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Abstract

The travel and tourism sector has become an increasingly important driver of growth and prosperity for many countries, with a reported contribution of around 9% of the World’s GDP and employment in 2013 (Crotti & Misrahi, 2015). In Vietnam this sector accounted for over $US 7 billion, or around 4.6% of 2013 GDP. While this is a significant contribution to the economy, it is markedly less than the contribution of the sector in neighbouring Thailand, with a contribution of $US 35 billion, or 9% of GDP. Given the comparatively low contribution of the tourism sector to the economy, a more in-depth exploration of aspects of the industry are worthy of further consideration. One such aspect is the human resources, the key factor exerting a major impact on the services delivered by the industry. This study focuses on the preparation of such resources through tertiary education.

The aim of the study was to explore factors influencing effective tertiary hospitality higher education (HE) in Vietnam that supports the on-going development of the industry through the availability of quality human resources. In addition, the study assesses the alignment between the knowledge and skills developed in education institutions, and those required by industry professionals.

The study employed a sequential exploratory mixed methods design, involving two phases, with the qualitative phase followed by the quantitative phase. Phase 1 was conducted via 26 in-depth interviews with industry professionals, hospitality academics, and hospitality students, and sought to provide evidence of stakeholders’ perspectives of Vietnamese hospitality tertiary education. Phase 2 involved the administration of an online survey to students enrolled in higher education institutions (HEIs) and VET colleges to explore their perceptions of working in the hospitality industry. In this phase the views of 149 HE students and 104 VET students were explored.
A key focus provided by industry professionals regarding their expectations of HE students related to personal attributes which made them well suited to work in the hospitality industry, including being hard working, obedient and enthusiastic. However, industry professionals criticised HE students for having unrealistic expectations, limited practical experience, and limited preparation. In terms of performance, industry professionals indicated their preferences for VET students as compared to their HE counterparts, as they expressed they were better prepared for the work environment. Hospitality academics expressed the industry professionals’ expectations of HE students were unrealistic, and their preferences for VET students were shaped by the immediate needs of industry, including limited employment opportunities. Many HE students indicated disappointment in the limited choices of hospitality work assigned to them during internships, however key differences in the views of VET and HE students were found, with HE students often expressing negative views of specific aspects of the industry. As a result, HE students expressed a low level of commitment to future hospitality careers.

Three factors were identified to be influencing effective tertiary hospitality education in Vietnam, including (1) the current employment demand in the Vietnamese hospitality industry, (2) the suitability of HE hospitality programs in preparation for hospitality careers, and (3) the reality of Vietnamese hospitality workplaces for tertiary education. This study confirmed the lack of industry-education linkage in the field of hospitality in the Vietnamese context. The industry-education relationship was found to be predominantly economically driven, with the actual operation of the hospitality industry dominated by preferences for vocational education in relation to satisfying immediate needs of the workplaces.

This study provided empirical evidence on the current status of tertiary hospitality education in Vietnam, contributing to scholarship investigating hospitality industry-education
linkages in an Asian context. This study offered evidence-based insights into key factors influencing high quality contributions of HE to an expanding hospitality industry. It also contributes to the knowledge and awareness of issues concerning over-education in developing countries, as it is the first study identified in the literature that has examined hospitality education-occupation matching in the Vietnamese context.

The results of this study have important implications for the three stakeholder groups, and also for policy makers. The current HE hospitality programs are in an early stage of development. Recommendations from this research make a contribution to inform further refinement of these HE programs, with the establishment of formal institution – industry linkages and collaborations leading both to enhanced training of HE graduates, and also greater retention of these graduates in the industry. At the policy level recommendations regarding greater future employment pathways for hospitality graduates have the potential to contribute to an increase in the international competitiveness of its sector – thus having implications for government and policy makers.
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Chapter 1 Introduction

1.1 Introduction

International hospitality and tourism has been widely recognised as a fast-growing, labour-intensive industry (Korpi & Mertens, 2004) that has the potential to make a significant economic contribution (Crotti & Misrahi, 2015; Truong, 2006). The interactions between tourists, and hospitality and tourism industry personnel, are an integral part of the tourist’s total experience, and thus a critical element of success. These interactions typically take place in hotels, resorts, other lodging enterprises, and restaurants, which collectively constitute the hospitality industry. A key factor behind the success of the hospitality industry is the availability of high quality personnel to deliver, operate and manage tourist products.

One key role of hospitality education is to support the profession, requiring a close partnership between the hospitality industry and education providers (Tesone & Ricci, 2005; Zopiatis & Constanti, 2007). Through such a partnership, industry needs can be identified and addressed, via the provision of skilled staff with appropriate educational qualifications (Smith & Cooper, 2000). A competitive education system must response to the needs and expectations of those involved, including industry employers, students, and educational providers (World Tourism Organisation [WTO], 2004).

In Vietnam, given the comparatively low contribution of the hospitality and tourism sector to the economy, namely 4.6% of 2013 GDP (Crotti & Misrahi, 2015), a more in-depth exploration of aspects of the industry are worthwhile to consider. Additionally, the hospitality industry in Vietnam is in an early stage of development, as is the education system that supports it. As the hospitality and tourism industry is by nature labour-intensive, one such aspect, which exerts a major impact on the services delivered by the industry, is human resources. This study focuses on exploring the factors that influence effective tertiary
hospitality education through examining the perceptions of stakeholders involved in this system in Vietnam.

1.2 Statement of problem

Vietnam is now moving toward a strong focus on enhanced economic development. Since the implementation of the *Doi Moi* policy in Vietnam in 1986, there has been a shift from a centrally planned model to a market-oriented model, to guide economic growth (Boothroyd & Pham, 2000). This shift has resulted in increased employment opportunities, and improved incomes and living standards for local residents of Vietnam (Beresford & Tran, 2004; Boothroyd & Pham, 2000; Trinh, 2010). The opening-up of the economy since this time has allowed Vietnam to develop into one of the fastest growing economies in Southeast Asia (King-Kauanui, Su & Ashley-Cotleur, 2006), and promoted the growth of private enterprises as one of the key factors that have shaped national economic development (Bartram, Stanton, & Thomas, 2009). Specifically, Vietnam saw an average annual economic growth rate of approximately 7% over the period 1989 – 2015 (The World Bank, 2016), and the private sector was reported to employ up to 90% of the workforce (Truong, 2006).

The hospitality industry, which is comprised of lodging enterprises and food services, many of which are mainly privately owned, is an important subsidiary of the travel and tourism sector. The travel and tourism sector has become an increasingly important driver of growth and prosperity for many countries, with a reported contribution of around 9.5% of the world’s GDP, and an employment contribution of one in every 11 jobs in 2013 (Crotti & Misrahi, 2015). In Vietnam, this sector accounted for over $7 billion USD, or around 4.6% of the 2013 GDP. While this is a significant contribution to the economy, when comparing Vietnam’s performance against its regional competitors in the Asia-Pacific region, Vietnam ranks relatively poorly. For example, although this sector in Vietnam accounts for 4.6% of
GDP, Vietnam is ranked 75th against 141 countries globally, and ranks 15th against the other 23 Asia-Pacific members. This is well below Vietnam’s close competitor Thailand, which is currently ranked 35th internationally and 10th in Asia Pacific, with a contribution of approximately $35 billion USD, or 9% of GDP (Crotti & Misrahi, 2015). Hence, while Vietnam has worked toward the development of its hospitality and tourism sector, further progress is needed to capture the full economic benefits that this sector could deliver.

In recognition of the importance of the tourism sector, the Vietnamese Government introduced the *Master Plan of Tourism Development* (1995-2010), ratified by the Prime Minister in May, 1995. Since this time, Vietnam hospitality and tourism has experienced considerable development, generating marked economic and social benefits to the country. More recently, the importance of hospitality and tourism development was reinforced in the national policy *Tourism Master Plan to 2020* in which human resources for the industry were identified as a major weakness (Ha, 2012).

