How does WIL minimise the gap between graduate attributes and industry expectations in hospitality?
3. Does WIL impact entrance and progression of WIL graduates within the hospitality industry?
4. Do demographic characteristics including but not limited to gender, age, ethnicity, prior experience, familiarity with the sector and level of education have an impact on perspectives of WIL?
5. What aspects of WIL need to be managed for realisation of these benefits and minimisation of the negatives in hospitality?

1.10 Definitions

Key terms and their context as employed in this thesis are detailed.

**Experiential Learning (EL):** learning by the act of doing, through participation and interaction within a real world setting (Kolb 1984).

**Hospitality:** denotes a diversity of businesses residing within four sectors, namely free-standing hospitality businesses, hospitality in leisure venues, hospitality in travel venues and subsidised hospitality (Slattery 2002) (See Table 1.1).

**Work Integrated Learning (WIL):** is an umbrella term encompassing a vast assortment of approaches and strategies focused on offering experience and linking theory and practice to deliver work-ready graduates, including practicums, cooperative education, work placement, internships, cadetships, apprenticeships and many others (Patrick et al. 2008). It is defined in this thesis as:

> a structured educational strategy integrating classroom studies with learning through productive work experiences in a field related to a student’s academic or career goals. It provides progressive experience in integrating theory and practice. It is a partnership among students, educational institutions and employers, with specified responsibilities for each party. (USA National Commission for Cooperative Education, cited in Bates 2005, p. 1).

**Tertiary Education:** is formal study in vocational education and training (VET) and higher education delivered through a variety of providers including universities, TAFE and colleges.

VET registered training organisations, which are organisations registered under the Australian Qualifications Training Framework (AQTF). These include technical and further education (TAFE) institutes, skills institutes, polytechnics, universities, secondary schools, industry organisations, private enterprises, agricultural colleges, community providers and other government providers.
Higher education providers, such as self-accrediting public and private universities, and other publicly and privately funded higher education providers that can either operate as self-accrediting or non-self-accrediting providers (NCVER 2012, p. 4).

1.11 Structure of Thesis and Outline of Chapters

The thesis is divided into seven chapters. This introductory chapter has served to outline the broad context of the research, identifying the direction and rationale framing the inquiry. Chapter 2 reviews current literature in relation to graduate attributes and industry expectations, graduate employability, overview of the Australian tertiary education system and examination of WIL, including benefits and costs for students, tertiary staff and employers. It identifies gaps in the literature and demonstrates that WIL for hospitality tertiary education is a neglected area of research. Review of WIL literature and pedagogy within industries more versed with WIL than hospitality, namely nursing, medicine, social work and teacher education, follows with lessons deduced from assimilation of WIL.

Chapter 3 describes the research methodology employed. It commences with a background to the quantitative and qualitative philosophies guiding the research design. A discussion of the methods of data collection and the data analysis process is followed by the limitations of the study.

Chapter 4 features the results and findings of the online quantitative study. Commencing with a review of sample demographics, the perceptions of the three sample groups, graduates, employers and educators, towards the benefits, challenges and satisfaction with WIL experiences are presented. Using SPSS software, the researcher then proceeds to test the strength and significance of associations between perceptions based on demographic variables, tertiary institute, WIL participation and business size.

Chapter 5 explores the findings of the qualitative focus group discussions with Nvivo software used to identify key themes and graphically portray results. Informed by the quantitative survey findings, the focus groups served to delve into the specific areas of
concern for WIL pedagogy within hospitality tertiary education to inform effective design and execution of WIL initiatives, maximising the benefits and minimising the challenges for stakeholders.

Chapter 6 provides a discussion and analysis of the quantitative and qualitative research findings in comparison with secondary research. Finally, Chapter 7 answers the research questions, explores the recommendations emanating from this study and acknowledges the limitations. Appendices and a Reference List complete the thesis.
CHAPTER 2
Chapter 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

As outlined in Chapter 1, this thesis investigates the perspectives of graduates, employers and educators to the contribution of WIL in hospitality tertiary education. This chapter consists of a review of literature commencing with a discussion on the current Australian economic context, establishing the necessity of both practical and technical competence within the labour force. The problem of graduate under/unemployability is explored, drawing attention to the urgency of a solution for hospitality and many other industries. The concept of WIL positioned as a means to redress this gap is reviewed in depth, with attention to types of WIL initiatives, the benefits and costs associated with implementation and the current experiences and rate of adoption. A detailed comparison of the use and outcome of WIL within the hospitality industry follows. The chapter concludes with an analysis of the WIL literature from specific industries more versed with WIL than hospitality to deduce lessons learned from assimilation of WIL.

2.1 Context

As businesses operating in the 21st century face increasing pressures, extensive competition and a rapid pace of change, the focus of strategic management has diverted to harnessing individual and organisational learning potential within the context of the ‘knowledge economy’ (DEEWR 2009; WACE 2008; Williams 2008). With the relative ease by which technology may be replicated, people as assets are seen as ways to distinguish businesses from their competitors and achieve competitive advantage (Carpenter et al. 2010; Okumus, Altinay & Chathoth 2010; Thompson, Peteraf, Gamble & Strickland 2012). Raelin (2008) notes that the diversification of skills now required by the labour market and the rise of transitory employment has drawn attention to the necessity of developing generalisable skills that are transferable between businesses and industries. Guthrie (2010), Lindstaedt et al. (2008) and
McLennan and Keating (2008) all contextualise this to the Australian scenario, where the Australian government is concerned with developing the labour market to cater for future economic requirements and to encourage healthy competitiveness. In particular, they identify the need to address skills shortages with low unemployment rates, an aging population, increasing populations from diverse backgrounds, graduate underemployment and workforce casualisation. The low unemployment rates currently enjoyed in Australia further support high competition for jobs contributing to a trend towards skills deepening within service industries (Shah & Long 2010; Pye 2012). Employment growth realised through increased workforce participation, immigration policies, increased fertility rates and increased tertiary education participation, support predictions that demand for service industry employees with formal qualifications will continue to increase (Shah & Long 2010). Importantly, whilst unemployment rates in Australia are trending down, underemployment is trending up with ABS figures indicating that 7% of the labour force were underemployed in September 2011 (Pye 2012).

The importance of education and a skilled workforce in the context of global economic uncertainty is perceived as crucial to ensuring economic stability and growth. The global financial crisis in 2007–8 was considered the worst since the 1930s Great Depression and now with increased international interdependence the implications of the current economic crisis have circled the globe (Helleiner 2011; Kyeong-Won and Hwa-Nyeon2009; Sen 2011). Originating in the USA with the collapse of the subprime mortgage market, this crisis has since contributed to the European sovereign-debt crisis and the most recent economic crisis in Egypt (Button & Reggiani 2011). Not even the economic powerhouse economies of China and India could avoid the impact, with both nations experiencing reductions in economic growth (Kyeong-Won & Hwa-Nyeon 2009; Sharma 2010). Increased labour market turmoil is being experienced within Australia with organisational downsizing and outsourcing, particularly across the mining, car manufacturing, technology and banking industries, including giants such as Toyota, Elders, Qantas, BHP Billiton, Holden, Billabong, OneSteel, Telstra, Xstrata, Rio Tinto, IBM, ANZ, Ford and Bluescope Steel (ABC 2012). The Australian economy has so far managed to remain reasonably stable and overall outperform many nations. The economic climate is further impacting graduate destinations with high
numbers of graduates competing for an increasing diversity of positions. This crisis serves as a wake-up call for national policy makers.

Whilst the recent How Young People Are Faring report (FYA 2012) revealed increases in education participation by Australian youth, the report demonstrated persistent challenges to securing full-time employment with the unemployment rate for youth significantly higher than the national rate.

One-quarter (25.2%) of 20 to 24 year olds are not in full-time education or work in 2012 (FYA 2012, p. 10).

Particular difficulties were encountered for youth from disadvantaged backgrounds including indigenous, regional, low socio-economic status (SES) families and young people with a disability or health problem (ibid. 2012). Opportunities for full-time employment and training in the workplace were identified as declining, with apprenticeships becoming harder to secure and the instability of the labour market contributing to progressively more part-time employment.

There is a plethora of literature proving the existence of a gap between graduate attributes and industry expectations with graduate under/unemployment increasingly detected within the Australian economy and specifically identified as a dilemma for the hospitality field (BIHECC 2007; DEEWR 2009; Green & Zhu 2010; Hager & Holland 2006; Kim 2008; Pye 2012). Research by Raybould and Wilkins (2005) into tertiary hospitality education identifies misalignment associated with expected graduate skills with industry demanding interpersonal, managerial and operational skills whilst universities are preoccupied with development of conceptual and analytical skills. The necessity of updating and aligning hospitality course curricula to the needs of industry and to establish clear and realistic expectations of a hospitality career for students is recurrent in the literature (Chi & Gursoy 2009; Jameson & Holden 2000; Kim 2998; Richardson 2009). Efforts to address this gap in contemporary research into adult learning, while still preliminary and largely conceptual, include specifically investigating the role of EL in tertiary education (Jonassen & Rohrer-Murphy 1999; Parker 2005; Raelin 2008; Williams 2008). There were two seminal works that informed the initial considerations for this research, namely Employer Satisfaction with Graduate Skills (AC Neilsen 2000) and Employability Skills for the Future (ACCI and BCA 2002).
The AC Neilsen (2000) research was a comprehensive study investigating satisfaction of Australian employers interested and or successful in recruiting graduates in 1998–1999 and perceived deficiencies within graduate skills. The research documented reasonable performance for graduates successfully recruited; however, it found 76.5% of the graduate population were deemed unsuitable for employment for both the applied position and more generally any job within the organisation (ibid. 2000, p. 33). The most unsuitable graduates were those from hospitality/services/transport industries, with the highest figure of ‘94 percent of (hospitality) applicants ... considered unsuitable’ (ibid. 2000, p. 34). The study identified employer perceptions of graduate skill deficiencies correlated to lack of practice or work experience. The feedback accentuated the need for graduates to grasp/comprehend the reality of the business world in order to function effectively within it. This effectively is the impetus for this thesis as anecdotal evidence shows that not much has changed since this report was released. In fact trends in the tertiary sector and the drive for paper credentials has driven a glut in book knowledge at the expense of more practical hands-on, work-related education and training. These changes might also be sheeted back to reduced staff numbers combined with an explosion in student numbers enrolling at university and other forms of tertiary education and the bureaucratic imperatives to cut costs and revert to straight chalk-and-talk methods with class sizes in the hundreds. The decapping of university places by the federal labour government in 2011 contributed to the increase in student numbers and the decline of Australian Tertiary Admission Ranks (ATARs) (Craig 2011).

The exploratory study by ACCI and BCA (2002) established an understanding of what constitutes ‘employability’ skills deemed necessary for current and future participants in the workforce. Employability skills were defined as:

- skills required not only to gain employment, but also to progress within an enterprise so as to achieve one’s potential and contribute successfully to enterprise strategic directions (ibid. 2002, p. 3).

The elevated importance of personal attributes, considered generic in nature and relevant to a multitude of disciplines, to complement specific technical attributes, was emphasised, with particular mention of employees with practical work experience as being the most desirable.
Educational learning literature continues to debate and refine the list of specific skills and attributes that denote this term ‘employability’ (BIHECC 2007; Cox & King 2006; Hager & Holland 2006; Lees 2002; McLennan & Keating 2008). These authors concur with the notion of graduates well versed in technical skills, perceived however as underdeveloped in generic employability skills and thus unable to apply this knowledge to the work context. Others note the inadequacy of traditional pedagogy methods through de-contextualising issues by increasing the generic component of study, e.g. business accounts for graduates experiencing culture shock on entry into the workforce (Halfer & Graf 2006; Newton & McKenna 2007; Nijhof & Brandsma 1999).

The most recent Graduate Outlook Study supports these conclusions, identifying ‘interpersonal and communication skills (written and oral)’ as the most important selection criteria for recruitment of graduates closely followed by ‘passion/knowledge of industry/drive/commitment/attitude’ (Graduate Careers Australia 2012). Characteristics considered least desirable were ‘poor attitude/lack of work ethic/approach to work’ and ‘lack of interpersonal and communication skills (etc)’. An interesting addition to the 2011 annual survey questioned the aspects deemed important by industry employers on a graduate’s curriculum vitae, with the highest ranked identified as ‘employment history’ (ibid. 2012). ‘Academic results’ and ‘academic qualifications’ were ranked second and third respectively with ‘details of voluntary employment and placement’ fourth, which demonstrates the value and increasing recognition of WIL by industry. Research conducted in New Zealand to decipher the desired attributes specifically for hospitality employees found divergent expectations existed between students and industry (Harkison, Poulston & Kim 2011). Students tended to assume knowledge and skills were important whilst industry valued personality.

In contrast to the proliferation of research on the transitioning from secondary to tertiary education, first year and college life, the transition between tertiary education and career is relatively under-researched (Brinkworth, McCann, Matthews & Nordström 2009; Lowe & Cook 2003; McKeown & Lindorff 2011; Perrone & Vickers 2003; Salisbury & Karasmanis 2011). Maintaining the focus on transitioning between tertiary education and career, Knight and Yorke (2002) accentuate a major criticism of
prior research into graduate employability, revealing how statistics collected on graduates employed in the workforce frequently include graduates regardless of job tenure and whether the position is at graduate level. Lees (2002) is critical of research measuring graduates simply based on succeeding in gaining employment saying that it fails to capture an accurate representation of graduate employability or of graduates being equipped for graduate-level positions. The disparity between what constitutes employment and employability indicates that graduate employability and prevalence of graduate underemployment may be worse than indicated. Additionally, graduate employability research typically undertaken six months after graduation may be skewed if no allowance is made for graduates opting to travel following completion of studies, undertaking further study or temporary underemployment during the search for a desired graduate position or acceptance into a postgraduate course (Lees 2002). These criticisms of research are still consistent in recent research, with acknowledgement they only provide a snapshot (Bridgstock 2009; McKeown & Lindorff 2011; Pye 2012).

Underemployment is identified as a product of over-education (Carroll and Tani 2013). The push to enhance participation rates of Australians into tertiary education has delivered an oversupply of qualified individuals. Research has demonstrated graduates perceive employment by small business as substandard and fear that they will be considered ‘too academic’ and not likely to stay long term. This stereotype compounds the issue of graduate underemployment despite the benefits qualified graduates afford small business (Connor & Shaw 2008). Research into the transition and utilisation of graduates in Hospitality SME’s exemplifies that employers pay limited to no attention to graduate identity instead placing value on competence and attitude to complete operational tasks (Holden & Jameson 1999; Richardson 2009). This is particularly concerning for the hospitality industry with the predominance of small business and the general lack of understanding of hospitality qualifications together with a deficient alignment of degree programs to industry career pathways, especially when such qualifications are generally not required or recommended for entry-level positions.

A review into vocational tertiary education in Australia (NCVER 2012) highlighted another significant trend, of student pathways from TAFE to university and vice versa. This has implications for the employability skills debate with the apparent need for
students to combine VET with degree qualifications, which also has the potential to exacerbate underemployment of graduates.

In 2010: 32,800 (7.1%) commencing domestic equivalent full-time students in the VET sector had a bachelor degree prior to commencing their VET studies ... 16,700 (7.0%) commencing domestic equivalent full-time students in the higher education sector completed a VET course prior to commencing higher education. An additional 3300 (1.4%) commencing domestic equivalent full-time higher education students had an incomplete VET course (NCVER 2012, p. 8).

Exploratory investigations identify potential disadvantages of underemployed graduates as possessing less earning potential, causing a decline in productivity and having fewer opportunities to develop skills, contributing to dissatisfaction with job, life and career (Green & Zhu 2010; Maynard, Joseph & Maynard 2006; Nabi 2003; Smetherham 2005). Psychological distress, lack of motivation and depression may exist when individuals are not able to satisfy higher order needs resulting in absenteeism, high turnover rates, less creativity and endemic boredom (Cassidy & Wright 2007; Dreijmanis 2004; Perrone & Vickers 2003). Reduced earnings potential inhibits ability to pay off student debts and may translate into a financial obligation for governments in the form of unemployment compensation in turn causing a lack of return on investment for society (Dreijmanis 2004; Smetherham 2005). Research results ‘suggest that on average, approximately three and a half years after graduation, underemployed graduates were in a disadvantageous position in the labour market’ (Nabi 2003, p. 379). Smetherham (2005) proposes that this disadvantage may actually take five to seven years to overcome; however, in context of the recent global financial crisis and current economic conditions in Australia, represented by low unemployment rates, high inflation and increasing interest rates (Reserve Bank of Australia 2010), the actual length of disadvantage may fluctuate, accentuating the need to enhance graduate employability. Whilst interest and inflation rates have since fallen in Australia, the uncertainty of the international market, changes to the value of the Australian dollar and persisting low unemployment rates all continue to perpetuate the potential of short-to medium-term disadvantage for graduate underemployment (Carroll & Tani 2013; Jefferson & Preston 2013).

The issue of graduate employability is of great concern for the hospitality industry. Kim (2008) explains that hospitality students with bachelor’s degrees are often at a
disadvantage when it comes to employment, with employers preferring people with experience, often regardless of the attainment of formal qualifications. The choice to undertake a university degree is often accompanied by the assumption of appointment to a management position following graduation. Research suggests this is an unlikely outcome, with graduates often having to work their way up from the ground regardless of attainment of qualifications; thus if they failed to gain this desired work experience prior to graduation they may need to gain it before progressing up the management chain (Ladkin 2000; Kim 2008). The prevalence of postgraduate programs, cadetships and internships that extend the basic orientation and induction to the business further suggests the requirement of employers to educate graduates before they are employable in a management capacity (see Appendix 4). The emphasis on attainment of operational experience across a 12-18 month period and lack of recognition or opportunity to utilise higher order skills adds to graduate frustration and leakage from the industry (Raybould & Wilkins 2005).

These same issues of graduate employability, devaluing of qualifications, and working from the ground up are also characteristic of human resource management and marketing (Garza & Morgeson 2012; Lengnick-Hall & Aguinis 2012; Martin & Chapman 2006; Stephens et al. 2010; Walker et al. 2009). Akin to employer perceptions of hospitality degrees in the literature, Wellmen’s research (2010) reveals that employers question the necessity of marketing degrees, based on lack of validity of course content regarding marketing practice. Academics in these fields are also exploring the role of WIL and deducing benefits would also exist on the basis that WIL benefits service industries.

2.2 Work Integrated Learning (WIL)

‘Work integrated learning’ is the term coined to denote engagement initiatives introduced through partnerships between industry and education, as defined in Chapter 1. With variations in definition and application of the term prolific within the literature, WIL is commonly recognised as an umbrella term encompassing those activities devised, implemented and managed to bridge the knowledge gap between theory and
practice with focus on experience to bring about learning which then creates job-ready graduates (Patrick et al. 2008). It comprises both formal and informal initiatives including internships, cadetships, field work, work placement, site visits, cooperative projects operated through industry and/or community connections (Hager & Holland 2006; McLennan & Keating 2008). Both authentic and simulated experiences have a place in WIL initiatives used within tertiary education. Smith (2013) notes that it is essential to recognise the limitations of this definition and alternative models due to the inability to operationalise the terms for empirical research.

The benefits of students undertaking WIL have been canvassed by numerous authors in the literature. Ricks and Williams (2005) suggest that students partaking in WIL benefit from increased employability and a more insightful educational experience thus gaining generic and specific attributes required to commence employment. Beard (1995) and Cox and King (2006) go on to assert WIL provides students with an opportunity to explore potential career options and improve transition into the workforce. Engagement within the student’s desired industry serves as a method of data gathering for students to re-evaluate expectations of the industry and job prospects. Students are able to clarify requirements of entry and gain a more detailed understanding of their chosen career path, in turn reducing culture shock upon commencing full-time employment and providing time prior to graduation for students to address any gaps in their personal development. In context of the increasing competition for graduate jobs, engagement experiences provide a competitive edge within the graduate labour market to secure better jobs and higher salaries in addition to establishment of professional contacts and potential future recruitment (Cornforth, Taylor & Varelidis 1983; Fallows & Steven 2000; Jancauskas et al. 1999). Additionally, WIL experience serves to educate students about their employment rights and arrangements, building confidence for contract negotiations (Carroll 2010).

The 2011 Graduate Outlook Study affirms that undergraduate qualifications comprising WIL programs were an increasingly exploited and valuable graduate recruitment method utilised by Australian employers (Graduate Careers Australia 2012). WIL initiatives also have the potential to offer financial support during studies and increase mobility, enabling graduates to travel and work across national borders and thus enhancing their appreciation of both cultural and work scenarios in global marketplaces (Cranmer 2006; Jancauskas et al. 1999).
The availability of work-ready graduates, i.e. those who have undertaken relevant practical experience, reduces training time and costs associated with new-hire productivity goals for businesses and industries (Ricks & Williams 2005). This point is particularly emphasised for graduates recruited by a business with a previously established association such as an internship. The early and continued exposure to industry provided by WIL reaffirms the student’s chosen career path and supports a better employee job fit and improved staff morale (ibid. 2005). The new ideas and fresh perspectives provided by students through exposure to business practices and potentially conducting specific projects are valuable in problem solving, increasing productivity and product innovation. Leadership and management abilities cultivated through WIL also strengthen the management pool securing the future direction of organisations (Lees 2002).

Collaboration by businesses with tertiary institutions provides opportunities for ‘consulting, research and technology transfer’ (Jancauskas et al. 1999, p. 3). Small-to-medium enterprises stand to benefit enormously through access to resources previously unattainable due to their restricted budgets. Prospects are also available for industry to positively influence curricula construction to enhance industry relevance, ensure information and knowledge is up to date and thus bridge the gap of graduate employability (Cox and King 2006). Industry maintains a key interest in course content and execution as ‘the ultimate arbiters of employability remain employers’ (ibid. 2006, p. 265) who constitute a primary customer of tertiary institutions (Lamancusa et al. 2008). Several professional bodies have even established compulsory accreditation of tertiary courses prior to entry (BIHECC 2007). With emphasis on increasing flexibility of the workforce to support a more adaptable business structure, particularly for surviving turbulence such as the recent economic crisis, and the trend towards broadening of job portfolios, the preference for generalisable skills is able to be communicated to curriculum and course design academics.

Educational institutions benefit through their students and academic staff gaining networking opportunities with business, providing institutions access to resources, current technology and knowledge (Bates 2005). While the graduate labour market has traditionally been dominated with recruitment by large business, small-medium enterprises are gradually recognising the benefits of graduate recruitment and WIL
and, through their participation, increasing availability of the number and diversity of engagement opportunities (Greenback 2002). Engaging with business experts builds rapport and enables academic staff to keep up to date with industry trends and advancements in technology, thereby assisting their own research interests and that of the institution. This may act as a source of motivation with staff able to stay in contact with the business world, produce relevant and constructive research and additionally enhance their teaching by comprehending the complexities confronted by graduates entering the workforce. Staff development prospects stem from gaining a deeper understanding of industry and community structure with comprehension of the current business landscape and associated challenges and priorities (Cashman & Seifer 2008). Henry, Mitchell and Young (2001) point out that an added benefit is the enhancing of awareness of practical application of the theory they teach, which in turn enhances course relevance and credibility with students. This removes information from the realm of the ‘ivory tower’ to the more real world society graduates live in. Engaging in networking and project facilitation contributes to up-skilling of staff and personal reflection and discussion of this experience, which in turn may lead to conscious learning about ways to improve their own teaching methods. Allowing staff ownership opportunities to advance course content and delivery in support of employability ideals will thwart inherent scepticism of change (Lees 2002). Prospective students tend to judge tertiary institutions based on their product offering and reputation with the nature, extent and proven track record of WIL initiatives under increasing scrutiny during institution and course selection. Good examples of this in the service industries include the internship opportunities for teachers, doctors, nurses and hoteliers.

The wider community also benefit from WIL through increased volunteerism and as students become more productive members of society they carry this throughout their working and personal lives (Cashman & Seifer 2008; Cranmer 2006). Strengthening ties with the community through community-oriented WIL initiatives is cited as improving civic responsibility and contributing to social change (Cashman & Seifer 2008). Engagement with community also helps to break down the distances between ‘town and gown’ and leads to a sense of ownership and pride in community and region. Awareness of funds and other resources available to the community from tertiary institutions has the potential to enhance staff recruitment and retention with expansion of services another possibility (ibid. 2008). Additionally, indigenous and other
underprivileged communities will benefit from equitable access to WIL, improving employment rates and thus economic independence (Karmel 2004).

Throughout the last decade the benefits of WIL have been noted extensively in the literature and cited as providing clear grounds for implementation within Australian tertiary contexts. However, actual uptake/adoption of WIL is low in Australia with only 33.9% of Australia’s higher education students reported blending academic learning and workplace experience (ACER 2008, cited in McLennan & Keating 2008, p. 3).

This discrepancy between rhetoric of the benefits of WIL and its adoption across educational fields is well documented (ACER 2010; Bates 2005; Henry, Mitchell & Young 2001; Patrick et al. 2008; WACE 2008). Only now is the concept gaining universal recognition for being positioned as a central ingredient in the education product and in the delivery of job-ready graduates. Results of the latest Australasian Survey of Student Engagement (ACER 2010) publication depict overall student participation in WIL within current courses offered at the Australian and New Zealand member institutions at 45.2%, with variations within student results according to mode of study, race, socio-economic background, geographic location, campus residency, field of study, and whether students were international or domestic. Major challenges to successful implementation of WIL were categorised by the Australian Learning and Teaching Council (ALTC) as: ‘Ensuring equity and access; Managing expectations and competing demands; Improving communication and coordination; Ensuring worthwhile WIL experiences and Adequately resourcing WIL’ (Patrick et al. 2008, p. vi).

In recent decades, WIL has emerged as a critical component in the delivery of tertiary qualifications (Bates 2005). The concept of incorporating practical work experience and establishing relationships with industry throughout the course of undergraduate studies is gaining credibility and increased application worldwide (Bates 2005; Tribe 2002; Ricks & Williams 2005). Australian tertiary institutions have been redesigning courses to integrate critical attributes, often referred to as ‘graduate attributes’, which serve to identify generic and specific/technical skills required for professional careers as determined through collaborative discussions with industry to produce well-rounded graduates who meet industry expectations, thus improving employability of
graduates. Acceptance of the value of WIL within Australian universities is observed/measured through the inclusion of WIL-related aspects into value statements and graduate attributes, as well as articulated in course content and delivery (see Appendix 8). Implementation of WIL within traditional disciplines such as medicine and engineering has already been prolific and highly recommended to achieve success. There is consensus among advocates of WIL that other disciplines will also benefit through adoption of WIL (ACER 2010, Bates 2005; Patrick et al. 2008; Raelin 2008; Ricks & Williams 2005; WACE 2008). The significant contribution of service industries as primary contributors to national and global economies and the subsequent popularity of service studies and market demand for hospitality professionals, further accentuate the opportunity for WIL to enhance educational offerings in the field and thus employability of graduates (Airey 1997, cited in Tribe 2002; Kim 2008; Milne & Ateljevic 2001; Richardson 2009).

Systematic assessment and management of WIL initiatives is required to provide constructive feedback to students and tertiary institutions in order to improve design and implementation of methods, measurable learning goals, evidence of student achievement and strict unit/assessment criteria stipulated by the institution to uphold its integrity and academic standing (Cashman & Seifer 2005). Various models, guidelines and best practices feature in the domestic and international literature though development of a singular acceptable model is still elusive as research into WIL, though abundant, is still in the early stages. Stock standard student experience studies tend to adhere to the higher educational experience and are not designed to specifically investigate satisfaction with WIL, whilst other proposed quantitative survey instruments, including the Work Experience Questionnaire or WEQ and the Menial Tasks Scale, fail to measure the ‘essential pedagogically-relevant characteristics of WIL curriculum’, survive transference across disciplines or provide rich qualitative assessments (Smith 2012, p. 249). Under this context, the following framework based on six independent measurement scales was proposed (adapted from Smith 2012, pp. 250–53):
A New Evaluation Framework

- **Authenticity**: Physical and cognitive authenticity through real work settings, activities/complexities with evaluation confirming student engagement in relevant and consequential versus menial tasks.

- **Alignment of teaching and learning activities with integrative learning objectives**: through reflective integrative of theory and practice, beyond mere application to practice to formation of a professional identity.

- **Alignment of assessment with integrative learning objectives**

- **Integrated Learning Support**: university and worksite specific support structures including counselling, learning support and inductions.

- **Supervisor Access**: maintenance of regular student contact with both their university and industry contacts to provide appropriate feedback and support.

- **Induction and Preparation Processes**: to adequately prepare students in both a pedagogical and practical sense for placements, with academics managing partner relationships, troubleshooting and managing risks.

A survey instrument was developed with a ‘9-point response scale’ for each of the six independent measures and piloted across four disciplines: criminology, engineering and film in Australia and business in the UK (ibid. 2012). Despite inherent limitations of the empirical model as a universal instrument, it does serve to provide a framework and foundation for future research into evaluation of key peripheries of WIL curricula across disciplines and institutions. These findings are aligned with a summation of WIL principles in a report prepared by Shehri (2012, p. 334):

1. WIL is a *three way relationship* between the student, the academic institution and the workplace, requires all involved to perform specific tasks and accept certain responsibilities (Martin & Hughes 2009).

2. WIL must be based on *collaboration* among stakeholders, *negotiation* in process and program design and *transparency in objectives and methodology* (Smith & Betts 2000, pp. 600–2, cited in Gibson et al. 2002).

3. Each WIL student should have an *academic advisor* and an *industry supervisor* for ongoing support and mentoring (Jancauskas et al. 1999).

4. WIL work should include interesting work activities and *learning needs to be intentional and proactive* to insure the high standards and desirable outcomes (Orrell 2004).

5. WIL works best if there is *equivalence in assessment*. This means awarding credit for WIL study units, equivalent to credit offered in pure academic units (Macquarie University 2007, cited in McLennan & Keating 2008).

6. *Self-evaluation* and other *reflective activities* are an important part of WIL programs to encourage a proactive outlook for the learners (Macquarie University 2007, cited in McLennan & Keating 2008).
In response to the growing importance of partnerships between universities and industry to the successful integration of WIL in curricula and absence of best practice frameworks to achieve this goal, Choy and Delahaye (2011) draw attention to the changing roles of academics and key constituents to building sustainable and mutually beneficial partnerships. There is growing acceptance that universities have to relinquish dominance when establishing partnerships with industry, as each partner contributes distinct knowledge and expertise and has inherent interests in the partnership. This co-production requires positive alignment of student learning with business outcomes and requires time, effort and resources. Accordingly the key constituents to successful WIL partnerships identified by Choy and Delahaye (2011, p. 162) are summarised as follows:

*Establishment of an open relationship* and open communication networks are requisite to building trust and understanding of partner interests. This in turn assists with the redistribution of power to appropriate sources and facilitates learning and adaption of the program.

*Partner familiarity* is crucial to ensure compatibility of partners from the outset and achieved through: liaison staff from each partner jointly preparing draft proposals to outline the partnership arrangement; openly discussing level of commitment and costs to resource the project; declaring constraining parameters of the partnership; and understanding culture, systems and thresholds of each partner as the foundations of partnership negotiations.

*Changed/atypical role of the academics* have followed the WIL agenda, transforming the traditional teaching roles to inclusion of building contractual relationships with industry.

*Right people* selected for the project demonstrating commitment to WIL pedagogy and partnership success funnels back to individual ‘ability, attitude and personality’ with skill sets including sensitivity and strategic planning.

*Complex design and facilitation of the curriculum* centred around the importance of tacit knowledge acquired through enculturation of the workplace, thick communication channels strengthen the partner relationship, innovation and flexibility for project design and assessment and sharing power over learning content and delivery.

It is important to explore in comparative depth the complexities and resistance to WIL. Tertiary institutions face numerous challenges when considering adoption of WIL.
initiatives. The number, variety, quality and suitability of industry or community experience placements/opportunities are highly variable. Availability of opportunities is subject to the attitudes and commitment of industry and community partners in allowing students into their workplaces. Students pose an added expense through occupational health and safety risks and reallocation of time and resources, which may reduce productivity and thus profitability (Hicks & Swain 2007; Patrick et al. 2008). Furthermore, the instability of the marketplace may impact on the ability of businesses to consistently provide engagement experiences due to the prospects of business failure. This point is exemplified for the hospitality industry through being strongly represented by small-to-medium enterprises. The added burden of supervising WIL students often puts potential industry partners off as it requires a commitment of time, expertise and other scarce resources. The paperwork that accompanies WIL is seen as onerous and overly bureaucratic as well. This can be mitigated if the industry participants can see the benefit of actually hosting WIL student/s in their own business.

All of these obstacles become exacerbated by the headlong rush of tertiary organisations to add WIL to every discipline area.

The concept of WIL is resource intensive for all stakeholders. Qualifications, experience and training of the academics/staff charged with developing, implementing and executing WIL must be considered in ensuring effective delivery and management of engagement experiences. Staff have a ‘duty of care’ and other legal and ethical responsibilities to students and industry partners, which also applies through their student placements. Thus academic staff must carefully assess each opportunity to ensure it is safe, effective and relevant to the area of study whilst maximising benefits for all participants. Staff with already demanding workloads may be resistant to taking on additional responsibilities and feel they don’t have the experience to judge such matters and establish such connections with industry and community partners (Lindstaedt et al. 2008; Raelin 2008). The issue of measuring and recognising academic and professional staff WIL workloads was identified as a key challenge in the Higher Education Base Funding Review 2011 (Commonwealth of Australia 2010). In attempts to tackle the gap in workload recognition for WIL roles at Griffith University, an investigation collected feedback from staff and other stakeholders to inform recommendations, expanding the following spheres:
- **Workloads** – explicit reference to WIL; utilisation of the classification system; opportunity to negotiate additional loading;
- **Resources** – central repository for pedagogical designs demonstrating excellence in WIL; centralised WIL database system; staffing oversight to maintain resources;
- **Specific staff development** – including evidence-based WIL practice and scholarship; auditable WIL outcomes; establishment of a WIL Teaching Category as part of the Excellence in Teaching awards; provision of a mentoring/buddying system for staff new to WIL; appointment at increased level of seniority in recognition of the additional responsibilities; and
- **Improving scholarship** – mentor and develop staff in the creation of evidence-based teaching practice in WIL (Bates 2011, p. 113).

The study supported the highly contextualised and individualised nature of WIL pedagogy, contrasting traditional classroom settings and involving both academic and administrative personnel on and off campus, which university policy needed to reflect. The workloads of WIL staff at Griffith University were found to be underestimated and although staff expressed commitment and enjoyment in WIL projects they acknowledged stress, burnout and lack of support. The study recommendations were subsequently integrated into university policy and are now subject to further collaboration and research by the Griffith University Work-Integrated Learning (GWIL) Working Party (ibid. 2011, p. 113). Whilst attempts to construct guidelines for determining WIL workloads at Griffith are evolving, the extent of ambiguous details and discipline variances complicates the process. Bates further contends the customary formulae mechanisms to calculate, for instance, lecture and repeat tutorial workloads, are not sufficient to capture the diversity and involvement of WIL roles with inherent inconsistencies and the difficulty in quantifying student contact and partnership administration and negotiations (ibid. 2011).

Other constraints on WIL include the reluctance to expose partners to less than adequate students or to over-burden them by taking advantage of their partnership to make other demands. Training needs are also a concern for the host organisation to ensure a qualified and competent supervisor is in place to monitor the students and ensure a safe and productive learning experience. Staff development is imperative within the strategy to revolutionise the education product as staff are charged with the responsibility for curricula design and delivery (Williams 2008).
students being sent off to find an industry partner, academic staff are unable to meaningfully engage with students or the partner for the duration of the WIL because of the enormous and unreasonable bureaucratic demands of the institution. Professional staff development is an essential and ongoing obligation of education institutions in efforts to generate quality education. Staff are inseparable to the learning experience, thus their ability to keep abreast of developments within the business operating environment and understanding of effective pedagogy directly dictates the quality of the learning experience for students (ibid. 2008). This may require changes to endemic pedagogical approaches employed by institutions, disciplines and individuals in accordance with policy revision and a strategic framework to govern staff development. Beard (1995) further highlights the detrimental judgement of institutions based on the students as ambassadors, if those students are unprepared for exposure in a real workplace.

An under-represented area in the literature is the challenges associated with placing students from diverse cohorts including students from low SES or non-English-speaking backgrounds, international students subject to visa restrictions, regional or remote students restricting access, indigenous students, students with carer’s responsibilities, students with a disability or mental illness, underperforming students and students with a criminal record (Munn 2013; Winchester-Seeto & Mackaway 2013). Additional implications of arranging childcare or eldercare, transportation, purchasing appropriate clothing and equipment, accommodation if placed away from home, impact of attending placements on GPA requirements for Centrelink payments, loss of income, disclosure, discrimination and managing physical and mental wellbeing (Munn 2013) need to also be factored into the equation.

In addition to the aforementioned factors, there is predictably lower uptake of engagement opportunities by students entering industries with an abundant supply of jobs, easier workplace entry and lower employment standards (Lindstaedt et al. 2008). By accepting this minimalist qualification or incomplete attainment of employability attributes, the prevalence of such views serves only to impede uptake of WIL thus discouraging efforts to improve the tertiary education product and undoubtedly restricting future career prospects of graduates. Whilst many risks are unavoidable, many of the concerns discussed seem manageable if due care is exercised by the
tertiary institution in preparing students (including orientation to the organisation), developing specific learning outcomes, organising relevant engagement opportunities at appropriate times and durations within the semester to balance student workloads and ensuring compatible values with selected host organisations. Beard (1995) suggests commencing work placements once students reach second year so that they are fully equipped with the basic knowledge, skill set and maturity to facilitate their ability to relate and engage effectively in the workplace. Second-year students are reported as having more direction, purpose and initiative and this idea further eliminates the graduates who are not committed to completing the course and drop out or change subjects during the first year. Like the very capricious nature of services, the variability of WIL precludes clear, concise and standardised measures to assess student performance. There is clearly a great deal of effort required, particularly in the establishment phase, though in the long term the benefits far outweigh the costs making the effort worthwhile.

There is currently an OLT project focusing on measuring the employability impacts of WIL, expected to be released early 2014, titled Assessing the Impact of Work Integrated Learning (WIL) on Student Work-Readiness (Griffith 2013a). The research encompasses five studies, targets employers, students and universities and is designed to provide an empirical evidence base for the impact of WIL on students’ preparedness for work or professional practice across multiple disciplines [and] inform strategic curriculum reform investment in universities (ibid. 2013a).

Preliminary findings suggest WIL does make a positive contribution to work readiness with full-time and both full- and part-time WIL participation better than only part-time WIL, which in turn is better than no WIL. Furthermore, simulations were also deemed better than no WIL (Smith 2013).

Resistance to the expansion of WIL is documented by Parker (2005), accounting for universities perceiving work-based learning as typically lacking credibility in comparison to the intentional academic learning and thus stopping the uptake of experiential learning initiatives. Universities however represent the ideal institution/structure for combining practice learning and theory instruction, as learning constitutes an individual and collective venture, and effective learning requires deliberate reflection guided by a qualified facilitator helping students to learn from
their experiences and from the perspectives and experiences of others. Raelin (2008) explores the highly bureaucratic nature of universities in order to explain the innate resistance to merging theory and practice. Preoccupation with research and theory development over improving teaching strategies results in academics, and more particularly management, poorly scrutinising delivery of knowledge transfer to students. Whilst conventional teaching methods serve to transfer explicit knowledge, they fail to encapsulate the tacit knowledge imparted through the act of doing (Argyris 1991; Nonaka 1991; Senge 2006). The premise behind WIL is that it merges theory and practice to provide a multifaceted learning process. Acknowledging the importance and interdependence of each enables the transfer of both explicit and tacit knowledge; going that extra mile to question what has been learnt and to provide opportunities to demonstrate application and reflection of these lessons (Kolb 1984; Schon 1983; Senge 2006). The ability to positively shape actions of the individual is the ultimate goal of the learning process, something that theory alone cannot verify. A major barrier to uptake of WIL by university educators has been well documented (Lindstaedt et al. 2008; Patrick et al. 2008; Raelin 2008; Richardson 2009) where staffing shortages mean that adequate supervision, particularly one on one, is impossible. Further, there is the sheer inability of industries and work-based assessors to absorb such high numbers of ‘learners’ into their workplaces whilst providing them with meaningful learning as opposed to menial repetitive jobs.

Practitioners construct theory through reflection on practice and actively engaging in problem solving. The key point to emphasise in achieving the benefits of WIL is the centrality of deliberate and guided introspection to bring to consciousness the lessons learnt. This requires emotional involvement and active participation of individuals with reflection complemented by peer advisement and direction from a supervisor (Wenger 2004).

An issue of serious contention in the WIL agenda is the practice of unpaid interns. Particularly systemic in the USA where fierce competition for internships exists and attainment of experience is a prerequisite before graduation, internships constitute a core recruitment policy for large firms. Following a succession of lawsuits in the USA and successful prosecution of Fox Searchlight Pictures (ABC 2013b; Smith 2013a), international research and government attention has centred on unlawful internship
conditions. Those conforming to old sentiments believe students should be willing and eager to volunteer their time in return for gaining valuable experience and mentoring by industry professionals in anticipation of reaping the long-term career benefits. This approach was common in earlier times when it was the custom to gain experience to be able to perform paid duties once fully qualified/competent, a process of ‘paying your dues’ (Sunburn 2012). However with a more sophisticated understanding of generational differences presented in Chapter 1, others purport this as an unfeasible approach with Gen Y and Millenials valuing money, thus making it difficult to mandate unpaid/volunteer work experiences with the necessity to fund study, accommodation, transport, childcare and clothing among others (Barron et al. 2007; Munn 2013).

Legitimacy and legality of internships are now being scrutinised in response to revelations of student exploitation, inequality of access to internships for students from disadvantaged socio-economic backgrounds and implications of job insecurity and depressed salaries of paid employees (Smith 2013a; OECD 2013). Typically targeting vulnerable communities, primarily youth, international students and people with a disability, such practices are of serious concern (AAP 2013). Internships both historically and presently fulfil an important role in providing practical experience across increasingly diverse fields with integration of internships in tertiary qualifications worldwide. It is seen as particularly important in developed countries such as the USA and Europe with high unemployment levels and the global economic crisis making it difficult for graduates with no track record or work experience in their discipline areas to break into the job market.

The general sentiment is not to proclaim universal abandonment of unpaid internships, as this would serve only to limit beneficial educational opportunities, but rather to address the issues surrounding the duration and nature of unpaid work, with the key concern of current lawsuits being the lack of structured educational components with work indistinguishable from that done by paid employees, including menial tasks for productive business purposes (ABC 2013b; OECD 2013; Smith 2013a). Intended to provide benefits to the student through structured workplace learning rather than free productive labour for the business, it is the long-term unpaid internships and replacement of paid staff by interns performing the same job that is making it a
necessity to regulate internships to prevent them from simply being free labour. A
disparity in understanding and expectations of what a graduate perceives as ‘work-
ready’ compared to the employer’s perspective also drive some of these anomalies.
For information regarding the legal statutes for WIL programs under the Fair Work
Act refer to section 1.2 of this thesis.

Part and parcel of this emerging international trend to tackle the expressed difficulties
of sourcing WIL placements involves colleges compensating students from low socio-
economic backgrounds with WIL stipends to enable access to internships or directly
paying employers to offer placements for their students (Baker 2013; Korn 2013).
Third party brokering agencies such as Professional Pathways Australia, Borch
Leeman, Punk Jobs and Sydney Internships are collecting high premiums from
students in return for providing internships (Stewart & Owens 2013). Though
increasingly prevalent within the Australian context evidenced by the growth of
brokering agencies and through tertiary provider fee structures, and despite appearing
to be an effective way of placing students for some institutions, this is not deemed as
a feasible and best practice approach, with many institutions claiming they would
prefer not to use these systems but finding a lack of alternatives and an overcrowded
market with oversupply and low demand necessitating such approaches.

Further challenges, yet to be adequately researched or addressed but of vital
importance to equitable access and quality education particularly in WIL, relate to
‘disability inclusion, anti-oppressive practice, and equitable social work education’
(Coriale, Larson & Robertson 2012, p. 430). A narrative exploring the experience of a
Canadian social work student with cerebral palsy identified key barriers and areas
warranting further research relating to understanding and assumptions of student
abilities and accommodating varying physical and pedagogical needs, role of support
assistants, and facilitating independence and empowerment (ibid. 2012). The student
expressed several challenges encountered during her course including preoccupation
by the institution to accommodate her physical needs above her social and emotional
needs. The student required an assistant to accompany her to classes and some of the
assistants she was assigned were identified as inhibiting connectedness with peers
thereby contributing to her estrangement from the student cohort. The student
struggled with gaining independence owing to incorrect and ignorant assumptions
made as to her abilities rather than focusing on ways to enhance her ability to operate in university and social work environments. Finding a voice was regarded as a successful outcome of the course which was further enhanced by the opportunity to provide feedback to improve the level of support for students with a disability at the institution and more broadly through the article (ibid. 2012).

An emerging pedagogy gaining popularity in education and interconnected to the WIL agenda is ‘blended learning’. Inspired by distance learning models, blended learning integrates online technologies with traditional face-to-face instruction to enhance learning through mixing the strengths of various approaches (Bishop & Dziuban 2007). Advocating integration of a variety of online technologies, including ‘videoconferencing, podcasting, wikis, blogs, and other media into class work’, is aligned to providing a multifaceted learning approach to better deliver outcomes for students with varying learning styles whilst ensuring students are equipped with the necessary technological skills required in their future careers (ibid. 2007, p. 8). Espousing flexible and hybrid learning contexts, this relatively new concept is under-researched with academics trying to determine best practices playing catch up to the technological advancement (Donnelly 2010). To maximise the benefits of blended learning emphasis on planned integration of online technologies, peer-to-peer interactions and engagement with academics is advised (Osguthorpe & Graham 2003). This area still remains largely unexplored given the utopian WIL experience to still do practical engagement face to face rather than through simulated or technologically driven practice.

One of the minor initiatives and least costly under the banner of WIL is having guest speakers visit classrooms. Guest speaking, akin to storytelling, has strong traditions in education as a means to engage students, enhance credibility and update knowledge (Fawcett & Fawcett 2011; Metrejean, Pittman & Zarzeski 2002). Proponents assert experienced and suitable speakers can paint a picture of reality, sharing experiences and workplace problems students can relate to and reflect upon whilst also serving as a conduit for student contact with businesses. The literature on guest speakers demonstrates that a lack of planning and integration with curricula and poor selection of speakers can in fact have the opposite effect and diminish the learning experience. This can occur if the speaker is not engaging, suitably qualified or experienced, or
informed of course and session objectives. Utilising a guest speaker is often simply a means to escape class planning, fill a void or staff absence (Fawcett & Fawcett 2011; McCleary & Weaver 2009; Metrejean, Pittman & Zarzeski 2002). Structuring effective guest speakers in curricula relies on various steps outlined by McCleary and Weaver (2009, pp. 404–7) comprising topic areas such as ‘Interaction between the faculty member and speaker ahead of time’ and managing expectations, ‘Necessary preparation’, ‘Balancing “War Stories” with content’, ‘Tying the presentation content to course objectives’ and concluding with feedback and a thank you. In accordance with relationship management theory, if such a connection with industry is nurtured effectively, the guest speaker arrangement can become the first stage in a long-term relationship. For many universities and the TAFE system, industry representation is already commonplace on curricula advisory boards and such participation is usually at minimal effort and time by industry partners. This initial contact however presents an opening for expansion of this relationship.
2.3 WIL in the Hospitality Industry

Consensus in the literature denotes the fields of hospitality as historically being under-theorised with the potential of WIL underutilised (Hollinshead 2008; Jennings 2001; Tribe 2002). Preoccupation with description as opposed to primary research, absence of rigour and methodological frameworks and no clarity in scope of the field has contributed little to the advancement of theory and of comprehension of operational issues (Jones 2004). Recognition of hospitality and tourism constituting the largest economic contributor to national and global societies (Airey 1997, cited in Tribe 2002; Milne & Ateljevic 2001) has served to increase the credibility of the industry and fuelled an expansion of the literature. The Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS)
acknowledges difficulty in isolating the actual contribution of hospitality and tourism to the Australian economy due to the interrelatedness of the tourism product and its multiplier effect through the economy. The latest publication from the ABS reports that in the period 2011–2012 direct tourism Gross Domestic Product (GDP) was calculated as $4.1018 billion and employed 513,900 people (ABS 2013).

Table 2.1: Direct Tourism Employment: By Industry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Direct employment ('000)</th>
<th>Indirect employment ('000)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation and food services</td>
<td>232.4</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>244.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail transport</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road transport and motor vehicle hiring</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air, water and other transport</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel agency and tour operator services</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and recreation services</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail trade</td>
<td>99.0</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>127.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and training</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other industries</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>261.4</td>
<td>286.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>513.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>393.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>907.3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Source: Tourism Research Australia (2012, p. 8)

In recent decades the growth in prestige of hospitality in Australia has ignited increased attention on field-specific education and theory development. Considering the educational product remains in a nascent state, the education levels of managers within the industry, particularly those with long tenure and high up in the management chain, are also relatively low (Ladkin 2002, cited in Kim 2008).

An Australian study by Ladkin (2002) found that 6.1 percent of the sample had a postgraduate degree, 7.8 percent had gained a degree from full-time study, 1.7 percent gained a degree level from part-time study, 7.8 percent had an advanced diploma, 13.3 percent a diploma, 7.8 percent a certificate, and 0.6 percent a culinary course or apprenticeship. Other qualifications were held by 2.7 percent of the sample (cited in Kim 2008, p. 17).
There is an ongoing perception devaluing degree graduates as inadequately prepared for employment in the industry. Employers affix priority to attainment of practical work experience reinforcing the prevalence of unqualified managers operating in the field (Kim 2008). Though dated, research conducted in the UK demonstrated little variance in length of time for individuals to progress into the role of hospitality general manager despite deviating education levels (Ladkin 2000). Vocational education is favourable for aspiring hospitality management students for imparting valuable business, management and technical skills, and may enable entry to the industry at a higher level however, it does not guarantee quicker career progression (ibid. 2000). The findings of this research are repeated in more current publications, which also serve to highlight deficiencies of research into career progression of hospitality graduates beyond the traditional destination surveys (O’Leary & Deegan 2005; Petrova & Mason 2004). Research conducted by Harper, Brown and Wilson (2005) within the hospitality industry in the UK explains how it is possible to fast-track a hospitality management career through attainment of qualifications however, it recognises the interplay of other factors on these prospects including the type, ownership, scale and traditions of employer organisations, graduates’ expectations of industry and acceptance of unsociable conditions, international work experience and with more emphasis placed on the personality traits, age and gender as well as strategically timed career moves of graduates (Garavan, O’Brien & O’Hanlon 2006). There still remains substantial conflicting information within the literature on the value of vocational education for the field of hospitality with an apparent link to stage of development of the industry and education product within individual countries. Major areas of contention are in the perceived value of formal qualifications in contrast to on-the-job training in pursuing a career in the industry. The prevalence of the ‘low skills’ profile and narrow views of the types of roles and sectors under the umbrella of hospitality contribute to the devaluing of formal qualifications with the simple understanding that skills needed for working in the industry can be acquired on the job (Baum 2002; O’Mahony & Sillitoe 2001). Furthermore, this argument neglects the ease of entry into the industry for small-scale and owner-operated establishments (Baum 2002). Importantly the industry is recognising the importance of formal management education for middle and senior management (Kim 2008). Whilst a definitive resolution still eludes, it is Ladkin’s (2000) expectation that advancement in
tertiary education and expansion of WIL will serve to fast-track hospitality management careers.

