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Abstract
Students undertaking Vocational Education and Training (VET) while still attending school now comprise an important and rapidly growing component of Australia's VET system, with numbers reaching in excess of 100,000 by the Year 2000, representing around 8% of Australia's vocational students (Australian National Training Authority, 2002). In Queensland in 2000, a record number of over 21,000 students representing more than 55 per cent of Year 12 students studied at least one VET module across their senior years (Queensland Board of Senior Secondary School Studies [QBSSS], 2002). Of the VET subjects studied in Queensland, hospitality is the most popular subject choice with around 16% of Year 12 students studying a hospitality subject. However, with this popularity come problems of sustainability of the supply of suitable teachers. Malley, Keating, Robinson and Hanks (2001) argue that the maintenance of the supply of vocational teachers for school-based VET is one of the key problems facing the field today. In the case of hospitality teachers, many of these teachers were initially trained as home economics teachers, potentially setting up a competitive situation regarding teaching preferences. This paper provides some insights into findings from a survey administered to hospitality teachers who were initially trained as home economics teachers in Queensland. The survey set out to characterise the nature of their work and their preference for teaching in either field. One hundred and seventeen surveys are analysed. Four key themes are presented in the results section: demographic information; hospitality teaching experience; knowledge, skills and experiences teachers have for teaching hospitality; and attitudes towards teaching hospitality. The discussion, which follows, raises questions about sustainability of the supply of hospitality teachers.

Context
Student numbers in the senior sector of schooling are on the rise. Students are increasingly taking up VET subjects in schools as a popular curriculum choice that is policy driven at a state and federal level. This trend reflects a growing commitment by education sectors to focus on the need for a diverse curriculum with both traditional academic and more contemporary vocational outcomes in order to meet the needs of the increasing numbers of students in the secondary school sector. This commitment to VET has been demonstrated at a national level. For instance, in 1999 a clear national policy emphasis for vocational education in secondary schools was established in the Adelaide Declaration on National Goals for Schooling in the 21st Century. With direct relevance to vocational education, the national goals stated that all students should have:

• participated in programs of vocational learning during the compulsory years and have had access to vocational education and training programs as part of their senior secondary studies
• access to the high quality education necessary to enable the completion of school education to Year 12 or its equivalent, and that provides clear and recognised pathways to employment and further education and training (Ministerial Council for Employment, Education, Training and Youth Affairs, 1999).

More recently in Queensland, the state government released a paper entitled Queensland the Smart State: Education and
Training Reforms for the Future (Queensland Government, 2002). In it, three major proposals for reforms to education and training in Queensland were detailed. The first proposal was to raise the school leaving age from the current 15 to 16 or 17, with all students engaged in school, vocational education and training, or work. The second was the reorganisation of senior secondary schooling; and the final proposal related to the recording of achievement to include all students’ ‘work readiness’ skills, thus providing a more meaningful picture for potential employers. Each of these proposals recognises the significant and increasingly growing role of vocational education and training of school-age students. Each has subsequently been endorsed, reinforcing the national commitment to VET education at the state level.

In Queensland, the authority responsible for the development, implementation and monitoring of curriculum—the Queensland Studies Authority (QSA)—states that the objectives of incorporating VET in schools include:

- enabling students to have access to a range of ‘VET in Schools’ options across current and emerging industries that support and expand their choice of flexible pathways
- delivering ‘VET in Schools’ options that have nationally recognised and valued outcomes while supporting seamless transitions from school to employment and further education and training
- raising the profile of ‘VET in Schools’ so that qualifications obtained through programs receive improved recognition from industry and tertiary entrance
- helping to prepare young people for employment and the world of work more broadly
- raising the profile of VET within post-compulsory schooling and thereby increasing the likely uptake of more advanced VET programs after secondary school
- contributing to the future skill base of Queenslanders, and enhancing the competitiveness of Queensland business and industry
- continuing the role of the Queensland Studies Authority in course development and recognition of VET programs in the post-compulsory school curriculum
- recording student achievement in recognised VET programs on the Senior Certificate, as well as more young people exiting with VET qualifications
- promoting the need for local communities and schools to make a commitment and accept shared responsibility to meet the diverse vocational needs of young people (QSA, 2004).