In aiming to raise the productivity of Vietnam’s economic sectors, including hospitality and tourism, a critical element is the provision of a high quality training and education system. Thus, the strengthening of human resources is positioned as one of the three breakthrough objectives in Vietnam’s ten-year (2011-2020) socioeconomic development strategy (Bodewig, Badiani-Magnusson, & Macdonald, 2014; Boothroyd & Pham, 2000; Ha, 2012). The rationale for this goal is justified in the Travel and Tourism Competitive Index (Crotti & Misrahi, 2015), which includes Human Resources (HR) as one of the major elements required to facilitate overall competitiveness (refer to Figure 1.1).
Vietnam’s overall performance in the area of Human Resources and Labour Market in the Travel and Tourism Competitive Index is 55th - well below the performance of close competitor Thailand, ranked 29th internationally. Human Resources (HR) are considered to be a key aspect of the Asia-Pacific region’s strategy to develop the travel and tourism sector, which offers possibilities for several countries to improve their position via a high quality education system (Crotti & Misrahi, 2015). This has important implications for Vietnam to improve its position in the overall competitiveness ranking in the area of HR via an improved education system.
1.2.1 Tertiary hospitality education in Vietnam

Recent research indicates that the full benefits from hospitality are not being realised in Vietnam, with concerns expressed regarding the rationale and approach of current higher education (HE) hospitality programs (Nguyen & Chaisawat, 2011; Oliver, 2002). Whilst not limited to the discipline of hospitality, the extent to which HE programs across disciplines meet students’ needs, and the expectations of industry in terms of professional knowledge and skills, is of vital importance (Bodewig et al., 2014; Littlejohn & Watson, 2004; Morgan, 2004). Research suggests the current education system in Vietnam does not effectively prepare graduates with the necessary skills required to successfully engage in the hospitality industry, particularly with respect to the skills needed to engage in enterprises with international connections (Bodewig et al., 2014). In a wider context, not limited to Vietnam, there has been dissatisfaction expressed by various groups within industry regarding preparation of graduates for relevant occupations. For example, within the hospitality industry, there has been debate between hospitality educators, industry professionals, and graduates, regarding the mismatch between the knowledge provided in the education system, and employer requirements (Hearns, Devine, & Baum, 2007; Zopiatis & Constanti, 2007). Industry representatives have expressed concern regarding the limited operational ability of graduates from the education sector (Beddingfield, 2005; Bodewig et al., 2014; Jenkins, 2001; Purcell & Quinn, 1996; Rimmington, 1999), while education providers have criticised industry practitioners in human resources management (HRM) for the lack of effective management practices (Bartram et al., 2009; Purcell & Quinn, 1996). In Vietnam, Bartram et al. (2009) brought industry practitioners’ attention to the major challenges facing HRM, including issues with management structures, formalisation of HRM policies, integration of HRM functions, and human resource planning.
In HE across different disciplines, several constraints have emerged including a mismatch between educational institutions’ training capacity, and the actual needs of industries, and the inappropriateness of program content across different subject areas (Institute of International Education [IIE], 2004; Oliver, 2002) including hospitality (Le, Klieve, & McDonald, 2015; Nguyen & Chaisawat, 2011). Limitations in the HE programs have been argued to result in high unemployment rates of graduates who are under-prepared in terms of professional knowledge and skills (IIE, 2004; Ketels, Nguyen, Nguyen, & Do, 2010; Oliver, 2002). Specifically, the development of work-related skills for students has been virtually ignored in HE programs (Oliver, 2002). Skill delivery and graduate quality are still a concern as a consequence of the limited market-orientation in HE (Bodewig et al., 2014; Tran & Swierczek, 2009). In the field of hospitality, the Vietnam National Administration of Tourism has raised concerns about the educational quality of hospitality education, as standards for hospitality education have not been fully formulated and consistently applied across educational providers (VNAT, 2012). Part of this concern centres on graduate quality.

Attempts to develop and improve the education system are dependent on a collective response from three primary stakeholders, including government agencies, educational institutions, and industry (Jafari, 2002). However, research indicates there is limited collaboration to accommodate the competing interests of these stakeholders in the development of HE programs across disciplines, including hospitality (Jafari, 2002; Tran & Swierczek, 2009). Whereas employers expect a focus on the development of graduate practical skills, the content of current educational programs is heavily skewed towards the development of theoretical knowledge (Stephen, Doughty, Gray, Hopcroft, & Silvera, 2006; Tran, 2012; Tran & Swierczek, 2009), thus employers report that additional training is required to effectively equip new graduates to enter the workforce.
HE programs are expected to provide a balance between the development of theoretical knowledge, and the acquisition of professional skills required by industry to effectively prepare graduates for entering the workplace (Baum, 1990; Christou, 2002; Tran, 2016). In the Vietnamese context, cooperation between educational institutions and industry is limited (Ashwill, 2010; Bilsland & Nagy, 2015; Ketels et al., 2010; The World Bank, 2008; Trinh, 2008). For example, a recent survey by the Vietnam Student Association reported 50% of graduates were unable to find a job in their field of study, and a significant number of these graduates had to be re-trained for jobs in their target field (Ketels et al., 2010). It has been suggested that an education system more oriented towards industry requirements is needed to ensure education plays a central role in boosting economic productivity (Bodewig et al., 2014; Ketels et al., 2010).

1.2.2 Hospitality HE programs in Vietnam

Like many other educational systems in Asia, a national framework for all programs in HE has been developed. In Vietnam, this framework is mandated by the Ministry of Education and Training (MOET). As a resolution for modernisation of the HE system by 2020, the HE reform agenda (HERA) was developed (MOET, 2005). Central to the transformation of the HE system is institutional autonomy, projected for introduction in 2020 (Hayden & Lam, 2007). When institutional autonomy is enacted, HE institutions will be authorised to make decisions regarding their program content. Given that no systematic evaluation of Vietnam’s hospitality HE has been undertaken since the release of the HERA, this study offers a timely opportunity to consider the educational programs that support Vietnam’s developing hospitality and tourism sector.

1.3 Purpose of the study
The purpose of this study is to explore factors influencing effective tertiary hospitality education in Vietnam. In addition, the study assesses the alignment between knowledge and skills developed in education institutions, and those required by industry professionals.
1.4 Research questions

The following research questions were addressed in this study:

1. What are hospitality stakeholders’ (industry professionals, academics, and students) perspectives of Vietnamese tertiary hospitality education?
   a. What are stakeholders’ views of tertiary hospitality education preparation?
   b. What are stakeholders’ views of the suitability for the hospitality industry?

2. What are tertiary education students’ views of Vietnamese hospitality workplaces and professional development in the hospitality industry?
   a. What are higher education students’ perspectives?
   b. What are vocational college students’ perspectives?

3. What factors influence effective tertiary hospitality education in Vietnam?

1.5 Significance

The potential economic contribution of the hospitality and tourism sector in Vietnam is well recognised (Crotti & Misrahi, 2015), with the current human resources preparation identified as a limitation (Ha, 2012). This study sought to explore factors that influence the effective delivery of hospitality HE in Vietnam. An understanding of various stakeholders’ perceptions and expectations of graduate knowledge and skills for hospitality careers will provide empirical evidence that contributes to the understanding of potential limitations in the readiness of students in Vietnam. In order for hospitality program development oriented toward industry requirements to be successfully implemented, insights into stakeholders’ perceptions and expectations to develop agreement on required standards are imperative to improve the sector. More importantly, for this relationship to be effective, standards must align with workplace practices. Findings from this study will contribute towards improving
Vietnam’s hospitality HE through its developmental orientations towards industry requirements.

Central to the transformation proposed by the HERA for 2006-2020 period is the emergence of institutional autonomy, scheduled for introduction in 2020 (Hayden & Lam, 2007). The enactment of institutional autonomy will provide higher education institutions (HEIs) with the ability to make decisions about their own frameworks including program content and structure, thus requiring the development of these programs to be considered with caution and diligence. Therefore, an important contribution of this study is to offer evidence-based insights into the key factors behind an enhanced contribution of HE to an expanding hospitality industry. This study also contributes to scholarship investigating hospitality industry-education linkage in an Asian context.

1.6 Structure of the thesis

This thesis is comprised of seven chapters in which this chapter provides an overview of the research, the background of the research problem, the research questions, and the significance of the research. Chapter 2 (Review of Literature) describes the contextual framework of the study, and critically reviews the literature relating to hospitality industry and education linkage, and related issues in relation to the Vietnamese context. Chapter 3 (Methodology) outlines the methods used in this study, an exploratory sequential mixed methods design, and justifies the suitability of the methods used to examine the research questions. Details of the research design, the sampling, and the procedures of data collection and analysis, and ethical considerations for conducting the study are also discussed. Chapter 4 (Results – Phase 1) presents the analysis of the data from Phase 1 using interviews to address the first research question. Chapter 5 (Results – Phase 2) presents the analysis of the data from Phase 2 using an online survey to address the second research question. Finally,
Chapter 6 (Discussion and Conclusion) presents a discussion of the interview and survey findings, and the identified factors influencing effective hospitality HE in Vietnam, as well as contributions of the study, recommendations and implications for stakeholders involved in hospitality HE emerging from the study, and identifies future research directions.
Chapter 2 Review of Literature

2.1 Introduction

Vietnam has witnessed progress in achieving universal primary education in working towards the goal of reaching *The Millennium Development Goal of Education for All* by 2015 (UNESCO, 2015). In addition to committing to this international goal, preparations for tertiary education reforms including major quality improvements of the national university system, are considered pivotal to the country’s economic growth and regional integration. Current strategies to review and reform tertiary hospitality education are one proactive response to the reform agenda at the institutional level, where the travel and tourism sector (under which hospitality and tourism is a subsidiary) has increasingly been viewed as an important economic indicator. In order to fully understand the development of Vietnam tertiary hospitality education, it is important to contextualise these sectors within the national tertiary education system.