Endemic questioning as to the necessity of hospitality qualifications is further challenged by Minett et al. in their study on leadership styles of Australian hospitality managers (2009, p. 19):

In addition to the generic characteristics of management, hospitality managers have different demands and expectations on them … they are concurrently managing both staff performance and guest expectations … as well as having a greater requirement for assertiveness, independence and mental stamina (Worsfold 1989b, cited in Minett et al. 2009, p. 19).

The notion of hospitality managers being multi-skilled in all business functions, i.e. marketing, HR and accounting, as well as possessing personal attributes including problem-solving, communication, flexibility, entrepreneurship and decision making, was supplemented in more recent literature as delivered through completion of a hospitality degree so managers could apply these skills to the complexity of the hospitality context: fast-paced, dynamic and ambiguous (Dawson, Abbott & Shoemaker 2011; Kim 2008). In view of the challenging context and role of hospitality and tourism managers as ‘agents of social, political, economic and environmental change’ and as global citizens, there is growing appreciation for hospitality managers to be responsive, highly skilled and innovative (Dredge et al. 2012a, p 9). Whilst hospitality managers have historically been depicted as autonomous, the accuracy of this depiction may be disputed in organisations subject to ‘McDonaldisation’ of hospitality services. Bureaucratic mechanisms pursued to standardised quality restrict the decision-making power of employees and have the obverse effect of inhibiting organisational citizenship behaviour and initiative required to respond to the transformative needs of hospitality customers (Raub 2008).

King, Funk and Wilkins (2011) further contend that the devaluing of hospitality academia in general has been exacerbated by the divergence of academic and industry research agendas. Whilst the industry struggles to deal with poor career image, generational shifts, technology and brand management, a lack of contribution by academics to assist hospitality managers in dealing with these contemporary issues is limiting collaborative partnerships and perpetuating ignorance as to the tertiary
hospitality product offerings and contribution. In attempts to achieve greater industry acceptance and adoption of academic research, as well as elevating the perceived value of hospitality qualifications and academia, researchers accentuate ‘relevance’ through conducting research to inform industry practice that is reflective of the current climate (King, Funk & Wilkins 2011).

The rising popularity of hospitality studies has witnessed the emergence of tertiary qualifications provided through universities, TAFE and specialised institutions, mainly private colleges. This proliferation of institutions and course offerings accompanied by increasing competition for students is placing the product composition and differentiation under extreme scrutiny. Qualifications offering WIL are perceived as advantageous as students typically have limited work experience prior to commencing tertiary studies (Bates 2005). This is even more prevalent with current government initiatives to increase collaboration of secondary and tertiary education institutions and promote trade initiatives to channel students into vocational/trade qualifications (DEEWR 2012). Assimilation of WIL and attention to graduate competency and employability is occurring within Australian tertiary education though varying in approach, magnitude and structure. The lack of a concise understanding or framework on how to effectively marry WIL into tertiary education for hospitality precludes equitable access and attainment of maximum benefits for students, industry and tertiary education institutions.

The next section serves to critically review national and international WIL literature within the fields of social work, medicine, nursing and education from a conceptual and empirical basis. Confined by limitations of time and scope, this is by no means an exhaustive evaluation of best practice; rather, it offers an informed insight into the directions and lessons deduced from WIL integration within curricula of tertiary education fields more mature than hospitality.
2.4 WIL in Social Work

Proclaiming the purpose of tertiary degrees to inform and support practice, Parker (2005) asserts the need for integration of theory and practice within tertiary course design. As portrayed throughout Parker’s writing, the field of social work appears more advanced in regards to not only accepting the importance of practice but also integrating practice within tertiary courses. Social work programs realise the importance of delivering experienced graduates, to provide productive job-ready candidates, whilst also upholding ethical standards and ensuring no harm to patients or employees. The Dearing Report (1997, cited in Parker 2005, p. 47) further contends the single most important value from the employers’ perspective was their preference for and expectations of graduates having already had relevant work experiences. In light of complications and implications of working with people, graduates must be qualified, confident and feel safe and competent in handling complex and sensitive personal issues and precarious situations ubiquitous within this field (ibid. 2005).

Multiple names are employed within the field of social work to depict WIL, with different approaches evolving to capture the complexity of social work in ‘practice education’, i.e. practice-based learning, competency-based education, evidence-based practice and authority-based practice. The importance of WIL in social work is well established in research on an international scale with a wealth of researchers regarding field education as a ‘signature pedagogy’ for social work (Parker 2005; Wayne, Bogo & Raskin 2010). Justification of field education in social work has theoretical underpinnings in adult learning theory and Kolb’s experiential learning model discussed in Chapter 3.

Learning outcome–focused debates are currently prolific in social work education with Carpenter (2011) acknowledging progression in developing outcome measures. Consistent with the global fixation to define and assess graduate attributes, social work research into outcome assessment intends to inform curricula and WIL assessment design to determine the extent of transference of skills to practice. This is in keeping with the established importance of experiential learning to positively influence future action and behaviour.
The historically scientific field of social work has been grappling in recent decades with the role of experimental learning and the role science should play in advancing the profession. Evidence-Based Practice (EBP) is building support relating knowledge and practice with engagement of the client, however, Cohen (2011) exposes limitations of this rational approach through relying on answerable questions selected from a definite set of solutions. The field of social work differs substantially from the rational models of natural sciences and must be developmental in nature to evolve with the uncertainties and complexities of the situation and determining the best outcome for the situation according to the available information. The reality of social work often lacks specific solvable problems. Focused on past events and data as evidence to determine future action, EBP inhibits innovation and fails to take into account new, un-researched variables. Cohen (2011) proposes a new framework labelled Design-Based Practice (DBP), as the social work industry, akin to hospitality, operates within turbulent and unpredictable environments with dynamic interactions of actors in the system. Adams, LeCroy and Matto (2009) concur with the limitations of EBP, asserting social work education should be grounded in theory and practice.

In efforts to overcome the relative isolation of the social work field and bolster the research and education of the collective health care professions, a new trans-disciplinary model called Evidence-Based Behavioural-Practice (EBBP) has emerged (Bellamy et al. 2013; EBBP.org 2013). Barriers to collaboration in health professions, identified as ‘dissimilar academic language, training, culture, and knowledge formation as well as profession-specific experiences’, have preserved profession-specific research and training materials (Bellamy et al. 2013, p. 428). This is the same scenario experienced by hospitality. The improvements on previous systems are achieved through interdisciplinary collaboration and synergistic systems to build on the strengths and perspectives of other disciplines.

There is disparity in national approaches to accreditation of social work qualifications. An editorial featuring in the Research on Social Work Practice Journal, Stoesz (2008) depicts America’s struggle with meritocracy of social work education. In response to the accountability movement in higher education, research into American graduate performance has revealed social work graduates significantly underperform graduates from other fields. Despite fieldwork positioned as a ‘signature pedagogy’ for social
work, implementation falls short, which is attributed to the absence of systematic incorporation within curricula and a lack of consistency and preparation (Wayne, Bogo & Raskin 2010). Currently bachelor programs require 400 hours of field experience with this figure increasing to 900 hours for masters level (Karger 2012). The history of self governance in American social work is regarded as inhibiting progression of social work education, with the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE), the national accrediting agency for social work education, implementing its own framework in place of other proven national student performance assessment instruments (Stoesz 2008). The American social work industry is characterised by an absence of scaffolded WIL in curricula, lack of collaboration, lack of standards and training required for field instructors and an absence of transparent accountability of a student’s role in placements (ibid. 2008). Analogous to the hospitality industry in Australia, the social work profession in America is held in low regard, attracting similar low levels of remuneration, which is a reflection of the clientele social workers serve; this fact impedes national intervention and funding (Davis & Blake 2008). Uncontrolled growth of social work education contributing to oversupply of social workers and inconsistent education standards compounds these issues (Karger 2012). Of critical relevance is the lack of unity in the American social work industry, with the presence of multiple industry associations and unions failing to provide a collective voice to achieve efficiencies in quality social work education (Davis & Blake 2008). The 2008 Educational Policy and Accreditation Standard framework is still operating in America today although the CSWE declares research into system improvements are underway (CSWE 2013).

Following a succession of child-care tragedies in the UK in recent decades and subsequent heightened concerns of inadequate training of social work professionals, the standard entrance level requirements was raised in 2003–2004 to completion of an undergraduate degree qualification (Wilson & Kelly 2010; MacRae & Skinner 2011). Further regulation, including the Health and Social Care Act 2012, has been designed to raise the training of social workers to be on par with other professions, which serves to enhance integration of health and other care services in England (HCPC 2013). The Health and Care Professions Council (HCPC) is the statutory and multi-professional regulator maintaining a register of qualified health care professionals and setting standards for education in the UK (ibid. 2013). Social workers are now required to re-
new registration every three years. Practical placement is a compulsory component in UK social work education and further research is being pursued to ensure such experiences deliver the desired graduate attributes. This research includes reviews of trainer qualifications and evaluation of training provision (MacRae & Skinner 2011).

Within the Australian context, the field of social work remains self-regulated by the professional representative association of Australian social workers, the Australian Association of Social Workers (AASW 2013). The AASW is responsible for accrediting social work degrees offered by tertiary education institutions and providing standards for social work education, the Australian Social Work Education and Accreditation Standards (ASWEAS), and for practice, the Practice Standards for Social Workers: Achieving Outcomes (ibid. 2013). The AASW is currently pursuing statutory registration and accreditation within the social work industry, making submissions to the federal government to be included in the National Registration and Accreditation Scheme (NRAS) and drawing attention to the inherent risks to social workers and the public. If successful, national regulation and accreditation standards will result in the establishment of entry-level qualifications, standards for practice-based education, codes of conduct and currency of social workers (ibid. 2013). Until such outcomes are achieved, the current 2012 iteration of standards for AASW accreditation require mandatory field work in social work education (see Appendix 9).

In a report commissioned by the Social Transition Team, Office of Democracy, Governance and Social Transition of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID/E&E/DGST), Davis and Blake (2008) conducted an analysis of social work in Europe and Eurasia for the explicit purpose of determining best practices and recommendations for social work education in the region. The report established a number of key areas for improvement and best practices for ‘Human Capacity Development’, with the most relevant consisting of the necessity of industry regulation, formalised frameworks in curricula for field education and training of field supervisors and building the capacity of professional associations to advocate and educate through collaboration to provide a united voice (Davis & Blake 2008). To gain public support, the report also advocates focusing efforts for increased regulation on the protection of the public similar to efforts in the UK and current attempts in Australia (AASW 2013; Davis & Blake 2008).
Progressing from national approaches to WIL in social work, specific best practices are recognised within teaching methods employed in the field proven to benefit student learning and transference of skills to practice. Tutors have been heralded in research as playing a key role in the learning process for social work through employing a portfolio of learning materials within tutorial sessions (Sieminski & Seden 2011). Effective strategies assessed as enabling tutors to support and monitor student performance included:

- online tutor–group discussions, personal communication with individual students,
- structured face-to-face teaching and feedback on assignments. The face-to-face teaching includes seven one-day workshops which focus on linking practice to social work theory (ibid. 2011, p. 799).

The techniques espoused in the study were aligned to principles of scaffolded learning with creative teaching methods such as case studies, scenarios and role plays designed to build student confidence accompanied by carefully constructed reflection exercises to focus student attention on what they have learnt and what they will apply differently in future practice (ibid. 2011). These techniques fall within the experiential learning repertoire complementing the more traditional and familiar field placement to integrating theoretical knowledge into the professional context.

The field of social work operates in a similar dynamic environment and with similar absence of regulation and accreditation systems typical of the hospitality industry. Though as demonstrated in the reviews of national approaches, the field of social work is making headway to address these historic limitations and is several steps ahead of hospitality, with the issues on the national agenda. Even in the absence of national regulation and accreditation, practical placement features as a mandatory element of social work education with a consensus that practical experience correlates to skill attainment in service industries. It’s not a hard stretch to imagine that similar health and safety risks that present in social work also exist in the hospitality industry; they require sound decision making and leadership such as in handling emergency and crowd management for major events, the threat of food poisoning and terrorism threats.
2.5 WIL in Medicine and Nursing Professions

The health professions have strong traditions of WIL embedded in curricula. Health practitioners work in a fast-paced and challenging environment where the importance of suitable qualifications and experience is imperative to avoid dire consequences for patients, visitors and staff (McAllister & McKinnon 2009). Much of the learning in health professions is conducted in the public arena, further complicating the design and assessment of WIL initiatives. Due to interrelatedness of health professions and operating environments the professions of nursing and medicine will be collectively analysed in this section.

Whilst the learning in practice concept is widely accepted in health education, the literature denotes extensive challenges and reservations for assessing learning during such practice by either industry supervisors or academic staff. In the fields of medicine and nursing the importance of assessing student performance in action is critical to assurance of ‘fitness to practice’ combining ‘evaluation of skill (technical, psychomotor and interpersonal), attitudes and insights, and reasoning’ (Price 2012, p. 1). Medical practice education requires opportunistic learning and assessment with flexibility to exploit sporadic occasions for witnessing student activity and, in the absence of such opportunities, to evaluate competence through other means such as interviews. During placements, students engage with a number of healthcare professionals and thus consultation with all relevant individuals during student assessments serves to provide a more thorough insight into student progress and competence (ibid. 2012). Incremental consultations commencing early in the placement where mentors routinely check student performance and monitor student attitudes to learning mean the structured provision of regular and, where feasible, immediate feedback will eliminate undesirable surprises at the final interview (ibid. 2012). Reflective learning is intrinsic to health programs, along with professional mentoring. Sharing reflections with mentors provides opportunities for students to clarify their understanding and correct misconceptions, setting the tone for standards expected by medical practitioners (Heerde & Murphy 2009; Price 2012).
Another alternative to assessment in practice that is widely applied in health education is Objective Structured Clinical Examinations (OSCEs). Typically conducted in campus clinical laboratories, OSCEs consist of a series of short tasks or ‘stations’ designed to test discrete clinical skills [and are] assessed by an examiner using a predetermined, objective marking scheme (Mitchell et al. 2009, cited in Nulty et al. 2011, p. 145).

This assessment technique extends into the realm of simulated WIL experiences, thus addressing one of the key issues challenging the WIL agenda of the medical field along with other fields: a shortage of placements accompanied by escalation of student numbers (Nulty et al. 2011). The education sector is responding to the demands of industry in innovative ways in utilising technology to replace traditional learning. Virtual WIL (VWIL) ‘computer-generated environments simulating real physical environments and physical situations’ (Shehri 2012, p. 2) have been utilised in a variety of fields including medicine, engineering, aviation and the military, constituting another complementary technique to the more recognisable repertoire of WIL initiatives. There are still many challenges encountered in the application of VWIL documented in the literature, such as cost, being labour intensive, fear of technology, training requirements and availability/creation of input data, that are worth concerted attention. In addition to the typical, achievable WIL benefits, VWIL further provides for ‘authentic interactivity, flexibility, constructivism, wider availability, equal opportunity platform, safe customizable, low-cost environments’ (ibid. 2012, p. 9). VWIL has also been observed on a smaller scale within business simulation programs for marketing and business students (UWS myIcicle; VU’s Xerox Virtual Enterprise or VE) and emerging within graduate programs such as Marriott’s Voyage Virtual Environment (Marriott International 2013). A series of best practice guidelines (BPGs) have been developed for OSCEs based on extensive research by Mitchell et al. (2009) and in concert with trialling and consultation measures (Nulty et al. 2011) (see Appendix 9). These guidelines emphasise relevant, authentic and integrative practice scaffolded within the course, holistic marking guides and integrated learning and assessment (ibid. 2011).

Resilience is universally recognised as a mandatory graduate attribute of health professions on account of the stressful and challenging work environment requiring responsive practitioners to correctly diagnose, treat and care for fragile patients and
their families. Although the risks may be disproportionate in other fields, the same justification of mitigating risks requires resilience in all graduates. Within the health professions, research suggests the emotional and cognitive labour-intensive caring role performed by nurses places them most at risk of strain, with absence of resilience contributing to the risk of stress, burnout or patient neglect (McAllister & McKinnon 2009). Resilience is a product of personal traits and external factors such as strong support networks, supportive peer relationships and provision of a safe and learning-centred educational setting (ibid. 2009). The medical literature advocates the following strategies to embed the development of resilience in health education: inclusion of resiliency dialogue to build student self-awareness, coping strategies and adaptive leadership skills; reflective learning practices within practice learning contexts augmented by inclusive decision making and support for team collaboration; competent placement supervisors to mentor and guide student development; and fostering students’ generativity (McAllister & McKinnon 2009; Price 2012; Nulty et al. 2011).

Other analogous issues with hospitality that affect the field of nursing include the devaluing of nurses by society, staffing shortages and generational characteristics:

This younger cohort of individuals tends to perceive hospitals as harsh and unresponsive institutions that offer stressful and unexciting employment opportunities, in which there is widespread unpaid overtime, disparaging and rigid management, limited autonomy, instability, difficult working conditions, and rapid staff turnover (Holmes 2006, cited in McAllister & McKinnon 2009, p. 372).

In Australia there are two means of entry into a medical degree. The first involves a 5–6year medical degree, the second, any type of bachelor degree graduate pursuing a 4-year medical degree (Jolly 2009). Applicants are assessed on ‘matriculation results, an admission test and an interview’ (ibid. 2009). The undergraduate medical degrees adopt a problem-based learning approach and various WIL initiatives are embedded into curricula including observation, placements, clinical experience, simulations and clinical skills laboratories (ibid. 2009).

On successful completion of a medical degree, students must then complete prevocational training in the form of a 12-month internship (see Appendix 9) and as
graduates ‘continue to work under supervision with increasing levels of responsibility, in a broad range of health care settings’ (Jolly 2009, p. 13).

The Australian government partially funds the university education of medical students, including provision of infrastructure, clinical training and the Australian general practice training program (Jolly 2009). Registration of health practitioners was originally completed by the states and territories, however, this changed to a single national registration and accreditation scheme in 2010 administered by the Australian Health Practitioner Regulation Agency (AHPRA 2013).

The Australian Nursing and Midwifery Accreditation Council (ANMAC) is the national accreditation authority for nursing (ANMAC 2012). Within the field of nursing there is a range of positions commencing with Enrolled Nurse (EN) and progressing up to Nurse Practitioner (NP). The lower levels of the nursing hierarchy have limited responsibilities; this is reflected in the reduced training requirements: Certificate IV or Diploma of Nursing with 320 hours or 400 hours of clinical experience, respectively, with qualifications and hours of clinical experience increasing through the ranks (Community Services and Health Industry Training Board 2010). The entry level for a Registered Nurse (RN) in Australia is completion of a Bachelor or Masters’ degree in Nursing (ANMAC2012). Nursing degrees feature a range of WIL initiatives, including ‘coaching, simulation, role-modelling, post-conferences, preclinical preparation, post-clinical conferences, and an articulation of experiential learning’ (Benner & Sutphen 2009, cited in Wayne, Bogo & Raskin 2010, p. 329). The national standards for clinical practice for an RN are stipulated in Appendix 9.

Important lessons deduced from the integration of WIL in medical fields include the relevancy and authenticity of controlled practice experiences that are both complex and integrated in design and emblematic of real practice. Holistic marking guides ensure assessments of competency are related to more than just individual items; for example, the ability to take an appropriate series of actions within an authentic and dynamic setting. Repetition of skill demonstration is inherent in medical training to aid scaffolded learning and overcome ‘brain dump’ after assessment. Placement of WIL must be appropriately timed within the course, aligned to course curricula and
accompanied by pre- and post-placement preparation and reflection. Feedback is linked to improved student performance with emphasis of immediacy requiring structured time and resources in the placement to deliver the maximum benefit. As emphasised by Nulty et al. (2011) student performance feedback must be motivational not discouraging and articulate both areas to improve and how improvement may be accomplished. Checklist style marking with clear identification of assessment outcomes linked to graduate outcomes serves to prompt specific feedback and reduce assessor variability.

2.6 WIL in Teacher Education

The Australian qualifications for primary and secondary educators are currently subject to transition from state regulation towards a national regulation and accreditation system subject to the National Professional Standards for Teachers (NSWIT 2013). The individual state and territory associations, such as the NSW Institute of Teachers (NSWIT), continue to administer the accreditation process in consultation (ibid. 2013). The justification for national accreditation is articulated by the Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership Ltd (AITSL 2011, p. 1–2) and summarised as follows: 1. Continuous improvement of initial teacher education; 2. Outcomes focus for setting and achieving high standards for graduate outcomes; 3. Flexibility, diversity and innovation by education providers in program delivery; 4. Partnerships with providers, authorities and teaching professionals; 5. Building on existing expertise to strengthen teacher education; and 6. Evidence-based practice to enhance the accreditation process.

WIL has broad traditions and continues to remain a signature and mandatory premise of teacher education delivered through supervised professional experience, practicums, internships and professional experience days (NSWIT 2009). Justification of professional experience in teaching emulates the previous fields: facilitating students to ‘observe, interact, experiment and reflect in a supportive environment’ (Walkington 2010, p. 177), developing knowledge of individual student learning styles and refining teaching skills to enhance student learning outcomes. Observation and
assessment in action is universally accepted as critical to determination of competency standards and work readiness.

Teacher education has been subject to increased scrutiny in recent decades with concerns for production, measurement and assurance of quality accompanied by educational reforms to redress Australia’s falling education rankings in the international community (White, Bloomfield & Cornu 2010). Operating within a neoliberal framework, quality of education is aligned to economic prosperity and resilience with innovation and life-long learning fundamental to procuring continuity of quality, transparency and accountability within the educational system (ibid. 2010).

The rational traditions of teacher education have undoubtedly morphed towards philosophies of action learning and reflective practitioners, with a focus on education quality and quality of educators. The field of teacher education is adapting to changing conditions with increased competitiveness of WIL placements, social inclusion, heightened demands for resources and changing student profiles through adoption of national curricula, a process informed by ongoing research into WIL and collaboration with other fields.

According to the NSW Department of Education and Community (DEC), there are numerous pathways into education as follows:

Teacher training usually involves four years of study at university, such as:

- a four-year Bachelor of Education
- a three-year Bachelor degree plus postgraduate teacher education training, such as a Diploma of Education or a Master of Teaching, or
- a four- or five-year combined degree program such as a Bachelor of Science/Bachelor of Teaching (DEC 2013).

Qualifications for primary educators require completion of undergraduate subjects across the primary curricula areas with electives tailored to specialty studies, which contrasts with the more subject-specific content studies for secondary educators aligned to subjects they intend to teach (ibid. 2013).

Numerous experiences within a variety of settings, scaffolded within curricula, denote a well-structured professional teaching experience program (White, Bloomfield & Cornu 2010). The majority of professional practice being mandated within school settings and with supplementary provisions such as subject-specific experiences,
embedded. Professional experiences are mapped against professional standards, with professional accreditation standards defining appropriate settings and program structures, duration of practice experiences, student outcomes and evidence of quality (ibid 2010). The specific structure of professional experience programs is left to the tertiary educational institutions; however, they have to meet minimum guidelines for accreditation of 45–80 days of supervised classroom experience depending on the degree program (NSWIT 2013) (see Appendix 9). The variability of entrance pathways complicates the minimum practice guidelines.

Resonating with the previous fields, the field of teacher education promotes national accreditation systems, with mandatory WIL initiatives embedded into curricula for achieving quality education, in addition to producing competent and professional educators to contribute to the future advancement of education quality. Clearly defined guidelines based on sound and ongoing research and intra- and inter-disciplinary collaboration are premised as central to the quality WIL agenda. Ensuring suitability of experiences and mandating a variety of practice settings, appropriate structures and durations ensure all graduates meet the stipulated requirements for fitness to practice. Successful WIL projects rely on learning partnerships between universities and industry where power is shared and constant communication and negotiation are innate.

2.7 Chapter Summary

Through analysis of WIL design, implementation and best practices from fields more versed with WIL pedagogy than the discipline of hospitality, it is evident that many of the challenges encountered are indeed common and trans-disciplinary. Attempts to address gaps in best practice in the literature and coordinate quality educational enhancement are forthcoming however, the more research conducted, the more complexity is realised. Mandatory structured WIL programs within degree qualifications have long been part of industry accreditation processes for medicine, nursing and education and are now found in social work in countries such as the UK and the USA. The field of hospitality can learn from the mistakes and lessons of these
more advanced fields by demanding more attention at a federal level to progress towards national accreditation approaches.

This chapter sets the scene for the complex structure of tertiary education in Australia and establishes the necessity of furthering the WIL agenda to improve education quality and Australia’s international standing. Importantly, the issue of underemployment warrants attention to align tertiary qualifications with appropriate career paths to meet labour market needs. The review of WIL literature serves to highlight the gaps in knowledge on effective design and integration of WIL in tertiary curricula.
Chapter 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter outlines the methodology underpinning the research. Commencing with a background to the quantitative and qualitative philosophies guiding the study, justification for the design is provided throughout the chapter with reference to the objectives and research questions. Discussion on the methods of data collection, sampling, recruitment process and data analysis is followed by a section outlining the validity, reliability and generalisation of the study.

3.1 Justification for the Methodology

The methodology adopted for this research thesis encompassed both quantitative and qualitative paradigms. The deductive nature of the research and the review of related literature also inform the choice of methodology. Denzin and Lincoln (2005), Jennings (2001), Creswell and Clarke (2011) and Ticehurst and Veal (1999) all refer to the suitability of mixed methodologies for service-related research. This suitability stems from the ability to provide empirical data through positivist means accompanied by deep data garnered from qualitative study methods. Additionally, a review of other studies revealed a combined technique as the most effective (Janta et al. 2011; Punjaisri & Wilson 2007; Wilkins, Merrilees & Herington 2007).

The principal primary research survey tool conforms to a quantitative methodology, with the researcher adopting an etic or external position to the research to remove researcher bias and subjectivity (Ticehurst & Veal 1999). With a highly structured design and adherence to strict procedures, a reflection of positivism, the research focuses on observable and measurable traits. Data collection is through a quantitative survey with data subject to statistical analysis and graphical representation (Jennings 2001). Facilitating collection of a wide range of information, surveys are most suitable for collecting responses with a limited number of possible answers. Designed to test
theory, the end product will be ‘derivation of laws or law-like generalisations’ and identification of causal relationships (Remenyi et al. 1998, p. 32). The selection of a quantitative survey is consistent with conventional tourism research methods (Veal 2011) and allows for comparison with related studies which informed the questions for this study as detailed in section 3.4. The decision to use quantitative methods first was to be able to access and identify broad and general themes relevant to WIL in the Hospitality industry. This empirical data was then de-constructed through qualitative techniques.

Qualitative methodology is present through the inclusion of focus groups. This methodology supports the researcher adopting an emic or insider position to establish rapport with research participants (Jennings 2001). This permits collection of qualitative and subjective data with inherent flexibility to pursue emerging trends and themes and also allowing for the researcher to seek explanation of responses. Qualitative methodology adheres to an inductive approach concerned with delving beneath the observable to uncover meaning and answer ‘what’, ‘why’ and ‘how’ (Remenyi et al. 1998; Stewart & Mickunas 1974). The end product of rich descriptions, meanings and explanations will supplement the statistical findings (Maylor & Blackmon 2005; Remenyi et al. 1998). Selection of focus groups permitted exploration of key trends and issues identified in the survey allowing for respondents to qualify and explain responses in depth. This reinforces the belief in qualitative research that participants are in the optimum position to describe and explain their perspectives and experiences and should have the opportunity to do so without the constraint of a researcher imposed framework (Veal 2011). By serving to provide insights into problems and understand the varying perspectives of stakeholders the selection of focus groups satisfied the data requirements to answer the final research question (Krueger & Casey 2000).

The research questions posed in this study are concerned with determining the value of WIL in enhancing graduate employability within the hospitality industry. The research aims to evaluate the perceptions of WIL held by employers, educators and graduates with WIL experience within NSW hospitality. The case for assimilating WIL within tertiary education in general, and specifically for the hospitality field, was established through the literature review and theoretical contribution. Numerous
authors have explored the determinants of graduate employability (BIHECC 2007; Cox & King 2006; Hager & Holland 2006; Lees 2002; McLennan & Keating 2008) and their findings detailed in the review of literature (Chapter 2). The seminal works of AC Neilsen (2000) and ACCI and BCA (2002) defined graduate attributes/competencies required by employers with identification of gaps within tertiary curricula. Potential disadvantages of graduate under/unemployment have been researched within national/international economies and have also been calculated for specific industries (Cassidy & Wright 2007; Dreijmanis 2004; Green & Zhu 2010; Maynard, Joseph & Maynard 2006; Nabi 2003; Smetherham 2005). Finally, numerous authors have researched specific and general application of WIL to improve graduate employability (ACER 2010; Bates 2005; McLennan & Keating 2008; Patrick et al. 2008; Raelin 2008; Ricks & Williams 2005; WACE 2008). The literature on WIL is however heavily skewed to favour attention on traditional disciplines like teaching, medicine, social work and nursing. The perceptions of WIL within hospitality tertiary education, and the best way to achieve assimilation of WIL to maximise stakeholder benefits, is under-researched. This gap in knowledge impedes the assimilation of WIL effectively within Australian tertiary education providers offering hospitality- and tourism-related courses and is the impetus for this research. From analysis of the existing literature, there appears to be a preoccupation with exploration of the concepts, conceptual works and empirical research adopting narrow samples and singular methodologies (BIHECC 2007; McLennan & Keating 2008; Kim 2008; Patrick et al. 2008; Williams 2008). This has been at the expense of establishing the contribution of WIL in EL and quantifying ideal approaches and development of a framework and understanding for effective assimilation tailored to the specific characteristics of the hospitality field. The underlying assumption for this research is that the design and execution of WIL needs to be developed and refined within hospitality tertiary education. The research has been structured to demonstrate the value of WIL in EL and decipher the central requirements to inform hospitality curricula to maximise benefits for all stakeholders.

Based on the groundwork provided by existing publications (BIHECC 2007; Guthrie 2010; Kim 2008; McLennan & Keating 2008; Nabi 2003; Raelin 2008; and Richardson 2009) this research adopted a deductive approach. The design of the research conforms to a mixed methodology. Method triangulation compensates for the flaws within
individual methodologies and contributes rigour and depth, thus enhancing overall comprehension of the phenomenon (Thomas et al. 2004). Individual data collection tools are tailored to gathering only certain types of data, thus method triangulation involves selection of multiple tools to collect multiple types and sources of data. Integration of both quantitative and qualitative methodologies provides a more complete picture of the situation with data collected from one tool used to inform, verify and complement other aspects of the design.

The study aims to answer the following questions:

1. Are the benefits of WIL experienced by other industries transferable to hospitality?
   a. YES (How?), NO (Why not?)
2. How does WIL minimise the gap between graduate attributes and industry expectations in hospitality?
3. Does WIL impact entrance and progression of WIL graduates within the hospitality industry?
4. Do demographic characteristics including but not limited to gender, age, ethnicity, prior experience, familiarity with the sector and level of education have an impact on perspectives of WIL?
5. What aspects of WIL need to be managed for realisation of these benefits and minimisation of the negatives in hospitality?

Questions 1 through 5 all evaluate the perceptions of the three main stakeholders in the WIL process for the hospitality industry in order to ascertain a more complete and comprehensive perspective of the value of WIL to hospitality education and to determine how to effectively manage integration of WIL. These questions were the product of clustered themes and identified gaps in the literature, with the first three research questions centred on the theme of WIL benefits for hospitality. Question1 required survey respondents to acknowledge from their own experience whether each of the pre-identified benefits of WIL listed have been experienced for hospitality, supplemented by an explanation to support how these items have or why they have not been realised within the focus groups. Questions 2 and 3 investigated the gap between graduate attributes and industry expectations, comparing perceptions of graduates,
employers and educators with or without WIL experience as to the value of hospitality qualifications for entry and progression within the industry. Question 4 identified whether the perspectives of each of the three sample groups were influenced by demographic characteristics and Question 5 explored the aspects of WIL that must be managed to maximise benefits and minimise negatives.

3.2 Quantitative Study

3.2.1 Data Collection Method
As depicted in Figure 3.1 below, the first stage to address these specific questions involved conducting primary quantitative research. An online quantitative survey instrument was selected as the most appropriate and cost-effective tool to access the sample population located across the state of NSW. The literature (Andrew, Nonnecke & Preece 2003; Case & Yang 2009; Dolnicar, Laesser & Matus 2009; Greenlaw & Brown-Welty 2009; Veal 2005) supports the popularity and attractiveness of online surveys as a preferred means to access participants. Online surveys are increasingly prevalent in research following advances in computer technology with benefits including: generating enhanced speed of administration, increased accessibility of the sample population, responses captured automatically into a database, lower on average direct spend per participant and the less confronting nature and convenience/flexibility to complete in one’s own time and in one’s own space contributing to higher quality data. Online surveys are also increasingly prevalent within Australian universities (Nulty 2008). Electronic surveys further afford the means to filter questions to the specific respondent thus simplifying the survey process (Veal 2005). This trend to replace ‘in person’ and telephone methods with online surveys has been readily observed within the hospitality and tourism industry and generates enhanced capabilities for economic impact studies conducted for large-scale events which tend to rely on survey methods (Burgan & Mules 1992, cited in Lee 2006).
Figure 3.1: Research Method Process

1. **Graduate Employability Gap in Hospitality and Tourism Industry**
   - Literature Review
   - Devise Conceptual Framework
   - Decide Research Questions

2. **Survey**
   - Tertiary Institutes
   - Employers
   - Graduate Employees

   - Design and Pilot Test Survey Instrument
   - Conduct Survey and Analyse

   - **Primary Research: Quantitative**

3. **Focus Groups**
   - Focus Group 1: Tertiary Institutes
   - Focus Group 2: Employers
   - Focus Group 3: Graduate Employees
   - Focus Group 4: All sample groups represented

   - Design and Pilot Test Focus Group Instrument
   - Conduct Focus Groups and Analyse

   - **Primary Research: Qualitative**

4. Report Findings
The disadvantages of online surveys, in particular the question of data validity, is widely featured in the literature. Whilst numerous studies (Case & Yang 2009; Dolnicar, Laesser & Matus 2009; Jansen, Corley & Jansen 2007), vary on account of field, context and topic, dispute the validity of online surveys, there appears a general reservation over the use of online surveys for collection of socio-demographic and sensitive personal data. Selectivity and exclusion are highlighted with the potential for members of the sample population without internet comprehension or access to be unable to participate thus resulting in less representative data. Additionally, researchers have limited access to personal email addresses and the impersonal nature of the requests for assistance in completing the survey further limit the recruitment and completion success of the method. The quintessential element for selecting an online survey format relates back to understanding the sample population (Dolnicar, Laesser & Matus 2009; Nulty 2008; Veal 2005). The sample population sought in this study was identified as relatively well-educated persons with a strong likelihood of internet access both at home and work. Socio-demographic data formed part of the survey and was collected to identify and provide comparisons in responses. Additionally, factors such as the long unsocial hours and busy schedules typical of hospitality professionals and researcher cost and time constraints meant online surveys were deemed the most appropriate for this sample. The adoption of the multi-method research approach was designed to mediate bias of the survey data and also to provide for triangulation (Jennings 2001).

The researcher was granted access to SurveyMonkey software licensed by UWS to create the online survey. SurveyMonkey software is gaining popularity with academics and commercial researchers with its versatility, customisation and its ability to create, disseminate and collate results (Massat, McKay & Moses 2009; SurveyMonkey 2012; Thomson et al. 2009; Tricoo et al. 2009). The functionality of the SurveyMonkey software permitted development of a single survey instrument incorporating different streams of questions for each sample group: hospitality tertiary educators, hospitality employers and recent hospitality graduates (within the last 5 years) who have either engaged or not engaged in WIL during tertiary education (featured in Appendix 10). All participants were required to complete standard demographic questions (name, gender, age, ethnicity, suburb, etc). In SurveyMonkey the ‘page logic’ tool permitted establishment of three separate pathways guiding participants to the required content.
questions for each sample group. Participants were asked to identify which sample
group they belong to and according to their response they were directed to the
 corresponding set of content questions. Likert scales were used extensively throughout
the content questions to allow respondents to record their perspectives from 1–5, to
denote Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree. Proliferation of open-ended questions is
recognised to cause increasing attrition of participants in online surveys (Andrew,
Nonnecke & Preece 2003) and this informed the closed constructs favoured in the
template.

Figure 3.2: Sample Likert Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 1:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This study was designed in accordance with the National Statement on Ethical Conduct
in Research Involving Humans to meet all ethical considerations and was approved by
the University of Western Sydney Human Research Ethics Committee prior to data
collection (Approval number H8994). Ethical measures relating to the survey involved
protection of participant welfare through informed consent, confidentiality and secure
storage of the data. The participants were supplied with the ethics approval and contact
details on the Participant Information Sheet for the researcher, supervisors and details
for the University of Western Sydney Human Research Ethics Committee in the
unlikely event of issues arising at any stage (see Appendix 10).

3.2.2 Sample

In the absence of central email registries and the paucity of hospitality vocational
education listings, identification of all members of the total population was not
possible, thus limiting techniques to non-random sampling (Andrew, Nonnecke &
Preece 2003). Network and convenience sampling techniques (Jennings 2001; Murray,
Pace & Scott 2004) were utilised targeting NSW hospitality tertiary institutions and
businesses the researcher was familiar with and could attain access to, in addition to
pursuing industry and academic associations including the Australian Collaborative
Education Network, Clubs NSW, Club Suntory (a community bartending network
membership organisation) and the National Centre of Vocational Education Research. Key contacts (networks) were identified and recruited within business and education facilities to distribute the survey invitation to colleagues and encourage completion. The internet and yellow pages was further utilised to provide a list of contacts of hospitality employers and hospitality tertiary education providers, improving variability and validity of the sample. The large sample size of 150 respondents for tertiary institutions was based on identification of approximately 30 hospitality TAFE/university/colleges operating in NSW. A sample of 300 employers from each of the four sectors of hospitality identified by Slattery (2002) refer to Table 1.2, and 150 recent hospitality graduates (graduation within the last 5 years), were sent an email inviting survey participation. A concerted effort to target each of the four hospitality sectors from both regional and metro NSW and each hospitality tertiary organisation listed was designed to enhance representation of the sample population. The invitation email was sent on the researcher’s UWS staff email account to enhance the credibility of the request. Information detailed on the email included participant information and a list of WIL initiatives and terminology to clearly articulate the meaning of WIL and other crucial terms as they applied to this study (see Appendix 10). This list was informed by the literature review and specifically featured the work of Patrick et al. (2008), the national scoping study into WIL providing a comprehensive review of WIL intelligence. Participants were asked to select the SurveyMonkey link embedded within the recruitment email to be able to access the survey.

At the conception stage it was envisioned that 2–3 mail-outs would occur via email to maximise the convenience for respondents and thus improve the response rate. The letter inviting voluntary participation in the study also mentioned the second component of the research methodology and sought respondents to provide contact details if interested in participating in a focus group. The contingency plan for the quantitative survey constituted a pen and paper version with manual entry by the researcher.

The divergence of demographic and socio-economic characteristics of the sample population, anonymity and privacy, survey topic, unsolicited versus solicited invitations, among other features of the survey design and implementation, drastically impact the perceptions of acceptable response rates for online surveys (Dolnicar,
Laesser & Matus 2009; Nulty 2008; Veal 2005). A response rate of 20% is not uncommon for email surveys, with numerous researchers finding response rates slightly lower than mail surveys (Dolnicar, Laesser & Matus 2009; Nulty 2008), whilst rates in excess of 70% have also been recorded (Dolnicar, Laesser & Matus 2009; Greenlaw & Brown-Welty 2009). There appears to be no consensus in the literature as to whether the location of demographic data requests and their placement at the beginning or end of survey impact positively or negatively on response rates (Andrew, Nonnecke & Preece 2003). The belief that repeated reminders enhance response rates for mail surveys holds true for email surveys as well, according to Nulty (2008).

3.2.3 Recruitment Process
Throughout the recruitment process for the online surveys there was significant interest in the research topic expressed verbally and in writing by both industry representatives and tertiary educators. Despite the level of interest in the study, the reality was a rather low and gradual response rate which can be attributed to a number of factors. Several key organisations that prearranged to circulate the survey link decided to concurrently conduct internal business surveys targeting all staff members. In one instance this involved multiple survey requests upon staff in a short period of time. The clash in timing coupled with the priority of the businesses in achieving satisfying response rates for their internal research caused a delay in circulation of the link for this study. This may have further contributed to possible survey fatigue. Many respondents also cited time constraints endemic to the nature of hospitality businesses for their inability to complete the survey by the original deadline. The deadline was extended to accommodate these factors, which are believed to have negatively impacted the response rate.

As the effectiveness of the snowball/networking sampling technique was deemed poor in the early recruitment stages more prominence was placed on convenience methods. The use of the internet to identify hospitality organisations and tertiary institutions was pursued to establish a list of emails. The business directories and contact information on industry body websites proved invaluable, including ClubsNSW, Australian Hotels Association (AHA), regional tourism organisations, Tourism NSW, Council for Australasian University Tourism and Hospitality Education (CAUTHE), as well as the online yellow pages directory and the list of previously identified educational
institutions (see Appendix 1). The convenience method has contributed to the successful recruitment of respondents across NSW and from a wide variety of industry sectors and tertiary institutions. University alumni associations were also approached to circulate the survey link to hospitality graduates and this was followed by a subsequent increase of graduate respondents.

Throughout the recruitment process, fortnightly progress reports containing the updated respondent data sets were received from the UWS SurveyMonkey administrator. Periodic reviews of this data and a more thorough review at the conclusion of the data collection process identified a number of missing values within individual responses precluding completion of the survey due to the mandatory structure of questions for each sample group to progress to subsequent pages. The consequence of this was 20 responses were removed from the data set. Several respondents prior to the survey deadline did advise of interruptions and technical glitches causing their session to time out. Respondents were advised that incomplete surveys would be removed from the sample however, all who proactively identified themselves as not completing the survey requested an opportunity to complete the survey so their data could be included. These respondents were given the opportunity to complete an electronic version of the survey with the data transferred into the data set. After screening of the surveys 156 were complete and usable (55 graduates, 72 employers and 29 tertiary educators). The response rate for this survey was 26%, which is considered adequate for an online survey as per discussion in the previous section.

An interesting observation during the survey process was that many small business owner/operators and specialised hospitality service providers (including caravan, holiday park and guesthouse operators) who received the invitation to participate in the survey sent emails wishing to take part although stating that they didn’t believe they were adequately qualified to participate or that they didn’t fall within the sample population. In the latter case in particular it was found that a lack of understanding of the industry they operate in contributed to their perspective and this was despite an explanation of what constitutes a hospitality business being in the participant information materials, as well as having a table representing the diversity of types of hospitality organisations (profit and not-for-profit). Responses were sent to advise the
prospective participant how they fitted into the industry and thus the sample population, emphasising that their perspectives would prove valuable as the research sought to gauge the perspectives from all hospitality sectors and all sized businesses. This point was essential to communicate as hospitality is comprised heavily of SMEs and thus this ensured representation of perspectives within the industry.

3.2.4 Data Analysis
The quantitative nature of data collected through the surveys was subject to statistical analysis using SPSS 20 (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) software. The data was subject to descriptive and bivariate statistical analysis to identify trends, frequencies, and strength and significance of associations within the demographic and content areas of the survey responses.

Descriptive research was obtained through frequencies and means of variables with explanatory research derived through cross tabulations to analyse causality (Veal 2005). Statistical tests like Cramer’s V were used to determine the strength of association between categorical variables with results ranging from zero to one (Lund Research 2013). This included the extensive list of demographic variables, for instance, age, gender, ethnicity, religion, language, disability, work status and living arrangements. Values closer to zero indicate a weaker relationship between the variables. Generally, only the statistically significant relationships at $p < .05$ are reported with significance levels below $p < .01$ highly significant and generalisable to the population (ibid. 2013). In some instances trend significance is indicated despite showing no statistical significance.

There is continuing and unresolved debate in the literature concerning the ‘appropriateness’ and ‘meaningfulness’ of parametric tests for ordinal data on the basis that a true measurable distance cannot be observed between each category in an ordinal scale (Campari 2013; Carifio & Perla 2007; Jakobsson 2004; Norman 2010). Growing acceptance for treating ordinal data as interval data is documented in the literature particularly in the field of social science (Camparo 2013; Carifio & Perla 2007; Hodge & Gillespie 2003; Lantz 2013; Norman 2010), with proponents emphasising the robustness of statistical tests despite violations of assumptions about interval data, though remaining cautionary on concluding statements from this data. The Likert scale
employed in this study adheres to the principles of symmetrical scaling about a midpoint with clearly defined and mutually exclusive linguistic qualifiers (De Vaus 2002). Symmetrical scaling implies equal distance between the categories and approximates interval scale data. With due consideration to the limitations of parametric tests for ordinal data the following parametric tests were employed to explore the perceived benefits, challenges and satisfaction of WIL by each sample group.

Shapiro-Wilk tests of normality were conducted to ensure t-tests, one-way Anova tests and significance tests were possible with the data collected (Lund Research 2013). The t-test is used to determine if there is a statistical difference between the means of two independent groups, while the one-way Anova determines statistical difference between the means of three or more independent groups (ibid 2013).

It was not possible to conduct Chi square analysis due to the minimum expected cell frequency requirements not being met and whilst Fisher’s exact test is the appropriate statistical test for a small sample size, this was also not valid with the necessary cross tabulations having more than 2x2 tables (IBM Corporation 2011).

3.3 Qualitative Study

3.3.1 Data Collection Method
The second stage of the research involved primary data collection through qualitative research. Four focus groups were conducted to confirm the consistency of the survey results and to explore ideas. The intention was that each of the four samples had approximately six individuals in each; the first targeted tertiary education institutions, the second targeted hospitality employers, the third targeted graduate employees and the fourth with an even representation of both employers and graduate employees. The original design of the study sought to match employers, graduates and tertiary education institutions. The intent of this design was data triangulation, where the consistency between tertiary institutions, employer and employee responses could be analysed to check for consistency between espoused theory and theory in use (Argyris
The contrasting view however is that having non-matched group members has the benefit of mitigating issues of power and control and political correctness; however, it also means levels of consistency and concurrence of perspectives cannot be tested in non-matched groups as it has the effect of not comparing like with like. The focus groups were conducted in line with ethics requirements providing participants with information about the study and the researcher, informed consent, right for participants to withdraw from the study at any stage and requiring each participant to sign a form acknowledging informed consent (see Appendix 11).

Focus groups are advocated as an effective and cost-efficient means to collect rich data through facilitating group interaction within a controlled, carefully planned discussion conducted within a non-threatening setting (Krueger & Casey 2000; Morgan 1988). Focus groups provide more revealing and complete data through gathering verbal and non-verbal data with a signature aspect being a focus on ‘why’ and ‘how’ questions as opposed to ‘what’, permitting the exploration of the intricacies of problems (Redmond & Curtis 2009; Stewart, Shamdasani & Rook 2007). All participants are able to verbalise and explain their ideas and perspectives while also listening to others and debating issues, thus stimulating thought processes. Clarification of participant answers is a huge benefit associated with focus groups along with the potential to build upon ideas of others in the group. It is possible for researchers to identify the shift in participant perceptions and how they are formed (Krueger & Casey 2000). To achieve the many benefits outlined, researchers must take care to manage the member composition to ensure representation of the wider population is achieved and that all members are selected based on the expertise/knowledge to make a valued contribution (McMurray, Pace & Scott 2004). The facilitator is also advised to maintain a comfortable and non-judgemental environment for participants to openly contribute to the discussions and must adhere to the moderation role by remaining neutral and simply guide the conversation according to the agenda (Krueger & Casey 2000).

The focus groups were facilitated by the researcher. It is acknowledged that researcher administration introduces bias, however this is balanced by positives such as the ability to prevent inconsistencies and the benefit of more rigorous discussion due to the researcher’s expertise and knowledge of the research field. To enhance the accuracy of the results and permit systematic analysis the focus groups were video and audio
recorded with participant permission through the consent and waiver forms (see Appendix 11). A combination of opening, framing, focal, probing and concluding questions were employed to ascertain rich qualitative data on the subject matter (McMurray, Pace & Scott 2004; Redmond & Curtis 2009). Questions and topics were developed from the themes identified through the literature review and supplemented by the quantitative survey results, with participants receiving an outline of the agenda in advance. The provision of the agenda was to ensure the discussion remained relevant and not veer into tangential areas unrelated to the topic. Circulation of the agenda and questions to be raised in the focus group to participants in advance of the session improves the effectiveness of this research method through providing clear direction to participants and allowing contemplation of ideas and confidence in communicating these ideas publicly (McMurray, Pace & Scott 2004).

3.3.2 Sample
The recruitment process for the focus groups employed snowball and convenience sampling. In case of insufficient interest for the focus groups, the contingency plan involved seeking the cooperation of specific tertiary institutions and industry organisations to help identify and arrange research participants.

3.3.3 Recruitment Process
During identification of potential participants, select businesses from various sectors of the hospitality industry were contacted to source the name of the human resources or venue manager to allow personalised invitations. To establish these details several methods were employed; firstly requesting the name of the HR manager alone, explaining the research purpose for why the name was requested and wanting to send information directly. The population was found to be not forthcoming and many were abrupt to the point of being rude. Many prospective respondents simply hung up the phone. Most organisations would not provide names of managers and provided email addresses instead. Where requests were made to send information by email, this replaced the snail mail version. The overwhelming negativity encountered in communications with industry is an alarming concern, considering the centrality of hospitable behaviour required by the industry.
The first round of email invitations elicited a minimal response confined to a select few confirmations from tertiary educators. A second mail out was conducted a week later and reminder letters were sent to the first group of invitees. The UWS Media Unit and alumni were also contacted to market the research to prospective participants, achieved through circulation of email messages to their contact lists. Advertisements were placed in local newspapers (e.g. Penrith Press) and on the UWS and Hospitality Hub websites (see Appendix 12). Four focus groups were conducted initially: graduates, employers, educators and mixed (representatives from each sample group). A subsequent employer focus group was conducted to enhance the employer data set. A second graduate focus group had been intended in the design, however time limitations precluded this.

The respondent demographics are displayed in Table 3.1 with respondents assigned codes featured in the left-hand column. These codes were derived from the respondent sample group and accompanied by a number with which the respondents will be referred to through Chapter 5 – Qualitative Findings.
Table 3.1: Respondent Demographics Key

| Graduate 1       | TAFE, full-time cafe worker; Experience: clubs |
| Graduate 2       | TAFE, part-time club worker; Experience: restaurant |
| Graduate 3       | TAFE, casual club worker; Experience: hotel/cafe/restaurant |
| Graduate 4       | University, part-time club worker; Experience: restaurants |
| Graduate 5       | University & TAFE, full-time hotel worker |
| Educator 1       | TAFE, full-time head teacher |
| Educator 2       | TAFE, full-time head teacher |
| Educator 3       | University, WIL coordinator/lecturer, recent graduate; hotels |
| Educator 4       | University, full-time lecturer, casual TAFE teacher, chef, PhD student |
| Educator 5       | NSW ITAB, full-time project officer, industry & teaching experience |
| Educator 6       | TAFE OTEN; Experience: hotels, restaurant, leisure, clubs |
| Educator 7       | TAFE OTEN; Experience: clubs |
| Employer 1       | Club event operations supervisor |
| Employer 2       | Club duty manager; Experience: hotels |
| Employer 3       | Hospitality recruitment company, Experience: restaurants |
| Employer 4       | Club HR manager, Experience: finance industry |
| Employer 5       | Hospital sous chef, Experience: pubs, clubs |
| Employer 6       | Restaurant manager, Experience: hotels, cinemas, recital hall |
| Employer 7       | Disability Employment Service, Experience: GTOs |

3.3.4 Data Analysis

Qualitative analysis software Nvivo9 was used for analysing the focus group transcriptions. These transcriptions were imported into the software package where they were subject to a coding process and analysis of recurring themes, topics and key words. A tree node coding structure was developed during the data coding process combining both facilitator and informer driven categories and condensing these into key terms for convenience (see Figure 3.3). A comparative analysis with the reviewed literature and the research objectives was also performed.
Figure 3.3: Nvivo9 Tree Node
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3.4 Research Validity, Reliability and Generalisability

The survey framework was constructed based on existing survey designs employed by Patrick et al. (2008), ACER (2010), Richardson (2009) and Kim (2008) with adaptation to the specific research questions pursued by this study. Using established and proven constructs ensures the research instruments for this study are more psychometrically sound than a ‘one shot model’ and will provide comparable results enhancing generalisability, reliability and validity.