The extent to which VET has become an integral part of school students’ subject choice and the rapidity of its uptake has been quite remarkable. In Queensland in the year 2000, a then record number of over 21,000 students representing more than 55 per cent of Year 12 students studied at least one VET module across their senior years (QBSSSSS, 2002). This had increased to 23,936, representing 61 per cent of Year 12 students, in the Year 2002, with over 390 schools registered as training providers (QSA, 2004). Of the VET subjects undertaken in Queensland secondary schools, hospitality is the most popular choice with just under 6,000 Year 12 students studying a hospitality subject in 2002. This translates to 16 per cent of Year 12 students studying a hospitality course of study in 2002 (QSA, 2004). Table 1 provides details of student numbers and schools offering hospitality for the Years 2000 and 2002.

Most of the VET studies undertaken by school students are embedded in Subject Area Specifications (SASs) for ‘Authority-registered’ subjects-that is, registered by QSA. SASs do not contribute to the calculation of scores for tertiary entrance. In the case of hospitality, this subject is called

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Number of schools offering the subject</th>
<th>Number of students (Year 11 &amp; 12 combined)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality Studies</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality Practices</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Year 2000 & Year 2002 Year 11 and 12 student enrolments in hospitality subjects (Data sources: QBSSSSS 2002; QSA 2004)
Hospitality Practices. Smaller numbers undertake VET through 'Authority subjects' (in the case of hospitality it is called Hospitality Studies), which do contribute to the calculation of tertiary entrance and represent a more academically rigorous course of study.

The inclusion of VET subjects is a relatively recent phenomenon in Queensland schools. Table 2 encapsulates the rapidity of the uptake of hospitality subjects in Queensland secondary schools. For the initial three-year period there was a constant increase in the number of schools offering hospitality subjects, and concomitantly, the number of students enrolled. In the most recent years enrolment numbers are beginning to stabilise, providing an idea of what is likely to become a relative percentage of students opting to study hospitality-related courses. When these data are presented diagrammatically, a better understanding of what is taking place emerges. Figure 1 presents a visual representation of the number of schools and numbers of students enrolling in Hospitality Studies. This subject contributes to students’ tertiary entrance calculation. Student numbers have peaked and are plateauing, while the number of schools offering the subject is still steadily increasing. This pattern is the same for Hospitality Practices (Figure 2), which does not contribute to tertiary entrance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Hospitality Studies</th>
<th>Hospitality Practices SASs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of schools</td>
<td>Number of students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Number of students enrolled and schools offering hospitality subjects with embedded modules, 1998-2002 (Year 12 only) (Data sources: QBSSSS, 2002; QSA, 2004)
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Figure 1. Number of students enrolled and schools offering Hospitality Studies with embedded modules, 1998-2002 (Year 12 only) (Data sources: QBSSSS, 2002; QSA, 2004)
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Figure 2. Number of students enrolled and schools offering Hospitality Practices with embedded modules, 1998-2002 (Year 12 only) (Data sources: QBSSSS, 2002; QSA, 2004)
calculation. What is particularly interesting to point out is that Hospitality Practices attracts around ten times more students, and is offered in around ten times more schools than the academically oriented Hospitality Studies, as represented in Figure 3.

Finally, the data tell us that the average number of students enrolled in Hospitality Studies and Hospitality Practises has declined over the five-year period, Hospitality Studies much more rapidly, to a relatively stable 15 students per school (see Figure 4).

The statistical picture that emerges is one of a stabilising demand for the VET hospitality courses. Given this context, the issue of the supply of teachers to accommodate a now relatively stable student population can be considered. In the early days of the introduction of hospitality courses into schools, there were few teachers who met both industry and Board of Teacher Registration requirements, so home economics teachers were likely to be seconded to teach the subject/s because they were most closely aligned in terms of discipline base. However, this was not the only initial challenge for introducing hospitality in schools. Other issues included: (see Pendergast & Cooper, 2001; Pendergast & Cooper, 2003) the very extensive and specific physical resource requirements to meet industry standards which must be accounted for in auditing processes; administrative issues such as the need for flexibility and extended class time when compared to non-vocationally oriented disciplines; and then the major issue-the availability of appropriately qualified teachers to deliver VET subjects (Malley et al., 2001; Pendergast, Reynolds & Crane, 2000). These issues have been reconfirmed in a recent report conducted on behalf of the National Council for Vocational Education Research (Polesel et al., 2004) as ongoing barriers to VET in schools. The report suggests that factors that limit the ability of schools to provide high-quality programs and/or to expand existing provision include:

- a shortage of adequately trained teachers prepared to accept the additional workloads associated with VET teaching
- costs associated with training teachers to the standards needed to meet Australian Quality Training Framework (AQTF) compliance (including time release for industrial experience)
- provision of adequate facilities for delivering VET within the school (and the costs associated with updating inadequate facilities or building new ones)
- costs of buying in provision from TAFE or another provider
- fees charged to students (Polesel et al., 2004).

As can be gleaned from the list, many of the factors are related to the provision of adequate teachers.

In the Queensland scenario, the particular difficulty that arises in the provision of appropriately qualified VET teachers in school-based hospitality, without the need to employ additional staff (for example from Technical and Further Education TAFE), is that they must meet both the
Queensland Board of Teacher Registration (BTR) requirements and human resource industry experience and training standards. Therein lies the challenge for sustaining appropriately qualified hospitality teachers to meet the demands for classes. BTR requirements are explicit, including extensive teaching practicum (80 days) and completion of a four-year education degree (or equivalent). At the same time, industry standards require teachers of hospitality to complete a range of requirements that sit alongside the education qualifications, including recent and relevant industry experience.

As a consequence of the strict requirements in Queensland, teachers of hospitality in schools are most likely to be home economics trained teachers who have typically undertaken additional training. Pre-service home economics teachers have, in the main, completed industry modules and other requirements as an additional activity outside the scope of their degree course. There exist other pathways to teaching hospitality in schools in Queensland (see Pendergast & Cooper, 2003 for details), but it has been commonplace that home economics teachers are those who have been requested by school management, or indeed have volunteered, to teach hospitality because it is the most closely aligned curriculum area.

The ongoing provision of teachers for VET subjects is a major threat to program continuity, and this challenges the sustainability of VET programs in our school sector. This is particularly challenging in rural areas, where VET education is popular as a curriculum choice (Fullarton, 2001), yet access to specialist teachers is most difficult. As Malley et al. (2001) have noted:

"....there is a shortage of teachers with the skills to initiate and develop effective school-industry programs. State education authorities and teacher training institutions will need to pay particular attention to appropriate training and professional development strategies if vocational education programs with school-industry links are to be sustained (p.99)."

Given this complex context, this research set out to gain a sense of the hospitality teacher workforce in Queensland: who they are; advantages and disadvantages to teaching hospitality; the characteristics typical of hospitality teachers; and importantly, since these were typically home economics trained teachers, whether there were competing demands or interests between the subject areas affecting their teaching role and attitude. In this way, an understanding of whether home economics and hospitality are in some way competing, or whether they are in fact complimentary, might be considered. This is, from the researchers’ perspective, an important philosophical consideration for the profession of home economics, and relates directly to the sustainability of the teacher workforce in both fields.

Method

After gaining appropriate ethical clearance and approval for access to participants, a postal survey was sent to 220 teacher members of the Home Economics Institute of Australia, Queensland Division. This cohort was selected as most teachers of hospitality in Queensland are home economics trained teachers (Pendergast & Cooper, 2001). In total there were 117 responses, providing a response rate of 53%. There were no follow-up procedures. The statistical data were analysed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) and simple content analysis was applied to free text.

The survey was designed to gather information in order to develop a better understanding of hospitality teaching and teachers in Queensland. Data collected included:

- Demographic information—for example: total years of teaching experience; gender; geographical location; full—time equivalent hospitality teachers in each department
- Hospitality teaching experience—for example: number of years of teaching experience in hospitality; subjects currently being taught
- Knowledge, skills and experiences they have for teaching hospitality—for example: how knowledge, experience and skills were gained; additional knowledge and experience teachers wish to acquire; how to recognise a hospitality teacher
- Attitudes towards teaching hospitality—for example: why teachers began
teaching hospitality; adjectives to describe a hospitality teacher; similarities and differences between teaching hospitality and other subjects; advantages and disadvantages of teaching hospitality; and what is a ‘good’ hospitality teacher.