The current study seeks to explore factors that influence effective tertiary hospitality education in Vietnam. In this chapter, literature relevant to the study will be reviewed and discussed in relation to the Vietnamese context. Firstly, the contextual framework of the study is provided to understand the structure that links the hospitality industry including hospitality multinational companies, and hospitality education. The framework is elaborated through documented links to Vietnam’s tertiary education, providing an overview of the current operation of the tertiary hospitality education system. In addition, a review of Vietnam’s hospitality industry, in which hospitality students undertake their work internships, is provided.

The relationship between hospitality education and the hospitality industry is then considered, acknowledging the importance of industry-education collaboration. A specific
focus on the operation of internships that are included in this training is provided, with the broader implications discussed. This includes implications for stakeholders (i.e., industry professionals, hospitality academics and students), and stakeholders’ expectations and perceptions. Finally, the interrelationship between industry and tertiary education is considered. The chapter concludes with a summary of the review, and an overview of the research questions guiding the study.

2.2 Theoretical framework

This study exploring hospitality higher education in Vietnam focuses on how students operate within what could be described as a market environment – between the operation of the higher education system and the diverse hospitality market place where they will ultimately work. In adopting this focus it is important to appreciate that the preparation of hospitality students, and their subsequent career trajectories, is unlikely to be as successful in Vietnam as in developed economies such as Switzerland, United Kingdom, or Australia (Bilsland, Nagy, & Smith, 2014; Busby & Gibson, 2010; Zopiatis & Constanti, 2007). As such, it is important to appreciate the operation of the various players in the market economy. From this perspective, a number of theoretical approaches have been adopted by researchers (Biggart & Beamish, 2003; Bourdieu, 1990, 2002a, 2002b).

One widely used approach is through the sociology of conventions (Biggart & Beamish, 2003; Blau, Ducan, & Tyree, 1967; Fligstein & Dauter, 2007; Granovetter, 1974; Hodson, 1983; White, 1970), where, for example Biggart and Beamish (2003) discuss conventions including habits, customs, practice and order of the market place. From a similar perspective, Bourdieu (1990, 2002a, 2002b) examined the operation of players in the market, with his field theory providing a sociological perspective in which interaction and importance between fields in an educational context might include players including schools, vocational
education and higher education bodies. This sociological perspective on the interactions in the higher education market place, and the links to the fields of hospitality employment are used as a theoretical underpinning to guide decisions in the design and analysis of this study.

2.2.1 Background to the Vietnamese situation

Since the national re-unification in 1975, the Vietnamese Government has initiated continuous reforms at all levels across the educational system, from school education through to tertiary education. The early 1980s’ educational reforms resulted in significant improvements in enrolments at primary, secondary, and tertiary levels. For example, the number of student enrolments in 2010 was 245 students per 10,000 persons in the total population, ten times higher than 1987, although this number remains much lower than neighbouring countries such as Thailand, with enrolments of approximately 400 students per 10,000 persons (Do & Do, 2014).

Preparations for HE reforms, including major quality improvements in the national university system, are seen as central to the country’s economic growth and regional integration. Vietnam has achieved rapid expansion of its tertiary education system aimed at strengthening the knowledge economy to produce graduates who can effectively adapt to technological advances and changing labour markets (Lee & Healy, 2006), with quality improvement prioritised on the national agenda (Harman, Hayden, & Pham, 2010). One of the key outcomes of these improvement efforts was an increased graduate employment rate to more than 70% in technical and professional fields (Sakellariou, 2010). However, the alignment of HE to the needs of labour markets is still a problem that has also been reported in other Southeast Asian countries (Postiglione, 2011).

On the other hand, the Vietnamese hospitality industry is in a relatively early stage of development, compared to that seen in countries such as Switzerland or Australia. However,
as is the case in other countries, this industry involves a range of sectors. To understand the Vietnamese hospitality industry, it is important to both recognise the different elements of the industry, and the interactions between them – levels of interaction that mark the stage of development in the industry.

In the Vietnamese context, the hospitality employer-employee linkage involves hospitality enterprises, hospitality higher education students/graduates, and the higher education institutions where students are undertaking their studies. The network between the industry and the higher education system is complex with existing tensions. The social relationships within this network involve different stakeholders, e.g. industry professionals, hospitality students, and hospitality academics. Tensions exist in the relationships between (i) hospitality enterprises and their existing or potential employees, i.e. student interns; (ii) hospitality enterprises and higher education institutes; and (iii) institutes and their students. Analyses to get insights into the network are needed to understand the Vietnamese social structure that links hospitality enterprises and hospitality higher education students/graduates whose educational qualifications justified by the higher education institutes where they had undertaken their studies.

Given the importance of the relationship between the different players in the hospitality market and the relevance of different levels of development in this market in Vietnam, compared to more developed economies, this perspective has been used to define the theoretical framework guiding this study. Figure 2.1 thus provides a conceptual mapping of the major field’s in this market, thus providing a focus through which this review is undertaken, and also supports the discussion of the research findings presented in this thesis.
As hospitality industry is by nature labour-intensive, it is important to consider the operation of the hospitality industry in relation to tertiary education providers that prepare staff to work within the industry. The key stakeholders noted in Figure 2.1 represent these two areas, tertiary education and hospitality industry, and also the students being trained by tertiary institutions as the future staff for the hospitality businesses, and the sector overall. It
is noted that the multinational hotel companies are specifically identified - while this group play a major part in the hospitality industry, they tend to source their employees for managerial positions externally from their international base (Andriotis, 2002; Dunning, 1988). Finally, this framework recognises that contributions to economic factors driving the success of hospitality enterprises will include impacts from Vietnam’s tertiary institutions, and also from multinational enterprises that form part of the delivery of hospitality operations.

In the Vietnamese HE context, the hospitality industry-education linkage involves hospitality enterprises, hospitality HE students/graduates, and the HEIs where students are undertaking their studies. The network between the industry and the HE system is complex and the relationships within this network involve different stakeholders, e.g., industry professionals, hospitality students, and hospitality academics. Tensions exist in the relationships between (i) hospitality enterprises and their existing or potential employees, i.e., student interns; (ii) hospitality enterprises and education institutes; and (iii) institutes and their students. Considerations of the network will provide insights to aid in understanding the Vietnamese social structure that links hospitality enterprises and tertiary HE students/graduates.

The framework profiles the key groups in the industry-education linkage which are considered to be of vital importance in achieving theory-practice balance in educational programs (Tran, 2016; Zagonari, 2009; Zopiatis & Constanti, 2007). This framework can be used to explore the level of development of HE in Vietnam, and compare this system with systems operating in other countries. The development of the framework was contextualised within two fields, i.e., the tertiary education system and the hospitality industry. The stakeholders involved in hospitality HE are industry professionals representing a diverse
group of hospitality operations, hospitality academics representing HEIs, and students present in both environments, academic and industry. Relationships were formed by the interactions among these stakeholders in relation to potential impacts from the two fields. The following discussion of these groups and their inter-relationships provides an understanding of the existing hospitality labour market, and the interactions between the hospitality industry and the tertiary education system. The detailed discussion of these fields will commence with a consideration of Vietnam’s tertiary education system in which tertiary hospitality education is situated.