Questions harvested from the national scoping study into WIL by Patrick et al. (2008) related to the position of WIL in university curricula, the hours and payment for WIL experiences, expectations, design elements and challenges of WIL. The ACER (2010) study assessed student engaged learning within universities contributing to the demographic questions, educational benefits and rating elements of student experience. The final two studies were specifically related to the hospitality field, with Richardson (2009) investigating the impact of work experience on student perceptions of a hospitality career and Kim (2008) examining career expectations and employability requirements for hospitality students. Hospitality career intentions, perceptions on tertiary hospitality education, years of industry experience and hospitality graduate employability were sourced from these two studies.

Reliability and validity of the survey tool was enhanced through conducting pilot tests of the survey format to evaluate effectiveness of the research design and instruments and reduce potential research errors. The pilot study resulted in minor refinements of the research instrument and to enhancement of the survey administration.

The mixed methodology design was selected to mitigate limitations of non-random sampling with similar questions asked in the focus groups to test validity of quantitative findings. Concerted efforts were also made to target all sectors of industry and tertiary types in both regional and metro areas. Furthermore, similar questions were incorporated at different stages of the survey and focus group discussions to confirm consistency of responses for example questions relating to respondents having WIL experience, hours of such experience and participation in types of WIL initiatives.
3.5 Chapter Summary

This chapter has described the methods of data collection, sampling, recruitment and analysis for the quantitative and qualitative methodologies. Mixed methods were employed to triangulate data, commencing with a quantitative online survey followed by qualitative focus groups. The survey framework was adapted from existing survey designs allowing for psychometric soundness, comparable results and enhancing generalisability, reliability and validity. The quantitative survey further enabled statistical significance to be determined with the qualitative focus groups clarifying and exploring relevant issues.
Chapter 4

QUANTITATIVE DATA FINDINGS

This chapter reports the findings from the data collected through the quantitative online survey. The investigation follows the sections of the survey template (see Appendix 10) commencing with an examination of demographic variables. The background and perceptions of benefits, challenges and experiences of WIL are explored for each sample group (graduates, employers and educators). The chapter concludes with generic employability perceptions.

4.1 Demographics of Survey Respondents

The first section of the quantitative survey was devoted to the collection of demographic data. The gender distribution of the sample was slightly skewed towards females, representing 58% (see Figure 4.1). A higher representation of females to males was evident in the Graduate and Tertiary Educator sample groups. Justification for this imbalance between genders in the sample was attributed in part to the convenience and networking methods used to recruit participants. The predominance of females in hospitality is evident in the target population (Duncan, Scott & Baum 2013; King, McKercher & Waryszak 2003; Zhong, Couch & Blum 2011). The median age range for each sample group varied significantly as expected by sample description, with Graduates ‘24–29’, and both Employers and Tertiary Educators ‘42–47’ (see Table 4.1). A further observation within the Tertiary Educator sample was that 50% of university academics were over 54 years old, compared to 22% of TAFE academics and 0% of private providers. Whilst the strength of the relationship between Educator Age and Tertiary Type was identified as moderate (V=0.421), it was not statistically significant (p=0.592) so is not generalisable to the population.
In the study residential information established that the majority of respondents resided within the Sydney basin. This was attributed to the snowball and convenience sampling used to establish email contact with most emails being sent to contacts within Sydney. There was however representation along the entire NSW east coast from Tweed Heads to Merimbula, in addition to a number of locations from inner NSW including Albury, Broken Hill, Orange, Cowra and Tamworth. This data was then plotted on the map of NSW (Figure 4.2) to show the coverage of the state and colour-
coded by sample group. The distribution of educators and recent graduates reflects residence near hospitality institute campuses in Sydney, Port Macquarie and Tweed Heads. The distribution of employers is indicative of the diversity of hospitality management roles in population centres across the entire state.

**Figure 4.2: Residential Representation by Sample Group**

Of the sample population (n=156), 94% were permanent residents with the same percentage of English-speaking homes though not identical respondent sets. There were 26 different nationalities and 18 religious orientations represented. This matches the cultural diversity depicted in the literature of the target population including an influx of international students (Australian Education International 2012; Dawson, Neal & Madera 2011). There were nine respondents who identified themselves as having a disability and seven indicated this impacted on their experience of WIL and work in the industry. Living arrangements were compared for each sample group with
35% of graduates living at home with parents/guardians and a further 42% with a spouse, partner or children; 75% of employers and 90% of tertiary educators identified as living with a spouse, partner or children. Interestingly, only 56% of graduates worked in a full-time capacity compared to 80% of the entire population. The income median range for the entire population was $60,001–75,000 however, when separated into sample groups, 25% of graduates earn below $30,000 and a further 50% earn below $45,000; 11% of employers earn below $45,000, and 18% earn over $120,000 and only 3% of tertiary educators earn below $45,000 and 66% over $75,001. These findings are consistent with the low-pay profile of the hospitality industry (Barron et al. 2007; Maxwell & MacLean 2008; Richardson 2009). A vast assortment of secondary, tertiary and industry qualifications were identified by respondents and are explored further within sample group demographics. The mode and median educational credentials achieved by fathers of all respondents was found to be ‘Vocational Certificate or Diploma’ while mothers of respondents had achieved lower qualifications, identified as ‘some or all of secondary school’.

4.1.1 Graduate Sample Findings

Within the Graduate sample, 71% identified hospitality as their major area of study leaving the remaining population completing qualifications where hospitality only constituted a minor or secondary area of study. It appears these minor hospitality qualifications were obtained to meet requirements of transient hospitality work whilst completing studies or working in other disciplines. The overall grades achieved by graduates during tertiary qualifications ranged from 50–100% with a mean range of 70–79%. In accordance with the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF 2013) terminology, graduates completed courses ranging from minor industry trade qualifications up to masters level (n=3) with the mode and median qualification a bachelor’s degree (n=24). The graduate population completed their highest hospitality qualifications from TAFE (29%), university (42%) and other providers (29%) (comprising: colleges, specialised hospitality schools, consultant training and industry association courses). There was one respondent who identified completing a specialised qualification offered by an international hotel chain and n=5 (9%) respondents attended multiple providers and courses. Graduate respondent qualifications ranged in degree of industry specialisation, levels, duration and titles. Considering the overlap of the terms hospitality and tourism as established in the
literature review, the titles of qualifications included the terms hospitality, tourism, clubs and events.

There were several questions in the survey designed to determine the nature of graduates’ work experience in the hospitality industry, with 64% claiming they worked in the industry prior to commencing tertiary studies. The instance of industry experience prior to commencing studies can be partially explained by respondent age, with 100% of graduates aged above 36 with industry experience compared to only 26.7% of graduates aged 18–23 (V=0.518, p=0.039). During tertiary studies and excluding WIL activities, 93% of graduates worked in the hospitality industry, 33% worked in industries other than hospitality, with 27% identifying they worked in both hospitality and another industry during studies. The range of hours worked in a typical seven-day week ranged from ‘0 to 41+’ with a modal group of ‘16–20 hours’ and a median of ‘21–25 hours’. The incidence of students working whilst studying is characteristic of the target population and identified as a characteristic of Generation Y (Josiam et al. 2010). Only 16% of graduates received direct financial payments from the government during tertiary education.

The Graduate sample was asked to respond to the question, ‘Did you intend to follow a career related to the hospitality industry after graduating?’ As depicted in Figure 4.3 below, 67% of respondents advised that they ‘Definitely’ or ‘Probably’ would follow a hospitality career, only 16% were uncertain and the remaining 16% were unlikely or had no intentions. Typically, the intentions of a hospitality career for hospitality major students after graduation was positively skewed with the responses ranging between ‘Definitely’ and ‘Uncertain’ (see Figure 4.4 below). This is in contrast to a negative skew for the graduates with hospitality as a minor qualification though intentions were documented across the entire response range from ‘Definitely’ to ‘No’.
On further investigation into intentions to pursue a hospitality career, three moderate statistically significant relationships were identified: Living Arrangements, with graduates living with parents less likely to pursue a hospitality career compared to graduates living with a spouse/partner/children ($V=0.346$, $p=0.049$), WIL Experience, increasing intentions of a hospitality career ($V=0.507$, $p=0.007$), and Tertiary Type, where TAFE graduates recorded higher intentions of a hospitality career compared to university and other institute graduates ($V=0.432$, $p=0.009$). Pursuit of a hospitality
career was further strongly and definitely related to Hospitality as a Major versus Minor Qualification (V=0.739, p=0.000), with hospitality major graduates recording higher intentions of a hospitality career and hospitality minor graduates more likely to declare they were unlikely or would not.

Questions relating to the length of time to gain permanent employment after graduation found that 31% already had employment with a further 9% finding employment immediately. For 20% of the population it took over six months to find employment or they were still looking. Importantly 75% of respondents fell into the category that the employment they secured after graduation was not a graduate level position or were still looking for employment. This supports the views discussed within the literature review of the significance of graduate underemployment. Only 53% of the sample sought employment directly after course completion. This is explained with 69% of students who did not seek employment being already employed. Other reasons given included the decision to travel (15%), completing further study (12%) or those who did not wish to seek employment. When this information is compared with industry experience prior to tertiary study, this suggests graduates found the need to gain qualifications in order to progress in the industry. The potential for employer funding and endorsed hospitality qualifications was also an incentive but needs further research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tertiary Type / Graduate Position</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TAFE</td>
<td>University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A, still searching for employment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was deduced from current employment information that 87% (n=48) of graduate respondents currently work in the hospitality industry in full-time, part-time or casual work capacities. Job descriptions of graduates ranged from predominantly front-line positions up to duty or department managers, with a select few being business development executives (see Table 4.3). Only 18% of the sample identified themselves as working full-time in the hospitality industry at a graduate-level position. Whilst the
survey targeted recent graduates (within 5 years of graduation), the significant proportion of graduates working in industry prior to and during tertiary education precludes assessment of time taken to reach graduate level positions based exclusively on hospitality tertiary course completion. Table 4.4 identifies the hospitality industry sectors graduates work in, with the predominance of clubs attributed to the network and convenience sampling and the principal researcher’s own employment in the club industry.

Table 4.3: Graduate Position Titles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Title</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front Line Staff: Waiter, Functions/F&amp;B attendant</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant/Administrator/Guests Service Agent</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Supervisor</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chef/Sous Chef</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Manager</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duty Manager</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Development Executive</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still looking/Studying</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Industry</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4: Industry Sectors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry Sectors</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motel/Guesthouse</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel/Resort Accommodation</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel/Pub/Tavern/Bar</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clubs: RSL, Golf, Workers, Bowling...</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant/Fast Food</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function Venue/Caterer</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital food services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cafe</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist attraction food services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear/multiple</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As featured in Table 4.5, when determining the position of WIL initiatives within tertiary qualifications undertaken by respondents, 43% were identified as ‘Voluntary’ or ‘N/A’. Despite this, 62% of respondents participated in WIL initiatives, with several participating in voluntary WIL components. Reviewing the modal groups for position of WIL by tertiary type, TAFE was ‘compulsory’, University was ‘N/A’ and Other ‘voluntary option’.
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Table 4.5: Position of WIL / Tertiary Hospitality Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tertiary Type</th>
<th>TAFE</th>
<th>UNIVERSITY</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A compulsory course to complete my qualification</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A mandatory requirement that is not a course</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A voluntary option</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 4.6 the position of WIL was also dependent on whether hospitality was a major or minor course with 52% of hospitality major qualifications requiring WIL as a ‘compulsory’ or ‘mandatory’ requirement compared to ‘N/A’ or ‘voluntary’ for minor hospitality qualifications. Respondent 42 had no actual WIL completed during the course yet ticked WIL as mandatory for the course, explaining in the string data this was due to acknowledgement of prior learning.

Table 4.6: Position of WIL / Hospitality as a Major or Minor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hospitality</th>
<th>MAJOR</th>
<th>MINOR</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A compulsory course to complete my qualification</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A mandatory requirement that is not a course</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A voluntary option</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When participation in WIL Initiatives is broken down further as depicted in Table 4.7 on the following page, of the 62% who participated in WIL initiatives, 30% completed work experience, 17% project-based learning, and a further 42% in either professional practice, practicums, internships, apprenticeships, field placement or volunteering. The average number of different types of WIL initiatives participated in by graduates engaged in WIL (n=34) was 2.32 with the range from 1 to 7, mode of one type, and median of two types. Moderate statistically significant relationships were observed between ‘Number of WIL Types’ and the following variables: ‘Tertiary Type’, with TAFE graduates participating in a higher variety of WIL initiatives compared to university graduates and the majority (75%) of graduates from other institutes not participating in WIL (V=0.464, p=0.022); ‘Hospitality as a Major versus Minor Qualification’, where 76.9% of hospitality major graduates participated in WIL compared to 25% of hospitality minor graduates (V=0.497, p=0.035), and Ethnicity with higher percentages of participation in two or more different types of WIL initiatives recorded by graduates from Asia (100%), China (50%), India (75%) and Sri Lanka (100%) compared to graduates from Australia (37.5%) and England (0%)
(V=0.618, p=0.007). It is important to acknowledge the small population size (n<5) for all ethnicities aside from Australians, with further investigations indicating WIL was declared as a compulsory or mandatory element of qualifications for 63% (n=5) of Asian, Chinese, Indian and Sri Lankan respondents at their enrolled tertiary institutions. A statistically significant moderate relationship was established between ‘WIL Participation’ and ‘Graduate Level Employment’ where graduates with WIL experience were more likely to have attained graduate level employment (V=0.405, p=0.011). In light of graduate participants completing hospitality courses at multiple tertiary types and prevalence of WIL undertaken as an elective or voluntary initiative, it was not possible to ascertain WIL initiatives by Tertiary Type.

Table 4.7: WIL Initiatives Partaken in Tertiary Hospitality Qualifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiatives</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practicums</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Education</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Practice</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internships</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Experience</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project-based Learning</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Service Learning</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadetships</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Experience</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged Learning</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Placements</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprenticeship</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents identified WIL initiatives were managed mainly by teaching staff or program coordinators, with a few identifying consultants as working for the employer and one graduate self-managing their WIL participation. When asked if their WIL participation was in a paid capacity, 41% said yes and a further 29% had some WIL participation on a paid basis (see Figure 4.5). This leaves a huge gap with 80% of the sample graduate population believing payment influences eagerness to participate in WIL. Moderate statistically significant relationships were identified between ‘Paid WIL’ and the following variables: ‘Hospitality as a Major versus Minor Qualification’ where hospitality major graduates were more likely to have received payment for some or all WIL (V=0.531, p=0.001), ‘Tertiary Type’, with the majority of TAFE graduates receiving some form of payment (75.1%) compared to University (43.5%) and Other
Institutes (12.6%) (V=0.397, p=0.008), ‘Hours of WIL Participation’, with only 33.3% receiving some form of payment for less than 20 hours increasing to 100% of graduates for 21–40 hours and 87.5% receiving payment for over 400 hours (V=0.680, p=0.000), ‘Number of WIL Types’, with graduates completing six–seven different WIL initiatives receiving no or some payment compared to 67% receiving payment for all WIL and a further 8% for some WIL when completing one WIL initiative (V=0.695, p=0.000) and ‘Disability’ where 100% of graduates with WIL experience who identified as disabled had no paid WIL compared to only 20% of graduates without a disability (V=0.512, p=0.002). Representing 5% (n=5) of the graduate population, the involvement of graduates identified as having a disability in WIL was further examined with WIL participation determined as mandatory for only one university respondent. The remaining respondents from university and other colleges participated in voluntary unpaid WIL ranging from 21 hours to 400+ hours.

Figure 4.5: Graduate Participants of WIL – Paid WIL / Hours Spent on WIL

Graduate respondents were asked to identify total hours spent on WIL participation during their tertiary hospitality education. The distribution of responses was positively skewed with the modal group ‘none’ and the median group ‘21–40 hours’ with only 18% spending ‘over 200 hours’. An interesting finding from questions relating to WIL was that 33% of the sample graduate population advised having a prior relationship with their current employer through WIL activities. A definite moderate relationship
was established between Hours Spent on WIL and Tertiary Type, with graduates from Other Institutions accruing less hours of WIL than University and TAFE ($V=0.472$, $p=0.017$).

**Table 4.8: Graduate Hours Spent on WIL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours Spent on WIL</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–20 Hours</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21–40 Hours</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>61.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41–100 Hours</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>78.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101–200 Hours</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>81.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201–400 Hours</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>85.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400+ Hours</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 4.6: Graduate Hours Spent on WIL**

**4.1.2 Employer Sample Findings**

The Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS 2011) definitions of business size, small (employing less than 20 people), medium (employing more than 20 but less than 200 people) and large (employing 200 or more people), were used to determine the size of respondent businesses. As depicted in Table 4.9, all categories were well represented with the majority (51%) of respondents working in medium-sized hospitality businesses. This is representative of the target population with the predominance of small-to-medium enterprises (RCA 2008; Service Skills Australia 2009).
Table 4.9: Business Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Size</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small scale: &lt;20 staff</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium scale: 20–199 staff</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large scale: 200+ staff</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Employer sample group comprised members of organisations involved in the management of business operations and specifically recruitment of employees. Accordingly, the position titles of respondents reflected their management roles as shown in Table 4.10 with 53% Department Managers, 18% Owner/Managers and 17% CEOs/General Managers. These employers came from a diversity of industry sectors as depicted in Table 4.11 including free-standing hospitality businesses, hospitality in leisure businesses and subsidised hospitality (Slattery 2002). Several respondents advised working for companies in operational and management roles with multiple venues and services.

Table 4.10: Position Title of Employer Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Title</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Manager</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO/GM</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Coordinator</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Supervisor</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Manager/ Director/ Hotelier / Licensee</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Assistant</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner and Manager/ Franchisee</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.11: Sector Representation of the Hospitality Industry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry Sectors</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caravan/Holiday Park</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motel/ Guesthouse</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel/Resort Accommodation</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel/Pub/Tavern/Bar</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clubs: RSL, Golf, Workers, Bowling, etc.</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function Venue/ Caterer/ Showground/ Specialty Cakes</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Food Services</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cafe/Coffee Cart</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist Attraction Food Services</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The highest education levels of employers ranged from nil (n=19) up to masters degree (n=1). The mode qualification was a bachelors degree (n=18) and the median, diploma level. Only 23% of these highest employer qualifications were related to hospitality and tourism. This matches the target population with a majority of uneducated employers and a more recent trend particularly observed in the club and hotel sections for managers to gain formal qualifications (Baum 2002; Kim 2008). Based on the raw data the length of time respondents have worked in the hospitality industry ranged from ‘2.5 to 46 years’ with a mode of ‘15 years’ and a mean of ‘17 years’. This data when plotted using a box plot shows distribution is positively skewed with one outlier, respondent 126, who has worked in the industry for 46 years.

**Figure 4.7: Length of Time in Hospitality Industry – Box Plot**

In the next section of the survey, the respondents were asked several questions about graduate recruitment within their businesses, with 61% advising that their businesses have at some stage employed hospitality graduates however, only 40% currently employ graduates with a further 7% who did not know. The number of known graduates currently employed ranged from ‘1’ up to an approximate number of ‘60’ (large-scale club), with 77% of these businesses employing less than ‘7’ graduates. When asked whether these hospitality graduates had WIL experience 50% did not know, 11% advised no WIL experience and the remaining 39% advised yes for all or some. Moderate and highly statistically significant relationships were observed between Past Employment of Graduates and Size of Business with 100% of large-scale
businesses employing graduates compared to 45.5% of small-scale and 56.8% of medium-scale businesses \( (V=0.388, \ p=0.004) \), and with this association to business size carried through for Current Employment of Graduates \( (V=0.358, \ p=0.001) \). Moderate definite associations were established between Past Employment of Graduates and WIL Participation, with 92.9% of employers engaged in WIL past or present currently employing graduates compared to 40.9% of employers with no WIL experience \( (V=0.519, \ p=0.000) \) and Current Employment of Graduates and WIL Participation with 78.6% of employers engaged in WIL past or present currently employing graduates compared to 15.9% of employers with no WIL experience \( (V=0.624, \ p=0.000) \). Moderate statistically significant relationships were established between Current Employment of Graduates and Number of WIL Types comparatively higher for employers who currently employ graduates \( (V=0.472, \ p=0.001) \), Hours of WIL with 41% of current employers of graduates participating in more than 21 hours of WIL compared to 11% of employers who currently do not employ graduates \( (V=0.468, \ p=0.001) \). Furthermore Number of WIL Types was comparatively higher for employers who have employed graduates in the past \( (V=0.536, \ p=0.002) \) and 34% of past employers of graduates participated in more than 21 hours of WIL compared to 7% of employers with no past employment of graduates \( (V=0.544, \ p=0.002) \).

The direction of the survey then focused on WIL with 39\% \( (n=28) \) of employers advising their business had participated in WIL initiatives for tertiary education. Table 4.12 is a cross-tabulation of past and current participation in WIL by employers, revealing that 10\% have in the past participated in WIL programs and currently do not compared to only 3\% now participating when they have not in the past. This finding will be explored within the qualitative focus groups and warrants further investigation to clarify if this trend is true for the wider population and if so why businesses are moving away from participation in WIL. A moderate statistically significant association was observed between Participation in WIL and Hospitality as the Highest Qualifications, where employers who had hospitality as their highest qualification were more likely to have participated in WIL as an employer \( (V=0.306, \ p=0.035) \).
Table 4.12: Cross-tabulation of Current and Past WIL Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you currently participate in WIL programs for tertiary hospitality students?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td><strong>72</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When employer participation in WIL was investigated further, as depicted in Table 4.13, of the 39% who participated in WIL initiatives there were two main initiatives supported by employer businesses: work experience provided by 89% of employers and 75% providing apprenticeships. The remaining 12 initiatives indicated as being partaken each scored below 29%. The average number of different WIL initiatives participated in by employers engaged in WIL (n=28) was 3.32, (mode 2, median 3), with one employer identifying participation in all 13 types of WIL initiatives through her previous employment within Accor Hotel Group. A moderate statistically significant relationship was established between the number of different WIL types and size of business, with 30.8% of large-scale businesses engaging in four or more different WIL initiatives compared to 16.2% of medium-scale and 0% of small-scale businesses (V=0.406, p=0.022).

Table 4.13: WIL Initiatives Partaken by Employers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practicums</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Education</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Practice</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internships</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Experience</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project-based Learning</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Service Learning</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadetships</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Experience</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged Learning</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Placements</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprenticeship</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents identified the management team, in particular head chef and HR team, as responsible for managing WIL initiatives. When asked if WIL participation was in a paid capacity, 11% said yes and a further 86% offered some WIL participation on a paid basis. This compares with 65% of employers who believe payment influences
student eagerness and acceptance to participate in WIL. The high proportion of payment for some WIL initiatives supplemented by the identification of head chefs managing WIL is attributed to the high percentage of apprenticeships accounting for paid WIL (as per legal requirements) and work experience, which is potentially unpaid. There was a moderate relationship between Past WIL Participation and Size of Business, with larger businesses more involved than medium scale and with small scale having the least amount of engagement in WIL ($V=0.392$, $p=0.004$), and this association was further replicated in Current WIL Participation ($V=0.480$, $p=0.000$).

Respondents were then asked to identify total hours spent on WIL participation. The modal and median group was none. Of the 39% of employers acknowledging WIL participation, 25% spent over 200 hours on WIL including 11% ($n=3$) spending over 400 hours on WIL.

4.1.3 Tertiary Educator Sample Findings

Within the Tertiary Educators sample, 41% taught at universities, 31% taught at TAFE and the remainder taught in other providers comprising specialised and consultancy training organisations as well as hotel schools (see Figure 4.8). Despite the inability to quantify the total educator population, the numbers and range of respondents appears representative of the hospitality tertiary education providers featured in Appendix 1.

![Educational Institution Representation](image)

The respondents identified their position descriptions as: academics, lecturers, head teachers, trainers, assessors and institution directors. When asked if hospitality was their major disciplinary area, 76% agreed with the remaining educators also involved
in tourism, management, human relations and finance. The highest educator qualifications ranged from nil (n=2) accounted for by educators at private RTOs, up to a doctoral degree (n=2), with the mode and median a bachelors degree. Years of hospitality industry experience ranged from ‘none’ to ‘15+ years’, with 7% advising no industry experience and 45% with ‘15+ years’ industry experience. The mode was ‘15+ years’ and the median ‘13–14 years’. Whilst the strength of the relationship between Years of Industry Experience and Tertiary Type was identified as moderate (V=0.567), it was not statistically significant (p=0.286).

Membership of the Australian Cooperative Education Network (ACEN) was observed for 42% of university academics however, they represented only 17% of the sample educator population. A further 7% advised membership of other WIL associations identifying the Australian College of Educators (ACE), Australasian TAFE Tourism, Hospitality and Event Educators Association (ATTHEA) and Greater Northern Skills Development Group (GNSDG). A moderate statistically significant association was established between WIL Membership leading to a higher number of Hours Spent on WIL (V=0.675, p=0.040). Within this sample, 72% advised they were involved in the design, execution and/or evaluation of WIL initiatives. On closer inspection of this figure, 29% have been in these roles ‘2 years or less’ and 24% ‘over 10 years’. One respondent further advised in the string data that now having done some research on WIL initiatives that they will propose this to their head of school.

As featured in Table 4.14, when determining the position of WIL initiatives within tertiary qualifications taught by respondents over half (53%) were identified as ‘voluntary’ or ‘N/A’. When this statistic is broken down further as depicted in Table 4.15, of the 72% (n=21) who participated in provision of WIL initiatives, 71% offered work experience, 43% internships, 38% apprenticeships and all other initiatives were offered to a lesser extent. The average number of different types of WIL initiatives participated in by educators engaged in WIL (n=21) was 3.43 (mode 1, median 3) with an outlier head teacher with TAFE having participated in ten different WIL initiatives. The strength of associations between Educators Tertiary Type and the 13 types of WIL initiatives identified in the study demonstrated three moderate and statistically significant relationships: Internships, more commonly used within universities (V=0.529, p=0.017), Work Experience utilised by 100% of TAFE educators and to a
lesser extent at universities (41.7%) and other institutes (12.5%) \((V=0.690, p=0.001)\) and Apprenticeships, more common in TAFE \((V=0.588, p=0.007)\).

**Table 4.14: Position of WIL in Tertiary Hospitality Qualifications**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A compulsory course to complete my qualification</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A mandatory requirement that is not a course</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A voluntary option</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.15: WIL Initiatives Partaken by Educators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiatives</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practicums</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative Education</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Practice</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internships</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Experience</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project-based Learning</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Service Learning</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadetships</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Experience</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged Learning</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Placements</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprenticeship</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents identified WIL initiatives being managed mainly by teaching staff or program coordinators, with several identifying training managers/directors and specific internship coordinators. When asked if WIL participation was in a paid capacity, 10% said yes and a further 81% had some WIL participation on a paid basis. With 86% of the entire educator population considering that payment influences student eagerness to participate in WIL, there is still room for improvement. Respondents were asked to identify total hours spent on WIL per year, the modal group was ‘none’ and the median group was ‘21–40 hours’ with only 21% spending ‘over 200 hours’. Whilst the strength of the relationship between Hours spent on WIL per year and Tertiary Type was identified as moderate \((V=0.517)\), it was not statistically significant \((p=0.214)\).
4.2 Perceptions of WIL

Within the survey template, three distinct sections of Likert scale statements were constructed in attempts to determine perceptions of each sample: Graduates, Employers and Educators towards WIL. These sections were orientated around the potential benefits and challenges of WIL engagement as well as satisfaction with WIL experiences.

4.2.1 Benefits of WIL

With over half of the sample graduate population (n=34, 62%) having engaged in WIL during tertiary hospitality education, the overwhelming response was that WIL can deliver numerous personal and social benefits: 31% of total responses ‘Strongly Agreeing’ with the benefits identified in the study and a further 44% ‘Agreeing’. The personal and social benefits for students were separated into a list of fourteen with ‘Acquiring a broad education’ and ‘Working effectively with others’ scoring the highest and ‘Offered financial support’ and ‘Contributing to the welfare of your community’ scoring the lowest. Students who had participated in WIL recorded comparatively higher positive scores on all accounts over students without WIL. The graduate scores for Personal/Social Benefits were averaged and a strong statistically significant relationship was identified to Work Status, with graduates working in a casual capacity rating benefits highest, with full-time a close second and a substantial gap to part-time and student categories (V=0.765, p=0.047).

The graduate response for career benefits was even higher, with 37% of total responses ‘Strongly Agreeing’ and a further 47% ‘Agreeing’. There were eleven career benefits identified with ‘Opportunity to re-evaluate expectations of industry and job prospects’ and ‘Clarify requirements and preparedness of workforce entry’ scoring the highest and ‘Increased interstate and national mobility within the workforce’ and ‘Progressing quickly through the ranks at your workplace or industry’ scoring the lowest. The graduate scores for Career Benefits were then averaged with almost no association to Disability (V=0.349, p=0.996) or Number of WIL Types (V=0.500, p=0.989) and no association to Religion (V=0.484, p=1.000).
Despite less than half the employer population engaging in WIL during tertiary hospitality education, the predominant response was that WIL can deliver numerous personal and social benefits for graduates, with 15% of total responses ‘Strongly Agreeing’ with the benefits identified in the study and a further 44% ‘Agreeing’. Employers were asked to rate the same fourteen personal and social benefits posed to graduates with ‘Acquiring a broad education’ and ‘Working effectively with others’ scoring the highest, which is consistent with the graduates, and ‘Offered financial support’, ‘Writing clearly and effectively’ and ‘Contributing to the welfare of your community’ scoring the lowest. The employer scores for perceived Graduate Personal/Social Benefits were then averaged and there were almost no associations to Work Status (V=0.450, p=0.964) or Sector of Business (V=0.554, p=0.955).

The employer response for graduate career benefits was even higher, with 30% of total responses ‘Strongly Agreeing’ and a further 43% ‘Agreeing’. The same eleven career benefits were presented with ‘Opportunity to re-evaluate expectations of industry and job prospects’ and ‘Explore potential career options prior to graduation’ scoring the highest and ‘Increased interstate and national mobility within the workforce’ and ‘Progressing quickly through the ranks at your workplace or industry’ scoring the lowest, which is consistent with the lowest scoring benefits identified by graduates. These results indicate that whilst it is recognised that WIL experiences have the potential to provide numerous career benefits, these are not necessarily currently recognised by industry upon graduation. Of importance is that there does not seem to be a strong sense of mobility being achieved through WIL qualifications. The only moderately statistically significant associations between average employer perceptions of graduate career benefits were to ‘Past WIL participation’, with employers rating career benefits higher if involved in past WIL experiences (V=0.699, p=0.013) and ‘Hours Spent on WIL’ with no hours translating to lower scores than respondents indicating one or more hours of WIL participation (V=0.609, p=0.003). There was almost no association between average employer scores for perceived graduate career benefits and ‘Ethnicity’ (V=0.469, p=0.977), ‘Language’ (V=0.295, p=0.997), ‘Income’ (V=0.461, p=0.952) or ‘Size of Business’ (V=0.429, p=0.919).

An additional set of 11 questions relating to benefits for employers was posed with 13% of total responses ‘Strongly Agreeing’ and a further 43% ‘Agreeing’, thus scoring
lower than benefits available for students. There were three highest scoring benefits, ‘Reduce training time and cost associated with new hire productivity goals,’ ‘Better employee job fit’ and ‘Staff development prospects’, and the lowest scored benefits were ‘Keep up-to-date with industry trends and advancements’ and ‘Positively influence curriculum construction and course relevance’. The researcher recognises that potential benefits available to employers will differ on the basis of the type of tertiary education institution (university is more likely to offer consultancy services, etc.); also there is more potential to benefit small–medium enterprises with limited access to funds. Although one of the highest ranked employer benefits, the underwhelming response for reduced training time indicates along with the low score for student benefits the apparent need to further train graduates before/during employment to make them employable. The only moderately statistically significant association was between average employer benefits and ‘Hours Spent on WIL’, with longer hours of participation generally translating into higher levels of agreement with employer benefits, with the exception of 55% of employers having participated in WIL for ‘1–20 hours’ having the highest benefit rating (V=0.670, p=0.021). There were almost no associations between average Employer Benefits and ‘Religion’ (V=0.562, p=0.961), ‘Language’ (V=0.450, p=0.964) or ‘Living Arrangements’ (V=0.538, p=0.932).

The mainstream response from the educator population was that WIL delivers numerous personal and social benefits for graduates, with 27% of total responses ‘Strongly Agreeing’ with the benefits identified in the study and a further 44% ‘ Agreeing’. Tertiary educators were asked to rate the same fourteen personal and social benefits posed to graduates and employers with ‘ Acquiring a broad education’ and ‘ Working effectively with others’ scoring the highest and ‘ Writing clearly and effectively’ and ‘ Using computing and information technology’ scoring the lowest. The response for career benefits was notably higher, with 50% of total responses ‘Strongly Agreeing’ and a further 39% ‘ Agreeing’. There was a strong statistically significant association between average educator perceptions of graduate personal/social benefits and ‘ Hours Spent on WIL’, with educators completing ‘41–100’ and ‘101–200’ hours of WIL recording higher average graduate benefits over all other categories (V=0.816, p=0.034). There were almost no associations between
average educator scores for perceived graduate personal/social benefits and ‘Living Arrangements’ (V=0.583, p=0.924) or ‘Work Status’ (V=0.573, p=0.974).

The educator response for graduate career benefits featured ‘Opportunity to re-evaluate expectations of industry and job prospects’ and ‘Acquiring job-related or work-related knowledge entry’ scoring the highest and ‘Increased interstate and national mobility within the workforce’ and ‘Progressing quickly through the ranks at your workplace or industry’ scoring the lowest. The consistency of the latter being the lowest scoring for all three sample groups should be sending alarm bells to program coordinators and reviewers.

An additional set of 14 questions relating to benefits for tertiary educators was posed, with 32% of total responses ‘Strongly Agreeing’ and a further 52% ‘Agreeing’. There were three highest scoring benefits, ‘Establishment of professional contacts/networking,’ ‘Enhanced course credibility with students’ and ‘Enhanced course credibility with industry and community’, and the lowest scoring benefits were ‘Source of motivation’ and ‘Staff development prospects’.

As featured in Tables 4.17 and 4.18, the benefits data for each sample group was then subject to further statistical analysis by WIL Experience and Tertiary Type. In light of the distribution of perceived benefits positively skewed and the small population size, Shapiro-Wilk tests of normality (Table 4.16) were conducted to ensure t-tests, one-way Anova tests and significance tests were possible. With p-values of 0.896 and 0.786 for average graduate personal/social benefits based on WIL participation, we can reject the alternative hypothesis and conclude that the data comes from a normal distribution. In instances when the p-values were significant representing an abnormal distribution, t-tests and one-way Anova tests could not be performed.

**Table 4.16: Shapiro-Wilk Test Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tests of Normality</th>
<th>Shapiro-Wilk</th>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average score for Graduate Personal/Social Benefits</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>.984</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>.896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>.972</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.786</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the total sample population, the aggregate mean graduate benefits rating of respondents with WIL experience (1.95) was higher (closer to 1 on a scale of 1–5) than the average of respondents with no WIL experience (2.09). The experience of WIL in both the Graduate and Educator samples correlated to a slightly lower rating of benefits. This contrasts the Employer sample average increasing with WIL experience. The perceived employer benefits were lower for those with WIL experience (2.46) compared to no WIL (2.35) and interestingly educators with WIL recorded higher benefits (1.77) compared to those with no WIL experience (2.12). A t-test was conducted to determine if the difference between WIL and no WIL responses was evidence of a real difference in attitude in the population or if the difference can be attributed to sampling variability. Since the p-values were >0.05, we accept the null hypothesis and conclude that there is no difference between the mean scores based on participation in WIL.

Table 4.17: Perceptions of Benefits by Sample Group and WIL or No WIL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>WIL exp mean*</th>
<th>No WIL exp mean*</th>
<th>Mean difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Sample (n=55; t[53])</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>1.153</td>
<td>0.254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Personal/Social Benefits</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Career Benefits</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.551</td>
<td>0.584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Benefits Total</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer Sample (n=72; t[70])</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Personal/Social Benefits</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Career Benefits</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Benefits Total</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educator Sample (n=29; t[27])</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.341</td>
<td>0.736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Personal/Social Benefits</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.172</td>
<td>0.864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Career Benefits</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td>0.923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educator Benefits</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>-1.727</td>
<td>0.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population (n=156, t[154])</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-1.489</td>
<td>0.138</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** value 1=Strongly Agree, 2=Agree, 3=Neither Agree nor Disagree, 4=Disagree, 5=Strongly Disagree

The average result for aggregate perceived Graduate Benefits based on Tertiary Type was lowest for University (2.06), compared to TAFE and Other Institutes (1.82). These results were reversed for educators at university rating aggregate perceived Graduate Benefits the highest (1.71), compared to TAFE (1.97) and Other Institutes (1.96). TAFE Educator recorded the highest mean benefits. For the total graduate and educator population, both TAFE and Other Institutes recorded the highest mean result at 1.87, with University not far behind at 1.94. With three categories within the Tertiary
Type variable, a one-way Anova test was conducted to derive the ‘f’ statistic and determine if the difference between responses was evidence of a real difference in attitude in the population based on Tertiary Type or if the difference can be attributed to sampling variability. As demonstrated in Table 4.18, since the p-value >0.05, we accept the null hypothesis and conclude that there is no difference between the mean scores of benefits for graduates and educators based on tertiary type. The Tukey HSD test was also used to determine the mean differences between ratings of aggregate Graduate Benefits of WIL between each Tertiary Type, featured in Table 4.19. With results for significance approaching p=1.000, the differences between perceptions based on Tertiary Type are not statistically significant and therefore likely due to chance.

Table 4.18: Perceptions of Benefits by Sample Group and Tertiary Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>TAFE mean</th>
<th>University mean</th>
<th>Other mean</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Sample (n=55)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Personal/Social Benefits</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>0.890</td>
<td>0.417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Career Benefits</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Benefits Total</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>1.399</td>
<td>0.256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educator Sample (n=29)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Personal/Social Benefits</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.458</td>
<td>0.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Career Benefits</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>0.790</td>
<td>0.465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Benefits Total</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.134</td>
<td>0.337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educator Benefits</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>0.875</td>
<td>0.429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population (n=)</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>0.177</td>
<td>0.838</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* value 1=Strongly Agree, 2=Agree, 3=Neither Agree nor Disagree, 4=Disagree, 5=Strongly Disagree

Table 4.19: Tukey Test: Aggregate Graduate Benefits / Tertiary Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) Tertiary type</th>
<th>(J) Tertiary type</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Bound</td>
<td>Upper Bound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAFE</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>-.06303</td>
<td>.13128</td>
<td>.881</td>
<td>-.3765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>.00565</td>
<td>.14327</td>
<td>.999</td>
<td>-.3364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>TAFE</td>
<td>.06303</td>
<td>.13128</td>
<td>.881</td>
<td>-.2504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>.06868</td>
<td>.13287</td>
<td>.863</td>
<td>-.2486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>TAFE</td>
<td>-.00565</td>
<td>.14327</td>
<td>.999</td>
<td>-.3477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University</td>
<td>-.06868</td>
<td>.13287</td>
<td>.863</td>
<td>-.3859</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Benefits for the Employer sample were further analysed according to business size as featured in Table 4.20. It was the large-scale businesses that had the highest overall rating (closer to 1 on a scale of 1–5) for Graduate WIL benefits (2.05), though also
recording the lowest average for benefits to employers (2.52). The results of the one-way Anova test show the p-values >0.05; therefore we accept the null hypothesis and conclude that there is no difference between the mean scores of employer-perceived graduate WIL benefits based on business size.

Table 4.20: Employer Perceptions of Benefits by Business Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Small Scale mean</th>
<th>Medium Scale mean</th>
<th>Large Scale mean</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employer Sample (n=72)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Personal/Social Benefits</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>0.249</td>
<td>0.780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Career Benefits</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>0.953</td>
<td>0.391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Benefits Total</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>0.409</td>
<td>0.666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer Benefits</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* value 1=Strongly Agree, 2=Agree, 3=Neither Agree nor Disagree, 4=Disagree, 5=Strongly Disagree

4.2.2 Challenges

In the challenges section, graduates were asked to record the extent to which they agreed that students encounter each of the eight challenges during WIL experience with 18% of total responses ‘Strongly Agreeing’ with the list of challenges being encountered and a further 52% ‘Agreeing’. The main issue identified for graduates was ‘Managing several commitments i.e. Family, study, work, etc., while on work placement’ with 47% ‘Strongly Agreeing’ and 49% ‘Agreeing’ with the statement. The statement of most contention was ‘Insufficient tertiary institute support’ with 45% in agreement, 27% disagreeing and the reminder neutral. Graduate scores for challenges of WIL were averaged and a definite association was established to ‘Age’ with 100% of respondents aged ‘48–53’ and ‘54–59’ undecided and all other categories predominately agreeing (V=0.678, p=0.000). There were almost no associations between average graduate challenges and ‘Ethnicity’ (V=0.494, p=0.968), ‘Language’ (V =0.411, p=0.902) or ‘Work Status’ (V=0.443, p=0.959).

The employers were asked to record the extent to which they agreed that employers encounter each of the thirteen challenges during WIL experience, with 11% of total responses ‘Strongly Agreeing’ with the list of challenges being encountered and a further 45% ‘Agreeing’. The main challenges identified for employers were ‘Managing several commitments i.e. Family, study, work, etc., while on work placement’ and the statement ‘Additional demands on my time’. The challenges of
least concern to the respondents were identified as ‘Insufficient tertiary institute support’ and ‘Insufficient employer support’. Employer scores for challenges of WIL were averaged and moderately statistically significant associations were found for ‘Hours Spent on WIL’ with a higher proportion of challenges perceived for respondents with 21 or more hours of WIL (V=0.603, p=0.013) and ‘Highest Qualification’, where 50% of employers with Certificate I or IV rated WIL challenges highest (V=0.571, p=0.047). There were almost no associations to average employer challenges and ‘Ethnicity’ (V=0.467, p=0.997), ‘Language’ (V=0.372, p=0.969) or ‘Living Arrangements’ (V=0.440, p=0.982).

Tertiary educators were asked to record the extent to which they agreed they encounter each of the eleven challenges during WIL experience with 19% of total responses ‘Strongly Agreeing’ with the list of challenges being encountered and a further 52% ‘Agreeing’. The main issues identified for educators were ‘Managing several commitments, i.e. Family, study, work, etc., while on work placement’ and ‘Obtaining appropriate placements for your students’ with the standout lowest scoring challenge ‘Relating the theory learnt at University/TAFE/other to the workplace’. When educator scores for challenges of WIL were averaged there were almost no associations to ‘Disability’ (V=0.414, p=0.933), ‘Ethnicity’ (V=0.469, p=0.999) or ‘Work Status’ (V=0.429, p=0.994).

As featured in Tables 4.21 and 4.22, the challenges data for each sample group was then subject to further statistical analysis by WIL Experience and Tertiary Type. Shapiro-Wilk tests of normality were conducted to ensure t-tests and significance tests were possible. For instances when the p-values were significant, representing an abnormal distribution, t-tests could not be performed. Graduates and employers with WIL experience rate the challenges as less severe than their counterparts without WIL experience. Educators with WIL experience conversely rated challenges higher (2.16) than educators without WIL experience (2.27). With the results of the t-test establishing p-values >0.05, we accept the null hypothesis and conclude that there is no difference between the mean scores of challenges based on participation in WIL.
Table 4.21: Perceptions of Challenges by Sample Group and WIL or No WIL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>WIL exp mean</th>
<th>No WIL exp mean</th>
<th>Mean difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate sample:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer sample:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1.326</td>
<td>0.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educator sample:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.807</td>
<td>0.427</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** value 1=Strongly Agree, 2=Agree, 3=Neither Agree nor Disagree, 4=Disagree, 5=Strongly Disagree

The average result for perceived challenges for graduates based on Tertiary Type were highest for Graduates from Other Institutes (2.12) and lowest for TAFE (2.37), though still recording agreement with the aggregate challenges. For the educator population, the result had university educators rating WIL challenges the highest (2.06) and lowest for other institutes (2.34) though still recording agreement with the aggregate challenges. Since the one-way Anova test had p-values >0.05, we accept the null hypothesis and conclude that there is no difference between the mean scores of benefits for graduates or educators based on Tertiary Type.

Table 4.22: Perceptions of Challenges by Sample Group and Tertiary Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>TAFE mean*</th>
<th>University mean*</th>
<th>Other mean*</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate sample:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.096</td>
<td>0.342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educator sample:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.151</td>
<td>0.137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** value 1=Strongly Agree, 2=Agree, 3=Neither Agree nor Disagree, 4=Disagree, 5=Strongly Disagree

Employer perceptions of the challenges were also investigated by business size as featured in Table 4.23. It was the medium-sized businesses that on average rated challenges the worst (closest to 1) at 2.33 however, since the one-way Anova test had a p-value >0.05, we accept the null hypothesis and conclude that there is no difference between the mean scores of benefits for graduates or educators based on Tertiary Type. The Tukey HSD test results confirm the differences between perceptions based on business size are not statistically significant and therefore likely due to chance (see Table 4.24).
Table 4.23: Employer Perceptions of Challenges by Business Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Small Scale mean</th>
<th>Medium Scale mean</th>
<th>Large Scale mean</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td>0.439</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a* value 1=Strongly Agree, 2=Agree, 3=Neither Agree nor Disagree, 4=Disagree, 5=Strongly Disagree

Table 4.24: Tukey Test: Aggregate Employer Challenges / Business Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) Business size</th>
<th>(J) Business size</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I – J)</th>
<th>Std Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small scale &lt;20</td>
<td>Medium scale 20–199 staff</td>
<td>.10584</td>
<td>.12149</td>
<td>.660</td>
<td>.1852</td>
<td>-.3968</td>
<td>.5197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large scale 200+ staff</td>
<td>-.06535</td>
<td>.15786</td>
<td>.910</td>
<td>-.4435</td>
<td>.3128</td>
<td>.1773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium scale 20–199 staff</td>
<td>Small scale &lt;20</td>
<td>-.10584</td>
<td>.12149</td>
<td>.660</td>
<td>-.3968</td>
<td>.5197</td>
<td>.1773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large scale 200+ staff</td>
<td>-.17119</td>
<td>.14549</td>
<td>.471</td>
<td>-.5197</td>
<td>.1773</td>
<td>.5197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large scale 200+ staff</td>
<td>Small scale &lt;20</td>
<td>.06535</td>
<td>.15786</td>
<td>.910</td>
<td>-.3128</td>
<td>.4435</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium scale 20–199 staff</td>
<td>.17119</td>
<td>.14549</td>
<td>.471</td>
<td>-.1773</td>
<td>.5197</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.3 Satisfaction with WIL

Of the total graduate responses with WIL experience (n=34, 62%), 15% rated experiences as ‘Excellent’ and 41% as ‘Above Average’. When compared with the benefits and challenges sections, more negative scores were prevalent with ‘The supervision and support you received from your tertiary institution’ and ‘Actual WIL experiences met your expectations’ identified as areas of concern. The highest scoring areas were ‘Relevance of the WIL experience to coursework’ and ‘The supervision and support you received during WIL from your host employer organisation’.

Within the educator population, one respondent selected N/A instead of rating their WIL experience, so this data set was removed when calculating satisfaction. Of the total completed educator responses with WIL experience (n=20, 69%), 5% rated experiences as ‘Excellent’ and 50% as ‘Above Average’. There was very little difference between the highest and lowest scoring factors although, of the 5% of total responses rated at ‘Below Average’ three areas ‘The quantity of contact with students during WIL activities’, Integration of WIL initiatives within course curriculum’ and ‘Effectiveness of how these WIL initiatives were managed’ were identified as areas of concern.

As featured in Table 4.25, the satisfaction of Graduate and Educator samples with their WIL experience was examined by Tertiary Type. The highest mean scores for
satisfaction were recorded for both the graduates and educators from the Other Tertiary Institute category (2.17). University graduates and TAFE educators recorded the lowest satisfaction rates though still rated well. As the one-way Anova test results had p-values >0.05, we accept the null hypothesis and conclude that there is no difference between the mean scores of satisfaction with WIL experience for graduates or educators based on Tertiary Type. The Tukey HSD test results confirm the differences between perceptions based on Tertiary Type are not statistically significant and therefore likely due to chance.

Table 4.25: Satisfaction of WIL Experience by Sample Group and Tertiary Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>TAFE meana</th>
<th>University meana</th>
<th>Other meana</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate sample (n=34):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIL satisfaction</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>1.310</td>
<td>0.284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educator sample (n=20):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIL satisfaction</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>0.584</td>
<td>0.568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sample (n=54):</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>1.409</td>
<td>0.254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a value 1=Excellent, 2=Above Average, 3=Average, 4=Below Average, 5=Extremely Poor; Note: N/A values were removed from sample

In regards to employer satisfaction with WIL, 13% rated experiences as ‘Excellent’, 27% as ‘Above Average’ with the majority 52% only scoring ‘Average’ and alarmingly 7% were rated ‘Extremely Poor’. When compared with the benefits and challenges sections, more negative scores were prevalent with ‘The quality of contract with Tertiary staff’ and ‘The quantity of contact with Tertiary staff’ identified as areas of concern. The highest scoring area was ‘The supervision and support you received during WIL from your employer’. There was a strong statistically significant association between aggregate employer satisfaction with WIL and an employer’s ‘Highest Qualification’ (V=0.849, p=0.048). The means of employer satisfaction rates by business size in Table 4.26 demonstrate the highest WIL satisfaction rates were large-scale businesses (2.74). With one-way Anova test p-values >0.05 and Tukey HSD test results for significance approaching p=1.000, we accept the null hypothesis and conclude that there is no difference between the mean scores of employer satisfaction with WIL experience and ‘Business Size’ and therefore likely due to chance.
Table 4.26: Employer Satisfaction with WIL by Business Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Small Scale mean(^a)</th>
<th>Medium Scale mean(^a)</th>
<th>Large Scale mean(^a)</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employer Sample (n=28)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>0.285</td>
<td>0.754</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*\(^a\) value 1=Excellent, 2=Above Average, 3=Average, 4=Below Average, 5=Extremely Poor; Note: N/As were removed from sample

4.3 Tertiary Hospitality and Employability Questions

All graduate, educator and employer respondents were asked to rate the extent to which they agree with a series of seven standard statements pertaining to their perceptions of tertiary hospitality education in general. Each will be discussed in turn, using both raw and weighted data (featured in Appendix 13), to redress the disproportionate representation of graduates, employers and tertiary educators.