Results
There was a wealth of data produced, so this report focuses on only some aspects of the data collected.

Demographic information and teaching experience
This cohort of hospitality teachers was almost exclusively female (99%), with a good representation of metropolitan (58%) and country (42%) areas of the state. Almost all had teaching experience of ten years or more, and half had more than five years experience of teaching hospitality. This provided a solid base of teachers who were both experienced, and those who were relatively new to teaching hospitality, included in the study. It is not surprising that almost all of the respondents were female, given that home economics teachers are almost exclusively female. This has subsequent implications for hospitality, as in Queensland the teachers are typically drawn from the home economics trained teacher cohort.

Knowledge, skills and experiences for teaching hospitality
Most of the knowledge, skills and experience explicitly required for teaching hospitality were reportedly gained through the teachers’ own initiative in formal industry placements and TAFE or other short courses. Many recognised the need for further training beyond their base education degree, and lamented that much of their ‘own time’ and ‘own money’ was spent acquiring new knowledge and skills. There was a general concern that this is an expectation placed on teachers. Respondents also consistently lamented the need for formal pre-service teacher education courses to redress this issue. The following respondents’ comments are provided to illustrate these points:

Attending TAFE courses in my own time, and in school holidays. I need a lot more but I can’t afford the time or money. Respondent 101

All self taught through inservice, work experience, in my own time and at my own expense. Respondent 106

In terms of their experiences of teaching hospitality, study participants provided free text responses to the statement: ‘I could recognise a good hospitality teacher by ……..’. Many respondents provided more than one completion for the sentence, and as a result the total number of responses (201) exceeded the number of respondents. Fourteen respondents did not provide a response. The majority of responses related to skills and knowledge (30%) and motivation (28%). Skills and knowledge included comments or responses such as:

- the hospitality teacher sharing their knowledge and experiences with others
- continuous improvement of knowledge and skills through industry involvement
- many personal hours spent obtaining skills and knowledge.

Respondents also noted that a good hospitality teacher is one who is able to motivate and keep motivated a group of ‘students who are there to fill in time’ and who see the subject as a ‘bludgeon subject’, providing the opportunity for a free feed. Respondents noted the need to be committed and organised in order to carry out the numerous tasks required to undertake a successful function or catering event.

Some respondents suggested a hospitality teacher could be recognised by less flattering characteristics. Around 4% of respondents made comments of this nature, such as:

- their non-appearance at events—they are always still in class finishing cooking
- her apron
- the grey hairs.

One response stood out because of its extremely negative orientation to hospitality:

I do not consider anyone who teaches hospitality to be a good teacher. It is not a subject that requires good teaching in the sense of pedagogy. It is vocational education and any numb skull can do it. Respondent 14.

Attitudes towards teaching hospitality
The respondents reported that they were  

“Much of their ‘own time’ and ‘own money’ was spent acquiring new knowledge and skills.”

18
most likely to have become hospitality teachers because their school introduced hospitality education and they were seen by school management as the best choice to teach the subject, even though it was not the teachers’ desire or preference. This accounted for 71% of teachers involved in teaching hospitality. As these respondents explain:

There wasn’t really a choice, I was assigned it. Respondent 78
Because it was put on my timetable by the deputy principal when it was introduced into the school. Respondent 21

There was no-one else available and home economics equals hospitality in the deputy principal’s eyes. Respondent 15

I was afraid that if I didn’t I would be out of a job. Respondent 81

Other less reported reasons given for teaching hospitality included: experience and interest in the field; and the view that hospitality is a growth area for teaching and home economics is a less popular subject choice, so it is a wise career move. For example:

Saw the trend for home ec teachers to be slotted into hospitality so didn’t have a choice. Respondent 83

These reasons for teaching hospitality were consistent for teachers in both metropolitan and country school locations, and across the range of years of teaching experience.