2.3 Tertiary education system in Vietnam

2.3.1 Organisation

Vietnam’s tertiary education system includes HE and vocational education and training (VET) providers as illustrated in Figure 2.2. Whilst HE comes under the jurisdiction of the MOET, the focus of vocational training in VET colleges is different, managed through the Ministry of Labour, Invalids and Social Affairs (MOLISA). As shown in Figure 2.2, there are two pathways to obtain vocational education from school education. VET at tertiary level, including HE programs and VET college programs. The latter, the focus of this study, are discussed further in section 2.3.1.2.
The tertiary education system consists of public, non-public/private, and foreign-owned institutions. Only public institutions are partially subsidised and funded by the Vietnamese government in terms of staff salary and investment in facilities. Private institutions operate as for-profit organisations, entirely reliant on tuition revenues in addition to support from the government in terms of tax incentives, and access to land for construction of campuses at lower cost (Tran et al., 2014).
2.3.1.1 Higher education (HE)

HE in Vietnam includes colleges, universities, and research institutes, hereafter referred to as HEIs. Programs of studies provided by HEIs are primarily academically focused, although in some institutions vocational education has a secondary focus.

Students enroll into diploma and bachelor’s degree programs on the basis of results achieved in national university entrance examinations (MOET, 2016). Student candidates must pass the centralised high school (senior secondary) graduation examination to be eligible for university examinations. The university examinations consist of three tests on three subjects selected from Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry, Biology, Literature, English and Arts (e.g., Drawing, Sketching, Music or Drama). The combination of three tests is dependent on the generic blocks of natural sciences, social sciences and arts.

The selection process within universities is dependent upon the discipline area. For a discipline area such as hospitality/tourism, students are selected from those who completed either the natural science or social science block tests. Candidates who meet both the MOET baseline scores, and the minimum scores set by each institution can enrol. The minimum scores, either the same or higher than the baseline scores, vary across disciplines and institutions.

The current Vietnamese HE sector consists of 223 colleges (awarding three-year diplomas), 163 universities (awarding four-year or five-year bachelor’s degrees, and postgraduate degrees), and 76 research institutes (authorised to award doctoral degrees). In addition to a primary focus on academic education, the HEIs administrated by MOET also share vocational education with VET colleges administrated by MOLISA. In terms of vocational education, MOET and MOLISA have overlapping responsibilities with regard to regulated functions, authorities and structural organisation (Tran et al., 2014). Hence, two
vocational curriculum frameworks exist for which institutions chose to deliver depending on their educational focus.

2.3.1.2 Vocational and Education Training (VET) at tertiary level

The current vocational and education training (VET) sector consists of 123 junior colleges, awarding 3-year vocational diplomas. Compared to the theoretical orientation focus in programs of HE colleges, these vocational tertiary institutions provide practice-based education and training programs. All programs of study in vocational colleges have been developed in accordance with the vocational curriculum framework mandated by MOLISA, which will be discussed in section 2.3.2. As mentioned earlier, there is an overlap between the HE sector and the VET sector in terms of vocational education which is also provided by many HEIs including 30 universities and 118 colleges. Figure 2.3 summarises by institution type, the number of tertiary education institutions, and the number of tertiary institutions providing vocational education.

*Figure 2.3. Numbers of tertiary education institutions and institutions with vocational focus*
As shown in Figure 2.3, compared to an absolute vocational orientation in all VET colleges, there are vocation-oriented programs in all HEIs with a lesser vocational focus in universities, with their level of focus highly dependent on the discipline focus of the university. For example, a discipline such as hospitality would include vocation-based components, whereas a discipline such as science would not necessarily include vocation-based components.

2.3.2 Leadership of the Higher Education Reform Agenda (HERA)

The HERA, approved by the Cabinet in November 2005, was developed by the MOET as a resolution for the modernisation of the HE system by 2020 (Resolution 14/2005/NQ-CP, 2005). A HE system by 2020 envisaged by the HERA will be “more flexible in providing opportunities for course transfer […], more attuned to international benchmarks of quality and more open to international engagement” (Hayden & Lam, 2007, p. 78). Among the specific objectives proposed in the agenda is an increase in the enrolment quota for the non-public HE sector to 40%, compared to current figures of 19.5% (Do & Do, 2014), as the current HE system is dominated by public institutions. In general terms, a significant transformation is expected to occur in Vietnam’s HE system by 2020. Central to such transformation is the emergence of institutional autonomy.

Institutional autonomy is described by Berdahl (1990) as “the power of the university or college in its corporate form to determine its own goals and programs” (p. 172). The construct of institutional autonomy implies certain freedoms, for which educational institutions can enjoy the autonomy of deciding their own curriculum content and standards (Ashby, 1966; Tight, 1992). Currently, common curriculum structure and frameworks for all programs of study across the HE sector are mandated by MOET, with those across the VET sector mandated by MOLISA. The frameworks on which discipline-based programs are
developed prescribe the objectives, the types of knowledge (general and discipline-specific), and time allocations to theoretical and practical components. Apart from deciding the curriculum frameworks, MOET and MOLISA allocate enrolment quotas for all HE and VET institutions, deciding the total number of students to be enrolled in an institution and that within individual programs in the institution.

2.3.3 Tertiary hospitality education

Hospitality education was first introduced by three universities during the 1980s, offering limited majors primarily focused on food and beverages (VNAT, 2006). Educational institutions that offer hospitality programs at tertiary level continue to grow in number, with 38 institutions identified in 2004 (VNAT, 2004), 114 in 2007, and 125 in 2010 (Nguyen & Chaisawat, 2011). Despite three decades of operation, Vietnam’s tertiary hospitality programs, particularly those at HEIs, have not experienced major improvements in updating program content in terms of work-related skills development. A focus on preparing human resources for the hospitality industry in terms of quantity, rather than addressing industry demand for high quality human resources, is an ongoing concern (Nguyen & Chaisawat, 2011). Educational quality is a major issue as standards for hospitality HE have not been fully formulated and consistently applied across educational providers (VNAT, 2012).

2.3.3.1 VET colleges and HE colleges/universities (HEIs)

In addition to a primary academic focus, several HEIs also provide vocational education. The vocational orientation in these HEIs is discipline-dependent in which hospitality is one of the typical disciplines that require a vocational focus. However, the vocational foci are different between programs provided by HEIs and VET colleges. For example, occupation-specific skills required in a hotel, e.g., Front Office, Food and Beverage Department, and Housekeeping, are embedded in the first year of a VET college program.
These skills are formulated into practice-based courses, whereas they have a reduced focus, and are often not officially included in several HE programs. Despite having different vocational foci in terms of occupation-specific skills preparation, both VET college and HE students are required by their institutions to undertake similar internships in the hospitality industry, preferably in 4-star and 5-star hotel companies. Table 2.1 provides a summary of characteristics of VET colleges and HEIs, with regard to vocational programs, highlighting the different content focus of the VET and HEI options and also the different skills targeted.

Table 2.1
Summary of differences between HEIs and VET colleges with regard to vocational programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>HE institutions (HEIs)</th>
<th>VET colleges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admission</td>
<td>Limited to the baseline scores in the university entrance exams</td>
<td>Limited to the scores in the centralised high school exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education sector</td>
<td>Higher education (HE)</td>
<td>Vocational Education and Training (VET)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory authority</td>
<td>Ministry of Education and Training (MOET)</td>
<td>Ministry of Labour, Invalids and Social Affairs (MOLISA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awarded degree</td>
<td>Diploma/Bachelor</td>
<td>Diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model of training</td>
<td>Lecture-based</td>
<td>Mixed mode (Lecture-based &amp; On-the-job training)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program length</td>
<td>3/4 years full-time</td>
<td>3 years full-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program content focus</td>
<td>Academic/Theoretical</td>
<td>Vocational/Practical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career preparation</td>
<td>Administrative/Managerial skills</td>
<td>Occupation-specific skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.3.2 Vocational specificities in MOET and MOLISA frameworks

Since HEIs and VET colleges are under the separate management of MOET and MOLISA, two different frameworks exist that specify vocational training programs in these educational institutions. Table 2.2 summarises the differences between the two frameworks for vocational education programs.
Table 2.2
Comparison between MOET and MOLISA frameworks for vocational education programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects</th>
<th>MOET framework</th>
<th>MOLISA framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutions under supervision</td>
<td>HE colleges</td>
<td>VET colleges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrance requirements</td>
<td>High school graduate</td>
<td>High school graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total time (in 45-min periods)</td>
<td>2110</td>
<td>3750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time allocations for general education</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time allocations for vocational training</td>
<td>1305</td>
<td>3300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MOET and MOLISA prescribe the objectives, the types of knowledge (general and discipline-specific), and time allocations to theoretical and practical components in all programs across disciplines. Whilst VET colleges are required to develop vocational training programs based on MOLISA framework, HEIs develop their programs in accordance to MOET framework. As shown in Table 2.2, whilst the allocated time to vocational training is double in VET college programs, the allocated time to general education is almost double in HE programs. This suggests VET college students have significantly more time to develop and apply their occupation-specific knowledge and skills than their counterparts in HEIs who have been provided with theoretical knowledge, whereas HE students spend more time on independent study to complete academic assessments. Examples of discipline-specific content in the vocational programs in hospitality are discussed in the following section.