**Hospitality educators know the industry well**

There is considerable support for this statement being true, with 70% of the weighted population ‘Strongly Agreeing’ or ‘Agreeing’. Tertiary educators were found to be more likely to support this statement at 86% compared to employers at 59% and graduates at 76%, however substantially more graduates ‘Strongly Agreed’. There was a moderate statistically significant association to ‘Intention to Pursue a Hospitality Career’ with 63.6% of the population agreeing with the statement definitely or probably pursuing hospitality compared to 27.3% of those uncertain and 9.1% unlikely or definitely not (V=0.418, p=0.004). Weak statistically significant associations were also observed for ‘Participation in WIL’, resulting in higher support for educator knowledge (V=0.266, p=0.026) and ‘Hospitality Highest Qualification’, where higher acceptance of this statement was demonstrated through respondents with hospitality as their highest qualification (V=0.232, p=0.033). There were almost no associations to ‘Disability’ (V=0.068, p=0.950), ‘Ethnicity’ (V=0.366, p=0.928), ‘Number of WIL Types’ (V=0.203, p=0.900), ‘Business Sector’ (V=0.291, p=0.930) or ‘Work Status’ (V=0.119, p=0.918).
A different understanding of career expectations exists between educators and managers in the hospitality industry

This was the most contentious statement as 35% of the weighted population considers there is a different understanding, with only a slightly higher percentage, 39%, refuting this notion. The graduate population represents the majority of votes supporting this statement, 55%, compared to 26% of employers and 24% of tertiary educators and this was supported by a weak statistically significant association with ‘Sample Group’ (V=0.265, p=0.005). Moderate associations were observed for ‘Tertiary Type’, with 59% of graduate and educator respondents from university supporting this statement compared to 42% from TAFE and 25% from Other Institutes (V=0.333, p=0.017), for ‘Participation in WIL’, with 46% of respondents with WIL experience in agreement compared to 25% without WIL experience (V=0.302, p=0.007), for ‘Graduate Position’, with graduates having attained a graduate-level position actually rating acceptance of this statement lower than those without a graduate-level position and with those still searching either uncertain or disagreeing (V=0.374, p=0.018) and ‘Intention to Pursue a Hospitality Career’ with those uncertain of pursuing a hospitality career more likely to agree with this statement and those not intending to undecided (V=0.386, p=0.017). There was almost no associations to ‘Ethnicity’ (V=0.364, p=0.938), ‘Religion’ (V=0.291, p=0.910), ‘Highest Qualification’ (V=0.248, p=0.991) or ‘Industry Sector’ (V=0.249, p=0.986).

Work experience is more important than a degree qualification for a prospective employee

Just over half the weighted population (53%) believe work experience is more important than a degree. The graduate population again represented the most votes, ‘Strongly Agreeing’ with this statement, however all sample groups recorded similar percentages for support in general. Tertiary educators recorded the highest percentage contesting this statement, at 31%, just ahead of employers at 29%. A weak statistically significant relationship supports these observations based on ‘Sample Group’ (V=0.216, p=0.024). Another weak statistically significant association was established for ‘Living Arrangements’, with respondents living with a spouse, partner or children more likely to agree (V=0.222, p=0.028). There was almost no association to ‘Graduate Industry Experience Prior to Study’ (V=0.083, p=0.945), ‘Intention to
Pursue a Hospitality Career’ ($V=0.183$, $p=0.939$) or ‘Work Status’ ($V=0.104$, $p=0.957$).

**A hospitality degree qualification is better than three years of work experience**

Despite 35% of the weighted population being neutral, 44% either ‘Disagreed’ or ‘Strongly Disagreed’, thus believing three years of work experience is more valuable than a degree. Interesting only 20% of tertiary educators supported degrees over work experience, though on further investigation 42% of university respondents supported the degree compared to 13% of other providers and no TAFE respondents. The remaining university respondents voted neutral with one exception disagreeing. There were almost no associations to ‘Ethnicity’ ($V=0.287$, $p=0.931$), ‘Participation in WIL’ ($V=0.067$, $p=0.950$) or ‘Living Arrangements’ ($V=0.118$, $p=0.926$).

**Having employees with degrees benefit hospitality organisations**

Despite the limited value placed on degrees in preference to work experience, 77% of the weighted population acknowledge employees with degrees benefits hospitality organisations. This statement was more strongly supported by tertiary educators and graduates though all three sample groups rated this statement highly with a weak statistically significant association observed for ‘Sample Group’, with employers more uncertain and 34% of educators strongly agreeing compared to 18% of graduates and 2% of employers ($V=0.270$, $p=0.004$). Moderate statistically significant associations were found to ‘Employment of Graduates’, with past or present employment of graduates by employers relating to higher agreement ($V=0.378$, $p=0.016$) and ‘Management Position’ with the highest mean responses from low-level managers and middle managers more likely to agree (77%) compared to senior managers (68%) and low-level managers (56%) ($V=0.360$, $p=0.005$). There was almost no association to ‘Age’ ($V=0.166$, $p=0.946$) or ‘Industry Sector’ ($V=0.263$, $p=0.971$).

**Graduates with a bachelor’s degree in hospitality will receive higher starting salaries than people who do not hold a degree**

The results reflect uncertainty, with 38% of the weighted population neutral. Graduates were more optimistic, with 49% believing a degree will provide a higher starting salary compared to 32% for employers and 24% of tertiary educators and this was supported by a weak statistically significant relationship to Sample Group ($V=0.266$, $p=0.005$).
Both graduates and tertiary educators also comprised the 5% ‘Strongly Disagreeing’ with this statement. The more reserved responses observed were from employers with only ‘Agree’, ‘Neither’ and ‘Disagree’ featuring on the scale, suggesting that degree alone does not determine salary. A moderate statistically significant relationship was established for ‘Tertiary Type’, with respondents from university least likely to agree at 22%, compared to Other Institutes at 66% and TAFE 39% (V=0.339, p=0.013). Weak statistically significant relationships was also observed to ‘Work Status’ with students, other and casual respondents more likely to agree (V=0.228, p=0.009), ‘Income’ with respondents earning below $30,000 or above $120,000 more likely to agree and a higher rate of disagreement and uncertainty between these income ranges (V=0.258, p=0.049) and ‘Living Arrangements’, with respondents living with a spouse, partner or children recording higher levels of uncertainty and disagreement (V=0.213, p=0.029). There was almost no association to ‘Industry Sector’ (V=0.251, p=0.957).

**Jobs in the hospitality industry need a bachelor’s degree in hospitality management for promotion purposes**

Like the previous instance, this statement was also received with uncertainty, with 35% of the weighted population neutral. Tertiary educators and graduates were more optimistic with higher prevalence of ‘Strongly Agree’ and 38% agreeing in each sample, however they also represented the majority of ‘Strongly Disagree’ responses, i.e. 9% of graduates and 14% of tertiary educators. This was substantiated by a weak statistically significant association to ‘Sample Group’ (V=0.237, p=0.025). A moderate statistically significant association was established to ‘Tertiary Type’, with university respondents more likely to be indecisive or disagree (V=0.374, p=0.003). There was almost no association to ‘Gender’ (V=0.048, p=0.986), ‘Age’ (V=0.171, p=0.922) or ‘Industry Sector’ (V=0.265, p=0.967).

**If you could start over again you would go to the same tertiary institution/s you graduated from**

The graduate sample was presented with an additional statement and this revealed 54% either ‘Strongly Agreeing’ or ‘Agreeing’ with attending the same institutions they graduated from with 16% ‘Disagreeing’ or ‘Strongly Disagreeing’.
The final section of the survey related to a series of employability questions:

**In your opinion which is the one characteristic you believe is the most important for an employee?**

All respondents were asked to select one characteristic as the most important from a list of seven characteristics. Examples to support the meaning of specific skills were communicated as ‘customer service skills, communication skills, IT skills, etc.’ and an ‘Other’ category was included, permitting respondents to propose an alternative characteristic. The most cited characteristic with 32% of the weighted total was ‘Willing to learn’, with ‘Enthusiasm’ at 22% and ‘Commitment’ at 17% also prominent. As depicted in Table 4.27, 48% of Tertiary educators identified ‘Willingness to learn’ as the most important along with graduates at 31% in comparison to employers’ preference for ‘Commitment’ at 28% followed by ‘Enthusiasm’ at 25% and this was supported by a moderate statistically significant relationship to ‘Sample Group’ (V=0.310, p=0.008). The least frequent characteristics were ‘Specific skills’ and ‘Other’. Qualitative responses from the ‘Other’ category included: ‘A Positive Attitude’, ‘All of the Above’, ‘Positive Work Ethic’ and ‘Honesty’. Moderate statistically significant associations were observed for ‘Highest Qualification’ whilst the majority of categories prioritised ‘Willing to learn’, ‘Enthusiasm’ and ‘Commitment’; the masters and certificate II and III respondents considered ‘Determination’ as important (V=0.311, p=0.017), ‘Intention to Pursue a Hospitality Career’ with results for respondents definitely intending to pursue hospitality spread across all characteristics with fewer characteristics represented with degree of intention less likely (V=0.413, p=0.038) and ‘Industry Sector’ with motel/guesthouse and government food services diverging from the most cited characteristics (V=0.422, p=0.015).
Table 4.27: Important Characteristics for Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Sample Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Weighted*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>Employer</td>
<td>Tertiary Educator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedication</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to learn</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardworking</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determination</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific skills</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Method of weighting data involved averaging the sample group percentages for each characteristic to overcome disparate sample sizes.

What do you think human resource departments consider as the most important characteristic for a new employee?

When asked to envisage the preferred characteristic sought by human resource departments, both ‘Experience’ and ‘Specific skills’ featured highly in the weighted totals at 32% and 28% respectively. As featured in Table 4.28, these characteristics represented the two highest rated by each sample group with the addition of ‘Personality’ recorded as equally important as ‘Experience’ by employers. Apart from the ‘Other’ category the least frequent characteristic overall and for each sample group was ‘Knowledge of the Industry’. Qualitative responses from the ‘Other’ category included: ‘All of the Above’, ‘Positive Attitude and Ability to Apply Knowledge to Actual Work Requirements’, and ‘Preparedness to Contribute, Bring Their Brains to Work’. Moderate statistically significant associations were observed for ‘Industry Sector’ with ‘Personality’ prioritised by Employers from Clubs, Restaurants and Cafe/Coffee Carts ($V=0.421$, $p=0.034$) and ‘Ethnicity’, with Chinese, Indian and European/US respondents more likely to prioritise qualifications than other ethnic groups ($V=0.485$, $p=0.001$). On account of the small sample size of ethnic populations, this warrants further research. There was almost no association to ‘Religion’ ($V=0.280$, $p=0.977$).
Select the most important single characteristic for an employee in the hospitality industry, in your opinion

Exactly half, 50% of the total weighted responses, identified ‘Attitude’ as the most important characteristic for hospitality employees and the second highest was a very similar characteristic, ‘Personality’, at 25%. Compared with the overwhelming importance of experience in the expectations of human resources department values from the previous question, only 6% of the total weighted population identified it as the most important for hospitality employees, with 61% of these being graduates. As depicted in Table 4.29, apart from the ‘Other’ category the least frequent characteristic overall was ‘Knowledge of the industry’. Interestingly, no employers or tertiary educators identified ‘Qualifications’ as the most important compared to 11% of graduates. Qualitative responses from the ‘Other’ category included: ‘Determination’, ‘Honesty’ and ‘Positive Attitude’. A moderate statistically significant association was established for ‘Ethnicity’, with Chinese, Indian and Australian respondents also recording ‘Qualifications’ and ‘Knowledge of Industry’ as important (V=0.447, p=0.036), though this warrants further investigation with higher representation of ethnic populations. Two weak statistically significant associations were determined for ‘Work Status’, with Full-time and Other respondents prioritising ‘Attitude’ and Casuals and Students prioritising ‘Personality’ (V=0.270, p=0.020), and the ‘Sample Group’, with 44% of graduates selecting characteristics other than ‘Attitude’ and ‘Personality’ compared to 19% of employers and 14% of educators (V=0.280,
There was almost no association to ‘Years of Educator Hospitality Industry Experience’ (V=0.352, p=0.997).

Table 4.29: Important Characteristics for Hospitality Employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Sample Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Weighted*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of the Industry</td>
<td>Graduate 3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employer 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tertiary educator 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifications</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Skills</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Method of weighting data involved averaging the sample group percentages for each characteristic to overcome disparate sample sizes.

Which skill do you think will be the most important for graduate career development?

Based on the total weighted responses three skills were identified as the most important for graduate career development, namely ‘Human Relations Skills’ and ‘Self Management Skills’ at 23% each, and these were closely followed by ‘Communication Skills’ at 20%. As featured in Table 4.30, tertiary educators identified ‘Using Initiative Skills’ as their second highest skill requirement. The least frequent skills were ‘Multilingual’ and ‘Front Office’, with no responses. Qualitative responses from the ‘Other’ category included: ‘A Combination of All Above’, ‘All Interpersonal Skills’, ‘Combination of Many Skills in an Entry Level Position’, ‘Don’t Think You Are Above Anyone Else and be Prepared to do Whatever is Asked of You – Happily’, ‘Experience and Understanding of Industry’ and ‘Multitasking Ability’. A moderate statistically significant association was identified for ‘Industry Sector’, with the whole range of characteristics prioritised by club respondents compared to a narrowed range from other sector respondents (V=0.446, p=0.004). There was almost no association to ‘Intention to Pursue a Hospitality Career’ (V=0.185, p=0.930) or ‘Years of Employer Hospitality Industry Experience’ (V=0.251, p=0.963).
### Table 4.30: Most Important Skill for Graduate Career Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Sample Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Weighted*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>Employer</td>
<td>Tertiary educator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication skills</td>
<td>15 27%</td>
<td>14 19%</td>
<td>4 14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using initiative skills</td>
<td>7 13%</td>
<td>10 14%</td>
<td>6 21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human relations skills</td>
<td>11 20%</td>
<td>22 31%</td>
<td>5 17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and beverage skills</td>
<td>1 2%</td>
<td>4 6%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem-solving skills</td>
<td>6 11%</td>
<td>5 7%</td>
<td>5 17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-management skills</td>
<td>12 22%</td>
<td>12 17%</td>
<td>9 31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilingual skills</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front office skills</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3 5%</td>
<td>5 7%</td>
<td>0 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Method of weighting data involved averaging the sample group percentages for each skill to overcome disparate sample sizes.

**What level do you expect a graduate to hold five years after completing a tertiary hospitality course?**

The expected employment level of the majority of total weighted respondents and for each Sample Group was ‘Department manager level’ at 64%. Graduates tended to expect higher levels of employment with 20% expected to achieve ‘Senior Management Level’. Employers and tertiary educators recorded more conservative expectations with no results for ‘Top Management Level’ and ‘Self-employed’ compared with 2% for each level by the graduate sample. Qualitative responses from the ‘Other’ category included: ‘Chef’, ‘Depends on Individual’, ‘Middle Management’ and ‘Not Everyone Strives to be a Manager or Supervisor’.
Table 4.31: Hospitality Graduate Expected Level of Employment After 5 Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Sample Group</th>
<th>Weighted*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>Employer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department supervisor level</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department manager level</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior management level</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top management level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self employed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Method of weighting data involved averaging the sample group percentages for each level to overcome disparate sample sizes.

What level do you expect a graduate to hold 10 years after completing a tertiary hospitality course?

The expected employment level of the majority of total weighted respondents and for each sample group was ‘Senior Manager Level’ at 56%. Consistent with the previous question graduates tended to expect higher levels of employment with 53% expecting to achieve ‘Senior Management Level’ and 33% ‘Top Management Level’. As featured in Table 4.32, employers and tertiary educators again recorded more conservative expectations, with each recording only 17% expecting graduates to attain ‘Top Management Level’ and only 8% of employers expecting them to be ‘Self-employed’. These findings were substantiated by a weak statistically significant association to ‘Sample Group’ (V=0.259, p=0.021). Qualitative responses from the ‘Other’ category included: ‘Any of the Above Provided the Attitude to Other Staff and Customers is Right’, ‘Depends on Individual’, ‘Interested in Another Field’, ‘Not Everyone Strives to be a Manager or Supervisor’ and ‘Varied Between Management and Self-employed’. Moderate statistically significant relationships were established for ‘Graduate Position’, with graduates who have not attained a graduate-level position having higher expectations (V=0.435, p=0.022), ‘Size of Business’, with employers from small-scale business having higher expectations (V=0.341, p=0.033) and ‘Industry Sector’ with expectations of self-employment higher for employers in the cafe/coffee cart and caravan/holiday park sectors (V=0.470, p=0.003). A weak statistically significant association was also identified for ‘Age’ with respondents aged ‘24–29’ recording the highest expectations overall and respondents aged ‘36–41’
recording the lowest expectations (V=0.264, p=0.020). There was almost no association to ‘Religion’ (V=0.272, p=0.989).

Table 4.32: Hospitality Graduate Expected Level of Employment after 10 Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Sample Group</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>Employer</td>
<td>Tertiary educator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department supervisor level</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department manager level</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>10%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior management level</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>56%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top management level</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>22%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>156%</td>
<td>100%*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Method of weighting data involved averaging the sample group percentages for each level to overcome disparate sample sizes.

4.4 Chapter Summary

The quantitative findings support many of the critical assumptions of the literature review, including the prevalence of hospitality graduate underemployment, low remuneration trends in the industry and importance of paid WIL to student willingness to participate. The results also contradict some assumptions, with the majority of hospitality students not coming straight from high school, with many having previous industry experience and not seeking employment after graduation on the basis of already being employed, suggesting the necessity of qualifications to progress in the industry. There was extensive support for WIL providing personal/social and especially career benefits to hospitality graduates and benefits also extending to employers and educators. With mandatory WIL only in approximately half of all qualifications completed by graduates or taught by educators, this represents a missed opportunity to infuse employability skills within curricula. The survey results emphasise the threat of challenges associated with involvement in WIL faced by each group which may serve to limit realisation of these benefits and inhibit involvement in WIL. Satisfaction levels of respondents with WIL experience were generally positive, though ratings of ‘bad’ and ‘extremely poor’ were observed for several respondents against various satisfaction items. Limitations of a small sample size and network
sampling methods have precluded more extensive statistical investigations. A larger scale study using random sampling is required to verify these results. As summarised above this chapter highlighted a number of key issues and concerns that were explored further in the qualitative focus groups and are presented in the following chapter.
Chapter 5

QUALITATIVE DATA FINDINGS

This chapter reports the findings of the qualitative focus groups, commencing with the respondent demographics and sample group characteristics. Emergent key themes are discussed, complemented by graphical models. The focus group agenda was aligned with and developed from the quantitative survey. This was further designed to inform a more rigorous discussion on what specific areas need to be addressed and how to improve the hospitality WIL agenda.

5.1 Sample Demographics

The industry experience of the employer respondents, as featured in Table 3.1, represent the diversity of sectors and roles within hospitality including but not limited to: clubs, hotels, nightclubs, restaurants, leisure, hospitals, pubs and hospitality recruitment services. This diversity facilitated consideration and discussion of the different requirements and working conditions from diverse hospitality roles and with each workplace very different, even within similar types e.g. hotels (policies, procedures). As predicted by the literature review, not all the hospitality professionals started out in hospitality and many of the employer respondents do not intend to work in hospitality or even related industries in the near future. Only employers 4 and 6 completed university degrees and these were not in the area of hospitality, though Employer 6 did complete a TAFE hospitality course along with Employer 5 who did a chef apprenticeship. Several employers declared participating in basic industry training linked to either TAFE or college qualifications through their workplaces. Interestingly, even the employers with university/TAFE backgrounds experienced difficulty adopting the educator and graduate mindsets, falling straight into the stereotypical employer concerns with indications the longer the time since graduation the greater the lack of focus on one’s own learning process, instead being replaced with an alignment to work focus.
Once you get on board for a while you’re too busy with the business of the business instead of what’s happening out there (Employer 4).

The educator respondents all had current industry experience with all besides Educator 3 having on average over two decades of experience. All expressed a passion for training, leading them into various roles within the tertiary education sector. The tertiary educators (walking the talk) tended to place themselves more easily and naturally in the perspectives of other stakeholders to analyse the issues with evidence of extensive prior contemplation of the issues.

Of the graduate respondents, only Graduate 5 had a full-time graduate-level position, the result of pursuing both TAFE and university qualifications subsequent to personal pursuit of industry experience. This proactive pursuit of experience set this graduate apart from the others and from the generational stereotypes discussed in the literature review. This difference could potentially be attributed to a cultural influence on the work ethic, i.e. Graduate 5 is an Indian student who has moved to Australia to pursue his qualifications and career in Australia.

Graduate 4, the other university graduate, was the only other graduate seeking a graduate-level position. The TAFE graduates were working part-time or casually in the industry. Three of the graduates had worked in the hospitality industry prior to commencing hospitality tertiary education. Since conducting these interviews, it has emerged that two of these TAFE graduates are now looking to switch to completely unrelated industries and the other TAFE graduate has recently returned to complete further hospitality qualifications at TAFE to improve employment opportunities.

5.2 Current Industry Conditions

Current industry conditions were examined through the course of the focus groups reiterating the enduring presence of issues and challenges facing the hospitality industry as previously addressed in the literature review. Firstly, there was an overwhelming acknowledgement by all sample groups of hospitality constituting a core industry in Australia yet undervalued, despite size and economic contribution.
The lack of respect for hospitality however is asserted as not as extensive as in the past with slow improvement attributed in part to the increased exposure and experience of hospitality services compared to previous generations.

My parents would never think about going to a restaurant because they could get something better at home was the argument and that has stuck but then as generations have gone through you now get to a point where a 18 or 19 year old couldn’t think about cooking something at home, just go get it at a restaurant, go out for it (Educator 7).

With extensive industry employment combined with normalisation of attending hotels and restaurants, the respondents believe it is becoming more acceptable to perform a service role.

That whole scenario has changed, perception and attitude has changed to hospitality and that’s why I think it is becoming more acceptable, ‘cause now it’s acceptable to go out and serve somebody (Educator 7).

Increased exposure to the industry was also attributed to the escalation of reality TV shows such as MasterChef and Hell’s Kitchen. Many employers took offence to these TV shows on the basis they spread inaccurate perceptions of the industry. In accordance with the literature review, the hospitality industry was depicted by respondents as hard work, fast paced, with constant technological and knowledge revisions and with diverse geographical locations and timeframes, an industry where employees need to grow up quickly and where the customer was not always right.

Some customers will go out of the way to get something for nothing, they will complain to get something for nothing I’ve seen it happen (Employer 1).

The assertion that anyone can work and succeed in hospitality was aggressively contested by all respondents.

Employer 5: ... the advance of all these culinary shows and MasterChef drives me up the wall.
Employer 6: They so glamorise it, don’t they ... As much as they say a lot of work done in the restaurant is common sense, to wipe a table, pick up, you’ll be surprised how many people you come across that don’t know how to wipe a table.
Employer 4: I do think a lot of people think hospitality is an easy industry, ‘Oh, it’s just a little job to do while I’m at university or as a second job’, but they don’t realise the demands of the industry.

Participants were in agreement that hospitality qualifications were both under recognised and undervalued. The respondents have observed many employers don’t value hospitality qualifications and those that do, do not care about the course details
but rather the outcomes as to employability of graduates. Attitude and experience or acquired skills are considered by the respondents as more important than qualifications.

Really don’t give a rats what you’ve got, what qualifications, if you have the right attitude I’ll train you, I’ll train you to the standard of this establishment (Educator 1).

What does industry see in a degree? It’s about outcomes, it’s not necessarily about the content (Educator 3).

What does society expect of you like for example if you’re an airline pilot you can’t afford to make one mistake but if you’re a waiter in a restaurant well you could probably get by making a couple of mistakes as nothing’s going to happen, hinge on that, so the other aspect of training in general is if you want to be a brain surgeon, god you want to make sure you get it right. But if you’re a general manager of a 5-star hotel that gets it wrong occasionally it still runs legally and profitably, does it matter? (Educator 7).

The prevalent belief that you must start from the bottom and work your way up the career ladder was reaffirmed by all focus groups. The only concession was that you can be working at the bottom levels whilst participating in tertiary education to expedite progression in the industry.

That element of very strong practical experience is required in order to move people through the organisation (Employer 7).

The best managers are the ones that start at the bottom (Educator 1).

The university graduates further expressed concerns over senior hospitality professionals/managers featuring as guest speakers within their course delivery sending conflicting messages to students as to the value and necessity of degree qualifications to succeed in the industry. Furthermore there was unanimous recognition by all sample groups that many hospitality owners, particularly small to medium, are not tertiary educated.

On further exploration the value of hospitality qualifications was deemed in current times to also be dependent on the industry sector and size of the business, following recent developments within large-scale hotels and clubs. Educator 4 from both TAFE and university with extensive and current industry experience predicts/anticipates hospitality employees will need a degree in the future for entry and progression. This belief was based on the increased education focus in Australia and worldwide, and evidenced already in part within the graduate programs of larger hotel chains.
Hilton has [its] elevator program and Four Seasons has [the] Manager In Training (MIT) program; all of these different programs that the hotel groups offer, the minimum requirement is a bachelor’s degree, they will not accept anything less than that (Educator 3).

As Educator 5 explains, Australia’s industrial awards for hospitality do not state requirements for ‘upper tier bachelor tertiary qualifications’. Commercial cookery qualifications for chefs do currently feature and the club industry does support diploma-level structures however, the absence of more stringent alignment with tertiary education precludes enhanced appreciation of degree qualifications.

A prime issue for the hospitality industry in Australia and a major impediment to transforming tertiary education was identified as the lack of regulation.

We’re the most unregulated and unlicensed industry in the country ... We have licences here but the licences in hospitality relate to the benefit of government as far as control goes and collection of revenue, not so much safety (Educator 6).

Consequently the hospitality industry was further described by Educator 6 as an ‘opportunists industry’ and regarded as a conundrum, both a negative in terms of risk—for instance to patrons from food poisoning—and as a positive:

It’s part of this great free country of ours where you can go out and start a business up without a qualification and can do it (Educator 6).

The respondents debated that whilst the industry is in need of increased legislative requirements, it is not ready for changes to be made; this is illustrated by the point:

They’re still working out weekend pay at the moment (Educator 5).

Other characteristics of the hospitality industry identified by respondents included being renowned for being one of the lowest paying industries. The prevalence of young university students across various disciplines working in hospitality as transient employees was noted, as a ‘means to an end’ (Educators 6 and 7). It was also recognised that many hospitality employees, particularly in small–medium businesses, start work often at a young age in family owned/managed hospitality businesses.

High labour rates were identified as constituting a major challenge to business. Historically high demand and scarce supply were identified as contributing to employment of unqualified people. Supporting the literature review, the respondents
discussed the hospitality industry skills shortage. The existence of government incentives to employ students, indigenous individuals and people with a disability were recognised, but deemed ineffective, with respondents advocating the government needs to investigate why. The employers declared a need for people who are interested and passionate in a hospitality career. Conflicting with this overt need to find suitable employees, the respondents stated that hospitality employers do not want employees to have transportable skills in fear of losing staff to competitors or other industries. Graduate 5, the only graduate successful in achieving a graduate-level position within hospitality, suggested that the industry appeared to be experiencing graduate underemployment with graduates applying for basic jobs not requiring a qualification. All sample groups expressed concerns that hospitality graduates are departing to other industries, with significant student attrition rates experienced within hospitality tertiary institutions. The other important staffing issue raised in employing staff from diverse backgrounds was the sheer hard work involved:

There are huge barriers for someone with a disability to spend any great length of time in the industry because it is so time weary; you know the whole kind of process of what it’s like, the shifts, the long periods of time standing, just the whole energy and dynamic of hospitality (Employer 7).

Descriptions of bureaucratic organisational structures within hospitality precluding the empowerment of staff were given by both employers and educators. Specific examples of centralised decision making were given within hotels and hospitals, with responses to requests delayed on account of submission through multiple levels of hierarchy for determination by the CEO/board of directors alone. Hesitancy to try new ideas and innovate was cited as a drawback to efficacy:

The answer came back no ... we’ve never done it before (Educator 4).

The majority of the industry is comprised of small-scale businesses typically faced with monetary and time constraints. Small hospitality businesses were depicted as possessing an internal and short-term focus. Factors like the tendency to ‘silo’ organisational work; be exceedingly territorial and refusing to share information; inability to understand the bigger picture of community, external environments and strategic partnering for mutual benefit all contributed to barriers to progression of industry interests and collaboration with hospitality tertiary educational institutions.
I don’t want to worry about it ‘cause someone else will benefit from it or what will I get from it, I’m too busy, too much red tape, all that sort of stuff (Educator 5).
Small-to-medium-sized enterprise; most businesses that fit into that have no concept of their [industry] (Employer 7).
Invasion of their inner sanctum and they don’t want that, they’re very comfortable with their own boundaries ... and they don’t want somebody else coming in and telling them what to do (Educator 6).

Interesting insights into how the industry has evolved over the last few decades were delivered through respondent recounts. When many of the respondents were starting out in hospitality, it was acceptable and commonplace to ‘beg’ employers for work experience. The respondents were not concerned at the time whether this was paid work experience, as the overwhelming priority was attaining experience. They acknowledge this does not happen today as the legislative environment has changed in regards to work experience, with a focus now on insurance and establishing formal employment contracts. A lack of networking by younger generations and utilising primarily internet databases such as seek.com are further considered by this older generation as a sign of poor work ethic. Another sign of changing times was identified as seniority not counting compared to its significance in the past and the apparent ‘softening’ of the industry especially in the kitchen where apprentice hazing is under increased scrutiny and bullying punishable by law were all recognised as shaping the perceptions of the industry.

The next section presents a mind map, thematically delineated by issues pertinent to the hospitality industry. They are broadly clumped under five main titles: Industry Labour Force, Industry Work, Socio-economic Status, Hospitality Education and Miscellaneous, which includes aspects such as inertia and short-term foci.
Figure 5.1 Hospitality Industry as Depicted by Focus Group Respondents

Hospitality Industry

- Lacks regulation
- Opportunist industry
- Diversity: geographic, time, job types, etc.
- Lack external community consciousness
- Inertia to change
- Casualisation/transient workforce
- High labour costs
- Inefficient industry associations
- Predominantly SMEs
- Fast paced
- Constant flux—technology, knowledge...
- Family owned/managed

Industry Work

- Low pay
- Hard work
- On-job training, need experience/attitude
- Fast paced
- Predominantly SMEs

Industry Labour Force

- Short-term focus
- Bureaucratic and centralised organisations
- Inefficient industry associations
- Predominantly SMEs
- Constant flux—technology, knowledge...
- Family owned/managed

Miscellaneous

- Lack regulation
- Opportunist industry
- Diversity: geographic, time, job types, etc.
- Lack external community consciousness
- Inertia to change
- Casualisation/transient workforce
- High labour costs
- Inefficient industry associations
- Predominantly SMEs
- Fast paced
- Constant flux—technology, knowledge...
- Family owned/managed

Social-economic Status

- Reality TV glamorising industry
- Normalisation in lifestyle
- Core industry Australia
- Undervalued industry
- Undervalued tertiary qualifications
- Providers: TAFE/University/Colleges/Graduate Programs

Hospitality Education

- Hard work
- Low pay
- On-job training, need experience/attitude
- Fast paced
- Predominantly SMEs
- Constant flux—technology, knowledge...
- Family owned/managed
Remarkably, criticisms of hospitality industry associations in regards to their poor track record of servicing hospitality businesses and for not helping to raise education standards in the industry were expressed by industry employers. Beyond calls for industry collaboration in WIL initiatives, industry associations including the Restaurant and Caterers Association and Australian Hotels Association were accused of not furthering the interests of the industry. Although lack of funding was acknowledged as a challenge for these associations, it was perceived that poor management was the cause of their failure to make a more substantial contribution.

The marketing of hospitality associations was deemed inefficient, precluding awareness of services available for all hospitality businesses and with poor communication with industry resulting in questionable value of membership. The competency and qualifications of association management were questioned especially regarding their ability to recognise these flaws and make the necessary changes and drive the necessary industry change.

The Restaurant and Caterers I think are a non-profit organisation, they run off the smell of an oily rag so to promote, even get, membership into that organisation therefore tell all the restaurants and cafes what all the benefits are is difficult ... there’s probably a case to answer for organisations like the RCA and the AHA to promote it [WIL] more If you go on the restaurant and catering website, it will have training but you have to look really hard to find out what you get ... half of them won’t join the Restaurant and Caterers and they probably should. It’s costing them 500–600 dollars, which is a lot of money for a restaurant ... you go on their website and I specifically looked at training and I thought, where does it tell me if I’m a prospective restaurant that I can actually make money out of training and make good money ...

The restaurant and caterers they’re sort of, like, we got bigger things to worry about, what’s bigger than making a restaurant more profitable and bringing people to make the industry more a better place, training, the customer wins, the student wins and the restaurant wins (Employer 3).

5.2.1 TAFE vs University

The focus groups sought to investigate the difference between TAFE and university as recognised by the sample groups and the extent of respondent knowledge and preference for each format. The graduates distinguished university as being harder with a more theoretical basis, longer duration courses and more expensive. Conversely, TAFE was described as being more practical and operationally focused although it was
acknowledged this changed at the higher-level TAFE qualifications. The recent emergence of TAFE degrees and university diplomas confused graduates.

University is more theory and more writing and essays and stuff like that (Graduate 2).

TAFE was a lot more operations focused, whereas university was a lot more theory and research focused (Graduate 5).

The choice to pursue TAFE qualifications over university was based on a combination of factors including a lack of confidence and self discipline to commit, concentrate and achieve at university level, self knowledge and preference for more practical learning styles, affordability and in one instance visa restrictions precluded a HECS debt to support university entrance.

Another reason I didn’t choose university over TAFE was TAFE was a bit cheaper than university and also visa. I’m not allowed to, I don’t have that many benefits as a citizen, I’m a citizen for 10 years; I think my visa doesn’t allow me to get HECS, that little help that university gives you and then you pay later so I couldn’t afford the full amount of the course either (Graduate 2).

Cultural influences to attend university were also observed:

I choose degree as my qualification because I came from an Asian background and you know Asians they looking for, they are more educated, they want their child, you know, my mum she really wanted me to be educated, bachelor’s degree even masters (Graduate 4).

In terms of preference, graduates believe employer choice between TAFE and university graduates depends on the organisation’s stance. The university graduates recognised the higher order skill set developed by a university education, such as reflection and analysis, is beneficial to graduate-level industry roles and gave them the necessary knowledge to be able to apply it to their own work.

I did the degree and then of course it gave me that data evaluation part so I know I’m doing it but how can I do it better; how can I do it in a better way and how can I evaluate the performance which I have for the work I have just done, and this is where it gave me benefits as soon as I finished the degree and then I was able to reflect back to my work (Graduate 5).

From the employers’ perspective, only one employer distinguished between TAFE- and university-earned qualifications within the hospitality industry.

I don’t think there’s any difference especially in the hospitality industry (Employer 4).
The discussion focused more on the outcome being a ‘graduate’, someone who has a demonstrated commitment to study for a period of time, rather than the type of tertiary education, with the implication that such qualifications were of less significance in an industry like hospitality as compared to neurosurgery. Employer 2, who agreed with this sentiment, was acquainted with differing formats:

TAFE has it pigeon-holed whereas university can’t try and grab everything at once.

Employer 5 explained that qualifications between TAFE and university graduates only came into play when hiring specialists like chefs. The expression of such perceived value emanating from employers speaks volumes about their understanding of the courses and marketing efforts by university to inform industry.

It goes down to what course you’re doing, we’ve taken on apprentices who come straight out of TAFE who’ve done their apprenticeship straight out of a TAFE college; I’m currently working with a couple of guys who’ve done a university course but they’ve both done different courses. Certificate III Commercial Cookery is what’s needed for the apprenticeship and these guys have done Certificate IV, which is more of the management-based stuff (Employer 5).

The most astute discussion stemmed from the two focus groups featuring educators. The educators recognised the uncertainty and historical misconceptions held by the wider community in the old adage ‘TAFE = practical and university = theoretical’ along with the persistent question, ‘Why a degree in cookery?’ The educator consensus was that TAFE applied a more competency skill-based approach particularly for the trade certificate qualifications and the array of specialised courses corresponding to specific industry roles such as cake decorating. University was described as developing higher order learning skills with a less hands-on approach, the extent of such approaches dependent upon the individual university’s stance on palming off skills training to industry. Both formats were associated with similar vocational outcomes of employability within the hospitality industry, though educators recommend students should commence at TAFE then progress to university if they want the higher qualifications. Educators acknowledged difficulties in articulating from TAFE to university study as TAFE courses were dynamic and constantly being revised.

We all do the same things just differently (Educator 2).

The prime function of them doing our course [university] is to be independent thinkers and to critique things and challenge things ... They ask us why should we do your degree; why can’t I just go on to TAFE, and the parents ask us this as well because they are toying
with big money values ... the parents ask as well, why should I send my son or daughter to get a degree; they still see it as a degree in cooking but it’s totally not like that (Educator 3).

Throughout the discussions other similarities were identified, with both TAFE and university currently undergoing hospitality course reviews following other ‘drastic’ changes in recent years. This process has involved industry consultation proving a challenge to finding suitably informed industry employers to contribute to curricula refinement.

We’re constantly trying to speak with and find more industry people to speak to government bodies, associations, unions and so forth; we sit on a variety of different advisory groups, to get their input and we can then take that back to say the training package development people and say look this needs to be incorporated into things. So we are constantly try to find more people to speak up. As I mentioned to you earlier that’s the hard part, to get enough people in the same room with enough knowledge of what they’re talking about to be able to say categorically, ‘Listen, this is what we need, not what you are actually giving us’, so getting those people in the same room and speaking as one is a very difficult thing to do; whereas at the moment a lot of upper-tier people particularly in government bodies do have their own certain little agendas and it is very, very hard to leave that hat at home when you walk into these types of conversations (Educator 5).

Specific loopholes threatening TAFE institute integrity were identified as analogous to the occurrence of dilution of hospitality-specific content amongst some university hospitality degree programs.

Issues with curriculum—TAFE non-trade versus trade certificates—leads to confusion from industry; the living document at TAFE constantly changing; loopholes in TAFE—once you’ve done the cores you can go on and do electives from basically any other industry ... Imagine someone coming along with a diploma of hospitality when they’ve only done marginal hospitality units and you’ve employed them. Where’s the goodwill for training gone from there? (Educator 6).

Reducing the units, the core units, I mean the new package that’s coming in is just the skin and bones there is no flesh to it at all and it’s difficult for those of us that have seen what it used to be like and that it had meat and quality ... We’ve got skin-and-bones training packages and a skin-and-bones budget, so, you know, our hands are tied (Educator 1).

Whoever does it they think they know ... They haven’t spoken to the students, what is it that you really prefer? While those guys up there who are writing out these books and notes are formulating the course, they think they know that the students really prefer online but they haven’t spoken to those guys. How do you know that? Oh, because they
are very technology savvy, so they’re technology savvy, does that mean that they learn better or they prefer to learn online? It’s got nothing to do with how they learn or what they learn ... So I think while the industry tells the academic side or the VET side that you must give us what we want, the industry should also get a little bit more realistic and go back to the students or to the younger generation; ok, what is it that drives you? How do you learn? (Educator 4).

Educators from universities and the VET sector identified problems with current program structures and financial constraints, which will be further addressed in sections 5.5 and 5.7. All educators appeared to be struggling to adjust to evolving pedagogy, with movement towards online technologies and WIL in curricula whilst facing bureaucratic hurdles. Distance learning schemes, TAFE, OTEN and Open University, overcome some access issues such as geographical distance, time constraints and family commitments, whilst introducing further challenges in regards to consistency and competency assessment. References to challenges associated with differentiating from other tertiary hospitality providers were raised along with the ubiquitous ignorance of tertiary hospitality education. The theme of competition between tertiary institutions featured repeatedly in the educator sessions, with educators expressing a strong desire to collaborate in terms of pedagogy and curricula development and TAFE/university student migration. Whilst relationships have been established to create new TAFE degrees and university diplomas, this is still to the exclusion of more substantial collaboration. The ‘stigma’ of TAFE and vocational education labels so feared by university bureaucrats and different semantics present hurdles to furthering mutual benefit; this is compounded by the resistance of industry to share information and the belief that sharing of such information is against commercial interests.

The differences in educator standards, with the TAFE system having highly rigid currency requirements and teaching qualifications and each university setting their own variable conditions, means TAFEs compare favourably to universities. Regardless of educator qualifications, respondents expressed concerns that in each format, information communicated to students was not always current, leading to students subsequently discrediting educators.

I had a few teachers that made me doubt if they knew what they were doing (Graduate 2).
I was in the industry at the same time and they were showing us the operating system of a hotel property management system and... I knew much more than the teacher from what I had been taught in the industry. Sometimes we have to be careful ‘cause she was teaching the wrong stuff and I then started to discredit her as a student (Educator 3).

5.3 Exploration into Graduate Employability

The deficiencies of the tertiary hospitality education system implicit in the previous section have direct correlation to respondent concerns for declining graduate employability. The educators were particularly aware of the diminishing priority of employability skills within hospitality curricula, with over-theorisation of units and with the elimination of professional skills development units within TAFE and some universities. There was relative consensus that hospitality graduates would need to be further trained in industry to meet standards.

When I was training people that I’d employed or just graduated as part of the TAFE system or university, when they had to face the challenge and make the real decision they still needed the support, they needed that little bit of finishing off from us to get them focused to know where they need to go and what to do (Educator 6).

The deficiencies of the system were further attributed to perpetuating inadequate training for trainers, as tertiary hospitality courses are not teaching students the skills required for their future career paths.

In all aspects of our structured training, chefs, the food and beverage manager, very little of the content is actually given to actually how to train staff, there is token training in there and therein lies a big problem that we are not encouraging them to actually adopt that as part of their qualification and that they would know how to pass on those skills and how to disseminate, you know, what is required (Educator 7).

Despite degree qualifications as the minimum entry requirement for many industries, the benefits of a degree qualification or similar in hospitality have long been questioned and this study sought to gauge the current temperature on this issue. All sample groups acknowledged that completion of a university degree demonstrated a graduate had discipline and commitment to the industry and to hard work. There was a definite value in a university degree over no degree for graduates through enhanced employability and for employers through updated knowledge transfer and higher quality recruits.
When you finish university, in the long-term industry will appreciate that having been to university and such-and-such school specifically, you’ve had to adhere to grooming standards, you’ve had to submit assignments on time, come to class, you’ve had to do all these things and in the course of doing all that it demonstrated commitment to something long term (Educator 3).

What formal qualifications do is they get you in the door and then there’s a multiple stage process you’ve got your formal qualifications, you’ve got your CV and so I would read your CV and say, ok, this person has qualifications but this [other] person has experience so I would say, who do I pick first? Depends on the role, to be honest, I would probably pick someone who is going to hit the ground running unless I’m looking for a management position and then it might be a bit different (Employer 3).

Get your foot in the door, initially, if you already have your foot in the door based on you know one of the house stewards there, or their uncle gives you a job for whatever reason and you work your way up, then people in-house are always going to get an advantage over people coming in externally because they know what you are capable of (Employer 2).

For Australians having a degree that actually enables them to go overseas and do better and bring that experience back eventually to the country, so you know there are benefits in them actually having that to make sure they can connect along the way (Employer 7).

The respondents cite transferability of degree skill sets as an observed benefit, with graduates easily moving between industries. The downside of this benefit is the flow of hospitality graduates out of the industry.

A lot of the students who were in my year, most of them are out of the industry already and that’s less than five years, I see that as a bit of a shame because they work so hard during the degree and they were so passionate (Educator 3).

On the converse side, expectations of job outcome on graduation, particularly for the expensive university courses, and of graduate level/middle management positions are not a guarantee. There is a general lack of understanding of what is in a hospitality degree—‘not just simply cookery’—and a further lack of alignment of upper-tier degree qualifications with industry career path.

When you look at career progression ... if you have got a university degree, where else can you go. Yeah you can go on and get your masters and your PhD but that’s some full-on stuff as far as your education is concerned, as far as your career path is concerned; do you really go to the top end of the stream then realise well there’s not much further I can go, I’ve got to actually go back and start again at the bottom (Educator 5).
When respondents were asked to discuss the value of ‘a hospitality degree qualification compared to three years of hospitality experience’, there was no definitive preference indicated. The respondents noted that the once explicit preference for experience has begun to change over the last few decades corresponding to a flood of graduates into the industry. Intense discussion on this issue was observed within each focus group session. Many graduates were of the belief that a degree means nothing if not accompanied by experience. Consensus was that both experience and qualifications were needed, however, experience seemed to still outweigh qualifications for immediate employability.

If I was going to employ somebody who had three years experience and compared to a person who just had a degree with no experience, I’d take the person with the three years experience (Educator 2).

This verdict corresponded to findings from the quantitative survey results. Importantly, the type of experience was scrutinised, as experience alone does not guarantee skill and knowledge attainment.

It depends, it really depends; the student could have had three years of experience in the industry but they could have just pushed a glass around the table and not really learnt anything from it (Educator 3).

Hospitality basically doesn’t need a qualification as long as you’ve got experience or even if you get a qualification you need to build up some experience before you move on in your career (Graduate 5).

From the employer perspective, no experience was an indication of a poor work ethic.

Well I look on applications and if they haven’t worked while they’re at school to me that means they’ve laid on the lounge watching television. If they haven’t worked while they’re at university, that’s it! I discount them for those reasons alone. It’s great that they’ve had a financial background where they don’t have to work but it’s not showing that they can interact in the workplace and it’s a big thing for someone to go straight out of school or university into the workplace at say 22 years of age (Employer 4).

Though acknowledging the selection process was based on more than just experience, quality experience was still highly valued and often the deciding factor for several employers. The use of competency demonstrations during recruitment was still often used as a benchmark, e.g. making a cappuccino.

If you are going to get people that have got the formal and/or the practical experience merging together, you are going to get better product in the end, better service attitude to mention the flow-on effect ...

There is nothing like experience is there? The sooner you start the better ...
If I am hiring the brightest university student who may be studying business or marketing or whatever but then I get someone in who’s already had the experience and walk in can you make a cup of coffee, a good cup of coffee the answer is yes (Employer 3).

Whilst most of the graduates had industry experience prior to commencing tertiary education, Graduate 4 stated that many employers recruiting graduates want them to have minimum three years management-level experience.

I just graduated from university and I’m looking for a full-time position in a club or hotels but they’re looking for three years at least industry experience ... but the experience they are looking for is management level, I already got like four years experience in the hospitality industry but ... not in management (Graduate 4).

Hospitality graduates were deemed to have a clear advantage for entrance into the industry, conditional on attitude and enhanced with experience. Experience translates into respect:

If you get someone who is formally qualified and they come in at a certain level you have to think about the position within the organisation as well. Nobody really, if we’re honest, likes somebody who’s qualified without any experience and all of a sudden they are up there; you have to earn respect (Employer 3).

The extent to which a degree or other formal qualification was determined to factor in career progression was more contentious. Opposition was on the basis of work performance determining promotion.

If you have got two people who are essentially equal in an establishment and looking for a promotion, it will be based on work performance not on a piece of paper (Employer 2).

The alternative perspective considered the higher learning skills imparted through tertiary education including reflection and analysis that would be more beneficial in the long term or when recruiting for management-level positions. The verdict appeared to be ‘more practical needed to get the job and more theory needed to progress’.

At this point of time I don’t see a lot of benefit of getting a degree and still working in the industry but if I look at after 5 years, after 10 years, I might start getting rewards for the time and money I have invested (Graduate 5).

You can’t have a senior management position without any experience in hospitality, you just don’t know what is going to happen, how do you know? You can’t run a function for 500 people with no experience, it just won’t work if you don’t have those foundation skills to understand how food is prepared, how service standards operate, what the actual service standards are (Educator 7).
5.3.1 Desired Characteristics of Hospitality Employees

To help gauge expectations and desired traits for hospitality graduates, the respondents were asked to identify desired characteristics for hospitality employees. Figures 5.2 and 5.3 showcase the main responses, with the tag cloud showcasing frequency of the terms used by respondents through font size. Attitude was valued as the most important characteristic followed closely by experience.

I think it depends upon the individual; again two people could have the same piece of paper, management or non-management diploma or not diploma, but again it’s like [Employer 3] said: attitude is a key factor, willingness to learn really, willingness to help out when needed, I think it depends on the individual (Employer 2).

If I can give a simple analogy that a lot of people think that having a driver’s licence is a right that you have, when it’s actually a privilege to have a driver’s licence and it’s a bit like that with some people with degrees or qualifications, they think it’s their right to be in a certain position because they have that qualification as opposed to the privilege of being in it, so I think that that gets back to attitude (Educator 7).

If your attitude’s great and you’re going to work hard, and you care, employers love employees that care and even if they have the right attitude and they’re not doing the right thing, they make mistakes but the care factor’s there, we will all try to nurture that person (Employer 3).

References to education were present in the mix though at a lower frequency, with respondents clarifying the value placed on education was ultimately dependent on attitude. A range of other related terms to attitude such as ‘passion’, ‘willingness’ and ‘care’ were also cited.
A recurring theme influencing graduate employability is the generational link. Generation X and Y people currently pursuing tertiary education and entering the industry are readily described as ‘arrogant’, ‘disrespectful’, having a ‘poor work ethic’ and ‘expect to enter industry as managers’ without having to work their way up from the bottom.

I found they’re overly confident, more arrogant thinking they know it and no matter how much you told them the old way, they just think you’re talking crap[sic]. I got a lot of disrespect and a lot of staff who weren’t listening ... a lot of them don’t like cleaning,
don’t like mopping, don’t like wiping, a lot of them are more in the selling aspect of the thing (Employer 6).

One of the biggest problems I found with graduates from any course that have come out with a so-called, say, hospitality management course or diploma of hospitality they would walk into a job and expect that they were going to walk in right to the top of the tree (Educator 6).

My generation, it was all about being loyal, but this generation coming through it’s not about being loyal, let me tell you (Employer 1).

I think kids are working younger if they’ve got the work ethic; I think if they can avoid working they will ... they just want the money, don’t want to work (Graduate 3).

Such attitudes may also be traced back to the misconceptions about the nature of the industry and types of career pathways. These stereotypes are reinforced through marketing by educational institutions and glamorisation by the media, where hospitality persons are treated as celebrities. The educators further discussed pressure placed on them by employers to address student attitudes as part of graduates’ expectations.

Industry always says we want you to produce better employees with a better attitude; I mean how do you? How do you? I mean if anyone has a recipe for attitude (Educator 2).

Another emerging theme to be analysed further in Chapter 6 is the deficiencies of primary and secondary education. The respondents’ mindsets were that many of the issues with graduate unemployability are a direct result of changes to school curricula and means of delivery. Traditional workplace skills, including observation, initiative and common sense, are being replaced by technology.

They’re learning so much, so much more advanced than even when you went to school that a lot of the self-initiative and observation in the workplace is lost (Employer 4).

Employer 6: They just don’t know how to ask.

Employer 4: So it goes back to their basic education not the tertiary education

Employer 6: That’s it, it is, it’s the basics. If they don’t get that, if they don’t learn that through high school.

I don’t think they will need to know anything, they’d have laptops in front of them (Employer 6).