Respondents were asked whether they had a preference for teaching hospitality or home economics. Of the 71% of respondents who were teaching hospitality because they were required to by school management, 46% indicated they did not have a preference subsequently. However, 38% strongly preferred teaching home economics, with over half of these (54%) indicating the preference for home economics is due to the variety of the subject matter, while 22% enjoy the challenge and academic rigour of home economics. Some direct quotes from open-ended responses illustrate this preference for home economics teaching:

Home economics is much preferred though not currently popular with Ed QLD and not promoted in schools. Respondent 117

I trained to be a home economist and this is where my passion lies. Hospitality was placed on me with no choice. It is frustrating. Respondent 71

Home economics because I love the content and the relevance of the subject for all individuals. Respondent 79

Home economics—I know the subject better and feel better qualified and prefer the student clientele. Respondent 80

Home economics—more training, experience and therefore confidence. Respondent 83

Only 14% of respondents preferred hospitality over home economics. Over half of these (57%) did so because of the perceived relevance of the skills and knowledge for their students entering the workforce. For example:

The students really enjoy it, which makes it enjoyable to teach. I like to follow different trends within the hospitality industry and share these with the students. Respondent 74

I do enjoy the practical and real life application that hospitality has. Respondent 78

The respondents were asked to provide up to five (5) words they would use to describe a hospitality teacher. Of the total 466 terms used, almost half used the most frequently used term—‘organised’ (48%). Other commonly used terms included: ‘hardworking’ (41%), ‘dedicated’ (38%), ‘enthusiastic’ (37%) and ‘creative’ (34%). On a negative note, relatively common terms
used to describe hospitality teachers were 'stressed' and 'tired' (19%), and some considered hospitality teachers to be 'crazy' (5%) and 'undervalued' (4%). Table 3 lists the most frequently used terms.

The study also sought to identify advantages and disadvantages of being a hospitality teacher. Fewer advantages (244) than disadvantages (281) were identified by respondents. With respect to advantages, these tended to be more of the nature of personal gains for the teacher. This is evidenced by the most obvious advantage of obtaining transferable skills (17%). Respondents identified that teaching hospitality provided them with more attractive employment opportunities within and external to teaching. Hospitality teaching expanded their skill and network base, through industry contact and experience. Another advantage was the opportunity to work with motivated students (11%)-that is, with students who believe they can 'get something' out of the subject. The rapport established with the students (9%) was also stated to be an advantage to teaching hospitality, along with the flexibility (7%) and practical nature (3%) of the subject. A number of respondents also identified the advantage of personal use (9%), such as the opportunity to obtain new recipes, take home leftovers and trial new restaurants and hotels. The opportunity to work as a team or assist the students in developing as a team was also considered to be a significant advantage (7%).

In total there were 281 disadvantages identified by the respondent teachers with respect to the teaching of hospitality. The most notable relate to the perception/reality of increased time and commitment involved in teaching the subject when compared to home economics. Time consuming (17%), out-of-hours work (14%) and preparation (8%) all related to the time and commitment required for the teaching of hospitality, with a combined total of 40% of respondents noting this aspect to be a disadvantage. Being perceived to be the school caterer for functions (13%) was also seen as a negative, along with student management (19%), which includes dealing with larger class sizes, unmotivated students and those who took the subject for its 'ease' or 'bludge' factor. Other disadvantages include: the lack of recognition from other staff and industry (6.5%), maintaining currency (10%) and paper work management (9%).

**Discussion and implications**

This snapshot of findings from the survey administered to home economics trained hospitality teachers in Queensland schools contributes to building a better understanding of hospitality VET teachers and their work in the schooling sector. Specifically, as the title of this paper implies, the question of whether there are some competing or perhaps complimentary aspects regarding home economics and hospitality teaching is the focus of this paper. There are some important clues to considering this question that emerge from the findings, and these can be considered collectively with regard to the sustainability of the supply of teachers in the fields of hospitality and perhaps home economics.

As indicated in the literature cited, the question of supplying suitably qualified teachers is a major consideration for sustaining vocational education in the schooling sector. The literature also builds a picture of a sound collective of students keen to undertake study in hospitality related fields during their school years, with stabilising numbers emerging. This gives a useful basis for predicting the ongoing requirement for teachers in hospitality in the future.