### 2.3.3.3 Hospitality in VET colleges’ and HEIs’ programs

The vocational focus also differs between programs provided by VET colleges and HEIs. Table 2.3 shows sample vocational courses in hospitality developed under MOET and MOLISA frameworks.
Table 2.3

Sample courses in the vocational hospitality programs in HE colleges and VET colleges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>HE colleges</th>
<th>VET colleges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge-based</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to tourism and hospitality</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics for tourism and hospitality</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and Culture</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist psychology and intercultural communication skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food production</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and Beverage Service Operation</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menu knowledge</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing principles in hospitality and tourism</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting and Finance for hospitality</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resource management in hospitality</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism political system and legal documents</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer service in a global environment</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills-based</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar and Beverage Services</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory skills in hospitality</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service skills at bar – Basic</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills of food preparation – Basic</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills of food preparation – Basic</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service skills in restaurant – Advanced</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment operations skills</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service skills at bar – Advanced</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills of food preparation – Advanced</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer care and customer relation</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Occupation-specific skills are taught in the first year of a VET college program. These skills are formulated into practice-based courses, simulating scenarios in various areas of hospitality enterprises, including front office, food and beverages, as well as kitchen/cooking. These skills have a narrow focus and are often not officially included in several HE programs. In other words, a VET college program is skill-oriented compared to the more theoretical orientation of the HE program (Tran, 2012; Tran & Swierczek, 2009). For instance, with regard to the vocational foci in hospitality programs, the VET colleges provide skill-based training courses such as ‘service skills at the bar/reception’, whereas the HE colleges aim at more operational knowledge course such as ‘food and beverage service operation’ preparing students for both a practical but also future managerial level role.

The current status of tertiary HE continues to reflect the centralised control by government departments (MOET and MOLISA). An official commitment to privatising more
educational institutions and granting autonomy to institutions expressed in the recent HERA (Hayden & Lam, 2007) is a significant issue with important implications for tertiary education in general.

### 2.3.3.4 Implications of HERA for tertiary hospitality education

The increased enrolment quota for the private sector proposed by HERA has important implications for tertiary HE, as hospitality-related majors are often offered at private tertiary institutions in Vietnam (Nguyen & Chaisawat, 2011). A rise in the enrolment quota requires private institutions to be prepared in terms of both quantity and quality of several aspects of development including size of the system, facilities, teaching academics, and institutional governance (Pham & Fry, 2002, 2004). As HERA comes into effect in 2020, HEIs will experience increased choice in determining their own frameworks including objectives, program structure, and program content. This will also result in increased competition between institutions to demonstrate the effectiveness of their programs, and ultimately attract students. This has important implications for institutions with regard to their alignment with current requirements within the education system, as well as with industry through their program design and implementation.

The above discussion has provided an overview of the tertiary education system, including tertiary hospitality education in Vietnam. The system, operating as one of the major sources of labour force suppliers, is currently providing the hospitality labour market with graduates at two distinct skill levels, i.e., graduates at operational skill level from VET and those at more strategic skill level from HEIs.

### 2.4 Hospitality industry in Vietnam

To explore the industry-education linkage, it is important to develop an understanding of the nature and operation of the hospitality industry. A brief overview of the hospitality
industry in Vietnam, including a consideration of multinational hotel enterprises, is provided in the following sub-sections.

2.4.1 Overview

The tourism sector, in which the hospitality industry is a subsidiary component, plays a critical role in the world’s economy, accounting for a significant share of global domestic product and employment, and providing enormous potential for economic growth and international development (Blanke & Chiesa, 2009). The Asia Pacific is the world’s second largest tourist destination and is forecast to maintain this position with estimated international arrivals of 397 million by 2020 (WTO, 2001).

Located on the Indochina Peninsula in Southeast Asia, Vietnam has significant potential for developing its tourism industry, with around 2,000 national historic sites and 125 beaches and park reserves (Do & Kumar, 2005). Despite its competitive advantages, Vietnam’s tourism industry was not considered as an economic generating activity until 1986 with the release of economic policy ‘Doi Moi’, which has transformed Vietnam into a market-oriented economy. Since that time, the Vietnam tourism industry has experienced a dramatic increase in the number of tourist arrivals, offering many opportunities to the hospitality industry. For example, according to national tourism statistics, the total international visitor arrivals in Vietnam in the first nine months of 2016 have increased 25.7% over the same period in 2015 (VNAT, 2016).

To meet the growing number of visitors, various tourist accommodation establishments, including hotels and resorts, were built with an accommodation growth rate of 20 to 34% between 2001 and 2007. This growth rate slowed in later years to approximately 8 to 14% between 2008 and 2012 (VNAT, 2016). In looking at the change in high end accommodation between 2013 and 2015, the number of 5-star establishments
increased from 64 to 91 while the number of 4-star establishments increased from 159 to 215, both marked increases or around 40%. Though the percentages of state- and foreign-owned establishments have not been reported, the majority of 4-star and 5-star hospitality enterprises are owned by multinational companies. The operation of these multinational hotel enterprises are discussed below to provide an understanding of how their recruitment policy has regulated the labour market in the hospitality industry.

2.4.2 Multinational hotel enterprises

Multinational hotel companies, a generic term used to include all types of multinational-associated accommodation establishments, play a major role in the development and progression of the international tourism industry in developing counties (Kusluvan & Karamustafa, 2001). Multinational accommodation establishments include 4- and 5-star hotels, serviced apartments, and beach resorts.

In Vietnam, and worldwide, there exist market tensions between the different groups in hospitality industry. Podolny (1993) discussed status hierarchy between different market players suggesting multinational hotel enterprises in developing countries such as Vietnam are positioned at the highest end of the scale in terms of size and prestige. Fligstein (1996) introduced the concept of an incumbent-challenger structure in which the incumbent, for example, multinational companies, officially holds the senior position in the labour market. These incumbents use their market power to sustain advantage over national and private enterprises in the hospitality market over time in these countries. Clearly the relationship between the different markets sectors differs with the level of development of the hospitality industries.

There are both costs and benefits from the involvement of multinational hotel companies in developing countries (Kusluvan & Karamustafa, 2001). Of all contributions, the
so-called ‘soft technology’ (i.e., human factors) transfer in the area of human resources training is considered to be the most important benefit from multinational hotel companies to host developing countries (UNCTAD, 2007; UNCTC, 1989). However, there is little empirical evidence of the diffusion of knowledge and skills at the managerial level in multinational hotel enterprises in developing countries (Fortanier & Van Wijik, 2010; Kusluvan & Karamustafa, 2001). In reality, key management positions are generally held by expatriates to maintain firm specific advantages (Andriotis, 2002; Dunning, 1988), and only lower level skill personnel are trained to assure service quality and performance (Ascher, 1985; Dunning, 1988; Kusluvan & Karamustafa, 2001), thus limiting the level of skills training delivered. The firm-specific, also known as competitive advantages, are related to both tangible (e.g., concrete properties) and intangible (e.g., trade mark or patents) assets. The cost of foreign dominance in terms of expatriate employment can also jeopardise the employment opportunities for indigenous skilled labour. Large scale enterprises tend to import managerial labour and offer less opportunity for profit and control to local staff (Andriotis, 2002; Rodenburg, 1980). As noted by Brohman (1996), the loss of control over local resources, i.e., the indigenous workforce, “may adversely affect the social, economic and ecological well-being of the host communities’ (p. 55).

The recruitment policy of multinational hotel companies is a component of strategic international human resource management (HRM), an approach used to achieve the strategic needs of the business (Schuler, 1992; Wright & McMahan, 1992). This recruitment policy responds to both strategic international HRM and the strategic needs of the business. Strategic international HRM is defined by Schuler, Dowling and De Cieri (1993) as “human resource management issues, functions, and policies and practices that result from the strategic activities of multinational enterprises and that impact on the international concerns and goals of those enterprises” (p. 422). This reflects the increased complexity of
international HRM applied by multinational companies and the associated challenges faced by multinational companies managing to co-ordinate their globally dispersed units.