The removal of professional development units within TAFE and many universities exacerbated these outcomes according to respondents.
5.3.2 Prior Knowledge of WIL
Prior respondent knowledge of WIL was appraised in each focus group before a detailed explanation of the term and examples used in this study were provided for them to review. The graduates and employers hesitantly suggested from the title that it involved the blending of theory and practice though the extent of knowledge on the subject matter was limited. It was found that many graduates and employers did not relate their previous experiences or organisation’s activities to WIL. For the select few determined to have previous WIL experiences, the connection to the pedagogy was not linked until much later in the conversations, on benefits and negatives, where they were then able to share their experiences. Educators from both TAFE and university were reasonably well informed on the WIL concept. They were able to self-moderate an in-depth intellectual discussion considering perspectives of multiple stakeholders on a magnitude of issues and deliberate on the benefits, negatives and recommendations for WIL. The educators welcomed the research attention on WIL, recognising the urgency to address WIL in tertiary hospitality curricula; graduates and employers echoed these sentiments as soon as the agenda for WIL and its incorporation was discussed.

5.3.3 Respondent WIL Experiences
To facilitate the respondents’ ability to probe the benefits and negatives of WIL, they were first asked to declare previous involvement in WIL initiatives. The types of respondent WIL experiences are displayed in Figure 5.4.
Figure 5.4: Respondent WIL Experiences
5.4 WIL Benefits

The benefits and negatives of WIL were pursued further in the focus groups from multiple stakeholder perspectives. The intent was to help stimulate critical thinking for addressing research Question 4: ‘What aspects of WIL need to be managed for realisation of these benefits and minimisation of the negatives in hospitality?’ To avoid repetition, this section only touched on this briefly as the main agenda was to extract from the data the specific areas to control and assist in devising recommendations.

As depicted in Figure 5.5, Educator Benefits were classified into two areas namely: benefits for the Institution and benefits for their personal Careers. The initial reaction to the question of benefits for educators was, ‘I don’t think there are any benefits for us’ (Educator 7). On the proviso of WIL being adequately resourced, designed and executed, the institutional benefits included better quality and informed students with a better skill set as it was determined that only committed students with a higher interest and concentration level, plus willing and able to contribute more, would remain in the course if they had job choice confirmed by early industry exposure. Institutional benefits also comprised: access to industry training resources and departments; enhanced educational product, more effective course delivery and practical context; enhanced product and institutional competitiveness; progression planning and development of better quality educators who remain in touch with industry; and availability of placements and experiences for students to enhance breadth of exposure to industry.

From the educators’ perspective they may not retain some of the students but more likely they will get a higher interest level from the students knowing they can come back and they can contribute more (Employer 3).

Weed out the ones who really aren’t suited to that industry early on (Employer 4).

... more realistic setting for the students to learn (Educator 6).

If we can get industry to engage with us and articulate with us, we would be able to be more effective to deliver what we are training now; you could get the opportunity to put it in a more practical context as well. You could only do so much with simulated environments but if you have somebody who’s learning in work, an actual work environment, they’re actually coming across work problems on a regular basis, unforeseen problems which they have to be challenged by, have to solve these problems (Educator 6).
In terms of educator careers it was readily accepted that their participation and administration in WIL served to update personal knowledge of industry and prevailing techniques as well as providing opportunities to contribute to industry.

**Figure 5.5: Benefits of WIL for Each Sample Group**

The benefits for the employers were more extensive and free flowing, categorised as: organisational learning, labour supply, quality recruits, monetary, time saving, productivity and philanthropic. The potential for the transfer of skills and knowledge across the organisation was recognised: updating employers about new training techniques, products and legislative changes. There were also development opportunities for existing staff to take on training roles.

... new techniques in training, new ways of applying things, even sometime new products and so by having the work in the learning space like this, what you’re doing is integrated learning, giving them an opportunity to actually up their skills as well (Employer 7).
It keeps your employees up to date with current market trends and educational practices (Employer 4).

Work placement students represented a steady source of free labour with the potential to cover labour supply shortfalls due to seasonality or special projects. Students also represented potential future employees for these employers. The arguments supporting better quality recruits comprised: brand standard trained recruits; passionate individuals wanting a hospitality career; proven work ethic (discipline and confidence); and recruits with the basic skills and experience of how to clean a table, carry plates, etc., who can hit the ground running.

I think by far the biggest benefit that comes is you get a far more tangible product; I hate to use that term but from a student you are getting something you can already use (Educator 6).

Discipline, confidence, product knowledge, customer service, skills, reputation, someone who’s willing to work instead of just study (Employer 3).

If you are going to get people that have got the formal and the practical experience merging together, you are going to get better product in the end, better service attitude to mention the flow-on effect (Employer 3).

I think the newest out of university or out of any kind of educational environment employees are the ones that should be on your committees, especially for delegating things well ‘cause they’ve got the newest knowledge (Employer 4).

Monetary benefits represent a huge incentive for hospitality businesses. Saving measures of WIL were identified as follows: save on training costs as recruits are already trained; higher retention rates decrease recruitment costs as WIL graduates are informed and have tested compatibility to industry; and availability of government incentives, including to employ apprentices (paid on completion) and tax exemptions.

It works out cheaper for businesses ‘cause you don’t have to go through intensive training of a new staff member (Employer 1).

At the end of the day I ended up getting a sizeable incentive and after 13 weeks and then again after 26 weeks ... if they get hired by an employer in the industry, yes, that has to be a minimum 8 hours or preferably 15 hours a week for 13 weeks and then they will get an incentive, then after 26 they will get another incentive and it’s duplicated and it could be like $1,500 after 13 weeks, another $1,500 after 26 (Employer 3).

Having WIL-experienced recruits reduces required training time. WIL also benefits business productivity with quality improvement and a better experience for customers.
Philanthropic benefits facilitating opportunities for employers to contribute to the education of students for the benefit of the industry were also highlighted. This ties in with the suggestion of the economic contribution by WIL to lowering unemployment levels and consequently requirements for welfare support.

You don’t have to go through intensive training (Employer 1).
Harvest the future market of labour (Educator 6).

Conditioned on quality and suitability of WIL experiences, the benefits for graduates were classified as: career, educational, personal/social and monetary. The career benefits comprised: opportunity to find out about industry, confirm industry fit and potentially identify preference for specialised fields; enhanced employability of graduates having both the theoretical and the practical, helping entrance into the hospitality industry and career progression; potential reputation of brand training; gain a more realistic career path and timeframe; and job prospects and networking with future employers.

The students, I think that it is important especially since they join us for an undergrad degree, they come in straight from school and don’t know what to expect (Educator 4). Students, after a while, they say, oh no, this is really not what I thought it was, or this is not what I really want to do, so it’s good for them to be able to drop out six months, eight months, one year into a course rather than three years later (Educator 4).

A lot of the girls look at the reception staff at hotels just, oh, they are so glamorous, they are so gorgeous, they just type away on their keyboards that’s all they are doing and then they just pass you keys and have a bit of a chat and that’s not what it’s like and you try explain these things to students, you show them videos, you show them examples, you tell them about your stories and you tell them I would never ever wish being on reception to an intern ever. I would never ever do that, I did it, it was very hard and they are like, oh, she did it that’s all I will listen to. And until they are actually in it, they don’t fully get it (Educator 3).

On the personal/social front, respondents identified WIL as providing students with confidence, resilience and self-esteem. Data that WIL would help reduce culture shock and increase career choice satisfaction was noted from the focus groups.
Graduates are more confident, more self-confident, so then tend to get the respect of other people in the organisation quicker because of their self-confidence (Employer 4).
There was an abundance of educational benefits identified for students, namely: develops critical thinking skills and challenges industry preconceptions; enhances understanding of course materials; instils flexibility in curricula to accommodate various learning styles; practical application of the theory with guidance and opportunities to learn from mistakes in a safe environment; skill development, including negotiation and people management; and potential for recognition of prior learning to reduce course duration.

The students have a much greater understanding of the content material; they get what we’re talking about. When we are talking about management styles, they go, yeah, we had this really shitty boss, so now I understand what their style is; then we talk about finances and they understand about what bosses go through, so they understand a lot more of the course and they are still getting exposed to it ‘cause they continue employment (Educator 3).

A second-year chef apprentice who’s dyslexic, now in a TAFE environment where a lot of it was theoretically based: read the menu, cook the dish, read the text, understand it; he failed miserably and when the new menu came out for the restaurant and he couldn’t do it, the head chef sure enough tore his head off about it and then he turned around and see, ‘Listen, I am actually dyslexic, I actually can’t read’, so the head chef tore his head off again for not telling him earlier; so from then on the learning method changed. There was no longer, here’s the menu, study it and apply it, it was, rightly oh, menu item number one: this is how we cook, ok you watch, he did it again and he learnt that way. It provides them with an alternative means of contextualising the content and being able to put it into a realistic environment (Educator 5).

... an opportunity for the learner to have that practical application of the theoretical knowledge, to be able to integrate into the workforce and be able to understand what’s written on the piece of paper and how to apply it to an actual workforce (Educator 5).

I went to Ryde TAFE, so as you were saying about the authentic restaurant compared to the learning restaurant, we had that as well, so that made things an advantage because if you stuffed up at TAFE, it wasn’t such a big deal but it got you used to the fact that if you stuffed up in the workplace, you were going to get a bit of a bollocking (Employer 5).

Paid WIL placements, including government-mandated payments for apprenticeships offer monetary benefits for students. Students will also save money on their education by having early career confirmation instead of wasting time and money completing a course only to find out they don’t like the industry and then having to re-train for another industry.

Most of our places are paid as well, 98% of them are paid, which is different to the rest of the university (Educator 3).
5.5 WIL Negatives

The graduate and employer focus groups struggled to identify negatives, in striking contrast to the myriad of negatives raised by the educators.

I think what we’re finding here is that we are probably struggling to find negatives (Employer 3).

As depicted in Figure 5.6, Educator Negatives were classified as: risk, personal/social, education quality compromised, time, obstacles, student management, industry management and costs. The educator risks incorporated student health and safety, financial and reputational: duty of care to protect students from being taken advantage of and mistreated; institute and educator reputation on the line if something goes bad; wastage of resources if not planned and executed well; poorly resourced training by employer; legal liability and insurance issues; and funding on course completion threatening financial viability of programs.

Last year I was teaching at Crow’s Nest the second half of the year there and I started with a group of perhaps 12 or 14 or something like that and I finished with a group of 5, so it is disheartening to hear you’ll be funded on completion because it’s really unfair (Educator 4).

Education quality is fundamentally compromised with inherent inconsistencies of quality and experience of the chef or trainer with further uncertainty if the trainer leaves the business. Respondents emphasised that proficiency as a practitioner does not automatically translate into competence as a trainer or indeed English language proficiency and this has implications for WIL and the teaching of WIL.

You have some of the best practitioners in the world but they are the worst educators ‘cause they have never been taught how to communicate their wonderful skills to other people ... There are a lot of people out there who have learned from people who really don’t know what they were talking about. Many people out there have done absolutely no training and been successful via a good streak of luck along the way and then they suddenly become icons or recognised as pillars of the industry and they get to espouse what they believe to be correct and subsequently get proven to be wrong but in the meantime other people have followed along for the ride (Educator 7).

Typically in the cookery area, you’ve got chefs moving in and out of country, they come from different training backgrounds, they don’t always stay put ... They’ve got all these young people underneath them to train and you know their teaching may have nothing to
do with what’s being taught at TAFE or anywhere else and then they’re out [leave] and you know these people are left floundering with only part of the knowledge and other bits they don’t need (Employer 7).

When I was doing my diploma I had this teacher she owned her own business ... and she knew all the background theory, all she needed to know to run a business, but teaching—

I never understood what she was saying (Graduate 2).

WIL was identified as having the potential to scare students away from industry through placement too early in the course, lack of preparation or having a negative experience on placement. Students learning bad industry practices such as poor hygiene, getting incorrect career advice from industry and no acknowledgement or appreciation of work could potentially get turned off the industry, particularly in unpaid placements.

What I do hate though is when we’ve had really good students going into industry ... and the placement isn’t giving them anything ... and mistreat them and often that’s either a turn-on for the student or a turn-off. You can easily get them to leave the industry and it doesn’t often have to be a lot of money, we’ve noticed a voucher, a restaurant voucher, something like that and acknowledgement of your contribution and a thankyou (Educator 2).

On the personal/social front, stress levels were emphasised as a major negative for educators, all of whom are currently involved in WIL in their respective institutes. The educators expressed frustration and anxiety over incessant curricula audits and program reviews, which in their opinions were not addressing the problems, only creating new ones.

I’ve banged my head that many times (Educator 5).

Whilst WIL benchmarks for hospitality educational institutes are absent, the disparity in access to funds and resources between institutes contributed to educators’ anguish. Time was another prominent negative exemplified through: finding placements for students; managing the relationship with business partners; managing the students and matching them with appropriate employers; delays encountered when businesses have to gain approval through multiple levels of hierarchy before an answer is given; and limited time within class and consultation hours to manage WIL programs.

... time to implement the program, so many things these days have to be decided by a committee sort of thing rather than something going to the board of directors; to make a decision it’s got to go through ‘subcommittee A’ first to see if it’s financially viable and it’s got to go through ‘subcommittee B’ to see if it’s time worthy and it’s got to go through another committee to see if they are actually going to be learning something and can it be
put back in. And if all three of these committees agree, great, it goes through to the board of directors and they finally make a decision. If subcommittee A, B and C say yes it’s a good idea and the Board of Directors go no, well there’s sort of six months of wasted time that could have been invested better maybe deciding something else, maybe coming up with a solution (Employer 5).

A number of obstacles to WIL encountered by educators were identified as: limited budgets; large cohorts; capacity restrictions, e.g. with TAFE venues; lack of resources for distance learning and difficulty placing students with disabilities/learning difficulties/poor communication skills/foreign students. Difficulties of securing placements extended to: limited suitable placements on account of predominance of small–medium businesses in industry not consistently able to host students; types of establishments not suitable, i.e. characteristically limited menus at clubs; availability of numerous placements in a small geographical area; competing with other institutions to place students; and business withdrawal on the grounds of cost/risk or noncompliance with WHS.

Most clubs are your typical club menus, they’re aimed at a specific target market that have a specific lean profit-and-loss margin, many of them actually run at a loss and are supportive of other avenues in the clubs, but the style of cooking you will never class as fine dining in many of the menus that you see in the club environment, so that encouragement, yeah, we will teach you how to cook in bulk, and quickly and all the details but if you really want to refine your skills and go further as a very efficient chef we encourage you to go elsewhere to, say, a restaurant (Educator 5).

... a log jam especially if it’s positions that aren’t that widely available in the community. I mean if the local TAFE came to us at the club and said look we’ve got 15 students and we need to place all of them in the next week, where would we put them all and that’s only 15; if it’s across the whole course across the university or TAFE that’s hundreds of students if they are all studying the same thing. In some towns there can’t be that many cafes and restaurants to take them all (Employer 2).

We’ve also got very strict OH&S or WH&S guidelines and numbers so we can’t have more than 15 in a kitchen or a bar area and you can do a lot of things en masse where we can’t and therefore that costs us more money (Educator 1).

Lack of big-business involvement was further emphasised, as they demand quality recruits yet don’t often contribute to facilitate the WIL agenda.

There are some big businesses that contribute but by and large there is more big businesses that don’t contribute as much as they should (Educator 6).
Ironically ... it’s the small and medium-sized businesses that do a lot of the training and the holding together and the making things happen and it’s the big businesses that sit back and go, well, I only want the third-year trainee (Employer 7).

Akin to generational issues, educators acknowledged difficulties managing students in the WIL process: bad students are a burden to educators and business; students not showing up for placement; and educators having to chase students to address disciplinary measures.

I’m having to pull students in on behalf of industry and explain to them why industry is not happy with them because the student’s been reprimanded so many times and the student doesn’t get it (Educator 3).

Managing industry partnerships, particularly guaranteeing a mutually beneficial long-term relationship, posed an array of challenges for educators: businesses wanting to self-select only the best students; educator trepidation in case business have a bad experience; difficulty meeting outrageous demands of business, i.e. stipulating students of a certain age and level of education; establishment of contracts between institute/student/employer; hesitancy of business to commit and sign a contract to offer WIL; business wanting to invest in only one student, not repeating the same training with a constant supply of new students, limiting return on investment for business; arrogance and opposition of business to educators’ instructions on how to run programs in their workplace; and businesses not wanting to assess students.

[xxx] doesn’t want to take students who haven’t completed eight units of study...they actually ideally want them to be 21 (Educator 3).

In some of those, especially three-hatted restaurants, one of the things that they want, well first of all very few want someone that’s green, they want a third year with all the experience that a third year has but only pay first-year rate (Employer 7).

Everyone just wants to go and advertise for the second-year apprentices ‘cause ... they don’t want to start polishing someone and then utilise cause they know that’s just the trend in the industry and you are going to leave down the line or after a year, so you wouldn’t be able to get a lot of or at least expected value out of that person, so why would you spend on that person when you are not getting any return unless it’s a not-for-profit business (Graduate 5).

They would much rather have the person there they started investing in to keep that person, ‘cause that made the whole operation gel a lot better than to have somebody continuing to come in (Educator 6).
... creates an invasion of their inner sanctum ... they don’t want somebody else coming in and telling them what to do ... they wouldn’t mind people in their workplace but they wouldn’t like the input from trainers and outsiders ... (Educator 6).

... accepting of new knowledge and that is often at times the issue because some employers don’t want to hear about it, I know everything (Employer 4).

The financial costs of WIL programs were identified as: staff wages, with several institutes employing WIL placement officers, extra admin or teaching staff to cover classes of staff engaged in WIL; gifts for industry to maintain and show gratitude for their involvement; recruitment activities such as fairs to find placements for students; TAFE covers insurance costs for students on placement; transportation for educator site visits; and resources such as paperwork.

We have staff wages ... we have the person responsible for WIL maintaining the relationships, we have gifts for industry ... recruitment activities we might run, such as the careers day so we get industry to come in and we run a particular careers day where 33 industry usually come in, so 33 different organisations times about 3–4 staff per organisation, so we provide lunch. We have to hire a function space and we bring students to them and they recruit on the day, so that’s a cost of WIL to us ... what the WIL person does is, that’s their role, their role is to liaise with industry to obtain placements for students and maintain relationships and then there is other staff who support the students who are on placement (Educator 3).

The cost is about setting up and fortifying the actual facilitation of the program for the employer or the host if you like, the cost for the trainer to be able to maintain the integrity of the program by overseeing that the student is getting treated rightly (Educator 6).

The employer negatives were classified as: risk, productivity/product quality, resource intensive, bad students, student availability, inflexibility/lack of control and employee resentment. Risk of damage to the business reputation is through customer exposure to inexperienced students and concerns for legal liability if a student gets injured. These concerns for reputation were heightened by the contemporary threat of social media.

Employer 6: In the restaurant side of things to like, if you’ve got to take the time out to train your staff, you’ve got to do it while you’ve got customers sitting in place, otherwise they are not going to know how to take the order. And you’re standing over you’re worker trying to get this person trained.

Employer 4: ... doesn’t make a good environment for your customers.

Employer 6: And if a customer’s like they heard that your place is fantastic they come in and they don’t get the experience. You know word of mouth is the biggest thing in hospitality, if you have a bad experience at a restaurant you will tell 20 friends that was
the worst place you have ever been and now with Facebook and everything you will see it online and more people will see it. So it could cost you a lot of money in the long run.

Hosting WIL students was associated with reduced productivity as the presumed inexperience of students constituted a burden to business requiring extensive training to correct. The respondents further stressed the necessity of business to be patient and tolerant when dealing with these ‘incompetent’ or ‘inexperienced’ students.

Productivity is not going to be as good, they’ve had their choice of perhaps hiring someone that’s already experienced, so in you go, you know how to use the cash register, you know how to pour a coffee, in you go, ok great, you get someone in who’s maybe not as qualified so there’s that productivity in the initial stages ... the burden, well that person might not know the etiquette of practical experience of doing (Employer 3).

Often times it’s quicker to do it yourself than to show someone. So you have to be prepared when you are training your new staff for someone in the system to invest the time in their education (Employer 4).

Hospitality employers were depicted as preoccupied with ‘return on investment’ (ROI), a significant challenge considering participation in WIL was described as resource intensive with resource wastage a real threat. Respondents mentioned monetary costs were associated with hiring trainers or allotting staff hours to work with WIL students, the high risk of financial outlay with no return regardless of success of WIL programs and with tight operating budgets it is not always financially feasible to take on a student. Design and implementation of WIL programs in business including the associated paperwork was considered time consuming.

The major cost is just the monetary cost, it costs money to train that person, costs money to get a person there to train them, costs time, costs resources, so not everyone’s out there willing because of course it’s a very cost-intensive industry, we’re talking about labour cost involved, 40–45% labour costs (Graduate 5).

[A] big cost factor [is] they have to put somebody in there to look after that person, nurture that person to ensure they truly understand what their role is in there (Educator 6).

If it is not planned very well it is not going to work and it’s going to cost money and it’s going to waste people’s time (Graduate 2).

There wasn’t enough time being dedicated to the apprentices to sit down with the executive chef to do it, plus the executive chef’s knowledge base is dated from when he did his apprenticeship, he’s not trained as a trainer and it wasn’t working for us in the workplace (Employer 4).
Consistent with the literature review, the likelihood of having a ‘dud’ student was a negative on account of covert and overt (no shows) attitudes, poor English or communication skills and poor attention span of youth. Student availability was another issue for business with course attendance requirements requiring block release or one day a week off work causing compromises in flexibility of staff rosters. If the student decided to leave the placement early after industry exposure, deciding that it was not for them, this in turn created a vacancy that industry needed to fill for operational purposes, incurring cost and time.

Losing hours by the person still having to go to TAFE or to university, so availabilities... if they wanted them on a full-time basis or if work got busy, you know and they needed them to come in because someone else was sick or they couldn’t come cause they were at university (Employer 1).

Inflexibility of WIL programs with a lack of control for business was highlighted through: employers not able to choose students; impediments to employers locking students in to long-term contracts to achieve ROI; and fear of workplace and training interference by educators.

If you are going to train these people here then they will be getting specifically trained. Most enterprises would be looking to lock them in for as long as they can ’cause you are making a big investment... it’s very hard to get loyalty, no matter how good a company you are, somebody else will come along and offer them something else, a lot better deal, and you’ve already given them a fantastic deal. For example another industry will do it now in this current climate, the miners will just come along and just offer somebody whatever it takes to get them out there (Educator 7).

Businesses participating in WIL also potentially contest with employee resentment illustrated through: contesting their duties training WIL students, as it is not part of their position description; adding to hectic workloads; interrupting of important tasks; being taken away to teach students further impacts employee concentration, increases stress levels and risks compromised product quality.

Your mind is still back on the job going... I hope this person has done this and this person’s done this, who’s looking after this function while I’m here, you’re not focused on what you’re actually doing (Employer 5).

The graduate negatives related to: time, cost, insecurity of placements, educational merit lacking and mistreatment. Pressures on students included juggling industry work
with full-time study as well as other commitments. Demands on student time were amplified by certain tertiary formats placing the onus on students to find placements. The notion of time intensity was connected to the notion of energy expended to accomplish all these tasks.

When I started in university I found that ok, full-time study and part-time work’s really hard for me (Graduate 4). The non-trade students have a problem gaining those 48 service periods especially when they are a mature-age student and they are working ... They have another profession so they get paid during the day but they come at night to do the course so they are non-trade students, they have to find their 48 service periods so they usually have to take their holiday leave to go and do that if they want the certificate (Educator 2). It’s just getting the job or the placement to begin with that’s the hard part (Employer 2). It’s the time taken when you have so many other things in your life like your study, etc. and then you have to go out and work (Employer 3).

Cost to partake in WIL was exemplified through certain tertiary formats requiring students to pay for work placement. This was an extension of the paid versus unpaid debate featured in the literature review and again in the surveys and focus groups. The employers typically took the stance that students should accept and, more so, welcome this cost for short-term placements in order to gain invaluable industry experience.

The students pay for their placements ... In terms of costs our students pay for their internship period, they pay I think it’s $1,800 per unit and there’s four units in one lot so $1800 times four and all students have to pay for the internship unless they get advanced standing through recognition of prior learning (Educator 3). It’s not so great for the person that has to do the workload because then they would have to try and fit in their university, do their work placement, and then not all kids but a good percentage of kids these days still have to earn their wage so I think it is an awful burden on them if they are not getting paid, even if they are getting paid something rather than nothing it would be better because in this day ’n age everyone needs money and everyone needs to survive and you can’t survive on a no-wage policy (Employer 1). Long term it would be a bad thing but short term yeah I agree with you what’s two weeks out of your life or what’s two weeks without pay. But if it came to six months or 12 months I think that would be a different story all together (Employer 3). Yeah short term is fine but in the long term a lot of them will struggle (Employer 1).

Insecurity of placements was considered a key concern for students following difficulty to find a placement in the first instance. Numerous examples of insecurity with apprentices were cited, as they are not always able to stay at the one location due
to limited menus, limited business funds with apprentices amounting to a paid position, and risk of employers replacing them with a preferred student or staff member when they are on block release.

A lot of good quality kitchens and chefs encourage their staff to leave after one or possibly two years of their apprenticeship to find another place of an equal stature to diversify because I mean even though the menu might change over that one- or two-year period, very similar type or style of cooking and menu type (Employer 5).

[An] employer might say, well listen, you’re supposed to come back for the next six months but I’ve found someone better, you know what, you’ll have to go somewhere else, and that apprentice had to deal with ‘What if I can’t find a job where that new employer will allow me to get block release’ (Employer 5).

The WIL inconsistencies in educational merit addressed in the educator negatives, resurfaced for the students: learning industry bad habits and contradicting ideas; quality of educational experience dependent on trainer quality; lack of transportability of the skills; and no assurances for relevance of lessons. The opposing perspective of the reality check WIL provides students is the emotional distress and disillusionment of the burst bubble.

The disadvantage to students I still see as being the hours that they are generally expected to work in real situations, the lack of transportability of the skills that they are actually getting at that particular establishment because they do tend to be very secular ... what their expectations are and what they are actually getting delivered ... I think that does untold damage getting people to sort of an illusion ... it’s just not like that at all (Educator 6).

Inflexibility within the TAFE format was further illustrated as compromising educational standards and disheartening students with blind adherence to the competency assessments differing from industry practice.

When I had to make béarnaise at TAFE I made it the chef’s way and yeah the teacher tried to tell me that was wrong (Employer 5).

The timing and design of placements within the course curricula have the potential to be disruptive to student learning, posing an ongoing risk with the ideal positioning to deliver optimum educational outcomes yet to be determined.

The problem with my course, with the two weeks in the industry and two weeks on campus, you had so many students halfway through going, no this is not for me, this is too full-on, because they were still learning about the industry while they are being launched into it and it was really disruptive for their learning ... Now we do a 6-month
block, 600 hours and it’s a set timeframe but most of them still work throughout their degrees anyway (Educator 3).

Mistreatment of students through being used as slave labour was another negative associated with WIL, with WIL students slotted in to fit gaps in the employer’s roster in the absence of a providing a structured learning opportunity.

Slave labour or take advantage of them and that’s one of the problems that we can see with WIL, that you’ve got to have this genuine attitude from all sides to make it work (Educator 6).

A final note of interest was the argument that contrary to WIL being an asset it actually ended up homogenising tertiary graduates, decreasing the ability to distinguish between individuals when it came to employment. The implication being that if WIL became standard practice in tertiary education programs it ceased to be an advantage to individuals.

For the students themselves, one negative I suppose is that if this is going to be put into widespread practice there is no benefit to having it ... if everyone is doing it then everyone stays the same ... you’re back to a level playing field ... it’s not so much a negative as more of a leveller (Employer 2).
Figure 5.6: Negatives of WIL for Each Sample Group

5.6 Comparing Hospitality to Other Industries

Respondents were invited to discuss awareness of WIL within other fields and deduce if there were transferable lessons for hospitality. Familiarity of industries with strong and mandatory WIL philosophies included medicine (inclusive of nursing and paramedics), veterinary science, basic trades (plumbing, electrical, carpentry), forensics, engineering and childcare. The commonality of standardised industry accreditation systems for these fields accounted for delivering suitably qualified graduates and creating general public awareness of industry educational standards. The approaches of two university (Macquarie University and University of Technology) -
wide WIL initiatives were also described to suggest options for further advancement of the hospitality WIL agenda.

Macquarie University implement[s] an internship program or some form of work placement in all of their degrees (Educator 3).

UTS has quite an interesting thing called shopfront which incorporates WIL with units of study so they might be doing a project management university unit and they’d apply for a university placement job through shopfront and they’d be working on some sort of project with an organisation and it’s part of their assessment for the university course (Educator 3).

The conditions compelling advancing of the WIL agenda for hospitality were likened to the retail sector, with both industries encountering similar issues including the predominance of young transient employees during their pursuit of tertiary education.

A condition of educator currency in hairdressing was also illustrated for consideration for hospitality.

I know in hairdressing you have to undertake 1 or 2 weeks in an active salon to maintain your hairdresser currency in the industry, then you can go out and continue to train but that’s done by the Hairdressers’ Association, that’s as far as making sure you can still be legal to own and run and cut people’s hair (Educator 5).

Respondents’ discussions centred on the early placement of WIL in curricula and extensive industry placement scaffolded throughout the course, citing examples within fields such as nursing, forensics, paramedics and childcare.

In nursing ... the government broke away from that theory when it was four years of theory, bang into the hospital ... they didn’t last the first week. A lot of them were squeamish, they couldn’t handle blood, didn’t want to change bedpans, didn’t want to deal with old people. A lot of downsides to it, so they’ve wasted four years on education and money spent on education is wasted as well, so I think having them as a joint partnership between the educational side and the practical side gives students an opportunity to know whether they are going to like the field or whether they can step back and use the study for something else. So it has its advantages in that there’s nothing worse than doing a course and then hating it; I’ve wasted four years studying this and I’m stuck with this (Employer 4).

That’s what they’ve done in the forensics course so they put you in so much blood and gore to start with and they give you the hardest subjects to start with, they don’t want the weak stomachs because in that industry there’s no way that you would survive in like a day in the industry, they toughen you up before you even get to the middle part of your course and then after that it’s a breeze, well it’s not easy but it’s easier to handle because
you do deal with a lot of bodies in the course, you do go to hospitals and you do do a lot of practical work (Employer 6).

Bachelor of Paramedic Practice, your first night on the job is Christmas Eve and they said, you know, this is what you can expect. You are going to be ['slammed’ Employer 6] and its four days on, five days off. Two day shifts, two night shifts, five days off. But then first year as an intern it’s the other way around, you go out Christmas Eve, you go out Christmas Night and then you’re doing Boxing Day and the day after sort of thing, so you are seeing the ugly side straight away and then you’ve got five days off and then your next day on, your next night on, is a couple of days after New Year’s Eve (Employer 5).

My cousin was training in childcare a couple of years back … it was part of the process that she had to get ... I think 20 hours a week; had to do it at a childcare and then there was a span of two weeks where there were no classes but she had to spend 38 hours a week full-time at the childcare facility in order for her to get that qualification and maybe because it’s a legalised industry that there are a lot of processes you need to know when you do it with childcare and maybe this is something that we can include in hospitality (Graduate 5).

The roles of government and industry in facilitating WIL were emphasised and respondents further advocated that the hospitality industry would need to advance towards a national industry accreditation scheme to realise the myriad of WIL benefits enjoyed by other fields.

Caterpillar is a large tractor-making company and they have just built a massive, massive site up near a place close to the Nelson Bay area but they’ve done it in conjunction with Newcastle University on the understanding that they will then take on engineering apprentices, engineering students, and they also have a massive learning centre there. So they’re doing it, but the government did pay a lot of money to have it built there as part of the education stimulus a few years ago (Employer 4).

5.7 Scope for Improvement of WIL Initiatives

It was evident from the articulation and proliferation of arguments addressed in the focus group discussions that the educators had previous extensive deliberations as to how WIL programs can be improved to realise graduate outcomes. Conversely, the employers found it difficult to adopt the mindset of tertiary education training, reverting to a focus on organisation training and training students who would stay and contribute to the business in the long run. The employers lacked understanding of basic training methods making it difficult for them to see how they could contribute to WIL
training in their organisation or industry, for example, they could not see how role-
plays and simulations in class could contribute to training for real customer service.

In these early stages key themes and respondent recommendations were already
-evolving to help answer the research questions. The foremost theme was raising
stakeholder awareness, specifically tertiary institute bureaucrats, industry members
and associations and the government, to the obstacles and issues inhibiting WIL. A
lack of funding, support and resources were standard impediments identified by all
focus groups and identified specifically for TAFE and University institutions.
Bureaucratic obstacles were prolific as educators recounted delays or rejection for
course change approvals, limited flexibility for course delivery and thus attainment of
desired industry skills and tertiary evolution and haste towards blended online learning
despite relative incompatibility with hospitality. Educators further expressed great
frustration with the dumbing down of hospitality course content, including constant
curricula changes causing uncertainty, deficiencies and loopholes.

   Educator 6: ... now have a living document that can change from month to month, critical
   things can change or components of training packages can change. So if for example
   people want to get a qualification under training package rules, it makes very onerous for
   both the host or the employers plus the trainer.
   Educator 6: It’s very flexible, so flexible in fact that it is possible ... you can get a diploma
   in hospitality without any mainstream hospitality units.
   Educator 7: Or practical experience.
   The framework people throw things out too quickly rather than giving things a good try
   and certainly not checking out how it’s being run and it didn’t work because, so we will
   go try something else and certainly I think we are going around in a big circle as far as
   training goes (Educator 6).

Stemming from an awareness and appreciation of distinct learning styles, the sentiment
was that integrating online learning within hospitality curricula is good, as this skill
will be required for future industry practice; however, this should not be replacing
existing pedagogy but rather complementing the existing techniques.

   The talk is that everyone wants go to online, they are all online learners now, that
   generation, but you talk to our students [about] the units we deliver online, they don’t
   really like it, I think they’d prefer to have face to face (Educator 1).
Respondents also called for involvement of industry associations such as the
Restaurant and Caterers to further the WIL agenda in hospitality education.
Marketing of tertiary courses, particularly to industry, to overcome the disparate understanding of differences between tertiary institute formats and course content to what they teach students. Transparency and efficacy of current stakeholder consultation practices were criticised along with the absence of tertiary hospitality intra- and inter-organisational collaboration.

When they keep changing elements or they keep changing the actual training packages themselves with such frequency supposedly at the behest of industry and that’s one of the things that I still struggle with. I don’t know who these industry people are that are driving this change, every industry person I talk to is as confused as I am about these changes. We’ve been to the consultation you went to and you heard the cry out there from the industry people that were there, we still are mystified as to why none of the suggestions that we made at that actually came back. I don’t know if you have actually seen the subsequent release of that phase but it hasn’t really changed at all. They are persevering with what they’ve got (Educator 6).

We have a yellow pages worth of acronyms in the VET sector so does university but they are not the same acronyms and they don’t mean exactly the same so sitting them down and speaking the same language was one of the big problems that we had but at the end of the day it’s a business from that perspective. You’re in competition and upper level, you are governed by two distinct and separate federal or state bodies that have their own agendas and getting those two people to sit in the same room and say, listen, this is what’s happening. We need to pull it all together and they said, ‘Well that’s my bucket of funding you can’t touch that’ or ‘That’s my little project, you’re not allowed to do anything’ (Educator 5).

In regards to WIL Types/Duration/Timing of Placement/Student Preparation submissions included scaffolding WIL in curricula with a multitude of placements conducted in a variety of industry contexts to reflect the fragmented nature of the hospitality industry. Whilst individual WIL initiatives are typically of varying durations from the short, medium to long term, sentiments were that for hospitality the overall duration of combined WIL experiences warrants substantial industry experience. A means to achieve this desired level of experience is to embed mandatory WIL initiatives within curricula which was also advocated to help develop work ethic in Generation Y and nurture appropriate attitudes and respect.

Now I’m working in another place so it shows me a different, differences between jobs, the differences you can get between jobs and the way the different places are managed as well (Graduate 2).
The consensus was that students should commence WIL experience early in their course to confirm industry fit though educators must first adequately prepare students for placement to protect the interests and maximise benefits for all stakeholders. A qualifier to early industry exposure was inherent flexibility to start WIL when a student is ready and to match placements to individual students. WIL situated near the end of course completion further served to tie together everything learnt in the course.

Have a student now ... very shy and now is not the time for her to go out on placement, she would flounder, it’s not good for her so it’s better for her to take some time with her studies and get through that a little bit more and then go out on placement; we have that flexibility in the program to do that which is great and those students for whom English is a second language, we can hold them back a little bit longer until they develop their English a bit more and then they’re ok to go out on placement (Educator 3).

Simulated experiences such as the TAFE and other college restaurants and hotel operations were considered beneficial learning tools that also help to overcome the challenge of multiple placements for large cohorts. Deliberate guided reflection, positioned as the crucial link helping students to bridge the gap between theory and practice was emphasised for all authentic and simulated experiences.

TAFE is a little more forgiving, customers know they are getting served by students (Employer 2).

Regular contact with educators during placement serves to reassure students, providing opportunities to gain answers to questions and facilitates guided reflective learning. Group learning/teamwork further helps develop people management skills, a fundamental industry requirement.

We had to do a journal, so we sort of analyse it, how we did, why we did, what’s the benefit for that, and I find that’s really good practical combine with theory cause you really know what you learn, not just theoretical, theoretical ... and always you feel like you refresh your memory, you refresh your memory all the time, what did it do wrong with last time, so what can I improve for my next stage (Graduate 4).

To satisfy the needs of educators and overcome key challenges discussed in the focus groups requires realistic times allocated and remunerated for educators to conduct site visits/assessments.

Extraordinarily difficult because the conditions that they put on you having to go out and assess them, you had to assess this whole raft of units and you got paid for 1.5 hours to do it and it was impossible to do it on that timeline, absolutely impossible ... It’s just like something that was always a foreign body in there, you were doing it but it felt like you weren’t apart of the whole operation (Educator 7).
Where’s the incentive for people to participate more intimately in WIL, and earlier and more consistently? (Educator 6).

The importance of achieving a balance of theory and practical in curricula was critical in tandem with raising the profile and value of hospitality qualifications as an incentive for people. In concert with mandatory WIL, appropriate support networks to facilitate placement selection and stakeholder preparation with flexibility to accommodate contradictory demands on student’s time were essential in order to be effective. Additionally, paid WIL was considered important for placements longer than two weeks.

*Educator qualifications* was a controversial theme, with respondents emphasising preference for tertiary hospitality educators to have minimum current and medium-term industry experience in addition to formal teaching qualifications or training. This would then serve as reassurance to industry and students that they will be taught relevant and correct information. The relevancy of the TAFE annual currency requirements, with consideration for adoption by other tertiary institutes, was debated with one respondent declaring this was superfluous as very little would change from year to year. The arguments further acknowledged that educator requirements would depend on the type of course, while several other educator respondents declared that the minimum 30 hours does not suffice to ensure currency of all competency units in courses.

Educator 4: Personally I don’t think there really is a need for, I’d say someone who’s teaching would need a minimum amount of experience in the industry ... for instance I haven’t worked in the industry as such for two years. Two full years before that I was just doing some part-time work just to keep my hand in it. But I’m sure if I went back now after two years I could still do what I have been doing for the past 20 years, it wouldn’t be a problem for me ... things don’t change drastically and you can show me how to turn that fancy oven on now because two years ago it might not have been that fancy but that’s about it. And even if I do know how to use that particular oven and I do go to another that has the same brand, every oven is different, that oven took five minutes less and this one burnt it in five minutes, you know, so I really don’t think it’s a big issue over there. I do believe, yes, you should have, I don’t know what the formula is, I don’t know what the minimum is but if you should have a minimum amount.

Educator 1: Ours is five years experience in the industry and is it minimum supervisory or manager?

Educator 2: Well, depending on what you are teaching.
The suggestion was also made and received with gusto that trainer criteria should extend to hospitality industry WIL trainers/hosts. An industry Training Standards and Compliance scheme was suggested for employer selection/industry trainer criteria, ensuring competent trainers with industry experience, as a stepping stone in the long-term agenda of standardised industry accreditation.

I would love to see, in the same way that you would give a 5-star rating to a hotel, a restaurant that across the industry for training you carry the hat for that or a star, or something, because that would just be, I think, it would lift the whole training aspect of the industry and enable, you know, choices to be made quite early by students as to where’s the best place to go for the ... practical training, rather than, well, I just want to go to that restaurant or that hotel because it’s top of its field without understanding what top of its field (Employer 7).

5.8 Chapter Summary

Through analysis of the focus group data, the persistence of hospitality graduate underemployment was established. Despite recognising the focus of tertiary institutions on defining graduate attributes and student outcomes, the respondents were concerned that dumbing down hospitality courses and lack of resources observed within TAFE and universities would further compound the problem. A lack of understanding of the hospitality tertiary education system and qualifications was prevalent within the Graduate and Employer samples, accounting for the devaluing of hospitality qualifications, particularly hospitality degrees aligned to discussions in the literature review. The importance of attitude was reinforced as the most important characteristic for hospitality employees congruent with the quantitative findings. Although preferences for industry experience were noted, and qualifications had the potential to enhance perceived employability, the overwhelming consensus was that positive attitudes ranked as number one in attractiveness of employment attributes.

All sample groups were enthusiastic at prospects of expanding WIL within hospitality tertiary education, identifying a multitude of personal/social, career and organisational benefits for all stakeholders. Although respondents strongly supported the pursuit of WIL within hospitality tertiary education, the lack of regulation and national accreditation of the industry was considered a major impediment to the advancement
and perceived value of hospitality qualifications and specifically the WIL agenda. A number of areas of concern were identified to help maximise benefits and minimise the array of challenges presented by those engaged in WIL, including stakeholder education and marketing campaigns, collaboration, educator and host supervisor standards and having a variety of WIL types and settings scaffolded through curricula. These areas and best practices will be explored further in the next chapter through analysis of conceptual and empirical data within more advanced fields in WIL design and execution.
Chapter 6

ANALYSIS & DISCUSSION

This chapter reports the results of the data analysis of the quantitative surveys and qualitative focus groups. Kim’s (2008) and Richardson’s (2009) studies are reviewed, as they formed the basis of the survey questions. Limitations in the comparisons are highlighted as Kim’s (2008) study was conducted in New Zealand and the sample did not include tertiary educators, instead targeting a larger sample size of hospitality management students from two specific universities (1st/2nd/3rd year). The Australian study by Richardson (2009) concentrated on investigating the impact of work experience on student perceptions of a hospitality career and did not specifically address the diversity or structured tertiary curricula initiatives under the WIL banner.

6.1 Hospitality Industry Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Findings:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate underemployment observed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIL experience positively skews intentions of a hospitality career</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriate/unhelpful workplace experience represents a challenge to graduate WIL engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment requirements for employees to complete Hospitality Tertiary Qualifications were identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers had limited knowledge of hospitality tertiary institute qualifications, graduate attributes and relevance to the workplace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality qualifications were more influential in commencing jobs than for progression, though tempered by the variables of attitude and experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality industry associations were depicted as inefficient and ineffective in servicing members and the interests of the industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequacy of the tertiary hospitality education system contributing to increasing prevalence of graduate programs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The findings of the quantitative survey and qualitative focus groups support the existence of the graduate underemployment phenomenon within the NSW hospitality industry. With the majority of the graduate survey respondents residing in the low-income range, and three-quarters without full-time graduate-level employment contracts, this study establishes through empirical evidence the difficulty transitioning hospitality graduates into the industry. This low remuneration trend further extends into the Employer sample populated by managers, CEOs and owners from a diversity of establishment types. Graduates expressed difficulty gaining graduate-level hospitality positions as employers demanded industry- and management-level experience. TAFE graduates in the focus groups did not share the same concerns or leverage for networking or desire to attain a graduate-level position. Consequently, they retained low-level industry positions contributing to job dissatisfaction and leakage into unrelated industries.

As readily demonstrated in the literature (Duncan, Scott & Baum 2013; Solnet & Hood 2008), hospitality employment is often seen as a transitory job whilst completing studies or as a stepping stone to another career. That trend was evident among respondents to this study and has consequently had significant implications on the way tertiary curricula are designed, impacting on student motivation, as well as willingness and eagerness to pursue WIL initiatives. With 67% of graduates stating their intention to pursue hospitality as a career after graduation, these findings were comparatively less positive to the 92.7% of the sample in the Kim (2008) study. In the Richardson (2009) study, work experience was claimed by 41.3% of the student population to have negatively influenced their perception of a hospitality career, with 19.6% ‘Unlikely’ to and 18.5% would ‘Definitely Not’ pursue a hospitality career (2009, p. 148). WIL experience was found in this study to positively skew intentions of a hospitality career although when the graduate population were asked within the range of challenges of WIL engagement to specifically rate the extent of agreement with ‘Inappropriate/unhelpful workplace experience’, 56% rated ‘strongly agreed or agreed’. The focus group participants also recognised the risk that unsatisfactory work experiences could negatively influence intentions to pursue a hospitality career.

Of the 29% of graduate survey respondents indicating hospitality tertiary education as a ‘Minor Qualification,’ the courses completed constituted college and predominantly other employer-funded programs, indicating an employment requirement as opposed
to ‘self-pursuit’. This is aligned with another interesting finding, with 64% of the graduate sample having worked in the hospitality industry prior to pursuit of hospitality tertiary studies and a reduced number of graduates seeking employment after graduation on the basis of already being employed in the industry. This finding gives credence to the idea that simply working in the industry is insufficient to progress and formal qualifications are viewed favourably by employers. These results were replicated in the focus groups with workplace training completed by graduate and employer respondents linked to TAFE and college qualifications.

The lack of respect and undervaluing of hospitality degrees depicted in the literature review was borne out in the survey and focus groups. It would however appear to have lessened in recent times on account of increasing exposure of the public to hospitality services and the proliferation of reality shows and educational media. The key deficiencies inhibiting realisation of the deserved value of hospitality credentials are in the areas of awareness and quality of hospitality qualifications and the lack of framework aligning degree programs to hospitality career paths. Employer respondents had limited knowledge of course variety, content, various tertiary institutes offering qualifications, the graduate attributes delivered and how any of this was relevant to their workplace. Contrasting with the recognition of skill sets on completion of degrees in other fields such as medicine, teaching and accounting, this lack of awareness led to little more than a recognition of personal commitment to education by hospitality employers. This lack of valuing contributes in some part to explaining high turnover and leakage of hospitality graduates into unrelated fields where the generic graduate attributes of a business degree are recognised.

Hospitality tertiary educators were generally perceived as knowing the industry well, however, the belief was they held a different understanding of career expectations to employers. Educators (86%) and graduates (76%) were found to be more supportive than employers (59%) of educator industry knowledge. These results were more conservative than Kim’s (2008) study where 93.4% of students and 78.4% of employers affirmed the value of educator industry knowledge. The focus groups raised concerns of divergent currency and training credentials of educators within the different tertiary formats impacting educator knowledge of industry, including current practice and career paths. Graduates were the most cynical of educators’ understanding
of career expectations, with 55% agreeing a difference exists compared to employers at 26%. These results represent an improvement on the Kim (2008) study, where 62.8% of current students and 68.9% of employers proclaimed divergence of graduate career expectations held by educators and employers. Subsequent questions in the survey relating to expected industry career levels actually support congruence between educator and employer understanding of career expectations, with graduates recording higher expectations and employers and educators responses harmonious and more conservative. Five years after graduation a ‘department manager level’ was expected of graduates with achievement of ‘senior manager level’ ten years after graduation. These results were comparable to the Kim (2008) study with 35% of students expecting ‘top management level’ after five years and a further 13.1% expecting ‘self employment’. After ten years 56.2% of students expected ‘top management level’, a further 38% expected ‘self employment’ with no responses recorded for low management levels. This question was not posed to employers in the Kim study.

Hospitality qualifications, in particular bachelor’s degrees, were more influential in commencing jobs than for progression, though again tempered by the variables of attitude and experience. Hospitality employers and graduates struggled to differentiate between TAFE and university institutions, exacerbated by the recent blurring of lines, with TAFE offering degrees and universities offering certificates and diplomas (e.g. Victoria University and UOB). These findings point towards the need for educational campaigns to make hospitality employers, prospective students and the wider public aware of the content, relevance and subsequent value of hospitality tertiary education. When the question of a whether a bachelor’s degree was required for promotion was posed in the quantitative survey, this was met with uncertainty. The focus groups further debated the disparity of opinions held by hospitality employers and determined there was a degree of congruence in opinions based on hospitality industry sectors, with hotel and club employers more likely to agree. The perceived value of a degree for promotion by graduates in this study at 38% was significantly less than the 54.7% observed in the Kim (2008) study. Conversely, this study recorded more positive employer responses, with only 19% disagreeing that a degree was valuable for promotion compared to the 63.5% of New Zealand employers disagreeing (Kim 2008).
Although the literature positions work experience as the most critical requirement for a prospective employee, no definitive answer was achieved in this study for whether work experience or a degree qualification was more important for a prospective employee. The survey recorded only a slight majority favouring work experience (53%) with the focus groups determining no preference, instead advocating other factors such as attitude. The survey results were slightly lower than the Kim (2008) study, recording 66.4% of students and 70.3% of employers agreeing with work experience being more important, accompanied by similar levels of uncertainty and opposition. Whilst a hospitality degree qualification was found not to be better than three years of work experience in the survey, the focus groups discussions emphasised the importance of both and that an absence of work experience indicated a poor work ethic and attitude. Conversely, more positive results were observed in the Kim (2008) study, with 51.1% of students and 48.6% of employers agreeing a degree was better. Despite disputes on the value of a degree, having employees with degrees was established as beneficial to hospitality organisations though this did not necessarily correspond to receiving higher starting salaries. These results were in accordance with Kim (2008), with 91.2% of students and 82.4% of employers agreeing that employees having hospitality degrees was beneficial. The Kim study found that perceived importance of degree qualifications by employers increased relative to seniority. This however, was not replicated in the current study with higher results observed for lower- and middle-level managers. Conversely, the results demonstrated lower stakeholder expectations of higher starting salaries than the Kim (2008) study, with 60.6% of students and 35.1% of employers agreeing with this statement.

The inconsistent quality of hospitality qualifications mirrored themes featured in the literature review. Educator respondents discussed ineffective stakeholder consultation practices impairing curricula design, combined with lack of funding and resources and the oversimplification of course content within business degrees reducing the ability of tertiary educators to deliver desired educational outcomes. These issues will be revisited in sections 6.4 and 6.5.

Associated with the quality of hospitality qualifications was the necessity of educators to drill into graduates the importance of attitude and experience to a hospitality career. Whilst the researcher recognises the difficulty in changing endemic generational
characteristics, many tertiary institutions are exacerbating this problem by eliminating or reducing professional practice course components, minimising face time and experiential learning opportunities. There was consensus among all sample groups that hospitality graduates still needed finishing off by industry largely owing to inexperience, thus they were not deemed ‘job-ready’; this in turn was seen as a failure of their tertiary education. Graduates were also readily described as arrogant by employers, expecting to enter industry at management level and not wanting to perform the menial tasks required such as cleaning tables and washing dishes.

Attitude and experience are regarded as the most valued traits for hospitality recruitment yet completion of hospitality tertiary education is not a guarantee of these traits. In agreement with the literature review, this research further demonstrates that hospitality tertiary qualifications are not imparting realistic expectations of industry roles or career paths achievable by early and continued exposure in the industry through WIL. The incidence of universities packaging supplementary vocational qualifications (e.g. UNSW and UOB) with degree programs specifically to enhance employability skills in lieu of embedding employability skill development within degree programs serves only to sidestep this problem. The consistent message is that curricula design and execution needs to be overhauled to ensure attainment of these traits. In essence amalgamation of theory and practice through constructive and varied WIL initiatives in hospitality curricula is required.