The data collected in this study demonstrate that many current hospitality teachers were initially trained as home economics teachers, and their shift to hospitality teaching was not desired by them, and is not their preferred teaching role. Very few of these teachers report that they now prefer hospitality over home economics. This revelation is an important one, and no doubt contributes to-and is a result of-the problem of sourcing adequately prepared teachers. This raises alarms about the long term attitudes teachers might have to teaching hospitality, with resentment, dissatisfaction, and the possibility of other negative emotions emerging with respect to teaching hospitality. Teachers noted a lack of recognition, difficulties in sustaining industry relevance, time demands and out-of-hours preparation and work commitments as contributing to problems associated with teaching hospitality. Many teachers also missed teaching the subject they felt passionate about home economics.
With respect to the choice of words used to describe hospitality teachers, data produced out of this study can be compared to data from a similar study conducted with one-hundred-and-ninety-nine home economics teachers—many of them the same individuals who also listed up to five words they would use to describe a home economics teacher. The findings revealed the words most frequently used to describe home economics teachers to be: multi-skilled (70%), professional (43%), organised (39%), resourceful (35%), practical (30%), hardworking (27%), caring (26%), and creative (25%) (Pendergast, 1999). Hence, the studies resulted in some common descriptors for home economics and hospitality teachers, these being: organised, hardworking and creative. However, the differences are particularly noteworthy. Home economics teachers described themselves foremost as multi-skilled (70%) and professional (43%), neither term featuring highly in the descriptions of hospitality teachers. It is interesting that the diverse nature of home economics (captured in the term multi-skilled) seems to be consistently desired by home economics teachers, as evidenced by 38% of respondents strongly preferring teaching home economics, with over half of these (54%) indicating it is due to the variety of the subject matter. It seems that home economics teachers miss this aspect of their work when they are required to shift to hospitality teaching.

The picture that emerges out of the data is that there are potentially some major issues regarding home economics trained teachers undertake the role of hospitality teacher, and on the whole, these are issues of a negative nature. This is occurring in an environment where home economics as a subject choice at school does not enjoy high status nor popularity, and has been questioned in terms of its stereotypical nature in the production of conservative values (Pendergast, 2001). Some home economics teachers have seen hospitality as a safe alternative, providing a solid teaching option for their future career, regardless of their dislike of teaching it. Others have had no choice in the matter. This is an issue that should be addressed by the home economics profession, and is embedded firmly in philosophical questions around the field of study, including its scope, purpose and parameters.

It is important to note that the study has significant limitations in that it includes responses only from hospitality teachers who are registered members of the Home Economics Institute of Australia, and consequently draws only from those who were initially trained as home economics teachers, and who have chosen to join a relevant professional association. The results therefore are not generalisable or representative of all hospitality teachers in Queensland. However, given that most hospitality teachers are home economics trained teachers, the findings assist in painting a picture that can be applied to the vast majority of hospitality educators in schools in Queensland.

The findings of this study confirm that a range of issues of concern regarding teachers of hospitality VET in schools exists. These issues can be summarised under two umbrella themes:

- Dissatisfaction by many home economics specialist teachers who are required to teach hospitality subjects, particularly where this is not their preference (71% of hospitality teachers in this study). This dissatisfaction occurs for a range of reasons, including the loss of the variety and multi-skilled nature of home economics

- Frustration at the assumption that home economics teachers will meet industry requirements for teaching hospitality in their own time and at their own expense.

In terms of sustainability, this study points to some of the issues that validate the concerns raised by Malley et al. (2001) and Polesel et al. (2004) that the maintenance of the supply of vocational teachers for school-based VET is one of the key problems facing the field today. Policy decisions at federal and state/territory level have privileged VET in the schooling sector, yet little has been done to facilitate the sustainability of these reforms by focussing on the unique teacher education and training required to ensure there are teachers available for classes. A number of questions are proposed, which require further investigation beyond this study:

- What measures are being taken to ensure that appropriate teacher pre-service programs are being developed and which do not rely on the assumption that home economics
teachers are best suited to teaching hospitality in schools?

- What is a suitable pre-and inservice teacher preparation program for hospitality teachers?

The need for initiatives in sustaining the supply of suitable teachers for hospitality VET in schools is fundamental to facilitating the implementation of major policy proposals, such as that heralded by the Queensland Government’s Queensland the Smart State: Education and Training Reforms for the Future (Queensland Government, 2002).
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