The increasing need to demonstrate corporate social responsibility in the globalised economy has challenged multinational enterprises with a paradox of thinking globally and acting locally (Harzing & Noorderhaven, 2009; Rowley & Benson, 2002; Smale, 2008). Multinational organisations are under pressure to maximise the benefits of global cooperation while maintaining responsiveness to local, national, and regional concerns. However, multinational hotel companies in developing countries appear to remain at the early stage of internationalisation thus targeting economic benefits at the expense of corporate responsibility. This is conceptualised by Perlmutter (1969) as an ethnocentric approach (i.e., home-country oriented), or maintain home region stance (Rugman & Braine, 2003; Rugman & Verbeke, 2004). This approach is characterised as a centralised recruitment system for which highest level of authority is centred at headquarters in the parent countries. With regard to HRM, this approach involves appointing all entire high level management positions in the subsidiaries to employees recruited from the home country of the parent company - reported to be the situation on which the recruitment policy of multinational hotel companies is grounded (Ascher, 1985; Dunning, 1988; Kusluvan & Karamustafa, 2001; Fortanier & Van Wijik, 2010; Mowforth & Munt, 2003).

With this recruitment practice existing in multinational hotel companies in developing countries, opportunities for promotion to higher managerial positions are likely to be unavailable to local hospitality employees, thus providing a very limited career path for those studying hospitality management. This is particularly relevant in the Vietnamese industry where the current market shares of 4-star and 5-star accommodation establishments, mostly owned by multinationals, represents almost 63% of available beds (VNAT, 2016).
The above discussion with regard to Vietnam’s hospitality industry and the dominance of multinational hotel companies in the country provides background information on the operation and interaction between these economic agents in the hospitality market. Thus, it is important to understand the mechanism through which the tertiary education system and hospitality industry operate. The following section will critically discuss this relationship.

2.5 Hospitality industry-education relationship

As a key role of hospitality education is to support a profession facilitating a stronger skills base in the development of the hospitality industry, the relationship between the hospitality industry and educational providers is critical (Tesone & Ricci, 2005). Hospitality education was originally developed from on-the-job training in hotels, and had a vocational focus that:

emphasised the important links between an educated workforce and a strong economy…the basis of knowledge about hospitality originally drew strongly from studies generated directly from the industry and the world of work rather than from the many disciplines or other fields of enquiry which help explain hospitality (Airey & Tribe, 2000, p. 277).

A large body of research lends support to the significance of hospitality industry-education collaboration (e.g., Barrows & Walsh, 2002; Goodman Jr. & Sprague, 1991; Jayawardena, 2001; Littlejohn & Watson, 2004; McHardy & Allan, 2000; Zopiatis, 2007). Although HEIs have maintained their agreement, in principle, with industry regarding the inclusion of internship components in hospitality education programs, questions have been raised regarding the quality of the industry-education relationship (Zopiatis & Constanti, 2007). Few studies have addressed the quality of this relationship and the degree to which
hospitality programs meet the requirements of industry (Lam & Xiao, 2000; Zopiatis & Constanti, 2007).

Research investigating the hospitality industry-education relationship in Cyprus (Zopiatis & Constanti, 2007) led to the development of a five-GAP model that revealed issues in the relationships between hospitality educators, students and industry. These gaps include the mismatch between students’ expectations whilst enrolled at educational institutions, and their learning experience in terms of academic delivery (Gap 1), between students’ expectations and their actual industry experience (Gap 2), between students’ expectations of workplaces and the actual operation of hospitality enterprises (Gap 3), between industry requirements and the delivery of educational providers (Gap 4) and between the institution’s planned experience and students’ actual industry experience (Gap 5). The researchers recommended these five gaps must be examined from the perspectives of all involved, i.e., hospitality industry, students and educators, to fully understand the nature of the relationships. They also noted that any discrepancies within these relationships would either directly or indirectly affect students’ professional development, since they are the only stakeholders present in both academic and industry environments.

As a pioneer in the European hospitality industry, Switzerland has successfully explored the industry-education relationship via the systematic integration of theoretical components and industry internships (Zopiatis & Constanti, 2007). Since the early 1920s, the development of educational programs in hospitality that were oriented towards industry expectations has been extensively adopted in the hospitality industry worldwide, and this orientation has been recently introduced in Asia (Sheriff, 2013). In the early 1980s, hospitality educators and industry practitioners agreed that internships should be an essential
component of hospitality education programs to effectively prepare students for being future industry professionals (Morrison & O’Mahony, 2003).

2.5.1 Internships and implications for stakeholders

Despite subtle differences in meaning, the term ‘internship’ (Crebert, Bates, Bell, Patrick, & Cragnolini, 2004; Singh & Dutta, 2010; McMahon & Quinn, 1995), also referred to as experiential learning (Dickerson, 2009; Kiser & Parlow, 1999; Lee, 2008), cooperative education (Garavan & Murphy, 2001; Leslie & Richardson, 2000), work-integrated learning (Spowart, 2006), or practicum (Lin, 2006) refers to “structured and career relevant work experiences obtained by students prior to graduation from an academic program” (Taylor, 1988, p. 393). Internships aim to enhance student learning by complementing classroom learning with practical experience (Evans, 1993; Jiang & Tribe, 2009), for students to develop a realistic view of their future career in their field of their study (Si, Cheung & Law, 2012), and develop understanding of work-related issues prior to graduation (Aggett & Busby, 2011). Thus, internships have become a compulsory component in many undergraduate academic programs, and recently have been included in postgraduate coursework in many institutions in Great Britain to demonstrate the theory-practice balance in these programs (Fidgeon, 2010).

Research suggests that internships can realise many benefits for all stakeholders, in a field where occupation-specific skills are critical. For employers, internships provide access to a pool of workers who are academically-trained at a low cost (Beggs, Ross, & Goodwin, 2008), typically enthusiastic and dedicated to the industry, and who bring fresh ideas to the workplace (Walo, 2001), thus helping to avoid the ‘turnover’ problem (Fell & Kuit, 2003). Internships also provide employers with opportunities to screen potential employees prior to making long-term commitments, and to have direct involvement in training future managers.
Employers’ recruitment processes are therefore facilitated through internships by providing a more in-depth assessment of potential employees working as interns than through one-off job interviews (Yiu & Law, 2012). Research indicates that interns who were recruited later by the organisations where they completed their internship exhibit greater job satisfaction and more realistic expectations grounded in their experience (Hiltebeitel, Leauby, Larkin, & Morris, 2000).

For education providers, internships can strengthen links with industry. This can enhance collaborative research opportunities, raise an institution’s profile, and establish long term working relationships between industry and institutions to optimise future graduate employment opportunities (Bell & Schmidt, 1996; Walo, 1999). The enhanced link between industry and institutions can lead to improved curriculum provision (Leslie & Richardson, 2000), and credibility of an institution may then be acknowledged by industry from enhanced student performance (Cook, Parker, & Pettijohn, 2004). In terms of student recruitment, the inclusion of an internship component provides the institution with a competitive advantage as research indicates that parents believe job search upon graduation can be facilitated via previous internship experience (Yiu & Law, 2012).

For students, internships provide opportunities to put into practice learnings acquired in their programs, gain a greater understanding of industry requirements, explore career choices, and develop important hands-on, work-related skills (Barron, 1999; Barron & Maxwell, 1993; Casado, 1991, 1992; Emenheiser, Clayton, & Tas, 1997; Petrillose & Montgomery, 1998; Velde & Cooper, 2000). The advantages of internships that benefit students include broadening knowledge, creating awareness, and influencing career choice (Busby, Brunt, & Baber, 1997). Research on hospitality work internships has focused on skill
development in internships (Busby et al., 1997; Callan, 1997; Leslie, 1991; Maher, 2005), with findings indicating that participation in internships contributes towards developing students’ managerial skills (Knight, 1984; LeBruto & Murray, 1994; Mariampolski, Spears, & Vaden, 1980; Tas, 1988; Walo, 2001), including leadership, human resources, oral and written communication, interpersonal communication, problem solving, teamwork, planning and decision-making (Bell & Schmidt, 1996; LeBruto & Murray, 1994; McMullin, 1998; Tas, 1988).

Since the 1980s, an increased emphasis on internship components has been included in hospitality HE programs in an attempt to balance the theory-practice nexus, and develop the link between the industry and education providers (Zopiatis & Constanti, 2007). Nevertheless, differences in the quality of internships across institutions are evident in terms of the content, structure, and approach to professional experience (Downey & De Veau, 1987, 1988). After more than three decades of widespread implementation, there remains no consensus on an appropriate model of hospitality internship that takes into account the unique characteristics of individual institutions’ hospitality programs, in terms of program design, resources, overall mission, and balance between theory and practice. The content of hospitality programs has become a concern in terms of both standardisation and diversification, in which one program can cover a very broad range of knowledge and skills in a single course, whilst other programs cover these knowledge and skill areas across several courses (Wang, Huyton, Gao, & Ayres, 2010). This has implications for essential knowledge and skills in hospitality to be identified and consistently applied in HE programs.