Employability traits were further investigated through primary research with ‘willingness to learn’, ‘enthusiasm’ and ‘commitment’ featuring as most desirable characteristics of employees. Similarly, in the Kim (2008) study ‘commitment’ followed by ‘willingness to learn’ were deemed most important by students and employers, with ‘specific skills’ not considered the most important by either sample. When asked to envisage the preferential characteristic sought by human resource departments, both ‘experience’ and ‘specific skills’ featured highly. The student population in the Kim (2008) study ranked ‘knowledge and experience’ highest at 40.1%, followed by ‘specific skills’ at 35%. ‘Qualifications’ received only 5.1% of the vote. An overwhelming 62.2% of employers considered ‘personality’ the most important characteristic and congruent with the student population, ‘qualifications’ were not rated highly (5.1% of students, 5.4% of employers). Desirable characteristics for hospitality employees related to ‘attitude’ and ‘personality’. Likewise in the Kim
(2008) study, ‘personality’ recorded 48.2% of the student vote and 64.9% of employers. The second most important characteristic for the samples was ‘knowledge and experience’ with ‘qualifications’ again on the lower end of the scale. ‘Attitude’ was valued as the most important characteristic in the focus groups followed closely by ‘experience’ and remained a consistent theme throughout the discussion for each sample group. ‘Human relations skills’, ‘self-management skills’ and ‘communication skills’ were respectively identified as most important for graduate career development. In the Kim (2008) study, the student population indicated ‘communication skills’ (43.1%) were the most important followed by ‘human relations skills’ 16.1%, with the employer population indicating ‘initiative’ at 28.4% and followed by ‘communication’ at 20.3%.

The conversion to online learning, generally a cost-cutting or accessibility exercise although not explicitly stated as such, if not suitably married with other learning styles, has the potential to further disadvantage student development of people management skills and work ethic. These facets extend into questionable legitimacy of qualifications causing confusion among students as to the value of pursuing hospitality qualifications in place of ‘on the job’ learning. Importantly, whilst there is a place and importance for hospitality professionals to be educated, it is recognised that there is an equally important place for employees who are not over-skilled to fulfi the low-pay roles prolific in the industry.

Industry associations were subject to extensive criticism by respondents and depicted as inefficient and ineffective in servicing the needs of members and furthering the interests of the hospitality industry. This is an alarming prospect considering they influence member perception of hospitality qualifications, particularly in the club and hotel sectors, through encouraging and on occasion providing formal qualifications for members. Inadequate efficiency and effectiveness of these industry associations in providing information, services and value to members was cited as a product of incompetent association management and limited access to funding. In the absence of a single all-encompassing industry association, the associations, much like the hospitality businesses themselves, are operating in silos. The lack of regulation and government support for hospitality is an impediment. In such a dynamic and high-risk industry, support for employers dealing with such issues as ongoing threats of changes
to penalty rates, alcohol taxes, low profit margins and skills shortages is crucial. A more coordinated effort is required to incorporate all industry associations in concert with the government to educate all industry members of the benefits and content of hospitality qualifications and alignment of these qualifications with industrial awards.

Another indication of the inadequacy of the tertiary hospitality education system in Australia and preference for industry employers for on-the-job training is the increasing prevalence of graduate programs. The existence and content of these graduate programs has been shown in the introduction, literature review and in the primary research to address the gap in hospitality graduate attributes through utilising WIL pedagogy, primarily extensive work experience.

Whilst it seems that reality shows such as *MasterChef*, *Hell’s Kitchen*, etc., are raising awareness and the profile of the hospitality industry, this is also having a detrimental effect in glamorising the industry. Respondents of the study were vocal in their belief that the resulting misconception of viewing these shows is that it’s easy to be successful in hospitality. Of more concern was how the existence of such shows served as a source of aggravation to the conventional hard-working chefs in the industry who progressed in a time of ‘apprentice hazing’ and had worked many long and hard years before completing their qualifications, yet were still presented with little chance of achieving similar fame or exposure as those in the TV shows. The longevity of contestants’ claims to fame erodes very rapidly if they have not capitalised on it within the first year of presenting and they are consigned to oblivion again. Winners and popular personalities have been able to prolong the longevity of their fame through establishing their public appearances and establishing their own TV shows e.g. Justine Schofield’s *Everyday Gourmet*, Poh Ling Yeow’s *Poh’s Kitchen* and Sammy and Bella featuring on Channel 7’s *The Morning Show*. 
6.2 WIL in Curricula

Key Findings:

- WIL in NSW hospitality tertiary curricula was frequently in a voluntary capacity.
- Work experience, internships, apprenticeships and project-based learning were the predominant forms.
- Generation Y and Millenials generally lack the work ethic to voluntarily participate in WIL.

The survey and focus groups demonstrated the position of WIL in NSW hospitality tertiary curricula was frequently in a voluntary capacity. Whilst a number of hospitality graduates selected to participate in voluntary WIL, the limitations of the survey prevented exploration of why this was the case and the duration of individual WIL initiatives which may have impacted the decision. Work experience, internships, apprenticeships and project-based learning were the predominant forms identified in the quantitative and qualitative research constituting simple, mainstream WIL initiatives with a long history of use in education. As mainstream initiatives, they attracted mounting documentation and investigations into how best to manage these compared to other less traditional initiatives. Despite the myriad of attempts to devise best practices, no universal or hospitality-specific benchmarks have yet been established. Instead guidelines are continually refined and appear to be more adhoc in approach.

From the review of Australian tertiary education providers, various centralised and decentralised approaches to WIL curricula were observed. Recognition that WIL initiatives, in particular internships, are increasingly regarded not as an option but rather as ‘must haves’ by employers is seen as the impetus for inclusion within curricula to prepare students for the job market, including developing the skill set employers are looking for. A recent formalised addition to university strategic plans and policy statements (as illustrated in Appendix 8), the progression of the WIL agenda is observed through the development of WIL resources (for students, academics and employers), establishment of partnerships with industry and TAFE, promotion of association membership and WIL research. In reviewing hospitality degree programs, a trend to reduce core hospitality units and a lack of alignment to industry career paths
was evidenced. This points to an urgent need for a review of such programs and a return to more robust discipline-specific subjects and curricula content.

The proactive attitude of students to procurement of education and personal development was raised in the survey, with one graduate respondent actively self-managing participation in a WIL initiative. Similarly, one of the graduates in the focus groups also assumed a proactive attitude to attaining both TAFE and university qualifications in addition to practical work experience. These examples, motivated by aspirations to enhancing professional skill sets and thus career opportunities, highlight potential dissatisfaction with the current system of tertiary education in the ability to provide employability. This occurrence was explored further in the focus groups and the consensus was that this was an exception to the rule and that Generation Y and Millenials lacked the work ethic and loyalty of previous generations. Concerns were raised by all three sample groups that without mandatory WIL within curricula, students would not generally voluntarily participate in such a program despite the mounting evidence of personal, social and career benefits of WIL. Members of the TAFE community expressed concern for loss of student numbers if WIL was mandatory however, they conceded this would hopefully weed out the ‘dead weight’ to benefit industry and the reputation of the educational institute through enhanced quality of graduates.

Generational issues impacting hospitality graduate employability are a recurring trend in the literature and primary research. The issues have been the subject of extensive research in general and specific educational contexts, for which valuable lessons can be deduced to inform educators and others involved in curricula design on how to manage hospitality education products for this audience. This must be achieved with the additional complexity of a cross-generational audience, including the increasing prevalence of mature-age students and interest in educating hospitality industry professionals. Critical lessons based on generational traits for the design and execution of hospitality education comprise: inclusion of multiple teaching tools within curricula to accommodate various learning styles; inherent flexibility; management of student expectations; integration of digital technologies; investment in experiential learning as Generation Y and Millennials prefer to learn through action, being engaged and operating in groups; and education of academics inclusive of digital literacy and
teaching philosophies such as blended and experiential learning (Barron, Maxwell, Broadbridge & Ogden 2007; Martin 2005; McCrindle & Wolfinger 2010; Shaw & Fairhurst 2008). The world of academia would also benefit from attracting young industry professionals who can contribute currency of industry experience whilst capable of relating to fellow Millenials.

6.3 WIL Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Findings:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• WIL provides career, social and personal benefits for each graduates, employers and educators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Authenticity of WIL was emphasised for maximum benefit although simulations also contribute to employability skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• WIL is a valuable and crucial source of industry experience, experience being one of the main desired traits for hospitality employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• WIL allows students to reaffirm their ‘fit’ with industry, exploration of the different avenues, working conditions and to correct misconceptions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• WIL has a positive impact on graduate entrance into the hospitality industry and the potential to positively impact graduate progression.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A variety of WIL types, durations and settings scaffolded throughout the curricula was advocated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was a strong positive representation among all the sample groups for the career, social and personal benefits of WIL for each stakeholder. The categories ‘Opportunity to re-evaluate expectations of industry and job prospects’ and ‘Clarify requirements and preparedness of workforce entry’ featured highly in the quantitative survey in comparison with ‘Increased interstate and national mobility within the workforce’ and ‘Progressing quickly through the ranks at your workplace or industry’, which scored the lowest ranked WIL benefits. In contrast to the more immediate benefits of WIL for securing employment after graduation, the notion of WIL experience facilitating career progression was still recognised as a potential benefit of WIL, though accentuated in the focus groups as conditional on attitude. Attitude was valued as the most important characteristic for hospitality employees recording exactly half of the total weighted responses in the survey followed by a related characteristic personality at 25% and the
focus groups further emphasised that the value of all other desired characteristics for hospitality employees ultimately dependent on having the right attitude.

Attitude is a key factor, willingness to learn really, willingness to help out when needed (Employer 2).

The array of benefits deemed possible for students through experience in WIL initiatives by the focus groups mirrored those depicted in the literature review (Beard 1995; Carroll 2010; Cornforth, Taylor & Varelidis 1983; Cox & King 2006; Cranmer 2006; Fallows & Steven 2000; Jancauskas et al. 1999; Ricks & Williams 2005), namely, career, educational, personal/social and monetary.

If you are going to get people that have got the formal and the practical experience merging together, you are going to get better product in the end, better service attitude to mention the flow-on effect (Employer 3).

The extent of these potential benefits was however stipulated as conditioned on quality and suitability of WIL experiences. Similarly, a comparable and extensive array of benefits for employers was easily identified by respondents encompassing: organisational learning, labour supply, quality recruits, monetary, time saving, productivity and philanthropy.

It keeps your employees up to date with current market trends and educational practices (Employer 4).

Aside from the educator sample, the identification of benefits by graduates and employers was frequently drawn from the application of WIL initiatives from non-related industries. These respondents considered the type and application of WIL initiatives transferable to hospitality. With the educators possessing a more comprehensive understanding of WIL pedagogy and the nature of tertiary institutes, hospitality educator benefits were more subdued in comparison to the array of benefits conveyed in the literature review. The educator respondents struggled to determine possible benefits specific to their personal or institutional context of WIL, preoccupied as they were with the bureaucratic hurdles that would have to be tackled before such benefits could be attainable. On the proviso of WIL being adequately resourced, designed and executed, the educators were able to identify a range of institutional benefits before conceding the potential to update their personal knowledge of industry and techniques.
From the educators’ perspective they may not retain some of the students but more likely they will get a higher interest level from the students knowing they can come back and they can contribute more (Employer 3).

Authenticity of WIL settings and tasks was emphasised for maximum benefit although simulations were also recognised as contributing to employability skills, particularly when dealing with large cohorts and when students are unprepared or incapable of being put into industry contexts for fear of bringing ‘disrepute’ to the educational institute. A variety of WIL types, durations and settings scaffolded throughout the curricula was advocated by the focus groups and evident in the analysis of secondary literature reporting on WIL initiatives in tertiary settings.

A noticeable and alarming trend in the data was that many WIL programs in curricula were of a voluntary nature and the modal of total hours spent on WIL was ‘none’ by each sample group; thus, for these respondents this represented no opportunity for students to gain employability skills.

### 6.4 WIL Negatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Findings:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Many WIL programs were poorly resourced, designed and executed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Negative WIL experiences contributed to negative perceptions of pursuing a career in the hospitality industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Foremost challenges to WIL participation were ‘managing several commitments’ and limited resources/support for graduates, employers and educators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Educators were the most vocal respondents about the negatives of WIL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Demographic characteristics were found not to significantly impact perceptions of WIL.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Despite the overwhelmingly positive support for WIL in hospitality tertiary education, it was clear from the response to WIL negatives and experiences in the survey that many WIL programs participated in by respondents were poorly resourced, designed and executed. This in turn contributed to negative perceptions of pursuing a career in the hospitality industry akin to the findings of Richardson (2009) and Kim (2008).
foremost challenges to WIL participation were identified as ‘managing several commitments, i.e. family, study, work, etc., while on work placement’ with limited resources/support for graduates, employers and educators. Hicks and Swain 2007, Lindstaedt et al. 2008, Patrick et al. 2008 and Raelin 2008 also noted this in the literature.

Following on from an extensive discussion of WIL benefits, the positive stance of graduates and employer respondents that had evolved during the course of the focus groups towards integration of WIL in hospitality tertiary curricula served to stunt equally exhaustive identification of the negatives.

I think what we’re finding here is that we are probably struggling to find negatives (Employer 3).

This was in striking contrast to the myriad of negatives promptly raised by the educators. Graduates and employers cited things such as labour cost and being resource intensive for business as negative outcomes of the WIL experience.

The major cost is just the monetary cost, it costs money to train that person, costs money to get a person there to train them, costs time, costs resources… (Graduate 5).

Educators on the other hand cited difficulties placing students, managing partnerships, limited resources and lack of workload recognition as being detrimental to actually making WIL as effective as it should be. For the student population negatives included ‘time’, ‘cost’, ‘insecurity of placements’, ‘educational merit lacking’ and ‘mistreatment’. These negatives echo the concerns of education quality and design to accommodate the changing demographics of the student population and environment (time-poor society, living expenses). Employers cited ‘risk’, ‘productivity/product quality’, ‘resource intensive’, ‘bad students’, ‘student availability’, ‘inflexibility/lack of control’, and ‘employee resentment’ as being the negative aspects that arise from WIL placements.

Aside from the inherent risks of social media whereby a poor customer service encounter can be broadcasted to a wide audience and damage a business’s reputation, respondents were accepting of the various employer risks understanding the intended learning context. Educator and Graduate respondents could further determine reasonable steps to mitigate these risks, e.g. through role-plays and simulations such that the risks were not deemed significant enough to preclude involvement in WIL.
initiatives. Surprisingly Educators were the most vocal respondents about the negatives of WIL. They enumerated ‘risk’, ‘personal/social’, ‘education quality compromised’, ‘time’, ‘obstacles’, ‘student management’, ‘industry management’ and ‘costs’. Educators also perceived involvement in WIL activities as being stressful, as they felt responsible not only for the design and execution of WIL initiatives but also for managing the wellbeing and interests of all stakeholders in efforts to secure ongoing positive relations, all whilst trying to balance inadequate resources including time, workload recognition and money.

6.5 Scope for Improvement

The central premise of the research design, after examining the value of WIL to hospitality tertiary education, was to subsequently provide a set of guidelines for the enhancement of benefits and mitigation of negatives for WIL in hospitality. Indications of challenges encountered by survey participants were explored within the focus groups and through review of WIL literature from more mature industries to identify specific areas to control and recommendations for practice.

Educator qualifications/experience/currency

Competency of hospitality educators is categorised as an area of concern for the delivery of quality tertiary hospitality education following discussions of divergent credentials espoused by differing tertiary education formats. Particular concern extended to the lack of industry experience and inadequate teaching and/or industry qualifications potentially held by educators within private colleges and other RTOs. The definition of a ‘competent educator’ as highly skilled in both practice and education must be further subject to currency stipulations for both training skills and industry practice. The recommended currency of qualifications across university, TAFE and colleges is to ensure teaching staff are still capable of operating within industry and to ensure relevance of institution learning is up to date with industry methods. Tertiary institutes need to consider providing lecturers and trainers with time away from work or WIL placements to maintain industry currency. This currency emphasis is also aligned to recent changes to the national accreditation standards for
Responsible Service of Alcohol (RSA) and Responsible Conduct of Gaming (RCG) (renewal every five years). Deficiencies of the system are further attributed to perpetuating inadequate trainers, as hospitality tertiary courses are considered to not be teaching students the skills required for their future career paths.

The older demographic profile of educators replicated in the survey, with the average age of tertiary educators at 42–47 years old, is identified as a challenge to effectively communicating with Generation Millennials. The need to entice younger industry members into academia is both implicit and explicit, with the merits of having educators closer to the age of the student population enabling them to get through to them easier. Inability to attract young, motivated industry professionals is attributed to current recruitment approaches, lack of support for new researchers and the repulsive nature of bureaucratic cultures within tertiary education.

Part and parcel of the education qualifications is having educators informed in WIL pedagogy. It is recognised that in order to achieve informed WIL academics, tertiary institutions must embrace a WIL culture with clear strategic direction for WIL and adequate resourcing. Provision of WIL training and information sources is identified as essential to update educators and ensure support for ongoing research collaboration as discussed in the resourcing section.

**WIL types/design/duration/timing of placement**

There is consensus in the primary research that placement of WIL in curricula should commence early on in the course (within the first 12 months of a degree program) to confirm student compatibility with the industry, maintain interest in the qualification and to align expectations to avoid wasting time and resources. Early exposure to industry has generally been avoided by educators convinced that first year students do not have the necessary skills and knowledge to negotiate WIL and thus are afraid of ‘letting them loose on industry’. Crucial lessons learnt by one educator who has shaped WIL design in their respective tertiary institute was the need to take care not to place WIL too early on and to ensure adequate preparation before exposure, as early controlled exposure will avoid culture shock and equip students to handle negative experiences. Employer concerns with taking on unskilled students being a financial and time consuming burden through WIL early in the academic cycle could be
addressed by having a VET component, for example RSA, bar skills or restaurant operations, in the first year with the dual purpose of building basic skills while weeding out those unsuited to the industry rather than imposing such a burden on the industry partners.

Differences between the nature of TAFE/college and university WIL experiences should be emphasised here with a focus on management and evaluation skills at the university level and operational skills for TAFE and other providers. It is generally expected that university students get a ‘job on the side’ with on-the-job training delivered through their workplaces or attend TAFE/colleges for the operational skills, with the university course focusing on higher skill development.

Participation in multiple WIL initiatives and workplace settings is associated with maximising prospective benefits. The diversity of hospitality industry careers further warrants multiple placements, permitting students to trial different parts of the industry and businesses to determine compatibility or incompatibility before settling on a final career path. Businesses are recognised as having unique political and cultural climates with the potential to impact career paths; thus exposure to multiple businesses and industry hosts will provide a more comprehensive appreciation of reality.

Scaffolding of WIL initiatives within curricula was repeatedly emphasised in both the primary analysis and WIL literature (Nulty et al. 2011; Sieminski & Seden 2011; Smith 2012; Stupans & Owens 2009; White, Bloomfield & Cornu 2010). Establishing WIL as mandatory core elements spaced throughout the course duration, starting with simple and potentially short-term initiatives within the first year and becoming progressively complex as students proceed through the course might be the solution to WIL practices. Alignment to curricula learning and assessments is critical for transparency of how WIL experience contributes to graduate employability outcomes. Structured pre-placement preparation will help reduce and manage student anxiety and should provide information about the workplace, establish standards of professional behaviour, outline activities and responsibilities on the placement, guide problem solving and outline forms of assessment. The WIL experience should also be structured to provide constructive feedback to improve student performance supplemented by post-preparation including guided reflective learning and debrief
sessions. Deliberate guided reflection is well established in the literature as a fundamental element in the learning process, enhancing consciousness of lessons learnt (Kolb & Kolb 2005; McGill & Beaty 1995; Parker 2005).

When designing WIL programs consideration must be extended to the numerous challenges to student participation outlined in the literature review including low socio-economic status background, disability and carer responsibilities. Flexibility and creativity in placement design is necessary to facilitate access and equality in WIL programs, with consideration for difficult placements accommodated within the institute’s workplace, e.g. campus food service outlets. Awareness and access to grants for mandatory and voluntary WIL, especially for students from disadvantaged backgrounds, and buddy and peer support programs will also provide additional support and learning.

Courses should embed a variety of WIL initiatives combining short-, medium- and long-term experiences as mandatory elements within curricula to provide a more informative induction to the industry. The value of both authentic and simulated learning has been widely established, including Virtual WIL, although the feasibility of this approach is currently limited within hospitality contexts. Based on the plethora of research and opinions, despite the archaic state of legislation and absence of mandated compensation for medium-to-long-term work experience that forms part of a tertiary qualification, it is advocated that medium–long-term placements (of more than two weeks duration) should be in a paid capacity.

**Resources/Institute support**
Creation, implementation and evaluation of WIL programs requires extensive resources and support by individual tertiary institutions and collectively through WIL associations. Several attempts have been made to ascertain the costs of WIL programs and further ongoing research is warranted to identify and quantify specific costs. Competition and availability of placements represents a universal challenge which is exacerbated by the wholesale approach to WIL by the tertiary education system. Attempts to develop models to recognise WIL in academic workloads are emerging to address the historical lack of understanding as to the time, effort and skill set involved in sourcing and managing partnerships with industry. Institute development of
guidelines, training and support for educators engaged in WIL initiatives is seen as vital, with membership in WIL associations providing a platform for debate and research. Frameworks for handling problems and addressing emerging issues must be established and maintained. An important part of the WIL program is the evaluation of past WIL activities to inform future actions. The primary research indicates this step is often forgotten by tertiary institutes, with educators expressing frustration at the lack of autonomy to adapt programs and incongruent bureaucratic decisions impacting WIL design.

**Industry partnership**

Transparency and accountability are essential ingredients for productive partnership arrangements. Selection of a compatible partner is the first step, requiring familiarity of partner organisations including structure, culture, resources and expectations. Negotiation of a formal contract to explicate roles and responsibilities of all parties sets the tone of the relationship. To minimise risks associated with partnerships, tertiary institutions should provide support for educators by means of guidelines, training and information as the foundation for establishing contact and negotiating contracts with prospective partners and how to manage relationships. Support mechanisms identified through research for industry partners include guidelines and information brochures to introduce WIL pedagogy, identify benefits for industry, templates and checklists detailing student requirements for workspace, induction, assessment and at the most fundamental, regular contact with the educator to monitor progress and take corrective action if necessary (GIHE 2009; IRU 2013; UNSW 2013). Here lies a crucial role for tertiary institution executives and WIL associations to overcome inter- and intra-institutional ‘turf wars’.

**Host supervisor training/qualifications**

When dealing with industry in particular on account of difficulty sourcing volumes of placements it is improbable to achieve consistent quality of instruction, which further supports the argument for multiple placements. During selection and negotiation phases, consideration must be extended to expectations of what constitutes an effective host supervisor. Whilst the ideal standards garnered from more mature fields include screening of field instructors beyond credentials to include reference letters and interviews, this is not always feasible with the myriad of small and medium hospitality
businesses. Field instructor training and guidelines are essential to help overcome uneven quality of instruction.

**Webinars and online courses**
Under the pretence of blended learning, the newest pedagogical craze of webinars and online courses when replacing traditional methods goes against engaged learning practice. The discipline of attending classes, demonstrating commitment skills desired by industries such as hospitality, along with the lack of questioning and peer-to-peer learning is at risk of being lost through these digital mediums. Although the researcher recognises the value of online learning to equip students for future needs of the workforce and the intuitive approaches adopted by some champions of online technologies to engage students through discussion boards and student presentations, the fear is that universities, in particular, are exploiting such technologies as a means to reduce teachers and teaching costs. This is a concern perpetuated by the hasty adoption of such technologies in the relative absence of preparation and resources to mitigate the aforementioned risks.

Social media and digital meeting places moderated by educators do have a place in WIL programs as they can facilitate networking with industry professionals and are generally easily relatable to youth whilst preparing them for technology in industry. These relatively low-cost approaches, if administered correctly, can enhance peer-to-peer learning and serve as a potential recruitment opportunity.

**How to implement WIL programs**
The best examples of integration of WIL by tertiary educators have been through staged implementation and centralised structures. Collaboration across the institution to share intelligence and allocating reasonable time in the planning stages to devise best practices affords quality WIL education to all students and avoids duplication and wastage of scarce resources. Flexibility afforded to each faculty enables educators to adapt WIL initiatives to the specific industry requirements and accreditation standards and WIL networking opportunities facilitate shared WIL intellectual advancement. Additionally, flexibility and creativity are required to overcome barriers that may lie with the student, employer, educational institution or academic supervisor. Clear
definitions of WIL initiatives, policies and stance on paid internships are required to inform WIL practice at the institution.

Due to the complex nature and time required by WIL, having a specialist team providing administrative support to educators is ideal. The team approach, as documented within select tertiary institutions in Chapter 1, would be responsible for sourcing industry partners through targeted campaigns in key industries and oversee risk management of WIL at the institution. Importantly, it is not envisaged that every member of the WIL teams will be conversant in every discipline area at their respective institute; rather, that they receive specialised training and resources to facilitate WIL. Raising stakeholder awareness as to the content, relevance and value of degree programs in hospitality is fundamental to the WIL agenda. An educational campaign would enhance industry awareness of tertiary hospitality education and address the inadequacy of current stakeholder consultations through encouraging industry ownership and collaboration. In consideration of the specific conditions of the Australian hospitality industry, an effective outcome in such a siloed industry warrants government intervention to facilitate and champion the WIL agenda through industry association collaboration or preferably amalgamation.

6.6. Chapter Summary

This chapter has examined stakeholder perceptions of WIL in hospitality tertiary education and explored a number of areas of concern for progression of the WIL agenda. The combined quantitative and qualitative analysis has established that graduates who have had experience of WIL in their tertiary studies are more attractive as employees than those who have only completed a theoretical qualification or degree where WIL is not implemented. It was found that extensive and varied contexts of engagement with WIL initiatives will enhance the perceived employability and performance of graduate employees with graduates who have had authentic experiences or both authentic and simulated WIL being found to be better prepared than those who have only experienced simulations or other contrived EL techniques, e.g. case studies, hypothetical projects and computer simulations.
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study sought to examine the perspectives of recent graduates, employers and educators to establish the contribution of WIL to enhancement of hospitality graduate employability. The major focus was to determine the transferability of benefits experienced from the application of WIL in traditional disciplines such as nursing, teaching, social work and medicine to the specific characteristics of service industries. Specific aspects of WIL that need to be managed for realisation of benefits and minimisation of negatives were identified. This final chapter will summarise the conclusions of the study relating to each research question. A series of recommendations and guidelines will then be presented followed by acknowledgment of the study limitations and directions for future research.

7.1. Conclusions about the Research Questions

This section will summarise the findings and analysis from Chapters 4, 5 and 6 to answer the five research questions.

Question 1: Are the benefits of WIL experienced by other industries transferable to hospitality? YES (How?), NO (Why not?).

The findings of both the survey and focus groups established clearly that the benefits of WIL experienced by other industries are indeed transferable to hospitality. The overwhelming response for each sample group in the survey was that WIL delivers numerous benefits for students, employers and educators. The weighted sample population achieved by averaging the sample sizes, demonstrates that 82% ‘Strongly Agree’ or ‘Agree’ that WIL provides career benefits for students and a further 68% ‘Strongly Agree’ or ‘Agree’ that WIL provides students with personal and social benefits. The range of career, personal and social benefits demonstrated in the survey as a product of WIL participation was replicated in the focus groups.
Justification for this transferability was explained as being through similar contexts, generic employability skills and common challenges, such as handling customer complaints and managing teams. On a fundamental level, hospitality encompasses standard business characteristics found across all industries along with the added complexity of service characteristics including simultaneous production and consumption (Kotler et al. 2004; Quester et al. 2003), thus providing further impetus to adequately prepare students for industry.

**Question 2: How does WIL minimise the gap between graduate attributes and industry expectations in hospitality?**

There is ample evidence in the literature from a pedagogical perspective that experience leads to improved graduate attributes and directly addresses the lack of experience often cited as a reason for graduate un-employability (Cornforth, Taylor & Varelidis 1983; Fallows & Steven 2000; Jancauskas et al. 1999; Patrick et al. 2008; Ricks & Williams 2005). Participation in WIL was established in both the survey and focus groups as a valuable and crucial source of industry experience, with experience constituting one of the main desired traits for hospitality employees. Through analysis of the benefits, WIL participation represented an opportunity for students to reaffirm their choice and ‘fit’ with their nominated industry, allowed exploration of the different avenues and working conditions within the industry and thus provided the potential to correct misconceptions including that attainment of a tertiary qualification automatically provided the status and knowledge to walk into a supervisory or management position. With WIL bridging the gap between industry, educators and students, this also served to inform employers about the content of hospitality tertiary education and thus re-evaluating their own expectations of what the capabilities of a graduate encompassed. Educators are similarly able to adapt curricula to reflect industry requirements based on consultation and partner engagement to adequately prepare students for WIL as the quality, suitability, placement, preparation, support and frequency of WIL initiatives within curricula directly impacts the extent to which the gap is minimised.
Question 3: Does WIL impact entrance and progression of WIL graduates within the hospitality industry?

Both the sample group survey responses and focus group discussions established WIL does have a positive impact on graduate entrance into the hospitality industry. The survey demonstrated that 74% of employers, 82% of graduates and 83% of educators all ‘Strongly Agreed’ or ‘Agreed’ that WIL participation afforded students the benefit of securing work after graduation. Hospitality tertiary graduates were favoured over individuals with no hospitality tertiary education in the focus groups. Specifically, the value of a hospitality tertiary qualification was associated with the demonstration of commitment in completing a long-term course (most notably a degree or diploma qualification), substantiating a graduate’s interest in hospitality as a career and participation in WIL further providing essential industry experience.

The research determined that WIL had the potential to positively impact graduate progression within the hospitality industry. Only a slight majority of the sample 61% believed participation in WIL allowed students to progress quickly through the ranks. This was substantially less than the 80% that perceived WIL to benefit entrance into industry. The prevalence of experienced hospitality employees enrolling in tertiary hospitality courses and those not seeking employment after graduation reinforced the idea that the purpose of their undertaking tertiary qualifications was to progress within their current workplace. The meagre response to progression in the workplace as a benefit of WIL evidenced in the data by all sample groups was tempered with a recognition that a graduate having the ‘right attitude’ was still the most important criteria in workplace progression rather than formal qualifications. This was consistent with prior research into WIL participation and hospitality career progression (Kim 2008; Ladkin 2000; O’Leary & Deegan 2005; Petrova & Mason 2004). Positive attitudes like a solid work ethic, emotional intelligence and resilience, were all considered as essential characteristics for hospitality employees. However, respondents expressed a belief that the tertiary education system was deficient in inculcating such attitudes amongst graduates. Respondent affiliation with the various hospitality sectors identified in section 1.6 (Slattery 2002), contributed to divergence in perceived value of a tertiary hospitality qualification with favourable views recorded for large hotel chains and the registered club sector as businesses which readily
recognised the values of tertiary hospitality qualifications as compared to small to medium enterprises run by independent operators.

**Question 4: Do demographic characteristics including but not limited to gender, age, ethnicity, prior experience, familiarity with the sector and level of education have an impact on perspectives of WIL?**

Statistical analysis demonstrated there was no real difference to participant perceptions of benefits, challenges or satisfaction based on participation in WIL, Tertiary Type or Business Size. Although several moderate and strong associations were identified towards benefits, challenges or satisfaction, these were predominantly based on hours spent on WIL, with no real difference to perceptions based on the majority of demographic variables.

The most notable and relevant associations to demographic variables related to Ethnicity, with Chinese, Indian and European/US respondents more likely to perceive human resources departments prioritising qualifications. Knowledge of Industry and Qualifications were valued by Chinese, Indian and Australian respondents. Higher percentages of participation in two or more different types of WIL initiatives were recorded by graduates from Asia, China, India and Sri Lanka. While only a small sample this desire to participate in WIL by these cultural groups might be seen as an effort to overcome perceived inadequacies in their own frames of reference as worthwhile employees and also point to their fitting in as first generation migrants who do not take employment for granted despite their paper qualifications. This supposition would need further quantitative research to validate or dispute this understanding.

Relationships were also established for Tertiary Type, with TAFE graduates participating in a higher variety of WIL initiatives compared to university graduates. A majority of graduates from other college institutes did not participate in WIL in part as WIL was not a required component of their curriculum. Interestingly University graduates were more realistic about the benefits of a degree equating to higher starting salaries and enhanced promotional opportunities in their workplaces.

Parental influence, expectations of degree qualifications and attainment of work experience were seen by the focus groups as being a cultural imperative particularly
among Indian and Asian subcultures. These ‘ethnic’ students bucked the generational trends of poor work ethic and lack of networking encountered with the general graduate population. Considering the demographic diversity of respondents in the survey and focus groups, there was universal support of WIL, and in progressing the WIL agenda within hospitality tertiary education.

**Question 5: What aspects of WIL need to be managed for realisation of these benefits and minimisation of the negatives in hospitality?**

Analysis of the primary data supported by the literature has identified several key areas for realisation of benefits and minimisation of negatives for hospitality WIL initiatives. These areas comprise: educator qualifications/experience/currency, WIL types/design/duration/timing of placement, resources/institute support, industry partnership, host supervisor training/qualifications, webinars and online courses, and how to implement WIL programs.

**Educator qualifications/experience/currency:**

Inconsistencies in educator standards within and between the tertiary educational formats (universities, TAFE, colleges) were identified in both the survey and focus groups as an impediment to quality control and to enhancing perceived value of hospitality qualifications. Qualifications of educator survey respondents ranged from no formal qualification up to doctoral degree. This finding was replicated for years of hospitality industry experience ranging from no experience to more than 15 years experience. In the focus groups the annual currency requirements (e.g. 30 hours of industry experience for instructors per annum) for TAFE compared favourably to universities. However respondents expressed concerns that in each format, standards were insufficient and inflexible to maintain currency across all aspects of the course, leading to students questioning the knowledge of instructors in line with industry practice. Respondents further emphasised that proficiency as a practitioner does not automatically translate into competence as a trainer or indeed English language proficiency. Both vocational and intellectual capital and the ability to articulate it was emphasised by the respondents.

The research determined the need to establish criteria for educators to be highly skilled in both practice and education, including currency stipulations and staff WIL
placements. The need to encourage young industry professionals into academia was also identified.

**WIL types/design/duration/timing of placement:**
The primary research concurs with WIL literature on the fundamental elements for an effective WIL program supporting transferability of these design elements to hospitality curricula. The focus groups identified benefits associated with multitude placements in a variety of industry contexts as this would maximise the benefits and reflect the diversity of the hospitality industry. This was consistent with repetition of skill demonstration within dynamic contexts in the disciplines of social work, medicine, nursing and teacher education (Nulty et al. 2011; Sieminski & Seden 2011; White, Bloomfield & Cornu 2010). Early controlled exposure to industry was accentuated to confirm student compatibility and a repeated WIL experience at the end of the course to tie everything together. Respondents emphasised inherent flexibility to start WIL when a student is ready, to match placements to individual students and the need for educators to adequately prepare students for placement. Scaffolding of WIL initiatives, alignment to curricula, performance feedback and deliberate guided reflection were also emphasised in the primary research and well supported in the literature (Kolb & Kolb 2005; McGill & Beaty 1995; Nulty et al. 2011; Parker 2005; Sieminski & Seden 2011; Smith 2012; Stupans & Owens 2009; White, Bloomfield & Cornu 2010).

The necessary elements to be managed in order to maximise benefits of WIL relate to embedding a variety and multitude of authentic and simulated WIL initiatives within hospitality curricula. Placement commencing early on in the course and additional placements scaffolded throughout the course duration. All WIL exposure must be supplemented by pre- and post-preparation.

**Resources/institute support:**
Tertiary educators were asked in the survey to record the extent to which they agreed they encountered challenges during WIL experience. The main issues identified were ‘Managing several commitments’ and ‘Obtaining appropriate placements for your students’ with 97% of the sample population ‘Agreeing’ or ‘Strongly Agreeing’ and with ‘Insufficient tertiary institute support’ at 66%. These challenges were replicated
in the focus groups as educators emphasised the stress of WIL participation and the disparity in access to funds and resources between institutes contributed to educators’ anguish. These themes echo sentiments in the literature (Bates 2011; Lindstaedt et al. 2008; Raelin 2008; Williams 2008).

An effort to combat such challenges warrants institute commitment of funds, support, policies, training, guidelines and workload recognition for educators engaged in WIL.

**Industry partnership:**
Numerous guidelines and resources articulating requirements for establishing industry partnerships including the necessity of formal agreements, selecting compatible partners, flexible arrangements and open communication were discussed in Chapter 1 with some tertiary institutions advocating specialised WIL teams charged with managing industry partnerships (Biggs 1996; Choy & Delahaye 2011; GIHE 2009; IRU 2013; Service Skills Australia 2013). Primary research demonstrated that managing industry partners was a challenge for hospitality educators with 62% agreeing that protecting the interests of industry/community partners was a challenge and only 3% disagreeing. The focus groups further revealed educator trepidation of a bad WIL experience, difficulties meeting outrageous demands of employers and the challenge to establish contracts between institute/student/employer.

Provision of WIL training, information sources and support services was identified as essential to update educators and equip them with the necessary skill set and confidence to manage industry partnerships. This should be accompanied by institutional support for ongoing research collaboration. Transparency and accountability through selection of compatible partners and negotiation of a formal contract are critical to maximising the benefits for all stakeholders.

**Host supervisor training/qualifications:**
The necessity of establishing trainer criteria for hospitality industry WIL trainers/hosts was emphasised within the focus groups. An industry wide training standards and compliance scheme was suggested for employer selection/industry trainer criteria, ensuring competent trainers with industry experience. This was positioned as a stepping stone in the long-term agenda of standardised industry accreditation. WIL
information and guidelines designed specifically for employer audiences to educate them on WIL pedagogy and their role in WIL programs was also identified in Chapter 1 with samples featured in Appendix 6 (GIHE 2009; IRU 2013; Service Skills Australia 2013).

Constituting a vital part of the industry partnership arrangements, establishing expectations of industry trainer competence, providing clear guidelines, screening field instructors and, if necessary, training for host supervisors will serve to maximise the benefits and develop long-term industry partnerships.

**Webinars and online courses:**

Blended learning, the integration of online technologies with traditional face-to-face instruction, is widely advocated to maximise the learning potential of students (Bishop & Dziuban 2007; Donnelly 2010; Osguthorpe & Graham 2003). The multifaceted learning approach accommodating varying learning styles of students and has been used successfully in WIL to support students on placements and in preparation before placement, as for instance, with the online pre-placement course conducted by Flinders University (2013). However, both the TAFE and University formats were identified in the focus groups as struggling to adjust to online technologies within hospitality courses with even the more progressive distance learning schemes challenged by consistency and competency assessment. The importance of achieving a balance of theory and practical in curricula was deemed critical in tandem with raising the profile and value of hospitality qualifications. Replacement of traditional face-to-face instruction by online technologies is thus inconsistent with blended learning with the risk of inhibiting development of social skills critical to hospitality.

Integration of online technologies positioned in hospitality curricula to augment and not replace the existing engaged learning methods has the potential to enhance benefits and counter the costs and resource requirements of WIL in hospitality.

**How to implement WIL programs:**

In the absence of a best practice model, attempts to prescribe implementation of WIL programs were canvased in the literature with the review of current practices in Australian Tertiary Institutions in Chapter 1. Key elements were identified as staged
implementation, integrated learning support, authenticity, alignment of learning activities and assessment to learning objectives, authenticity, pre and post preparation, three way contracts and compatibility with partners (Cashman & Seifer 2005; Choy and Delahaye 2011; Shehri 2012; Smith 2012). The focus group discussions accentuated the role of collaboration across the tertiary formats to enhance the WIL knowledge base including intra and interdisciplinary. Essential elements for WIL in hospitality curricula were considered consistent with other disciplines including mandatory WIL, substantial industry experience in a variety of industry contexts through multiple placements and other WIL initiatives, scaffolding, early exposure to industry, authentic and simulated experiences, flexibility to accommodate student needs, individual and group learning, induction and preparation, reflection and WIL built in to academic workloads.

Commencing with the strategic aspirations and resourcing by each institution, inherent flexibility and creativity are vital to accommodate for discipline variances and challenges associated with WIL. Collaborative planning and staged implementation, guided by WIL personnel at an institutional level are essential. Other important aspects to maximise the benefits for all stakeholders include industry ownership and government intervention.

7.2. Recommendations

Specific recommendations pertaining to this study are categorised in the following areas: research agenda, educator training needs, institution approach to WIL and WIL resources, and role of the Federal Government.

Research Agenda
Rapid expansion and demand for hospitality programs in the absence of accreditation standards is perpetuating underemployment of hospitality graduates and associated devaluing of hospitality qualifications. In order to address this issue it is recommended that an urgent national investigation should be conducted into the value and necessary composition of hospitality degree programs. A specific focus on alignment of these
programs to hospitality industry career paths is necessary to improve transition of graduates into industry and minimise leakage into unrelated industries.

Despite the abundance of WIL research on both a national and global scale encompassing attempts to develop models, guidelines and best practices, the development of a singular acceptable model is still elusive. Consensus does exist for recognition of the resource intensive nature of WIL and it is recommended that further research be undertaken to ascertain the specific costs and resource needs of WIL programs with respect to each tertiary education format. This should include examination of the human resource requirements relating to the time, effort and skills required to perform WIL roles and these factors need to be aligned to academic workloads.

**Educator Training Needs**
Competency of hospitality educators was identified in this study as an area of concern on account of the divergent credentials espoused by differing tertiary education formats. Particular concern extended to the lack of industry experience and inadequate teaching and/or industry qualifications potentially held by educators. It is recommended that further research be conducted to determine and/or review competency standards for hospitality tertiary educators within each format, namely; TAFE, university and other institutes/RTOs, and the mandating of currency stipulations for both training skills and industry practice. Such industry currency requirements must be appropriate to industry role skill sets, and as such, warrant expansion of currency hours for commercial cookery educators within the TAFE format. Potentially, such currency within the university format could adopt the system of national accreditation standards for RSA, which requires accreditation every five years. A further recommended is the establishment of formalised workload provisions by tertiary institutes for lecturers and trainers to allow them to take time away from their core work to participate in WIL placements to maintain industry currency.

**Institution Approach to WIL and WIL Resources**
This section canvasses a series of recommendations drawn from the primary and secondary research to inform and guide the approach tertiary institutions take to WIL. It is recommended that each institute establish clear strategic direction, operational
tactics and adequate resourcing for WIL. Clear definitions of WIL initiatives, policies and stance on paid internships are required to inform WIL practice at the institution. It is also recommended that each institute establish membership in a WIL association, most notably ACEN, thereby reinforces their commitment to WIL whilst facilitating networking and professional collaboration. Staged implementation and centralised support structures for WIL programs through collaboration across the institution serves to share intelligence while avoiding duplication and wastage of resources.

It is further recommended the development of institution guidelines, training and support mechanisms for educators engaged in WIL initiatives including frameworks for handling problems and addressing emerging issues as essential foundations for WIL programs. Such materials and educator support to encompass the provision of WIL training and information sources for all educators; guidelines, training and information informing selection of a compatible partner, establishing contact and negotiating contracts and how to manage relationships; as well as guidelines and resources to share with industry/host supervisors, including screening of field instructors beyond credentials to include reference letters and interviews where feasible, field instructor training and guidelines to help overcome uneven quality of instruction. Further guidelines, training and support for industry partners to comprise guidelines and information brochures to introduce WIL pedagogy, identify benefits for industry, templates and checklists detailing student requirements for workspace, induction and assessment.

The need to entice younger industry members into academia is both implicit and explicit, with the merits of having educators closer to the age of the student population enabling them to ‘get through to them easier’. In terms of educator recruitment a review of institute recruitment processes with a view to entice younger industry members into academia are recommended. Appropriate support mechanisms must be in place so prospective educators can negotiate the bureaucratic environment.

Creating a specialist team providing administrative support to educators is highly recommended. The team approach (as documented within select tertiary institutions in Chapter 1) to be responsible for sourcing industry partners through targeted campaigns in key industries and overseeing contract negotiations and risk management of WIL at
the institution. The benefit of this approach would extend to rationalising the structured periodic evaluation of WIL programs essential to inform improvements to design and execution of WIL within the discipline’s curricula and intelligence shared within the institution.

It is recommended that a degree of autonomy be afforded to hospitality departments to adapt programs aligned to the specific conditions of the industry and to evolving industry accreditation standards. Furthermore it is recommended that hospitality theoretical units be interspersed throughout hospitality degree programs to establish connection to industry in year 1 and scaffolded in each subsequent year. Improvements to stakeholder consultation in hospitality course reviews were emphasised in both the primary and secondary research and can be achieved through securing and maintaining strategic relationships with WIL industry and community partners and by establishing relationships with industry associations.

Securing placements for large cohorts is a universal challenge encountered by educators in which may be somewhat alleviated by institutions embedding conditions in contracts during the tendering process for onsite institute facility suppliers, e.g. food outlets, to place/employ a quota of students. This presents an opportunity to place ‘problem students’ (low SES, disabled, criminal record, visa restrictions) within tertiary institutes where they have familiarity and accessibility to support mechanisms. It is recognised that community and volunteer organisations and special events provide placement opportunities for hospitality students. In the absence of industry/community partners, institutions can create events in support of a community cause or fundraising effort. Furthermore promotion of institute, government and WIL association grants and available funding to students for financial support during WIL placements will make WIL more accessible for students. Expansion of blended learning initiatives is conditional on being adequately resourced and integrated within curricula to supplement traditional methods so that it equips students to meet the future needs of the workforce whilst still enhancing commitment, discipline and peer-to-peer learning.

**Role of Federal Government**

In consideration of the specific conditions of the Australian hospitality industry and the plethora of hospitality tertiary education offerings, an effective outcome in such a
siloed industry warrants government intervention to facilitate and champion the WIL agenda through industry association collaboration. Considering the myriad of replica hospitality and tourism associations often working in isolation permitting inefficiencies, a further case can be made for rationalisation by government facilitation and encouragement of amalgamation of the excessive number of hospitality industry associations to further the interests of the industry and to support better management of such organisations. Encouraging industry ownership and collaboration is achieved through getting the key associations on board, namely: Restaurant and Caterers Association, Australian Hotels Association, Club Managers Association Australia.

Australian and international governments are still grappling with the legalities of unpaid internships with attempts to clarify terminology, establish guidelines and to regulate. It is highly recommended that an urgent government review be conducted into the legality, accessibility and ethics of medium-to-long-term unpaid work experience constituting a mandatory component of tertiary courses. Although the use of unpaid placements is justified under the Fair Work Act when linked to course credit, the significant financial and associated challenges to WIL participation faced by students, equity issues when some students get paid and others unpaid as well as the importance of paid WIL to student willingness to participate need to be addressed.

At a strategic level it is recommended that a joint State and Federal Government educational campaign be undertaken for raising stakeholder awareness as to the content, relevance and value of degree programs in hospitality to the WIL agenda. It is recommended the positioning of hospitality industry accreditation on the national agenda (as observed in recent times with the fields of medicine, social work and education) as being critical to ensure quality education standards. Furthermore a commitment to funding for research into hospitality degrees and WIL in hospitality curricula must be aligned to improving quality standards. On completion of such research and improvements to course offerings, it is envisioned that the government would then assist industry associations in marketing these changes to industry, and society in general, to create awareness of the value of a hospitality degree.

In the short term, establishment of a set of national industry training standards, such as a star rating scheme, for tertiary education providers, with 5-star providers actively
promoted on government and industry association websites is recommended. The system requires a minimum standard or accreditation process to be reviewed annually to ensure providers maintain qualifications.

The final recommendations is for the Federal government to actively promote and facilitate collaboration within the tertiary education sector through encouraging and potentially funding membership to ACEN and providing funding for state and national forums, targeting both professional and academic staff within each tertiary education format, and with industry and government representation, to address mutual issues whilst still maintaining unique differences.

**Guidelines for WIL Design**

Specific guidelines have been development based on primary and secondary research for WIL integration in hospitality tertiary education (also trans-disciplinary in nature). It is important to clarify that whilst these guidelines featured below serve to outline key elements for the design of preeminent WIL programs the ability to deliver upon these aspirations is dependent on the adequate resourcing and commitment to WIL by each institution, industry associations and government as well as inherent creativity and flexibility in order to overcome the associated challenges of WIL. Such challenges include securing placements for large cohorts which remains a universal disciplinary and tertiary format complaint. Implementation of these elements into institution WIL programs constitutes an incremental development process.
Specific WIL Guidelines:

- WIL to be positioned as mandatory with core components of the curricula targeted to provide adequate induction to the industry and impart employability skills.

- Scaffolding of WIL within the curricula with initiatives spaced throughout the course duration, starting with more simple and potentially short-term initiatives within the first year and becoming progressively more complex as students proceed through the course.

- WIL initiatives placed early on in the course (within the first 12 months of a degree program) to commence with a VET component, for example RSA, bar skills or restaurant operations, to confirm student compatibility with the industry and alleviate employer burdens of unskilled students.

- Appropriate focus of WIL experiences to be aligned to the type of course, with degree level emphasising management and evaluation skills and diploma/certificate courses emphasising operational skills.

- WIL programs within hospitality curricula to comprise multiple types of WIL initiatives, various durations and workplace settings to expose students to the diversity of hospitality industry careers, so students can trial different parts of the industry as well as different businesses and management types.

- Mandatory authentic WIL initiatives extending to real work settings, complexities and relevant tasks. These may be complemented by simulated WIL experiences.

- Consideration for university formats to incorporate long-term placements such as internships, through a sandwich WIL year, extending degree programs from three years to four years, embedding all industry relevant employability skills.

- Alignment of WIL initiatives to curricula, learning and assessments to ensure transparency of how WIL experience contributes to graduate employability outcomes.

- Mandatory structured pre-placement preparation to reduce and manage student anxiety, providing information about the workplace; establishing standards of professional behaviour; outlining activities and responsibilities on the placement; providing guidelines and opportunities to practise problem solving; and outlining forms of assessment. Simultaneous integration of employability-related modules within curricula to focus on both operational skills and career management to develop professional identity.
- **WIL partnership arrangements to be based on negotiation of a formal contract** to explicate roles and responsibilities of all parties (educators, students and hosts) and set the tone of the relationship.

- **Maintain regular contact with industry/host partners** through preferred means established in contract negotiations phase, enabling the educator to monitor progress and take corrective action as necessary.

- **Establish mechanisms to provide constructive feedback** to improve student performance during the placement, including scheduled performance reviews and meetings with host supervisor.

- **Structured contact between the student and academic supervisor and between the academic supervisor and host supervisor**, to monitor student progress and address emerging issues.

- **Post preparation including guided reflective learning and debrief sessions** to maximise learning from WIL experience, demonstrate alignment of teaching to practice and facilitate peer-to-peer learning.

- **Flexibility and creativity in placement design** to facilitate access and equality in WIL programs and to overcome barriers that may lie with the student, employer, educational institution or academic supervisor.

- **Establishment of buddy and peer support programs** to support students on placements and enhance learning.

- **Medium–long-term placements (of more than two weeks full time duration)** to be in a paid capacity. Considering limitations of many small businesses to access funds, tertiary institutes to inform prospective hosts of available government and industry association funding to cover costs of some WIL placements. Consider adoption of the apprenticeship pay structure of paying students proportional to their skill level, for example, 75% of industry wage if 75% trained.

- **Utilisation of social media and digital meeting places** moderated by educators to facilitate networking with industry professionals and serve as a potential recruitment opportunity on account of low cost, easily relatable to youth and can enhance peer-to-peer learning.
7.3. Limitations of the Study

There are several limitations to this study that need to be acknowledged. This study is by no means an exhaustive examination of WIL in Australian hospitality curricula. Limited time and resources contributed to the confined scope of the NSW hospitality tertiary education system. This decision also accommodated the variances in state and federal jurisdictions regarding university, TAFE and colleges.

The absence of central email registries and the paucity of hospitality vocational education listings, further precluded identification of all members of the total population thus limiting techniques to non-random sampling. The use of network and convenience sampling techniques contributed to the overrepresentation of respondents residing in the Sydney basin due to proximity to the researcher. A concerted effort to target each of the four hospitality sectors from both regional and metro NSW and each hospitality tertiary organisation listed was designed to enhance representation of the sample population for the survey. Efforts were also made to recruit focus group members from all formats and industry sectors though again overrepresentation of Sydney residents was observed as this was where the sessions were conducted as it was not feasible for the researcher to travel all over NSW.

Despite the level of interest in the study, the reality was a rather low and gradual response rate which was attributed to survey fatigue with several key organisations prearranged to circulate the survey link deciding to concurrently conduct internal business surveys. Many respondents also cited time constraints endemic to the nature of hospitality businesses for their inability to complete the survey by the original deadline with the response rate improving following extension of the deadline.

The limitations of a small sample size and non-random sampling methods have precluded more extensive statistical investigations. The mixed methodology design has served in part to mitigate these with similar questions asked in the focus groups to test validity of the quantitative findings. A larger scale study using random sampling is required to verify these results.
7.4. Conclusion

This study has demonstrated there is a critical need to streamline education to deliver highly skilled and responsive recruits for industry. Whilst there has been a broad update of WIL and expansion of WIL literature, tertiary education institutions continue to struggle with strategic direction and effective design and integration of WIL in curricula. Advancing the WIL agenda is difficult at the faculty and institution level with conflicting cultures, structures and hierarchy let alone at any strategic government level. Improved trans-disciplinary professional collaboration would benefit underdeveloped fields like hospitality, with all disciplines encountering the same dilemmas. To make a substantial contribution to improving the quality of hospitality tertiary education, considering the siloed nature of hospitality businesses and industry associations, in addition to the undervalued hospitality degree, is a momentous undertaking requiring champions from industry, education and government. Considering improved quality of the labour market and employability for graduates is in the best interests of industry and government; industry (supported by government) needs to push the WIL agenda.
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Appendices
APPENDIX 1: LIST OF HOSPITALITY TERTIARY INSTITUTIONS

The tables below feature directories of Australian Tertiary Institutions derived from multiple sources and internet searches. The institutes in green colouring are classified as hospitality/tourism providers through offering one or more H&T courses.

Sources:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Name of TAFE</th>
<th>Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>Hunter Institute</td>
<td><a href="http://www.hunter.tafensw.edu.au/Pages/default.aspx">http://www.hunter.tafensw.edu.au/Pages/default.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Illawarra Institute</td>
<td><a href="http://www.illawarra.tafensw.edu.au/">http://www.illawarra.tafensw.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northern Sydney Institute</td>
<td><a href="http://www.nsi.tafensw.edu.au/">http://www.nsi.tafensw.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open Training and Education Network (OTEN)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.oten.edu.au/oten/oten.htm">http://www.oten.edu.au/oten/oten.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Western Sydney Institute</td>
<td><a href="http://www.swsi.tafensw.edu.au/">http://www.swsi.tafensw.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sydney Institute</td>
<td><a href="http://www.sit.nsw.edu.au/">http://www.sit.nsw.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Western Institute</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wit.tafensw.edu.au/">http://www.wit.tafensw.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Western Sydney Institute</td>
<td><a href="http://wsi.tafensw.edu.au/">http://wsi.tafensw.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bendigo Regional Institute of TAFE</td>
<td><a href="http://www.bendigotafe.edu.au/Pages/default.aspx">http://www.bendigotafe.edu.au/Pages/default.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Box Hill Institute of TAFE</td>
<td><a href="http://www.bhtafe.edu.au/Pages/default.aspx">http://www.bhtafe.edu.au/Pages/default.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Name of TAFE</td>
<td>Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>Central Gippsland Institute of TAFE</td>
<td><a href="http://www.gippstafe.vic.edu.au/">http://www.gippstafe.vic.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chisholm Institute of TAFE</td>
<td><a href="http://www.chisholm.edu.au/">http://www.chisholm.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gordon Institute of TAFE</td>
<td><a href="http://www.gordontafe.edu.au/">http://www.gordontafe.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Holmesglen Institute of TAFE</td>
<td><a href="http://www.holmesglen.edu.au/">http://www.holmesglen.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institute of Land and Resources (Melbourne University)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.land-environment.unimelb.edu.au/">http://www.land-environment.unimelb.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kangan Batman Institute of TAFE</td>
<td><a href="http://www.kangan.edu.au/?inst=52">http://www.kangan.edu.au/?inst=52</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Royal Melbourne Institute of TAFE</td>
<td><a href="http://www.rmit.edu.au/?inst=59">http://www.rmit.edu.au/?inst=59</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South West Institute of TAFE</td>
<td><a href="http://www.swtafe.vic.edu.au/">http://www.swtafe.vic.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Swinburne University of Technology (TAFE Division)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.tafe.swinburne.edu.au/index.html">http://www.tafe.swinburne.edu.au/index.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Ballarat (TAFE Division)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ballarat.edu.au/vfed/">http://www.ballarat.edu.au/vfed/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victoria University (TAFE Division)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.vu.edu.au/about-us/academic-colleges">http://www.vu.edu.au/about-us/academic-colleges</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Angliss Institute of TAFE</td>
<td><a href="http://www.angliss.edu.au/">http://www.angliss.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wodonga TAFE</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wodongatafe.edu.au/">http://www.wodongatafe.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gold Coast Institute of TAFE</td>
<td><a href="http://gcit.edu.au/">http://gcit.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southbank Institute of Technology</td>
<td><a href="http://www.southbank.edu.au/site/">http://www.southbank.edu.au/site/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Name of TAFE</td>
<td>Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland continued</td>
<td>Sunshine Coast Institute of TAFE</td>
<td><a href="http://www.sunshinecoast.tafe.qld.gov.au/site/">http://www.sunshinecoast.tafe.qld.gov.au/site/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>Canberra Institute of Technology</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cit.act.edu.au/">http://www.cit.act.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.trainingwa.wa.gov.au/trainingwa/detcms/portal/">http://www.trainingwa.wa.gov.au/trainingwa/detcms/portal/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Central Institute of Technology</td>
<td><a href="http://www.central.wa.edu.au/Pages/default.aspx">http://www.central.wa.edu.au/Pages/default.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Challenger TAFE</td>
<td><a href="http://www.challenger.wa.edu.au/Pages/default.aspx">http://www.challenger.wa.edu.au/Pages/default.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Durack Institute of Technology (formerly Central West)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.durack.edu.au/Pages/Home.aspx">http://www.durack.edu.au/Pages/Home.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Great Southern Institute of Technology</td>
<td><a href="http://gsinstitution.wa.edu.au/Pages/default.aspx">http://gsinstitution.wa.edu.au/Pages/default.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kimberley Training Institute</td>
<td><a href="http://www.kti.wa.edu.au/Pages/Home.aspx">http://www.kti.wa.edu.au/Pages/Home.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pilbara Institute</td>
<td><a href="http://pilbara.wa.edu.au/">http://pilbara.wa.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Polytechnic West (formerly Swan TAFE)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.polytechnic.wa.edu.au/">http://www.polytechnic.wa.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South West Regional College of TAFE</td>
<td><a href="http://www.swrc.wa.edu.au/Pages/default.aspx">http://www.swrc.wa.edu.au/Pages/default.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Coast Institute of Training</td>
<td><a href="http://www.wcit.wa.edu.au/home">http://www.wcit.wa.edu.au/home</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Australia</td>
<td>TAFE South Australia</td>
<td><a href="http://www.tafesa.edu.au/">http://www.tafesa.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasmania</td>
<td>TasTAFE</td>
<td><a href="http://www.tastafe.tas.edu.au/Pages/default.aspx">http://www.tastafe.tas.edu.au/Pages/default.aspx</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Universities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Name of University</th>
<th>Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>Australian Catholic University</td>
<td><a href="http://www.acu.edu.au/">http://www.acu.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charles Sturt University</td>
<td><a href="http://www.csu.edu.au/">http://www.csu.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curtin University of Technology</td>
<td><a href="http://www.curtin.edu.au/">http://www.curtin.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Macquarie University</td>
<td><a href="http://www.mq.edu.au/">http://www.mq.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southern Cross University</td>
<td><a href="http://www.scu.edu.au/">http://www.scu.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of New England</td>
<td><a href="http://www.une.edu.au/">http://www.une.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of New South Wales</td>
<td><a href="http://www.unsw.edu.au/">http://www.unsw.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Newcastle</td>
<td><a href="http://www.newcastle.edu.au/">http://www.newcastle.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Sydney</td>
<td><a href="http://www.usyd.edu.au/">http://www.usyd.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Technology Sydney</td>
<td><a href="http://www.uts.edu.au/">http://www.uts.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Western Sydney</td>
<td><a href="http://www.uws.edu.au/">http://www.uws.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>Name of University</td>
<td>Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>Deakin University</td>
<td><a href="http://www.deakin.edu.au/">http://www.deakin.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RMIT University</td>
<td><a href="http://www.rmit.edu.au/">http://www.rmit.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Swinburne University of Technology</td>
<td><a href="http://www.swinburne.edu.au/">http://www.swinburne.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Ballarat/Industry Skills Centre</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ballarat.edu.au/">http://www.ballarat.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Melbourne</td>
<td><a href="http://www.unimelb.edu.au/">http://www.unimelb.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>La Trobe University</td>
<td><a href="http://www.latrobe.edu.au/">http://www.latrobe.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victoria University</td>
<td><a href="http://www.vu.edu.au/">http://www.vu.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td>Queensland University of Technology</td>
<td><a href="http://www.qut.edu.au/">http://www.qut.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bond University</td>
<td><a href="http://www.bond.edu.au/">http://www.bond.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Central Queensland University</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cqu.edu.au/">http://www.cqu.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Griffith University</td>
<td><a href="http://www.griffith.edu.au/">http://www.griffith.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>James Cook University</td>
<td><a href="http://www.jcu.edu.au/">http://www.jcu.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Queensland</td>
<td><a href="http://www.uq.edu.au/">http://www.uq.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Southern Queensland</td>
<td><a href="http://www.usq.edu.au/">http://www.usq.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of the Sunshine Coast</td>
<td><a href="http://www.usc.edu.au/">http://www.usc.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Australia</td>
<td>Edith Cowan University</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ecu.edu.au/">http://www.ecu.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Murdoch University</td>
<td><a href="http://www.murdoch.edu.au/">http://www.murdoch.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Notre Dame Australia</td>
<td><a href="http://www.nd.edu.au/">http://www.nd.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Western Australia</td>
<td><a href="http://www.uwa.edu.au/">http://www.uwa.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Australia</td>
<td>Flinders University</td>
<td><a href="http://www.flinders.edu.au/">http://www.flinders.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Adelaide</td>
<td><a href="http://www.adelaide.edu.au/">http://www.adelaide.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of South Australia</td>
<td><a href="http://www.unisa.edu.au/">http://www.unisa.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Australian National University</td>
<td><a href="http://www.anu.edu.au/">http://www.anu.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Canberra</td>
<td><a href="http://www.canberra.edu.au/home/">http://www.canberra.edu.au/home/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasmania</td>
<td>University of Tasmania</td>
<td><a href="http://www.utas.edu.au/">http://www.utas.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Territory</td>
<td>Charles Darwin University</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cdu.edu.au/">http://www.cdu.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Private Colleges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of College</th>
<th>State of Operation</th>
<th>Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>development.aspx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Beaumont Hospitality Training College</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOT-Accredited Online Training</td>
<td>online</td>
<td><a href="http://www.aot.edu.au/">http://www.aot.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apex Institute of Education Pty Ltd</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td><a href="http://apexaustralia.com/">http://apexaustralia.com/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian College of Applied Education</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td><a href="http://www.acae.edu.au/schools/asthm/">http://www.acae.edu.au/schools/asthm/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of College</th>
<th>State of Operation</th>
<th>Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Australian Catholic University)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Institute of Food Safety</td>
<td>online</td>
<td><a href="http://www.foodsafety.com.au/">http://www.foodsafety.com.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Pacific College - Young Rabbit Pty Ltd</td>
<td>NSW, QLD</td>
<td><a href="http://www.apc.edu.au/">http://www.apc.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australis Institute of Technology and Education - ALIF Australia Pty Ltd</td>
<td>NSW, QLD</td>
<td><a href="http://www.australisinstitute.nsw.edu.au/">http://www.australisinstitute.nsw.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APM College of Business and Communication</td>
<td>NSW, QLD</td>
<td><a href="http://www.apm.edu.au/">http://www.apm.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian College of Applied Education</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td><a href="http://www.acae.edu.au/">http://www.acae.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Solutions Pty Ltd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Hospitality Institute</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.ahihospitality.net.au/">http://www.ahihospitality.net.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Training Solutions</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td><a href="http://www.oztrains.com/">http://www.oztrains.com/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2B Hospitality</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta College Pty Ltd</td>
<td>QLD</td>
<td><a href="http://www.beta.edu.au/">http://www.beta.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Mountains International Hotel Management School</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td><a href="http://www.bluemountains.edu.au/">http://www.bluemountains.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cairns Business College</td>
<td>QLD</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cbcaustralia.com/aboutus/default.htm">http://www.cbcaustralia.com/aboutus/default.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Careers Australia Institute of Hospitality - Careers</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td><a href="http://www.careersaustralia.edu.au/">http://www.careersaustralia.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia Institute of Training Pty Ltd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central College</td>
<td>NSW, online</td>
<td><a href="http://www.centralcollege.edu.au/">http://www.centralcollege.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSL Club Ltd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of College</td>
<td>State of Operation</td>
<td>Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crown Institute of Business and Technology Pty Ltd</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cibt.nsw.edu.au/">http://www.cibt.nsw.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empyrean Education Institute</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td><a href="http://eei.wa.edu.au/">http://eei.wa.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmes Institute Pty Ltd</td>
<td>VIC, NSW&lt; QLD,</td>
<td><a href="http://www.holmes.edu.au/">http://www.holmes.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality Training Australia</td>
<td>VIC, NSW, SA</td>
<td><a href="http://www.hosptrain.edu.au/">http://www.hosptrain.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International College of Hotel Management</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td><a href="http://ichm.edu.au/">http://ichm.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International College of Management Sydney</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td><a href="http://icms.edu.au/">http://icms.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Institute for Professional Development, Australian IT and Hospitality Institute</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td><a href="http://www.iipd.edu.au/">http://www.iipd.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS Bar Skills</td>
<td>QLD</td>
<td><a href="http://www.its.qld.edu.au/">http://www.its.qld.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of College</td>
<td>State of Operation</td>
<td>Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Trobe International College (La Trobe University)</td>
<td>VIC</td>
<td><a href="http://www.latrobemelbourne.edu.au/">http://www.latrobemelbourne.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macleay College</td>
<td>NSW, VIC</td>
<td><a href="http://www.macleay.edu.au/">http://www.macleay.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin College</td>
<td>QLD, NSW, VIC</td>
<td><a href="http://www.martincollege.edu.au/">http://www.martincollege.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open College of Tourism and Hospitality - Open Colleges Pty Ltd</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td><a href="http://www.opencolleges.edu.au/">http://www.opencolleges.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIBT - Perth Institute of Business and Technology (Edith Cowan University)</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td><a href="http://www.pibt.wa.edu.au/">http://www.pibt.wa.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Hospitality International</td>
<td>Online</td>
<td><a href="http://www.qhint.com/promo/">http://www.qhint.com/promo/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland Institute of Business and Technology (Griffith University)</td>
<td>QLD</td>
<td><a href="http://www.qibt.qld.edu.au/">http://www.qibt.qld.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raffles College of Design And Commerce</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td><a href="http://www.raffles.edu.au/">http://www.raffles.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarina Russo Institute</td>
<td>QLD</td>
<td><a href="http://www.russo.qld.edu.au/">http://www.russo.qld.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Patrick’s Institute of Education</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td><a href="http://www.spie.edu.au/">http://www.spie.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathfield College - Australian Vocational Institute Group Pty Ltd</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td><a href="http://sc.nsw.edu.au/">http://sc.nsw.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Training for Hospitality Services, Student Training Services</td>
<td>VIC, NSW, QLD</td>
<td><a href="http://www.sths.com.au/">http://www.sths.com.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney School of Business and Technology Pty Ltd</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ssbt.nsw.edu.au/">http://www.ssbt.nsw.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Illawarra Business College - Focal Holdings Pty Ltd</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td><a href="http://www.tibc.nsw.edu.au/">http://www.tibc.nsw.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of College</td>
<td>State of Operation</td>
<td>Website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Salvation Army Booth College</td>
<td>NSW, QLD</td>
<td><a href="http://boothcollege.edu.au/">http://boothcollege.edu.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Course Professionals</td>
<td>NSW, online</td>
<td><a href="http://www.tcptraining.com/">http://www.tcptraining.com/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2: MACQUARIE UNIVERSITY PACE PROGRAM

PACE Strategy

Macquarie University’s Participation and Community Engagement Strategic Plan (PACE) fits within the University’s Strategic Directions 2008–2012 to:

- contribute to social environmental, cultural, economic and commercial well being (Research)
- promote local and global perspectives in the curriculum (Social Inclusion)
- renew the curriculum and foster student engagement (Learning and Teaching)
- develop mutually beneficial relationships (Business and Community Engagement)
- develop partnerships with the community (Organisational Sustainability)

OUR VISION

Mutually Beneficial Learning and Engagement

OUR MISSION

- Develop the capability of Macquarie students and staff to actively contribute to the well being of people and the planet.
- Assist local, regional and international partners to build their capacity to meet their mission and purpose.
- Establish Macquarie as a leading university for transformative learning and research recognised for excellence in socially inclusive practice and research.

OUR PRINCIPLES

The PACE initiative is based on the following principles:

- Ethical Practice
- Partnership and Reciprocity
- Social Responsibility
- Sound Pedagogy
- Recognition of and respect for diverse ways of doing, being and knowing
- Whole Person Learning
- Knowledge Generation and Dissemination
- Transparency
- Equity of Access to Resources
OUR STRATEGIC GOALS
1. Utilise Participation units and activities to strengthen graduate and staff capabilities.
2. Support partnerships which encourage principles of social and environmental responsibility.
3. Develop a continuously improving PACE initiative that is reflective and converts lessons learnt into practice.
4. Demonstrate an effective model for community engagement that contributes to a distinctive international reputation for excellence for Macquarie University.

PACE OUTCOMES

- A clearly articulated Strategic Action Plan for Participation is adopted and implemented based upon agreed guiding principles and criteria.
- A comprehensive and sustainable business plan is developed to ensure proper resourcing of program delivery across the University.
- Funding for participation activities is formally budgeted and supports students, staff, partnerships and ongoing administration.
- A well-equipped and resourced ‘hub’ with an integrated relationship and management infrastructure.
- Increased awareness and enthusiasm to embrace the PACE Initiative and develop participation throughout Macquarie.
- Participation pilots successfully completed and evaluated and a range of models identified to facilitate participation experiences.
- Increased numbers of creative and innovative units and activities consistent with guiding principles and showing tangible benefits.
- Partners, students, and staff engaging in Participation are having beneficial learning experiences.
- Participation is embedded and integrated across policy, process and, practice as well as the curriculum and University life.
- Macquarie is a leading university for transformative learning and research and recognised for excellence in socially inclusive practice and research.

Macquarie University 2013, *PACE Strategy*, Date accessed: 5/8/2013,
http://students.mq.edu.au/opportunities/participation_and_community_engagement/
## APPENDIX 3: FLINDERS UNIVERSITY PRE-PLACE FLYER

### PrePlace

An online Work-Integrated Learning (WIL) preparation program for use across disciplines

*Centre for University Teaching*

### Synopsis

PrePlace is an online program designed to provide guidance to students prior to commencement in a Work-Integrated Learning (WIL) placement.

PrePlace is multi-disciplinary in its approach. It conveys key information on Flinders University’s policy requirements and procedures including occupational health and safety, problem solving tasks (using case study scenarios), guidance on utilising feedback, contexts of organisations, professional attitudes and skills.

Accessible to students through online delivery, PrePlace supports Flinders University’s diverse student population including those in regional and remote settings.

Pre-Place provides students with information leading to knowledge acquisition and the establishment of a firm foundation for participating in a successful WIL experience.

### Background

PrePlace has been designed by a dedicated Working Group consisting of academic and professional staff from across the faculties and key student support areas.

PrePlace content is based on the University’s Administrative Procedures for Student Work-Integrated Learning Placements; recommendations from Flinders University Work-Integrated Learning (WIL) practitioners; and incorporates material from the 2003 WIL Online Preparation Practicum Program and Teacher’s Guide.

### Learning Outcomes

Delivered in three modules PrePlace addresses the following learning outcomes through content and assessment tasks.

**WIL Policy and Procedures:** students identify the requirements that demonstrate fitness for placement (linking with InPlace when applicable) and criteria/reasons under which a student may be withdrawn from placement.

**Occupational Health and Safety (OHS):** students identify their role and responsibility in OHS while on WIL placement; OHS processes and equipment within a workplace; correct process for reporting an injury incurred while on placement; and their further responsibilities and expected practices in relation to them and OHS in the workplace.

**Thriving on Placement:** students recognise a variety of issues that may occur in a WIL placement and identify appropriate methods to address these WIL related issues. Issues cover preparing for placement, organisational culture, work-life balance, and dealing with feedback.

### Assessment

PrePlace learning outcomes are assessed by quizzes throughout the three modules. A tracking system enables students to view their progress of both the required readings and quiz completions.

Feedback responding to the selected answer(s) is provided immediately after submission of the quiz. Feedback clarifies the goals of the task and provides guidance on further steps and considerations. Where a student receives a grade lower than the required pass mark they are able to re-take the assessment task until the passing grade is obtained.

### Implementation

PrePlace is intended to be undertaken by all Flinders University students prior to commencing their WIL placement. We recommend that you include PrePlace in your WIL topic’s Statement of Assessment (SAs).

Students may be directed to self-register into PrePlace through the following processes:

1. a link from their WIL Topic’s FLO site to PrePlace.
2. referral in a topic handbook or outline to PrePlace.

Students can be asked to submit their grades from PrePlace directly to their WIL University Supervisor or the Center for Educational ICT (CEdIC) can provide a grade report for your student cohort upon request.

---

Enquiries regarding PrePlace can be directed to:

The Centre for University Teaching
cut@flinders.edu.au

CRICOS No. 00114A

---
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APPENDIX 4: SAMPLE POSTGRADUATE COURSE OUTLINES

InterContinental I Grad Program

I Grad Future Leaders Program Australasia 2013

Why I-Grad?

Read on to find out why you should join our I-Grad program...

I-Grad is a twelve month graduate management trainee program where you'll learn the ins and outs of running a great hotel while developing your capabilities as a future leader. I-Grad programs are offered within Hotel Operations and in 2013 we will also offer some specialised I-Grad programs within the Business Functions of Finance, Sales, Marketing and Human Resources. As an I-Grad you’ll:

- Learn the fundamentals of how the hotel industry works
- Develop skills and experience in the function of your choice
- Manage an innovative project from start to finish
- Receive one-on-one monthly coaching from the hotel’s General Manager
- Gain leadership experience with an internationally recognised hotel brand
- Be a part of the world’s fastest growing international hotel group

The 12 month program is defined by three rotations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I-Grad</th>
<th>Rotation 1</th>
<th>Rotation 2</th>
<th>Rotation 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>Food and Beverage Operations</td>
<td>Front Office Operations</td>
<td>Housekeeping Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>Hotel Operations</td>
<td>New Business Development</td>
<td>Relationship Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>Hotel Operations</td>
<td>Marketing Communication</td>
<td>eCommerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>Hotel Operations</td>
<td>Talent Development</td>
<td>Talent Rourcing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>Hotel Operations</td>
<td>Hotel Accounts</td>
<td>Finance and Business Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What we offer:
► Competitive full time graduate salary and great benefits
► Fast track development, building your leadership capability
► Career progression into great leadership roles within our hotels and business support functions
► Two intakes a year, commencing February and July

What you need to be successful in your application:
► I-Grad Operations: A recent Bachelor’s Degree or a recent Diploma or Advanced Diploma in Hospitality
► I-Grad Business Functions: A recent Bachelor’s Degree
► Intellectual curiosity
► Excellent interpersonal skills
► Leadership qualities
► Passion for the hospitality industry
► Mobility to move to take up the program and mobility on completion of program (relocation support provided)

What to do next?
► Visit the jobs
► Create a profile
► Search for Graduate Opportunities
► Submit your application & your resume for the I-Grad Future Leaders program
► For I-Grad February 2013 - Applications open 1 June 2012 and close on 30 July 2012
► For I-Grad July 2013 - Applications open 1 December 2012 and close on 31 January 2013

InterContinental Hotels Group 2013, I-Grad, Date accessed: 5/8/2013,
Welcome to Crown College

Crown College is the centre of learning at Crown Melbourne. We began operating in 1995, and now deliver qualifications in Tourism, Hospitality, Hotels, Security & Safety, and Business & Leadership - all with an emphasis on working in the industry. Our purpose-built premises include Culinarium (our training kitchen and restaurant), a 70-seat auditorium, general-purpose and specialist training rooms, meeting rooms, a reception area, a cafe, and an administration centre. We have over 70 employees at Crown College, including training managers, qualified and highly experienced trainers, and dedicated administrative personnel. Together, all of these people design and deliver innovative and quality programs, and will work closely with you to ensure that your experience at Crown College is enjoyable and rewarding.

About Tourism & Hospitality at Crown College

If you’re interested in a career in tourism and hospitality, completing one of the programs available at Crown College could be the first and most important step you take in your career. Our Certificate III in Hospitality (Commercial Cookery) program prepares you for a career as a qualified chef in premium and casual restaurants. The program is delivered in Culinarium, our state-of-the-art training kitchen, where you will prepare meals for our guests under the supervision of experienced and award-winning culinary trainers. Our Certificate III in Hospitality program prepares you for a career as a food and beverage attendant in cafes, bars, restaurants, and other outlets. Our Certificate III in Tourism program prepares you for a career in entertainment venues, delivering quality service to our international and interstate guests. http://www.crowncollege.edu.au/hospitality

Security & Safety

Crown offers programs where you can learn the skills and knowledge that you need to work in the security industry. With an emphasis on practical know-how, customer service, and your compliance responsibilities, our programs are thorough and highly regarded. Courses are delivered by trainers who have years of experience, and are still working in the industry, so you’ll learn the required technical skills from qualified trainers who are industry professionals. After gaining your qualification and security licence, you could be employed in many different fields, including: working as a bodyguard for celebrities; undertaking crowd control at major events such as concerts and sports events; working as a security officer in tourist resorts and complexes. http://www.crowncollege.edu.au/school/2626/security-safety

Business & Leadership

Crown College delivers two unique and innovative leadership and management programs, focussing on the skills required to be a supervisor or manager in the tourism and hospitality industry.
Participants enrol in one of the following programs, depending on their current role and experience:

**Leadership Development Program** (Certificate IV in Frontline Management)
This program is designed to help frontline managers develop a range of skills to help them lead and motivate others.

**Next Generation of Leaders** (Diploma of Management)
Participants of this program are introduced to effective management practices, and tools they can use to make personal changes to produce positive and sustainable business outcomes.

**Hotels**
Crown Melbourne operates three award-winning hotels: Crown Towers, Crown Promenade Hotel, and Crown Metropol. Together, they offer a range of accommodation experiences, including villas, day spas, and premier suites.
Crown College delivers a number of programs that prepare participants for various roles in Hotels, in areas as diverse as reservations, concierge, housekeeping, administration, and management.

**Certificate III in Hospitality**
As well as completing face-to-face training, trainees complete on-the-job training in all facets of the hotels business, developing practical skills and know-how that provide the foundation for a successful career. Click here for more information.

**Co-operative Placement Program**
This is a 1-year rotational program where students work in frontline roles in all three of our hotels, learning about every aspect of hotel operations.

**Graduate Program**
This is a 2-year in-house rotational program where graduates spend one year working in frontline roles in all three of our hotels, learning about every aspect of hotel operations, and then one year developing leadership capabilities and supervising frontline employees.

**Suitable for:** graduates who have completed a higher education course in hospitality or tourism and are passionate about working in hotel management.


*Applications open:* towards the end of each semester.

GRADUATE OPPORTUNITIES
Are you Australia’s next top mogul? If you’re a recent hospitality school graduate or current student getting ready to start your exciting hospitality career, there are many ways to fast-track your career at Accor:

**Internships**
Most Accor properties offer students paid or unpaid internships as part of your independent studies. This is an excellent way to expand your practical experience and make key relationships with Accor personnel while helping to decide which hotel departments most appeal to you.
To find out more about internship opportunities, please speak with your education institution or placement officer.

**Work Experience**
Many of our hotels operate work experience programs with local schools, colleges and universities. Ask your careers advisor or work experience coordinator to send a written request to your local Accor hotel including:
- Your name
- The name of your school or education institution
- Your current year
- The course you’re studying
- Your preferred work experience dates
- Your preferred working hours
- The duration of your work experience placement
- Your hotel department preference

**Graduate Management Traineeships**
Accor’s Graduate Management Traineeships are offered to graduates we’ve identified are the leaders of tomorrow and are designed to harness and develop your management skills. This paid 12-month program is designed to further develop your practical experience with Accor and equip you with the knowledge and skills you need to progress through the ranks of hotel management.
Identified as a future leader, you’ll assist with hotel operations and work in key departments of the company while gaining operational competence that will enable your further career progression.

**Hotel School Fairs**
Visit us at Australia’s leading hotel school fairs and hospitality career expos where we can help you identify and take advantage of the many graduate opportunities that exist across our hotel departments.
Just speak to your careers advisor or work experience coordinator for more information, or get in touch with Accor’s key education partners across Australia and New Zealand:

- **Blue Mountains International Hotel Management School**
- **The Hotel School Sydney**
- **International College of Management**
- **Queenstown Resort College New Zealand**

**Apprenticeships**

Apprenticeships at Accor are an excellent way to receive on-the-job training while being paid for your time and studying for a nationally-recognised qualification. Apprenticeships can be full-time, part-time or school-based and are open to school leavers, people who are re-entering the workforce, or those who are simply wishing to change careers.

Most of our apprenticeships are available in the food production department, however will vary depending the needs of your local Accor hotels.


**Academie Accor**

Our innovative Online University is a registered training organisation (RTO) that offers you custom-designed courses, as well as the opportunity for self-paced learning and flexibility when scheduling face-to-face teaching sessions.


### Program Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Placement One</th>
<th>Practical Experience</th>
<th>Human Resources focus:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duration - 6 months</td>
<td>Rooms Division Experience may include:</td>
<td><em>Complete a training needs analysis for the department</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Reservation Sales Agent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Front Office Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Duty Manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Placement Two</th>
<th>Food &amp; Beverage Experience may include:</th>
<th>Sales &amp; Marketing focus:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duration - 6 months</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Complete a marketing plan for a special event</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Food &amp; Beverage Attendant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Conference &amp; Catering Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Restaurant Team Leader</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Manager In Training Programmes and Internships

The future growth and success of Four Seasons depends on our ability to attract and retain the brightest and best university graduates. While students can pursue a career with us in different ways, we regularly conduct on-campus interviews at hospitality institutions around the world. Our Manager In Training (MIT) programmes include a 3-month Branches programme, designed for students who already have supervisory experience, and a 12-month Roots programme for those seeking to acquire the necessary skills to supervise and lead. Please refer to the Recruitment Calendar for our on-campus visit schedule.

Compensation, benefits and relocation vary by location and will be discussed during the application process. Please visit our Recruitment Calendar for school visitation dates or contact the Four Seasons hotel or resort that you are interested in to inquire about available opportunities.

http://jobs.fourseasons.com/Students/mitprogrammes/Pages/MITprogrammes.aspx

Internships

Four Seasons offers global internship opportunities to undergraduates and graduates who want to get a head start in their career. An internship allows you to experience the Four Seasons culture, learn our standards and gain exposure to various areas of a hotel or resort. To ensure that you have the best possible experience, you will be...

- Assigned a buddy at the beginning of your internship to guide you through our five-stage introductory training programme.
- Exposed to operational and management meetings.
- Participating in individual or group projects.

Please contact the Four Seasons hotel or resort that you are interested in to inquire about available opportunities.

http://jobs.fourseasons.com/Students/internships/Pages/Internships.aspx

Recruitment calendar

The future growth and success of Four Seasons depends on our ability to attract and retain the best and brightest graduates who have excellent skills in our core competencies. While students can pursue a career with us through different paths, we currently partner with select hospitality programmes around the world, meeting students on campus to give them a first-hand introduction to Four Seasons.

Marriott Australia

Students and Recent Graduates

THE VOYAGE GLOBAL LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM
Learn firsthand how we guide our global business and set the standard for the hospitality industry. Here’s what to expect from the 12–18 month, full-time Voyage experience:

• Be part of an elite, global group of selected future leaders from top universities
• Build a global mindset by networking with fellow Voyagers from around the world
• Understand the global scale of Marriott’s operations
• Engage with senior leaders in our cutting-edge virtual environment
• Develop your knowledge through our proprietary online learning
• Gain hands-on experience in your chosen business area (e.g., Food & Beverage, Culinary, Revenue Management, Accounting & Finance, Rooms Operations, and Sales & Marketing)

After successful completion of the program, you will be eligible for management or supervisory opportunities. Voyage is currently available in various locations within the Americas, Europe, Asia Pacific and Middle East & Africa.

THE VOYAGE VIRTUAL ENVIRONMENT
We’re bringing cutting-edge technology to the Voyage program through an innovative virtual community—the only one of its kind. Through chat features, live webinars, and social media access, you’ll find everything you need in one place, accessible from anywhere in the world, including:

• Online interactive learning
• Webcasts and chats with Marriott leaders
• Networking with Voyagers around the world
• Program and corporate resources

Internships
Experience the hospitality business, and discover what it takes to build a career in a leading global business. Internships offer a combination of on-the-job training and an introduction to Marriott’s culture and values. Generally, internships last 8–12 weeks but can extend up to 12 months in certain locations.

Shangri-La Hotels and Resorts

An enriching career with global opportunities

The Corporate Trainee Programme allows Shangri-La’s new talent to be systematically groomed in order to assume further leadership roles within the organization.

This programme consists of a 16-month Developmental Programme divided in three phases:

Phase One: (four months) - Two months Hotel Orientation and two months institutional learning at the Shangri-La Academy
Phase Two: (six months) - On-the-Job training focused in the area of specialisation
Phase Three: (six months) - Stand-in / Acting position in the target role

The Corporate Trainee will be initially attached to a hotel or resort from his / her country of origin.

The Selection Criteria for the Corporate Trainee Programme are:

- Education: Three-year degree education and above
- Language Skills: English fluency (both verbal and written)
- Mobility: Willing to take up overseas assignments during and after the programme

Desired competencies of a Corporate Trainee:

- Strong interpersonal skills
- Strong communication skills
- Personal presence - an image appropriate to Shangri-La
- Personality and attitude that emulates the Shangri-La Core Values
- Guest focused
- Strong team spirit
- Initiative and drive - gets things done
- Unquestionable integrity and ethics
- Creativity and an open attitude in working with different cultures
- Strong business acumen

Campus recruitment days
Australian Hotels Schools Association
Bond University
James Cook University

Sydney October 2013
Gold Coast September 2013
Cairns September 2013

Shangri-La 2013, Career Opportunities, Date accessed: 5/8/2013,
APPENDIX 5: COLLABORATIVE ASSOCIATION DETAILS AND MEMBERSHIP

IRU Members

The Group of Eight (GO8)

The GO8 exists to:

- enhance the contribution of its member universities to the nation’s social, economic, cultural and environmental well-being and prosperity;
- extend the contribution of its member universities to the generation and preservation of the world’s stock of knowledge;
- strengthen Australia’s capacity to engage in and benefit from global developments, respond to global and local challenges;
- expand opportunities for Australian students, regardless of background, to participate in higher education of world class (The Group of Eight Ltd 2013).
GO8 Members


Association of Australian Hotel Schools (AAHS)

Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Association of Australian Hotel Schools (AAHS)</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australian School of Tourism &amp; Hotel Management</td>
<td><img src="asthm.jpg" alt="ASTHM" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hotel School Sydney</td>
<td><img src="hotel_school_sydney.jpg" alt="HOTEL SCHOOL SYDNEY" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Mountains International Hotel Management School</td>
<td><img src="bluemountains.jpg" alt="BlueMountains" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International College of Hotel Management</td>
<td><img src="international_college_hotel_management.jpg" alt="International College of Hotel Management" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International College of Management Sydney</td>
<td><img src="international_college_management_sydney.jpg" alt="International College of Management Sydney" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenvale College of Hospitality &amp; Event Management</td>
<td><img src="kenvale.jpg" alt="Kenvale" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Cordon Bleu</td>
<td><img src="le_cordon_bleu.jpg" alt="Le Cordon Bleu" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Blue College of Hospitality Management</td>
<td><img src="william_blue_college_hospitality_management.jpg" alt="William Blue College of Hospitality Management" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: AAHS 2013
The International Centre of Excellence in Tourism and Hospitality Education (THE ICE)

What We Do
Our Standards of Excellence and accreditation system offer a rigorous and independent review of an institution’s courses. Using our Standards of Excellence accreditation system, members have to progress through a two-stage accreditation process that involves self-review, peer review, site visit and evaluation (THE ICE 2013).

THE ICE has a progressive membership scheme, with the categories and member organisations displayed below having member representation from Europe, Asia and Australasia (ibid. 2013). THE ICE is a ‘full member of the International Network of Accreditation Agencies in Higher Education (INQAAHE)’ (ibid. 2013).

THE ICE – Members

Foundation and Accreditation PLUS membership.
- Australian School of Management, Australia
- Blue Mountains International Hotel Management School, Australia
- Emirates Academy of Hospitality Management, Dubai, UAE
- Griffith University, Australia
- Lyceum of the Philippines University, Philippines
- The Hotel School Sydney, Australia
- William Angliss Institute, Australia
- William Blue College of Hospitality Management, Australia

Accredited membership.
- Charles Darwin University, Australia
- IMC University of Applied Sciences, Krems, Austria
- MCI Management Center Innsbruck, Austria
- The University of the South Pacific, Fiji

Pre-accreditation status – Associates.
- DusitThani College, Thailand
- Free University of Bozen, Bolzano, Italy
- KDU University College, Malaysia
- Republic Polytechnic, Singapore
- Stenden University of Applied Sciences, Netherlands
- Taylor’s University, Malaysia
- The University of Applied Sciences HTW Chur, Switzerland

Observers
- CQU University, Australia
- Haaga-Helia University of Applied Sciences, Finland
- Heilbronn University, Germany
- INTI International University College, Malaysia
- Lao National Institute of Tourism and Hospitality LANITH, Laos
- NHTV Breda University of Applied Sciences, Netherlands
- NMIT Northern Melbourne Institute of TAFE, Australia
- Oman Tourism College, Oman
- Phuket Vocational College, Thailand
- Stamford International University Thailand, Thailand
- Swinburne University of Technology, Australia
- University of New Hampshire, USA
- University of Waikato, New Zealand

Source: THE ICE 2013
**Australian Collaborative Education Network (ACEN)**

**Members**

- Australian Catholic University
- Central Queensland University
- Charles Darwin University
- Charles Sturt University
- Curtin University of Technology
- Deakin University
- Edith Cowan University
- Flinders University
- Griffith University
- James Cook University
- La Trobe University
- Macquarie University
- Monash University
- Murdoch University
- Queensland University of Technology
- RMIT University
- Southern Cross University
- Swinburne University of Technology
- University of Canberra
- University of Melbourne
- University of New England
- University of New South Wales
- University of Newcastle
- University of Notre Dame Australia
- University of Queensland
- University of Southern Queensland
- University of Sydney
- University of Technology Sydney
- University of the Sunshine Coast
- University of Western Australia
- University of Western Sydney
- University of Wollongong
- Victoria University

*Source: ACEN 2013a*

**National Centre for Vocational Education Research (NCVER)**

NCVER is a UNESCO Centre of Excellence in Technical and Vocational Education and Training, in partnership with TAFE South Australia, and actively communicates with key international training research agencies. It has developed strategic links with similar international organisations to foster comparative analysis and collaborate on issues of mutual interest (NCVER 2013).

NCVER’s areas of activity:

- undertaking a strategic program of vocational education and training (VET) research, including the management of the national VET research competitive grants program and the analytical services of the Longitudinal Surveys of Australian Youth (LSAY)
- collecting and analysing national VET statistics and survey data
- collecting and making available research findings on VET from around the world through the VOCEDplus research database
- disseminating the results of research and data analysis
- building links with similar international organisations to foster comparative analysis and collaborate on issues of mutual interest
- undertaking commercial consultancies (ibid. 2013).
Council for Australasian University Tourism and Hospitality Education (CAUTHE)

Current CAUTHE Chapter Members
APPENDIX 6: IRU WIL RESOURCES

TAKE YOUR BUSINESS TO THE NEXT LEVEL

PARTICIPATE IN WORK INTEGRATED LEARNING (WIL) AND HELP BUILD AUSTRALIA’S EMERGING TALENT.

Work Integrated Learning allows industry and universities to work together to develop Australia’s future workforce. It refers to diverse approaches to learning which bring together the theory of a discipline with its relevant work practice, using a specifically designed curriculum.

WIL is now best practice in many parts of the world in a wide range of industries. It is used in a range of forums, usually via work placements (or internships) and workplace projects.

GET A HEAD START, NURTURE EMERGING TALENT

THE BENEFITS OF WIL FOR EMPLOYERS INCLUDE:

- allowing your organisation to explore new project territory in a flexible manner;
- helping you find and recruit the best graduates;
- putting your staff in touch with up-to-the-minute thinking in your area through contact with fresh and enthusiastic WIL students;

- providing professional opportunities for existing staff to gain some experience in a supervisory or leadership role;
- giving you the chance to align talented students with your organisation’s core values; and
- permitting you to have input into your industry’s curriculum, allowing you to shape the learning experiences of university students in your field.
SO WHAT’S NEXT?

In taking on a WIL student you are accepting responsibility to supervise and guide the student in the workplace. The accompanying resources will assist you in this vital role. Your university partners will work with you to ensure a productive experience, giving additional support as required. Successful WIL programs rely on a negotiated three-way partnership between the employer, the university and the student.

Usually an employer takes on a WIL student for a fixed block of time each week (e.g. one day) over a period of approximately twelve weeks or one semester, but the time can be arranged differently (e.g. in a format from one to twenty weeks) according to different needs and conditions.

Prior to coming to the workforce, students receive targeted preparation at University. Intricate design goes into creating a WIL placement which is aligned to the curriculum and the overall aims of the course undertaken.

Because the project or placement is aligned with the curriculum, there is generally no expectation that the student will be renumerated. Your university partner can provide more information about this.

NEW WIL RESOURCES DEVELOPED BY IRU TO ASSIST EMPLOYERS

The IRU has developed some resources to assist employers in supervising WIL students effectively. In so doing it has sought the advice and feedback of industry peak bodies (ACCI, AHRI, AIG and BCA) as well as selected employers. The resources will aid both you and the student to derive the maximum benefit from the WIL experience.

Resource #1: Roles and responsibilities of the workplace supervisor define WIL supervision, detailing roles and responsibilities, benefits and supplying general guidelines.

Resource #2: The WIL Checklist provides specific actions for employers to consider when taking on a student.

Resource #3: includes more disciplinary-specific WIL material, with customised information on WIL in: business // creative arts // information technology // law.

These disciplines are profiled here as being some of those newer to WIL, where there is a less well developed tradition of university-industry partnerships than in other areas such as engineering, health and education.

1Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry (ACCI), Australian Human Resource Institute (AHRI), Australian Industry Group (AIG), Business Council of Australia (BCA)
ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE WORKPLACE SUPERVISOR

Workplace supervisors play a critical and invaluable role in equipping students with up-to-date work skills and professional attitudes. They help to mould passionate practitioners in their field who are ‘career ready’ and eager to contribute. Supervisors mentor students to understand the ethos of a workplace and corresponding professional behaviour.

Workplace supervisors are an indispensable link in the three-link chain of workplace supervisor-student-academic supervisor. They give back to their industry, providing enthusiastic and emerging professionals glimpses into the big work picture, where occupational theory and workplace practice come together.

This resource provides general guidelines for WIL supervision.

WORKPLACE GUIDELINES FOR WIL SUPERVISION BY WORKPLACE SUPERVISORS:

1. The Work Integrated Learning (WIL) workplace supervisor, along with the academic supervisor, is responsible for the pre-agreed work performed by the student along with the level of practice.

Prior to the placement, you form an agreement with the university partner around the nature of the work the student is to perform. As the workplace expert, you are aware of the standards the student needs to achieve as a novice in your workplace.

2. The Work Integrated Learning (WIL) workplace supervisor negotiates the work duties and learning goals with the academic supervisor and in some cases, the student.

You should negotiate these duties and goals clearly and realistically with the academic supervisor and in some cases, the student. Together, you will agree upon the tasks to be undertaken and their associated learning goals, or project, if this takes the form of a specific project. The learning goals will constitute a formal or informal learning contract that will be reviewed periodically throughout the placement. The student will be evaluated against these goals at the end of the placement. There may be some adjustment of the goals over time but normally they should not be radically modified during the placement.

3. The Work Integrated Learning (WIL) workplace supervisor provides the student with a workspace, a computer and/or other necessary workplace tools to perform the specified work.

It is useful to plan for the student’s arrival by allocating a workspace for them. Define which day/s and hours the student will work, in accordance with your needs and those dictated by the theoretical part of the student’s course. You should also identify a staff member who will look after the student in the workplace.

4. The Work Integrated Learning (WIL) workplace supervisor arranges a workplace induction for the student, including an Occupational Health and Safety induction.

It is beneficial to meet with the student early in the placement, briefing them about workplace confidentiality and ethics. Where required, the student should sign intellectual property and non-disclosure agreements. The student will have undergone a generic workplace health and safety orientation on campus, but any protocols specific to your workplace should be reviewed, with both you and the student signing any relevant documentation. If it is available, the student should also be issued with a copy of the company handbook (mission statement, organisational chart etc.) as appropriate and a full list of relevant contacts.

The student should receive a thorough induction to the organisation and its clients, including an orientation and overview of the organisation, its training and the scope of the student’s assigned work tasks. Define reporting responsibilities clearly and create a user-friendly role description of the WIL tasks, spelling out all requirements.

It is also advisable to discuss the student’s own expectations about the placement and try to discover what personally interests and motivates them, orienting certain tasks in this direction if possible. Help them to discover the scope of different roles in your organisation and career paths. Assist the student to feel part of the team by including them in relevant meetings and team-building activities.
The Work Integrated Learning (WIL) workplace supervisor provides ongoing supervision of the student, preferably through regular timetabled meetings, with written outcomes forming a documentary record of this journey. Ideally and for future reference, these meetings should be accompanied each time by an agreed agenda and brief written notes documenting outcomes. These notes should record actions and key decisions with clearly indicated timescales and responsibilities. In some situations these meetings are less regular than others and may occur through ICT channels in lieu of face-to-face.

In these meetings, the student will view you as a dedicated professional in your field and as an accessible role model. It is usual to provide information about the workplace culture/values/codes of conduct: explain your company’s ethics, dress code, behaviour and what it means to cultivate resilience in workplace exchanges. Define professionalism in your organisation and in your industry.

The Work Integrated Learning (WIL) workplace supervisor provides constructive and ongoing feedback on the student’s performance in the workplace.

In regularly appraising the student’s progress to maximise placement benefits, it is suggested that your feedback conforms to benchmarks for constructive feedback. Feedback is generally:

- individual & pertinent;
- directed towards learning goals;
- timely & expected;
- focused on behaviour that can be modified;
- positive & encouraging;
- collaborative;
- focused on change and free from value judgements;
- easy to understand;
- respectful;
- checking the student’s perceptions;
- noted in writing, and
- followed up at a later date.

Ongoing mentoring from the workplace supervisor provides the student with the opportunity to reconcile workplace theory and practice and the chance to reflect on workplace activities.

It is helpful to discuss critically any workplace instances where there is a gap between everyday practice and how this is described in discipline theory. Encourage the student to connect theory with its workplace application. Provide opportunities for your student to examine the meaning of practice through questioning their reactions to situations encountered. In this way the work component of the placement as well as the carefully designed curriculum being studied at the same time, combine to show the student the linkages between practice and theory.

In questioning your student, you can promote the development of their reflective workplace thinking about how certain work functions could be more effectively approached. Encourage the kind of thinking that lends itself to the writing of the student journal/reflective blog (generally an assessment requirement for WIL). This includes identifying what occurs, evaluating and analysing the various components, forming a conclusion about the experience and deciding what has been learned for future reference.

The workplace supervisor takes stock of the learning achieved by the student, verifying whether learning goals have been met and helping to evaluate and report on student outcomes.

At the halfway point of the placement, it is advisable to check off which learning goals have already been met, in consultation with the student. Plan for dealing with the remaining learning goals and adjust the plan for any changes of emphasis. If you estimate that problems will arise in meeting all learning goals by the end of the placement, it is important to make contact with the student’s academic supervisor.

At the placement’s conclusion, it is customary to hold a final wrap-up meeting with the student. Review and evaluate the learning goals, summing up what has been learned and what has been of most relevance and interest. Complete the form evaluating the student’s workplace performance, discussing this evaluation with them. Finally, record your perceptions about the overall WIL experience for your company’s future reference.
WIL CHECKLIST:

WORK INTEGRATED LEARNING (WIL) is a term describing diverse approaches to learning which integrate theory with the practice of work into a specifically designed curriculum. Examples include projects or placements in information technology, creative arts, business, law, engineering, architecture, nursing and teaching to name a few.

The benefits of WIL for employers and students are well documented. The future success of Australian industry will be improved by effective partnerships between business and universities to give students a realistic experience of learning in the workplace.

The IRU universities can help you to get involved in WIL in your field and seek to collaborate with you and support you in this important initiative. WIL in the case of your company might take the form of a business student developing a marketing plan, an information technology student developing a software application for your company or a law student helping you resolve an issue of community engagement.

This resource provides a checklist for guiding employer participation in WIL.

DO YOU THINK YOUR BUSINESS WOULD BENEFIT FROM HAVING A WIL STUDENT UNDERTAKE A PLACEMENT OR PROJECT FOR YOU?

DO YOU WANT TO LEARN MORE ABOUT HOW TO GO ABOUT THIS?

WILL YOU ALLOW US TO COLLABORATE WITH YOU AND SUPPORT YOU TO HELP REALISE ADDITIONAL POTENTIAL IN YOUR BUSINESS WITH THE ASSISTANCE OF AN ENERGETIC AND ENTHUSIASTIC WIL STUDENT?

THEN, LET US SHOW YOU HOW.
CHECKLIST FOR IRU WIL SUPERVISION:

The University appreciates your willingness to host a student undertaking WIL in your workplace. The following checklist guides your participation in this activity, assisting you and the student to derive maximum benefit from the experience.