2.5.2 Industry expectations of work-related skills

Research has documented several attempts to identify work-related or professional knowledge and skills in hospitality in seeking industry perspectives (Bach & Milman, 1996;
Connolly & McGing, 2006; Nolan, Conway, Farrell, & Monks, 2010; Raybould & Wilkins, 2006; Tesone, 1995; Umbreit, 1993). So (2006) characterised the process of analysing knowledge and skills as an attempt by society to define its human resource needs. A model outlining knowledge, skills and personal attributes has been applied in several settings as a tool for managerial assessment, training, and recruitment (Foxon, Richey, Roberts, & Spannaus, 2003; Rifkin, Fineman & Ruhnke, 1999). This suggests the importance of human resource needs to be identified through an understanding of industry expectations of work-related skills.

In relation to desired management knowledge and skill sets for hospitality managers and graduates, extensive research has been conducted (e.g., Baum, 1991; Boam & Sparrow, 1992; Chung-Herrera, Enz, & Lankau, 2003; Geissler & Martin, 1998; Hefferman & Flood, 2000; Kay & Russette, 2000; Sneed & Heiman, 1995; Tas, 1988; Thorpe, 1990; Umbreit, 1992, 1993; Walo, 2001; Yukl, Wall, & Lepsinger, 1990). Findings from these studies lend support for the need to develop these knowledge and skills for both hospitality managers, and graduates. Management knowledge and skills are believed to be more important in academic hospitality management programs, than technical or occupation-specific skills (Baum, 1990; Okeyyi, Finley, & Postel, 1994; Tas, 1988; Umbreit, 1993). Research conducted on industry expectations, found that the skills considered to be of prime importance for successful hospitality jobs include human resources skills (Chung-Herrera et al., 2003; Kay & Moncarz, 2004; Knutson & Patton, 1992; Raybould & Wilkins, 2006; Tas, LaBrecque, & Clayton, 1996), interpersonal skills (Annaraud, 2006; Nelson & Dopson, 2001; O’Halloran, 1992; Raybould & Wilkins, 2006; Suh, West, & Shin, 2012; Tas et al., 1996), problem solving skills (Knutson & Patton, 1992; Okeiyi et al., 1994; Suh et al., 2012), and guest liaison skills (Knutson & Patton, 1992; Okeiyi et al., 1994).
For example, Raybould and Wilkins (2005) adopted the generic skills framework to identify graduate skills as expected by hospitality industry employers and perceived by graduates. Interpersonal skills, problem solving and self-management were identified by employers to be among the ten most important skills. These skills were also rated highly by the graduate participants in the study. Based on previous research on hospitality management skills, Suh et al. (2012) developed a questionnaire of 44 statements to measure hospitality managers’ and students’ perceived importance of these knowledge and skill sets. The results of this study again confirm the previous research findings on the key importance of interpersonal skills for hospitality jobs.

The hospitality industry has recently been subject to an increasing level of competition and complexity (Kandampully & Suhartanto, 2000). Thus, it is important for the knowledge and skills required by managers and graduates in this industry to reflect these changes (Chung, 2000). Previously proposed changes were driven by the increased need for management leadership, rather than traditional management practices characterised by high levels of supervision and control (Umbreit, 1993). Later changes were characterised by an increased focus on the development of strategic skills (Gilbert & Guerrier, 1997), and a decreased focus on the development of technical and operational skills (Tas et al., 1996).

From an educational perspective, Valesey (2006) proposed the development of a profile of knowledge and skills for quality graduates, to initiate the transformation of culture, content, and learning of hospitality management programs. Providing a profile of desired attributes can assist in engaging hospitality and tourism educators in planning and implementing teaching, learning and assessment. In addition, the objectives of hospitality and tourism programs can then be articulated and communicated to other stakeholders, i.e., hospitality and tourism industry professionals, and future hospitality students.
2.5.3 Students’ perceptions of hospitality workplaces

As previously discussed, the benefits of internships support the wider incorporation of these components into hospitality programs (Yiu & Law, 2012). Student motivation and commitment to a hospitality career varies, and is highly dependent on their experiences during their industry internships (Aksu & Koksul, 2005; Bednarska & Olszewski, 2013; Jiang & Tribe, 2009; Kusluvan & Kusluvan, 2000; Richardson, 2010a; Richardson, 2010b; Wang & Huang, 2014). In other words, student attitudes towards working in the hospitality industry are likely to be influenced by their internship experiences.

Early research on students’ perceptions of working in the hospitality industry was predominantly conducted with secondary or high school students in developed nations (Airey & Frontistis, 1997; Getz, 1994; Ross, 1992, 1994, 1997). For example, in a study carried out with Australian high school students, Ross (1994) found that these students had a high level of interest in working in the hospitality industry. In a comparative study with secondary school students, Airey and Frontistis (1997) revealed that UK students, despite a strong career support system, had less favourable attitudes towards a career in hospitality than their Greek counterparts. In Scotland, through a longitudinal case study, Getz (1994) reported the attitudes of the surveyed high school students towards working in the hospitality industry had deteriorated as they progressed through their programs.

More recent studies have been carried out with HE students, a group who are considered an important part of the workforce as they are trained to form management teams of the industry (Tribe, 2002). Cook, Parker, and Pettijohn (2004) examined HE students’ attitudes towards specific elements of an ongoing internship program from 12 colleges and universities in the United States. After the internship, students reported appreciation of their experiences, and stated they had developed enhanced confidence and an improved ability to
work with others (Cook, Parker, & Pettijohn, 2004). In other research, other benefits students perceived from their internship experiences included a better understanding of an organisation’s structure and functions, the ability to form realistic career expectations, a wider professional network, an increased ability to adapt to change, and improved leadership skills (Lee, 2008). However, research indicates a difference between students’ expectations (before internships) and perceptions (after internships), which results in a low level of satisfaction towards internships (Lam & Ching, 2007; Singh & Dutta, 2010).

Several studies have reported a substantial number of hospitality graduates leave the industry due to low levels of job satisfaction, lack of motivation, and poor working conditions (Kusluvan, Kusluvan, & Eren, 2003; Pavesic & Brymer, 1990; Shin & Lee, 2011; Zacerelli, 1985), accounting for increased staff turnover and attrition of trained personnel in the industry. One study by Barron and Maxwell (1993) conducted with undergraduate students compared pre- and post- internship perceptions. Results indicated that direct industry experience resulted in the development of negative perceptions towards hospitality jobs. Kusluvan and Kusluvan (2000) developed a multi-dimensional attitude scale to investigate students’ career perceptions of hospitality, and had their instrument tested and validated with fourth-year tourism and hotel management students in Turkey. In their study they reported students’ negative perceptions towards almost all dimensions of working in hospitality. Later, Richardson (2010a) applied their attitudinal scale in an Australian context, and found that more than 50% of the surveyed students were contemplating careers outside the industry, with 91.7% of these participants citing that such a decision primarily resulted from negative working experiences in the industry. When comparing hospitality students’ views at two universities in the United Kingdom and the Netherlands, Jenkins (2001) found that students tended to develop unfavourable attitudes towards the industry as they progressed through their studies. One exception was a study examining the perceptions of undergraduate gaming
management students in Macau (King & Hang, 2011), with results indicating that students showed high career intentions in the industry despite their neutral attitude towards the industry, and its career prospects. In an Asian context, Jiang and Tribe (2009) investigated Chinese students’ attitudes towards working in the hospitality industry and found that these students perceived hospitality professions ‘short-lived’. The factors impacting on their attitudes were related to individual characteristics, the nature of hospitality jobs, interactions with tourists, pre-internship practical training, and management practices at the hospitality organisations. These concerns about long-term hospitality careers have implications for different stakeholders with regard to the HE sector and hospitality industry in China.

In summary, research in a variety of contexts indicates that industry internships or work experience tends to affect students’ career perceptions in a negative manner. Maintaining students’ satisfaction with their internship experience has been argued to be of crucial importance (Chen, Ku, Shyr, Chen, & Chou, 2009; Fong, Luk, & Law, 2014; Lam & Ching, 2007; Sigh & Dutta, 2010). Therefore, on-going investigation and monitoring of students’ views of working in the industry are needed to update and improve educational programs to realise the benefits of internship for students.