Specifically, we ask you to please:

✓ Review the University Placement Handbook or Subject/Course Guide;
✓ Be aware of the policies and legal requirements of the placement, e.g. Occupational Health and Safety;
✓ Create a welcoming atmosphere, introducing the student to staff and carrying out a full induction to the workplace;
✓ Ensure that the student has a dedicated workstation (or other tools) and formalise the days and hours they will work;
✓ Check the learning goals of the student’s learning contract together with them;
✓ Set up a series of regular meetings with the student;
✓ Ensure there are opportunities to supply the student with constructive feedback on work performed;
✓ Create some discussion with the student on how theory and practice come together in your workplace;
✓ Ensure all the learning goals in the learning contract are covered during the placement;
✓ Contact the Academic Supervisor immediately if things do not proceed as you anticipate;
✓ For some universities, meet with the university representatives and the student in the workplace during the placement at least once; and
✓ Have a final meeting with the student, summing up what has been learned and evaluating the student’s work.

www.iru.edu.au
WORK INTEGRATED LEARNING IN THE FIELD OF BUSINESS

Work Integrated Learning (WIL) refers to diverse approaches to learning which bring together the theory of a discipline with its relevant work practice, using a specifically designed curriculum. The practice of WIL in various forms in engineering, health and education is well developed, with relatively long histories of collaboration between Australian workplaces and universities.

This resource offers some advice on the benefits and challenges for employers participating in WIL, in other disciplines such as business. This is a field, where students are expected to exhibit work-readiness when they graduate, but where the traditions of WIL are less well defined. The resource commences with some characteristics of effective WIL supervisors and industry mentors and proceeds to identify more specific, discipline-linked characteristics for business.

AN EFFECTIVE WIL SUPERVISOR AND INDUSTRY MENTOR IN GENERAL:

- asks the students lots of questions;
- seeks explanation from the student on specific points of detail;
- encourages the students to analyse workplace interactions;
- requests evaluations of how effectively work tasks are performed;
- discusses effective interpersonal skills involved in workplace interactions;
- checks the student's knowledge and understanding;
- links practical knowledge with theoretical ideas;
- verbalises problem-solving and practical thinking processes.
SOME KEY POINTS ABOUT WIL IN BUSINESS

BENEFITS FOR EMPLOYERS:

- Business students can undertake new projects or complete existing projects e.g. business plans, marketing plans, communication protocols, fiscal planning, new market or new product research and/or social media communications
- WIL Business students help you stay in touch with current trends, methods and approaches
- WIL students bring fresh ideas, new perspectives and energy to your organisation
- WIL Business students who work for you on placement or as interns tend to make committed employees later on should you need to recruit.

HOW EMPLOYERS CAN ASSIST:

Business students undertake WIL chiefly as practicum placements, industry projects and 'reverse cadetships' (a compulsory stint in the workforce at the end of the degree). Employer guidance is needed in the form of:

- Workplace feedback and supervision on contemporary business practices
- Suggested topics for projects of value and relevance to industry to be undertaken by students
- Advice on planning, time management and project management
- Advice on effective teamwork, collaboration and communication
- Evaluation and appraisal of completed projects
- Introduction of student to principles of professionalism and industry networks.
### APPENDIX 7: AUSTRALIAN AND NSW/REGIONAL HOSPITALITY AND TOURISM BUSINESS ASSOCIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Association Name</th>
<th>Website Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant and Caterers Association (RCA)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.restaurantcater.asn.au/">http://www.restaurantcater.asn.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Hotels Association (AHA)</td>
<td><a href="http://aha.org.au/">http://aha.org.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club Managers Association Australia (CMAA)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cmaa.asn.au">www.cmaa.asn.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leagues Clubs Association (LCA)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.lca.asn.au/">http://www.lca.asn.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecotourism Association of Australia (EAA)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ecotourism.org.au">www.ecotourism.org.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Amusement Leisure and Recreation Association (AALARA)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.aalaracom.au/aalar.htm">www.aalaracom.au/aalar.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Australian Tour Guides (IATG)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.australiantouristguides.com">http://www.australiantouristguides.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Tourist Export Council (ATEC)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.atec.net.au/about.htm">www.atec.net.au/about.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist Attractions Association (TAA)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.taa.asn.au">www.taa.asn.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTF Australia (Tourism &amp; Transport Forum)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ttf.org.au">http://www.ttf.org.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Amusement Leisure and Recreation (AALARA)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.aalaracom.au">www.aalaracom.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Institute of Travel and Tourism (AITT)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.aiit.asn.au">http://www.aiit.asn.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous Tourism Australia</td>
<td><a href="http://www.indigenoustourism.australia.com">http://www.indigenoustourism.australia.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venue Management Association (Asia &amp; Pacific)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.vma.org.au">http://www.vma.org.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Convention and Congress Association (ICCA) - Australian Chapter</td>
<td><a href="http://www.iccaworld.com">www.iccaworld.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backpackers Operators Association NSW</td>
<td><a href="http://www.boansw.org.au">www.boansw.org.au</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange Unique Accommodation Inc</td>
<td><a href="http://www.orangeaccommodation.net.au/">http://www.orangeaccommodation.net.au/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX 8: SAMPLE VISION, MISSION AND ENGAGEMENT STATEMENTS

University of Western Sydney

Our Mission
To be a university of international standing and outlook, achieving excellence through scholarship, teaching, learning, research and service to its regional, national and international communities, beginning with the people of Greater Western Sydney.

Our Vision
Bringing knowledge to life in Greater Western Sydney though community and business engagement with our learning and research.

What we Believe in
- The primacy of the student experience
- Environmental and social responsibility
- A vibrant and inclusive intellectual community
- Opportunity and excellence
- Being connected locally and internationally
- Valuing and rewarding our staff

Our Values
UWS has a shared and explicit set of values which underpin all that it does:
- excellence and quality in all endeavours
- scholarly rigour and integrity
- equity of access and inclusiveness
- collegiality and participatory decision-making
- academic responsibility and freedom
- relevance and responsibility to our communities
- ethics and accountability

Strategic Plan - Making the Difference 2010–2015
Endorsed by the Board of Trustees, Making the Difference 2010–2015 is the cornerstone of UWS strategic planning and captures the key priorities to 2015. The Strategic Plan includes: focus areas for action; key performance indicators, and links to over 100 implementation projects. It is also linked to enabling plans (teaching and learning; research and community engagement) and to specific plans and KPIs for Divisions and Colleges.

Key areas of focus 2010–15
1. Create a superior and engaged learning experience
2. Develop focused, relevant and world-class research
3. Build organisational and financial strength

Key Performance Indicators & Current Priorities
- Widening participation
- Student retention
- International enrolments
- Research outcomes
- Postgraduate load

UWS Engagement Strategy 2010–2013

Flinders University

About us
Flinders University enjoys a well-justified reputation for its excellence in teaching and research. It has a long-standing commitment to enhancing educational opportunities for all and a proud record of community engagement.
Since being established in 1966, Flinders has achieved much of which we can be very proud—in innovative research, in high quality teaching and in community engagement. We have led the way in providing access to higher education for individuals who did not traditionally aspire to University.
We have attracted students from over 100 countries and our alumni have built careers and lives that enrich communities across Australia and throughout the world. Flinders’ achievements are underpinned by the network of strong external links that we have developed with our stakeholders and with the communities we serve. We commit to being a university that is outwardly engaged, continuing to build the supportive and valued relationships which will be vital for the future.

Work-Integrated Learning (WIL)
Work-integrated learning (WIL) is recognised as a strategic priority at Flinders University. We aim to provide all students with access to a WIL opportunity during the course of their studies, through more ‘traditional’ placements, practicums and field studies, or simulated workplace settings and assessment activities.

What is Work-Integrated Learning?
Work-Integrated Learning (WIL) is the term normally used to describe directed or supported educational activities that integrate theoretical learning with its application in the workplace. Flinders University places an emphasis on integration as a key element of WIL, and recognises the importance of student-centred learning as a focus for its delivery. Work-Integrated Learning that is intentional, organised, recognised and accredited by the University can provide powerful learning experiences for students and staff. The Vice-Chancellor has made a clear commitment to WIL, and has initiated an exploration of WIL becoming an explicit feature of all undergraduate programs. The aim is to ensure that students develop a truly integrated approach to learning through a combination of academic and work-related activities.

Such commitment builds upon the already significant levels of WIL participation across the University. An audit (Practicum Audit Report 2007.pdf (PDF 636KB)) of Work-Integrated Learning programs conducted at the University in 2007 found that over a third of our students were enrolled in topics requiring specific practicum, work experience or Work-Integrated Learning placements, and also identified a similar percentage of academic and general staff involved with the co-ordination, management, supervision and teaching of WIL activities. With the inclusion of simulated workplace settings on campus and assessment activities designed to simulate authentic workplace activities or requirements, Flinders is well on track towards providing WIL opportunities for the majority of undergraduate students.

About VU
Victoria University (VU) is one of the few Australian universities that is a multi-sector institution (higher education and TAFE). We offer short courses, apprenticeships, certificates, diplomas, degrees and postgraduate studies. Our flexible learning pathways means you can choose your own study journey, entering from various points and exiting when you’ve reached your goal.

We have over 50,000 students enrolled at our campuses, primarily located in the western region of Melbourne (Australia) and at international sites. Our teaching, training, research, scholarship and partnerships are locally relevant and globally significant.

Practice integrated learning (PIL)
PIL is a new approach to practice integrated learning being adopted by VU. Variously known as Learning in the workplace and community (LiWC) Learning integrated work (LiW) Community integrated Learning (CiL) and Work integrated Learning (WiL).

Practice integrated learning is an umbrella term for a range of approaches and strategies that integrate theory with practice of work within a purposefully designed curriculum.

Practice integrated learning is more than ‘just work placements’ and should be considered as reflecting a broad range of approaches that include project work, classroom based simulation – both real and virtual, both internal and external to the university.

By incorporating PIL into the core curriculum you are providing a range of meaningful learning opportunities relevant to the real world, initially in a safe, supported and teacher facilitate environment before students independently work on their own.

PIL learning activities present a rich range of experiences and environments that enable students to engage with practitioners, industry professionals and workplace and community settings. PIL activities can be grouped in these broad categories as placements, projects, workers as learners and simulated workplaces, with a host of contextualised variations available in each.

RMIT University

RMIT’s vision is to be:

- **global** in attitude, action and presence, offering our students a global passport to learning and work;
- **urban** in orientation and creativity, shaping sustainable cities and drawing inspiration from the challenges and opportunities they provide; and
- **connected** through active partnerships with professions, industries and organisations to support the quality, reach and impact of our education and research.


From the workshop to the world market

RMIT University was established in 1887 to serve the needs of Melbourne’s economy. More than 120 years on, the University’s mission remains the same in spirit – but dramatically different in scope. Today, RMIT is a **global university** of technology, with an engagement with industry on a scale to match.

From the design of curriculum to applied research, the University works with domestic and international partners to equip students with the state-of-the-art knowledge that enables them to excel in their chosen professions.

Engaging with industry and community is a dialogue. RMIT seeks advice and input from industry leaders, in order to provide value in the many areas of engagement: skill development, work placements, applied research, consultancies and more. RMIT’s partners include sectoral trend-setters such as Siemens, Pacific Brands, Airbus, Volkswagen, Bioproperties Australia, City of Hume, China Power, Guess, Alcoa, BaulderstoneHornibrook and Boeing.

A central component of this strategy is a commitment to Work Integrated Learning. About half higher education and vocational coursework programs include an assessed element of professional or vocational work in a work context.

This may be real or simulated, at RMIT or in a workplace, but feedback from clients and others from industry and community is always integral to the experience.

As part of its approach, RMIT has identified five broad industry sectors as the focus for advancing strategic partnerships in education and research. They are:

- Aerospace and aviation
- Automotive
- Built environment, construction and infrastructure
- Health and community services
- Media and communications

RMIT holds regular industry forums in each sector, where senior University staff can received detailed feedback from industry executives about trends in skills formation and research priorities.

Find out how work placements can work for students, staff and industry
Looking for expertise to help drive your business forward? RMIT has the answers.
Download RMIT’s industry capability statements.
Find out more about RMIT.

Griffith University

Work-integrated learning
Griffith University values the inclusion of work-integrated learning in its degree programs and courses. Work-integrated learning involves educational activities that integrate theoretical learning with practical application in the workplace. Work-integrated learning experiences are designed to meet the personal and professional aspirations of Griffith students and to facilitate their transition to the world of work.

Staff need support to conceptualise, design and support new curricula and to embrace leading practice in this academic speciality.

The GIHE has developed a series of WIL professional development modules and resources aimed at building staff capacity for the establishment and sustainable maintenance of work-integrated learning programs in existing and new curricula. Topics covered include:

- Introduction to and conceptualisation of work-integrated learning
- Learning in and from work-integrated learning
- Assessment of work-integrated learning outcomes
- Administration and sustainability of work-integrated learning in the curriculum
- Academic management of work-integrated learning activities
- Recruiting and managing relationships with industry partners / collaborators
- Managing students in work-integrated learning settings

For further information the Good Practice Guide: Work integrated Learning (WIL) (PDF 275k) is available to download.

Swinburne University

Swinburne University of Technology: 2020 Plan

Our students
We will engage our students through quality, personalised education. Swinburne will attract and develop students who are creative, motivated by a desire to be innovative and wish to make a difference. We will ensure that our students have access to high-quality education that enables them to be life-long learners and innovators, adaptable to change and ready to embark on successful careers.

We will create innovative learning environments led by teachers and researchers that challenge students to achieve their potential. We will capitalise on global advances in tertiary education to meet the learning needs of our students.

Our focus will be on:

**Engaged Learning:**
We will provide opportunities for students to participate in engaged learning by creating industry, research, community and international experiences. We will take advantage of new educational technologies to ensure that students are well supported in their learning.

**Innovative Teaching:**
We will support innovative teaching and personalised learning to meet the changing needs of our students. Our teaching will be founded on evidence-based curriculum design and teaching pedagogies that apply the latest innovations in good teaching practice and transformative approaches that incorporate new technologies.

**Reaching more students:**
We will continue to lead in the development of online and blended learning. We will be inclusive, accessible and supportive, ensuring that every student has opportunities for success through access to high-quality academic development programs and support services.

**Outstanding Graduate Outcomes:**
Our graduates will be forward thinkers able to adapt to global challenges and technological advances. They will reflect Swinburne’s values: innovation, integrity, accountability, diversity, teamwork and sustainability.

**Industry-Based Learning**
In 2013 Swinburne is very proud to be celebrating an amazing 50 years of delivering Industry Based Learning to our students.

Industry-Based Learning (IBL) is a renowned program open to Swinburne undergraduate students from all discipline areas. It provides students with the opportunity to undertake a paid, relevant work placement as part of their university degree.

IBL is known by many names, including Cooperative Education, Sandwich Year and Work Integrated Learning and has been an integral part of Swinburne since 1963. Now into its 50th year, the IBL program continues to build on its strong reputation for producing work ready graduates and mutually beneficial partnerships with host organisations.

University of Technology Sydney

UTS Strategic direction

OUR VISION
Our vision is to be a world-leading university of technology. We will do this by embedding and showcasing leading edge IT and other technologies in all disciplines; performing strongly in the disciplines of science, engineering and technology; remaining highly relevant to industry and the professions; and aligning our education and research with relevant national and economic priorities.

UTS Strategic Plan 2009–2018
Our strategic plan (PDF 140kB) is guiding our activities in the years ahead and to ensure that we realise our potential as a university.

OUR PURPOSE
Our purpose is to advance knowledge and learning to progress the professions, industry and communities of the world.

OUR VALUES
The values that guide our performance and our interactions with each other, with students, our partners and the wider community:

- Discover and share new knowledge and new ways to lead through our teaching, research, intellectual debate and use of technology
- Engage and collaborate with each other, our students, alumni, partners, professions and communities, locally and internationally
- Empower each other and our students to grow, contribute, challenge and make a difference
- Deliver on our obligations to each other, our students, our partners and communities while maintaining high standards and ethical behaviour
- Sustain our local and global environment, organisational health and our ability to create a positive, viable future

OUR OBJECTIVES DURING 2009–2013
To build our reputation during 2009–2013 we are:

1. Strengthening the standing of the UTS Model of global practice-oriented learning
2. Increasing the scale, quality and impact of research in our discipline fields
3. Enhancing our strong, inclusive university environment through state-of-the-art learning, research and social spaces, infrastructure and highly responsive services
4. Building the capabilities of our people and processes to sustain and improve performance into our third decade and beyond.

We monitor our progress towards these objectives through a commitment to quality improvement.

Practice-oriented learning
Imaginative and collaborative approaches to practice-oriented learning and teaching are emphasised in the UTS Model of Learning outlined in the UTS Strategic Plan 2009-2018. This builds on and extends our strong professional focus and our established record as innovators in professionally-focused learning environments. IML supports this priority through our work with faculties and the University’s Teaching and Learning Committee. We offer support to academics and course teams in refining existing practice-oriented learning approaches and developing innovative new approaches.

UTS 2013, UTS Strategic Direction and Practice-orientated Learning, Date accessed: 17/9/2013,
http://www.uts.edu.au/about/university/uts-strategic-direction
APPENDIX 9: TRAINING REQUIREMENTS IN SOCIAL WORK, MEDICINE, NURSING AND TEACHING

Social Worker Training Requirements - England

Ensure that all social work students spend at least 200 days gaining required experience and learning in practice settings. Each student must have experience:

- in at least two practice settings
- of statutory social work tasks involving legal interventions
- of providing services to at least two user groups (e.g. child care and mental health)

(Department of Health 2013, p. 3).

Social Worker Training Requirements - Australia

Guideline 1.2: Guidance on field education programs (Ref ASWEAS 3.4)

1. Requirements of a program for learning in field education
   1) Field education subjects must demonstrate a developmental approach to learning that complies with the principles for social work education set out in ASWEAS 2012 (Section 2).
   2) Field education subjects must be taken over two years within the professional social work program of study.
   3) Students must successfully complete a minimum of 1,000 hours in at least two field education subjects. These hours must be completed within the normal working hours / days of the organisation hosting the placement. No leave of any kind may be included in this requirement; that is, the full 1,000 hours must be completed.
   4) Practice–theory integration seminars may be included within the required hours up to a maximum of 14 hours per 500-hour placement.
   5) No placement will be shorter than 280 hours.
   6) No placement will be an observational placement.
   7) Placements must be structured in a way that is educationally viable (so that educational goals can be achieved). Patterns of placement days may vary from five days per week, to a minimum of two days per week. Placements that are two days per week must include at least two full-time (five-day) block periods, unless the SWAOU determines that extenuating circumstances apply (AASW 2013).

Medicine - Best Practice Guidelines for Objective Structured Clinical Examinations (OSCEs)

BPG1 Focus on aspects of practice related directly to delivery of safe client/patient care;
BPG2 Focus on aspects of practice which are most relevant and likely to be commonly encountered;
BPG3 Be judged via a holistic marking guide to enhance both the rigor of assessment and reliability. (This allows judgements of students’ performance to be related to clinical practice as a whole, rather than as a collection of discrete independent actions.)
BPG4 Require students to perform tasks in an integrated rather than piecemeal fashion by combining assessments of discrete skills in an authentic manner;
BPG5 Be structured and delivered in a manner which aligns directly with mastery of desired knowledge and skill. This alignment should be both internal to the course and (in keeping with #2) aligned prospectively with clinical tasks likely to be encountered;
BPG6 Be appropriately timed in the sequence of students’ learning to maximise assimilation and synthesis of disparate course content and to minimise the potential for students to adopt a piecemeal, superficial learning approach;
BPG7 Allow for ongoing practice of integrated clinical assessment and intervention skills, thereby also ensuring the appropriate and timely use of feedback to guide students’ development (Nulty et al. 2011, p. 146).
Medical Training Requirements - Australia

Interns are required to perform satisfactorily under supervision in the following terms:
- A term of at least 8 weeks that provides experience in emergency medical care
- A term of at least 10 weeks that provides experience in medicine
- A term of at least 10 weeks that provides experience in surgery
- A range of other approved terms to make up 12 months (minimum of 47 weeks full time equivalent service)

(Medical Board of Australia 2012, p. 1).

Nursing Training Requirements - Australia

National Standards for Registered Nurse - WIL components:
3.6 A minimum of 800 hours of workplace experience, not inclusive of simulation activities, incorporated into the program and providing exposure to a variety of health-care settings.
3.7 Content and sequencing of the program of study prepares students for workplace experience and, wherever possible, incorporates opportunities for simulated learning.
3.8 Workplace experience included as soon as is practically possible in the first year of study to facilitate early engagement with the professional context of nursing.
3.9 Extended workplace experience in Australia included towards the end of the program to consolidate the acquisition of competence and facilitate transition to practice. A summative assessment is made at this time against all National Competency Standards for the Registered Nurse in the clinical setting (ANMAC 2013, p. 15).

Teacher Training Requirements - Australia

Minimum Provision of Professional Experience
The minimum total number of days of professional experience set by the Institute for approval of initial teacher education programs is as follows:
- 45 days for a one year full time equivalent (FTE) graduate entry program
- 50 days for an 18 month FTE graduate entry program
- 60 days for a two year FTE graduate entry program, and
- 80 days for a four or five year FTE undergraduate program..

where the above minimum number of days of professional experience is provided:
- 90% or more of the days must be in schools with no more than 10% of the days being in educational settings other than schools (if applicable); and
- 80% or more of the days in schools must involve the pre-service teacher in the direct act of teaching a group or class of students with no more than 20% of the days being structured observation days only (NSWIT 2009, p. 4).
APPENDIX 10: QUANTITATIVE SURVEY MATERIALS

Work Integrated Learning in Hospitality

1. Introduction

This study titled “Investigating the Contribution of Work Integrated Learning (WIL) for Service Industries” is being conducted by Katrina Wardle, PhD student in the College of Business at University of Western Sydney.

Dissatisfaction with Graduate Employability has been elevated within contemporary discussion with exploration of Work Integrated Learning (WIL) escalating as a potential means to redress this gap within Australia and abroad. This study aims to examine whether student participation in WIL during Tertiary Hospitality Education improves Hospitality Graduate Employability skills. The investigation focuses specifically on Hospitality Graduates, Employers and Tertiary Educators within NSW.

The survey framework was constructed based on existing survey designs employed by Patrick et al (2008), ACER (2010) and Kim (2008) with adaptation to the specific research questions pursued by this study. Using established and proven constructs ensures the survey instrument is more psychometrically sound than a ‘one shot model’ and will provide comparable results enhancing generalisability, reliability and validity.

Please read the participant information letter and cover sheet attached to the email prior to commencing this survey.

Thank you for your participation.

References:


## Work Integrated Learning in Hospitality

### 2. Demographics

1. **Name**

2. **Gender**
   - [ ] Male
   - [ ] Female

3. **Age**
   - [ ] 18-23
   - [ ] 24-29
   - [ ] 30-35
   - [ ] 36-41
   - [ ] 42-47
   - [ ] 48-53
   - [ ] 54-69
   - [ ] 60+

4. **Suburb of residence and postcode**

5. **Are you a permanent resident or citizen of Australia?**
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No
   - If no, what is your country of residence?

6. **Are you of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander origin?**
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

7. **What is the main language you speak at home?**
   - [ ] English
   - [ ] Other (please specify)

8. **What is your ethnic background? eg Malay Chinese or Caucasian**

9. **What is your religious orientation?**
Work Integrated Learning in Hospitality

10. Do you consider yourself to have a disability, impairment or long-term condition?

☐ Yes
☐ No

If yes how has this impacted on your WIL experience, please explain:

11. Which of the following describes your current living arrangement? Select the option that best applies to you.

☐ Living with parents or guardians
☐ Living by yourself
☐ Living with friends or in a share house
☐ Living with a spouse, partner or children
☐ Other

12. Current Employment Title:

13. Current Employer:

14. What is your current work status?

☐ Full time
☐ Part time
☐ Casual
☐ Voluntary work
☐ Student
☐ Other

15. What is your current income range:

☐ Below $30,000
☐ $30,001-$45,000
☐ $45,001-$60,000
☐ $60,001-$75,000
☐ $75,001-$90,000
☐ $90,001-$105,000
☐ $105,001-$120,000
☐ Above $120,000

16. Details of Qualifications: Qualification, Institution, Course Duration, Year of Completion


### Work Integrated Learning in Hospitality

17. What is the highest level of education completed by your parents? Mark one box per row.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Mother</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No school or primary school</td>
<td>Vocational certificate or diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some or all of secondary school</td>
<td>Undergraduate university degree or diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Postgraduate university degree or diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Which sample group do you belong to?

- [ ] Graduate
- [ ] Employer
- [ ] Tertiary Educator
## 3. Graduate: Background Information

19. Was Hospitality your major area of study?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No
   If no please specify major area of study

20. Which category best represents your average overall grade percentage for your highest qualification:
   - [ ] No result
   - [ ] 0-49
   - [ ] 50-59
   - [ ] 60-69
   - [ ] 70-79
   - [ ] 80-89
   - [ ] 90-100

21. Did you work in the hospitality industry prior to commencing tertiary education?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

22. Did you work in the hospitality industry during your studies?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

23. Did you work in any other industry during your studies?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No
   If yes please specify industry

24. During tertiary education how many hours did you work in a typical seven day week?
   - [ ] 0
   - [ ] 1-5
   - [ ] 6-10
   - [ ] 11-15
   - [ ] 16-20
   - [ ] 21-25
   - [ ] 26-30
   - [ ] 31-35
   - [ ] 36-40
   - [ ] 41+

25. Did you receive direct financial payments from the government during tertiary education?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No
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26. Did you intend to follow a career related to the hospitality industry after graduating?
   - Definitely
   - Probably
   - Uncertain
   - Unlikely
   - No

27. How long did it take you after graduation to gain permanent employment?

28. Was this a graduate level position?
   - Yes
   - No
   - N/A, still searching for employment

29. Did you have a prior relationship with your current employer through your WIL activities?
   - Yes
   - No

30. Did you seek employment directly after course completion?
   - Yes
   - No
   If no why not?

31. In my qualification/s completing a WIL initiative was:
   - A compulsory course to complete my qualification
   - A mandatory requirement that is not a course but must be completed (eg 120hours work experience)
   - A voluntary option/elective subject
   - Not applicable
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Graduate: WIL Experience Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32. During your tertiary hospitality education did you partake in WIL initiatives?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Graduate: WIL Experience Questions

33. During your tertiary hospitality education what WIL initiatives did you partake in?
- Practicum
- Cooperative Education
- Professional Practice
- Internships
- Work Experience
- Other (please specify):

34. Who at the tertiary institution was responsible for managing WIL activities? Please provide Position Title

35. Were your WIL placement/s in a paid capacity?
- Yes, all
- Yes, some
- No
- N/A, no WIL experience

36. Do you consider payment influences student eagerness/acceptance to participate in WIL?
- Yes
- No

37. Approximately how many hours in total in your tertiary hospitality education did you spend on WIL?
- None
- 0-20 hours
- 21-40 hours
- 41-100 hours
- 101-200 hours
- 201-400 hours
- 400+ hours
### Work Integrated Learning in Hospitality

#### 6. Graduate: Benefits Attained Through WIL Engagement

**38. To what extent do you agree that students encounter the following personal and social benefits during tertiary WIL experience?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquiring a broad education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing clearly and effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking clearly and effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking critically and analytically</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysing quantitative problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using computing and information technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working effectively with others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning effectively on their own</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solving complex, real-world problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing a personal code of values and ethics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offered financial support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing to the welfare of the community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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39. To what extent do you agree that students encounter the following career development benefits during tertiary WIL experience?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explores potential career options prior to graduation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to re-evaluate expectations of industry and job prospects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarify requirements and preparedness of workforce entry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquiring job-related or non-related knowledge and skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive advantage in the graduate labour market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of professional contacts/networking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential future recruitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve transition into the workforce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased interstate and national mobility within the workforce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Securing relevant work after graduation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressing quickly through the ranks at your workplace or industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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#### 7. Graduate: Challenges of WIL Engagement

40. To what extent do you agree that students encounter the following challenges during tertiary WIL experience?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managing several commitments (i.e. family, study, work etc.) while on work placement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining an appropriate placement for the discipline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient tertiary institute support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applying the theory learnt at University/TAFE/other in the workplace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing the transition from study to work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriate/unhelpful workplace experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial costs associated with work placement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional demands on time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. How do you rate the following factors of your WIL experience?</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>Extremely Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The supervision and support you received from your tertiary institution</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quality of contact with tertiary supervisors</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quantity of contact with tertiary supervisors</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The supervision and support you received during WIL from your host employer organisation</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of how these WIL initiatives were managed</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance of the WIL experience to coursework</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated of WIL initiatives within course curriculum</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual WIL experiences met your expectations</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your overall WIL experience</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. To what extent do you agree with the following statements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality educators know the industry well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A different understanding of career expectations exist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between educators and managers in the hospitality industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work experience is more important than a degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qualification for a prospective employee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A hospitality degree qualification is better than three</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>years of work experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having employees with degrees benefit hospitality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organisations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates with a bachelor's degree in hospitality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>will receive higher starting salaries than people who</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do not hold a degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs in the hospitality industry need a bachelor's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>degree in hospitality management for promotion purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you could start over again you would go to the same</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tertiary institution/s you graduated from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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10. Employer: Background Information

43. Position description:

44. Please provide a brief overview of your business: eg type of business, clientele, location

45. Detail size of workforce: please provide approximate number of Full Time, Part Time and Casual staff

46. Has your business ever employed hospitality graduates?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No

47. Do you currently employ hospitality graduates?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No
   ○ Don’t know
   If yes, please specify number

48. To the best of your knowledge, have these hospitality graduates had WIL experience?
   ○ Yes, all
   ○ Yes, some
   ○ No
   ○ Don’t know

49. Do you currently participate in WIL programs for tertiary hospitality students?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No

50. Have you ever participated in WIL programs for tertiary hospitality students?
   ○ Yes
   ○ No
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51. Are you a member of any WIL associations?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes please specify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. How long have you worked in the Hospitality Industry?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
53. Has your business been directly involved in WIL activities for tertiary hospitality students?

☐ Yes
☐ No
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| 12. Employer: WIL Experience Questions |

54. During your involvement with tertiary hospitality institution's, what WIL initiatives have you partaken?

- Practicum's
- Cooperative Education
- Professional Practice
- Internships
- Work Experience
- Other (please specify):

55. Who at your workplace is responsible for managing WIL activities? Please provide Position Title

56. Are the WIL placement/s in a paid capacity?

- Yes, all
- Yes, some
- No
- NA, Don't know

57. Do you consider payment influences student eagerness/acceptance to participate in WIL?

- Yes
- No

58. Approximately how many hours in total per year do you spend on WIL?

- None
- 0-20 hours
- 21-40 hours
- 41-100 hours
- 101-200 hours
- 201-400 hours
- 400+ hours
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#### 13. Employer: Benefits Attained Through WIL Engagement

59. To what extent do you agree that students encounter the following personal and social benefits during tertiary WIL experience?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquiring a broad education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing clearly and effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking clearly and effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking critically and analytically</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysing quantitative problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using computing and information technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working effectively with others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning effectively on their own</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solving complex, real-world problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing a personal code of values and ethics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offered financial support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing to the welfare of the community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### 60. To what extent do you agree that students encounter the following career development benefits during tertiary WIL experience?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explores potential career options prior to graduation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to re-evaluate expectations of industry and job prospects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarify requirements and preparedness of workforce entry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquiring job-related or non-related knowledge and skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive advantage in the graduate labour market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of professional contacts/networking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential future recruitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve transition into the workforce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased interstate and national mobility within the workforce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Securing relevant work after graduation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressing quickly through the ranks at your workplace or industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**61. To what extent do you agree that employers encounter the following benefits during tertiary WIL experience?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of professional contacts/networking</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to resources, current technology and knowledge</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultancy and research services</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep up-to-date with industry trends and advancements</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce training time and cost associated with new-hire productivity goals</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better employee job fit</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved staff morale</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New ideas and fresh perspectives for problem solving and product innovation</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultivation of leadership and management abilities</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff development prospects</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positively influence curriculum construction and course relevance</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### 14. Employer: Challenges of WIL Engagement

62. To what extent do you agree that employers encounter the following challenges during tertiary WIL experience?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managing several commitments (e.g., family, study, work etc.) while managing WIL activities</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating appropriate placements for students</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient tertiary institute support</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient employer support</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relating the theory learnt at University/TAFE/other to the workplace</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing student's transitions from study to work</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriate student conduct whilst on work placement</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional demands on time</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage student rights (ethics, privacy, safety etc)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect business interests (OH&amp;S, privacy, productivity etc)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess student learning from WIL experiences</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a qualified and competent supervisor to monitor students</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage scarce resources</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Work Integrated Learning in Hospitality

### 15. Employer: Satisfaction with WIL Experience

**63. How do you rate the following factors of your WIL experience?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Extremely Poor</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The support you received from the tertiary institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quality of contact with tertiary staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quantity of contact with tertiary staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The supervision and support you received during WIL from your employer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparedness of students sent to you for WIL placement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of how these WIL initiatives were managed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual WIL experiences met your expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your overall WIL experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 16. Employer: Perceptions of Tertiary Hospitality Education

### 64. To what extent do you agree with the following statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality educators know the industry well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A different understanding of career expectations exist between educators and managers in the hospitality industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work experience is more important than a degree qualification for a prospective employee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A hospitality degree qualification is better than three years of work experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having employees with degrees benefit hospitality organisations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates with a bachelor’s degree in hospitality will receive higher starting salaries than people who do not hold a degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs in the hospitality industry need a bachelor’s degree in hospitality management for promotion purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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17. Tertiary Educator: Background Information

65. Name of Institution/College/School/Department:

66. Position description:

67. Is hospitality your major disciplinary area?
   - Yes
   - No

If no please specify major disciplinary area:

68. How many years of Hospitality Industry experience do you have?
   - None
   - 1-2
   - 3-4
   - 5-6
   - 7-8
   - 9-10
   - 11-12
   - 13-14
   - 15+

69. Are you currently a member of the Australian Cooperative Education Network (ACEN)?
   - Yes
   - No

70. Are you a member of any other WIL associations?
   - Yes
   - No

If yes please specify:

71. What is your role in context of WIL? eg design of WIL initiatives, execution and evaluation

72. How long have you been in this role and/or involved in WIL?
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73. In your institution/department completing a WIL initiative is:

☐ A compulsory course to complete the qualification
☐ A mandatory requirement that is not a course but must be completed (eg 120 hours work experience)
☐ A voluntary option
☐ Not applicable
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Integrated Learning in Hospitality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18. Tertiary Educator: WIL Experience Questions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

74. During your career as a tertiary hospitality educator have you partaken in WIL initiatives?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
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#### 19. Tertiary Educator: WIL Experience Questions

**75. During your career in tertiary hospitality education what WIL initiatives have you partaken?**

- [ ] Practicum's
- [ ] Cooperative Education
- [ ] Professional Practice
- [ ] Internships
- [ ] Work Experience
- [ ] Other (please specify)
  
  
- [ ] Project Based Learning
- [ ] Academic Service Learning
- [ ] Cadetships
- [ ] Clinical Experience
- [ ] Engaged Learning
- [ ] Field Placements
- [ ] Apprenticeship
- [ ] Volunteering

**76. Who at your tertiary institution is responsible for managing WIL activities? Please provide Position Title**

**77. Are the WIL placement/s in a paid capacity?**

- [ ] Yes, all
- [ ] Yes, some
- [ ] No
- [ ] NA, Don't know

**78. Do you consider payment influences student eagerness/acceptance to participate in WIL?**

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

**79. Approximately how many hours in total per year do you spend on WIL?**

- [ ] None
- [ ] 0-20 hours
- [ ] 21-40 hours
- [ ] 41-100 hours
- [ ] 101-200 hours
- [ ] 201-400 hours
- [ ] 400+ hours
80. To what extent do you agree that students encounter the following personal and social benefits during tertiary WIL experience?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquiring a broad education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing clearly and effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking clearly and effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking critically and analytically</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysing quantitative problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using computing and information technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working effectively with others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning effectively on their own</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding self</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solving complex, real-world problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing a personal code of values and ethics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offered financial support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributing to the welfare of the community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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81. To what extent do you agree that students encounter the following career development benefits during tertiary WIL experience?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explores potential career options prior to graduation</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to re-evaluate expectations of industry and job prospects</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarify requirements and preparedness of workforce entry</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquiring job-related or work-related knowledge and skills</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive advantage in the graduate labour market</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of professional contacts/networking</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential future recruitment</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve transition into the workforce</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased interstate and national mobility within the workforce</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Securing relevant work after graduation</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressing quickly through the ranks at your workplace or industry</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**82. To what extent do you agree that hospitality tertiary educators encounter the following benefits during tertiary WIL experience?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of professional contacts/networking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to resources, current technology and knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing the future availability (number and diversity) of engagement opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep up-to-date with industry trends and advancements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produce relevant and constructive research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance teaching skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve comprehension of the complexities confronted by graduates entering the workforce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff development prospects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced course relevance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced course credibility with students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced course credibility with industry and community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced institution credibility and attractiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff ownership opportunities for course content and delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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#### 21. Tertiary Educator: Challenges of WIL Engagement

**83. To what extent do you agree that hospitality tertiary educators encounter the following challenges during tertiary WIL experience?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenge</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managing several commitments (i.e. family, study, work etc whilst managing WIL activities)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining appropriate placements for students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient tertiary institute support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relating the theory learnt at university/TAFE/other to the workplace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing student transitions from study to work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriate/unhelpful workplace experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriate student conduct whilst on work placement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional demands on time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage student rights (ethics, privacy, safety etc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect the interests of industry/community partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assess student learning from WIL experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### 22. Tertiary Educator: Satisfaction with WIL Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>84. How do you rate the following factors of your WIL experience</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Below Average</th>
<th>Extremely Poor</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The support you received from your tertiary institution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quality of contact with students during WIL activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quantity of contact with students during WIL activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The supervision and support you received during WIL from host employer organisations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness of how these WIL initiatives were managed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance of the WIL experience to coursework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated of WIL initiatives within course curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actual WIL experiences met your expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your overall WIL experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 23. Tertiary Educator: Perceptions of Tertiary Hospitality Education

#### 85. To what extent do you agree with the following statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality educators know the industry well</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A different understanding of career expectations exist between educators and managers in the hospitality industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work experience is more important than a degree qualification for a prospective employee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A hospitality degree qualification is better than three years of work experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having employees with degrees benefit hospitality organisations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates with a bachelor’s degree in hospitality will receive higher starting salaries than people who do not hold a degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs in the hospitality industry need a bachelor’s degree in hospitality management for promotion purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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#### 24. Employability Questions

86. In your opinion which is the one characteristic you believe is the most important for an employee?

- Enthusiasm
- Willing to learn
- Specific Skills (customer service skills, communication skills, IT skills etc.)
- Dedication
- Hard-working
- Determination
- Commitment
- Other (please specify) 

87. What do you think human resource departments consider as the most important characteristic for a new employee?

- Knowledge of the industry
- Qualifications
- Specific Skills (customer service skills, communication skills, IT skills etc.)
- Personality
- Experience
- Other (please specify) 

88. Select the most important single characteristic for an employee in the hospitality industry, in your opinion?

- Knowledge of the industry
- Experience
- Specific skills (customer service skills, communication skills, IT skills etc.)
- Personality
- Attitude
- Commitment
- Qualifications
- Other (please specify) 

89. Which skill do you think will be the most important for graduate career development?

- Communication skills
- Food and beverage skills
- To be multi-lingual
- Using initiative skills
- Problem solving skills
- Front office skills
- Human relations skills
- Self-management skills
- Other (please specify)
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90. What level do you expect a graduate to hold five years after completing a tertiary hospitality course?

- Department supervisor level
- Senior management level
- Self-employed
- Department manager level
- Top management level
- Other (please specify)

91. What level do you expect a graduate to hold 10 years after completing a tertiary hospitality course?

- Department supervisor level
- Senior management level
- Self-employed
- Department manager level
- Top management level
- Other (please specify)
1st July 2011

You are invited to participate in a study Investigating the Contribution of Work Integrated Learning (WIL) for Service Industries. The study is being conducted by Karina Wardle, PhD student in the College of Business at University of Western Sydney, under the supervision of Professor Bobby Banerjee and Dr Pheroza Daruwalla.

The aim of this study is to examine whether student participation in WIL during tertiary studies improves graduate employability skills. There is a lack of information on whether WIL has specific benefits for Hospitality. This study seeks to gain perspectives of hospitality graduates, employers and tertiary educators within NSW about WIL. Findings from this research will be used to improve curriculum and implementation of WIL within tertiary hospitality education.

Please click on the embedded link in the email to complete the survey about your perspectives and experience with WIL. The survey will take approximately 20 minutes. Completion of survey will be deemed as participant consent and all information supplied will be treated with complete confidentiality. Contact information is for the sole purpose of the research and the survey data will be de-identified for analysis purposes. To help manage the information flow, we also ask that you complete the survey within two weeks of receiving this invitation.

If you are interested in participating in the second stage of the research project, a two hour focus group discussion to explore the issues that emerge from the surveys, please forward your contact details to the researcher. Participants can also use this email to request a copy of the research findings.

If you require any further information or have any questions regarding participation please contact:

- Karina Wardle (m: 0421 087 588; email: k.wardle@uws.edu.au); or research supervisors:
  - Dr. Pheroza Daruwalla (tel: 9685 9852; email: p.daruwalla@uws.edu.au)
  - Professor Bobby Banerjee (tel: 9685 9328; email: b.banerjee@uws.edu.au).

This study has been approved by the University of Western Sydney Human Research Ethics Committee. The Approval number is H8994. If you have any complaints or reservations about the ethical conduct of this research, you may contact the Ethics Committee through the Office of Research Services on Tel 02-4736 0883, Fax 02-4736 0013 or email humanethics@uws.edu.au. Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated fully, and you will be informed of the outcome.
Definitions

Graduate: someone who has completed a hospitality qualification at a tertiary institute including University, TAFE or private college within the last five years. Includes graduate with or without WIL experience.

Work Integrated Learning (WIL): is an umbrella term encompassing a vast assortment of approaches and strategies focused on offering experience and linking theory and practice to deliver work-ready graduates including Practicum’s, Cooperative Education, Professional Practice, Work Experience, Project Based Learning, Academic Service Learning, Clinical Experience, Internships, Engaged Learning, Cadetships, Apprenticeship, Practical Training, Field Placements, Volunteering and many others (ATLC 2009). It is defined as “a structured educational strategy integrating classroom studies with learning through productive work experiences in a field related to a student’s academic or career goals... It is a partnership among students, educational institutions and employers, with specified responsibilities for each party” (USA National Commission for Cooperative Education cited in Bates 2005, p1).

Hospitality: denotes a diversity of businesses residing within four sectors namely Free Standing Hospitality Businesses, Hospitality in Leisure Venues, Hospitality in Travel Venues and Subsidised Hospitality (Slattery 2002).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Free-Standing Hospitality Businesses</th>
<th>Hospitality in Leisure Venues</th>
<th>Hospitality in Travel Venues</th>
<th>Subsidised Hospitality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hotels</td>
<td>Casinos</td>
<td>Airports</td>
<td>Workplaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday centres</td>
<td>Bingo clubs</td>
<td>Rail stations</td>
<td>Health care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quasi hotels</td>
<td>Night clubs</td>
<td>Bus stations</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cruise ships</td>
<td>Cinemas</td>
<td>Ferry terminals</td>
<td>Military</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time-share</td>
<td>Theatres</td>
<td>Aeroplanes</td>
<td>Custodial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bars</td>
<td>Sports stadia</td>
<td>Trains</td>
<td>Retailers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants</td>
<td>Theme parks</td>
<td>Ferries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attraction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health clubs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 11: QUALITATIVE FOCUS GROUP MATERIALS

20th March 2012

Dear ___________________,

You have been selected based on your knowledge and expertise in the Hospitality Industry as a Tertiary Educator to participate in a focus group discussion. The study is titled Investigating the Contribution of Work Integrated Learning (WIL) for Service Industries.

The aim of this study is to examine whether student participation in WIL during tertiary studies improves graduate employability skills. Findings from this research will be used to inform improvements to design, implementation and evaluation of WIL within tertiary hospitality education.

Date: Monday 23rd April 6.30-8.30pm or Monday 30th April 6.30-8.30pm (attend one session only)
Address: The Epping Club, 45-47 Rawson Street Epping NSW 2121
Transport: 20 minute drive from the city and a few minutes from the M2 Motorway. Car parking is available on site with parking passes available on request. The Club is just a few minute’s walk from Epping Railway Station. Bus stations are located on Oxford Street and Beecroft Road. A short walk through “The Epping Club Walk” brings you to the Club.

Light refreshments will be provided. To assist in maintaining accuracy of the data the researcher further requests your permission to audio and video tape the focus group discussions. All information supplied will be treated with complete confidentiality and anonymity.

If you are interested in participating in the focus group please send your confirmation of preferred date and contact details to: k.wardle@uws.edu.au. Email addresses are requested to facilitate dissemination of the focus group agenda and to provide feedback to participants on research findings. This contact information is for the sole purpose of the research.

If you require any further information or have any questions regarding participation please contact:

Karina Wardle (m: 0421 087 588; email: k.wardle@uws.edu.au); or research supervisors:
Dr. Pherozza Daruwalla (tel: 9685 9852; email: p.daruwalla@uws.edu.au)
Professor Bobby Banerjee (tel: 9685 9328; email: b.banerjee@uws.edu.au).

This study has been approved by the University of Western Sydney Human Research Ethics Committee. The Approval number is H8994. If you have any complaints or reservations about the ethical conduct of this research, you may contact the Ethics Committee through the Office of Research Services on Tel 02-4736 0883, Fax 02-4736 0013 or email humanethics@uws.edu.au. Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated fully, and you will be informed of the outcome.
Participant Consent Form

I,……………………………..……, consent to participate in the research project titled “Investigating the Contribution of Work Integrated Learning for Service Industries”.

I acknowledge that:

I have read and understand the participant information sheet and have been given the opportunity to discuss the information and my involvement in the project with the researcher/s.

The procedures required for the project and the time involved have been explained to me, and any questions I have about the project have been answered to my satisfaction.

I consent to participate in the focus group discussion undertaken by Karina Wardle under the supervision of Professor Bobby Banerjee and Dr Pheroza Daruwalla and give my consent freely. I agree to have the discussion audio and video taped and I understand that the study will be carried out as has been described to me.

I understand that my involvement is confidential and that the information gained during the study may be published but no information about me will be used in any way that reveals my identity.

I understand that I can withdraw from the study at any time, without affecting my relationship with the researcher/s now or in the future.

Signed:____________________________________

Name:____________________________________

Date:____________________________________

Return Address: k.wardle@uws.edu.au
Investigating the Contribution of Work Integrated Learning (WIL) for Service Industries.

Focus Group Agenda

Topics:
1. Introduction to session
2. Participant self introductions
3. Work Integrated Learning (WIL)
4. Benefits of WIL
5. Costs of WIL
6. Graduate attributes and industry expectations
7. How to design/integrate effective WIL in curriculum
Work Integrated Learning (WIL): is an umbrella term encompassing a vast assortment of approaches and strategies focused on offering experience and linking theory and practice to deliver work-ready graduates including Practicum’s, Cooperative Education, Work Placement, Internships, Cadetships, Apprenticeship and many others (ATLC 2009). It is defined in this thesis as “a structured educational strategy integrating classroom studies with learning through productive work experiences in a field related to a student’s academic or career goals. It provides progressive experience in integrating theory and practice. It is a partnership among students, educational institutions and employers, with specified responsibilities for each party.” (USA National Commission for Cooperative Education cited in Bates 2005, p1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assorted WIL Terminology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practicum, professional practice, internship, workplace learning, work integrated learning, industry-based learning, project-based learning, cooperative education, fieldwork education, service learning, real world learning, university engaged learning, placements, experiential learning, clinical placements, professional placement, work experience, clinical practice, clinical education, doctoral supervision with industry partners, work based learning, academic service learning, adult learning, androgogy, clinical attachments, clinical experience, competency assessment, corporate business management, employment experience, engaged learning, experiential placements, faculty internships, field placements, industrial experience, industry experience, industry links, industry placement, learning in the workplace, operational performance, practical projects, practical training, practice based education, practice-based learning, problem-based learning, professional experience, professional learning, sandwich, site visits, structured workplace learning, student employability and volunteering.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graduate Employability

- **PRACTICE**
  - Practical competence, job-specific skills
- **EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING: WIL**
- **THEORY**
  - Theoretical knowledge, technical job-specific
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PARTICIPANTS are needed for a new University of Western Sydney study that will investigate the employability of graduates in the hospitality industry.

Karina Wardle, a PhD candidate from the UWS School of Business, is conducting the study of the value of Work Integrated Learning (WIL) in the hospitality industry.

Hospitality graduates, employers and educators are invited to participate in focus groups and share their experiences and views of the importance of WIL.

The focus groups will be held on Monday, April 30, for graduates, Tuesday, May 1, for employers, Monday, May 7, for educators and Tuesday, May 8, for a mixed group.

Hospitality workers may work in diverse businesses and venues, including hotels, holiday centres, bars, restaurants, casinos, theatres, theme parks, health clubs, airports or retail outlets.

For details contact Karina Wardle: k.wardle@uws.edu.au, 0421 087 588
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## APPENDIX 13: QUANTITATIVE SURVEY FINDINGS: PERCEPTIONS OF TERTIARY HOSPITALITY EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceptions</th>
<th>Graduates</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality educators know the industry well</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary Educators</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted %*</td>
<td>16%*</td>
<td>58%*</td>
<td>16%*</td>
<td>10%*</td>
<td>0%*</td>
<td>100%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A different understanding of career expectations exist between educators and managers in the hospitality industry</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary Educators</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted %*</td>
<td>6%*</td>
<td>29%*</td>
<td>38%*</td>
<td>1%*</td>
<td>0%*</td>
<td>100%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work experience is more important than a degree qualification for a prospective employee</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary Educators</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted %*</td>
<td>11%*</td>
<td>42%*</td>
<td>24%*</td>
<td>0%*</td>
<td>0%*</td>
<td>100%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A hospitality degree qualification is better than three years of work experience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary Educators</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted %*</td>
<td>2%*</td>
<td>19%*</td>
<td>35%*</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%*</td>
<td>100%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having employees with degrees benefit hospitality organisations</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary Educators</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted %*</td>
<td>18%*</td>
<td>59%*</td>
<td>18%*</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%*</td>
<td>100%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates with a bachelor’s degree in hospitality will receive higher starting salaries than people who do not hold a degree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary Educators</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted %*</td>
<td>5%*</td>
<td>30%*</td>
<td>21%*</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%*</td>
<td>99%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions</td>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs in the hospitality industry need a bachelor’s degree in hospitality management for promotion purposes</td>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary Educators</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighted %*</td>
<td>7%*</td>
<td>30%*</td>
<td>35%*</td>
<td>19%*</td>
<td>8%*</td>
<td>99%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you could start over again you would go to the same tertiary institution/s you graduated from</td>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Method of weighting data involved averaging the sample group percentages within each category to overcome disparate sample sizes.