Research shows that well-structured internship preparation courses and industry internships are needed to provide graduates with more realistic expectations of their career paths, and shorter on-the-job training periods (Harper, Brown, & Irvine, 2005; Scholarios, Lockyer, & Johnson, 2003; Whitelaw, 2003). The internship experience can enact a positive effect on both students and industry employers because they “can provide the ‘bridge’ necessary for new graduates even before they have completed their degree course whilst at the same time making a significant contribution to the employment organisation” (Heaton, McCracken, & Harrison, 2008, p. 278). When industry needs and requirements are
successfully identified, sector-specific education disciplines can be developed, training skill standards established, and industry involvement in educational program design enhanced (Smith & Cooper, 2000). A competitive education system needs to identify and respond to the needs and expectations of those involved, i.e., industry employers, students, and educational providers (WTO, 2004). Specifically, “tourism [hospitality] education and training should offer (i) quality, responding to the needs of the tourism industry, and (ii) efficiency, studying and evaluating the costs and benefits of the wide range of education process and methods available” (WTO, 2004, p. 5). Ultimately, structured internships and employer involvement in educational program design and delivery have positive effects on graduate abilities of securing employment at high-skilled professional levels (Mason, Williams, & Cranmer, 2009).

2.6 Interrelationship between industry and tertiary education

The above review has highlighted the importance of hospitality industry-education relationships. The quality of industry personnel is highly dependent on the quality of graduates. This interrelationship between industry and tertiary education can be seen in the process of graduates entering the labour market - discussed in the sections below.

2.6.1 Tertiary education and labour market entry

Labour market entry and the successful transition from tertiary education to industry work are of crucial importance for subsequent career opportunities. Research indicates there are marked differences between developed countries in terms of patterns of labour market entry and job quality (Ryan, 2001; Muller & Gangl, 2003; Wolbers, 2007). The variation across countries is underpinned by several structural factors including the overall state of the country’s economy (OECD, 2000), the youth cohort sizes, the educational level of the labour force, and the occupational structure of the labour market (Gangl, 2002). In addition to these
structural factors are institutional arrangements described by Kerckhoff (1995) to be the national institutional setting with regard to the education/training system and the employment system, which shape the structure of opportunities for labour market entry.

Research indicates that employment protection legislation and the vocational specificity of the education system have widened the differences amongst countries with regard to patterns of labour market entry (Breen, 2005; van der Velden & Wolbers, 2003). Factors linked to the employment opportunities of labour market entrants are the degree of labour market regulation, and occupation-specific skills focus of the education system made known to employers. To capture the dynamics of the actual labour market entry process, several studies using longitudinal data have been conducted (Bernardi, Gangl, & van de Werfhorst, 2004; Korpi, de Graaf, Hendrickx, & Layte, 2003; Scherer, 2004; Wolbers, 2007). These studies examined European cross-national patterns of labour market entry and their consequences for occupational status attainment.

2.6.1.1 Labour market entry

Wolbers (2007) investigated patterns among school-leavers in 11 European countries entering into their first significant job which is defined by Albert, Davia, and Toharia (2003) as a job starting after an interruption from continuous education. He found that school-leavers in countries with highly legislated employment protection experienced a delayed entry into their first significant job, however attained better occupational status. In contrast, the occupational status attained by school-leavers in countries having an educational system with a stronger vocational orientation was lower than those predominantly offering academic-oriented education. The strongest negative effect of the vocational specificity on occupational status of the first significant job was found for tertiary education graduates. To secure employment, many graduates needed, initially, to be highly flexible, for example accepting
‘unchallenging’ jobs such as under-qualified positions. Whilst this type of flexible work arrangement (Scherer, 2004) of labour market entry to avoid unemployment was argued to have potentially positive effects by several researchers (Korpi & Levin, 2001; Schizzerotto & Pisati, 2003), others emphasised long-lasting negative consequences such as employment insecurity and career instability (Kalleberg, Reskin, & Hudson, 2000; Kurz, Hillmert, & Grunow, 2002). Despite the advantages which may result from taking up short term positions in low-skilled labour market segments, under-qualified jobs can be an indicator of poorly matched graduate skills and abilities, which implicitly disadvantages graduates in the recruitment process.

The consequences of non-optimal labour market entry vary across developed countries depending on the structure of the labour market (Scherer, 2004). In this regard, countries differ in the forms of labour market entry, labour market segmentation, mobility structures, and the extent of stigmatisation based on previous employment (OECD, 1996, 1999; Ryan, 2001; Scherer, 2001). That is, if positions not requiring higher-level graduate skills are considered to be normal step in the process of entering the labour market in a country, the stigma should be low. Scherer (2004) examined three European countries (Great Britain, Germany, and Italy), and developed arguments to explain the mobility structures and their signalling effects in these countries. For example, Great Britain is considered a highly flexible European labour market characterised by the greatest feasibility among the three countries of entering the labour market. Since labour market entry is not strictly bound by qualifications, atypical/non-optimal entry demonstrates flexibility, and frequently occurs in the labour market. Accordingly, Great Britain has a less segmented labour market which dictates lower mobility barriers so previous lower-level jobs have less stigmatising effects. The German and Italian markets, on the other hand, are more segmented and regulated by educational credentials. Qualifications and occupationally defined fields are primary bases of
market segmentation in Germany. Therefore, a non-optimal entry into the labour market will have negative impacts on career prospects. A similar situation exists in Italy, however the mobility at the job level is already limited as the Italian labour market consists predominantly of small businesses (Schizzerotto & Cobalti, 1998), therefore access to internal career progression is limited to certain entry positions (Scherer, 2004). Hence, a non-optimal entry may not affect career progression in a large company, but can be a disadvantage in a small company.

Educational mismatch, especially over-education, and its impacts on earnings in developed countries, are well documented in the literature (e.g., Bauer, 2002; Robst, 2007; Rubb, 2003). An individual who is overeducated when she/he accepts a job at a level lower than her/his level of educational attainment, and this is one of the most important adjustment mechanisms of the labour market (Wieling & Borghans, 2001). Research conducted on over-education in Germany, the Netherlands, Spain, the United Kingdom, Portugal, Hong Kong, and the United States indicated overeducated individuals generally earn more than those with less education in their occupation (Hartog, 2000; Rubb, 2003).

In developing economies, the issue of education-occupation matching has received little attention (Quinn & Rubb, 2005) with a predominant focus on over-education and its impact on productivity and earnings (Abbas, 2008; Marchante, Ortega, & Pagán, 2005; Quinn & Rubb, 2005, 2006). One major reason for the dearth of studies on over-education in developing countries is that the data, i.e., the number of years of schooling required to perform a given job, have not been collected in these countries (Mehta, Felipe, Quising, & Camingue, 2011). Using data from India, Mexico, the Philippines and Thailand, Mehta et al. (2011) revealed the evidence of a high level of growth of over-education in unskilled jobs in the Philippines, and lesser evidence of over-education in the other three countries in the
study. The weak demand for skilled labour and slow expansion of education-intensive occupations were found to be underlying the growth of over-education in the Philippines (Mehta et al., 2009, 2011). In this regard, the hospitality industry, which is still characterised by a workforce with a relatively low level of skills, has experienced problems in retaining and recruiting skilled labour due to its negative image including poor working conditions, low pay, seasonality, and no career prospects (Jensen, 2001). Thus, overeducated entrants into sub-optimal positions in the hospitality industry are likely to be sustained in these positions (Marchante et al., 2007), which creates significant long-lasting negative consequences for these workers (Scherer, 2004). The situation poses a challenge for the credibility of academic qualifications, and the return on education in terms of employment outcomes.

With respect to employment, employer-employee relationships have generated much discussion. There are different ways in which economic activities and exchanges are socially structured, which forms social networks mediating employer-employee linkage (Granovetter, 1974). Network analysis has been found to be a useful way to understand the social structure that links employers and employees (Granovetter, 1974; Fligstein & Dauter, 2007; Hodson, 1983; White, 1970). To understand the decisions taken by the economic agents of education, i.e., employers, in the employer-employee network, Bailly (2012) examined the role of employers’ attitudes in determining individuals’ entry into the world of work. Findings highlight the importance of employers’ beliefs about the origins of individuals’ qualities influencing their performances at work. These qualities were categorised into two quality sets in which one was believed to be innate to individuals, and the other to be acquired through education and training. Therefore, the education output, i.e., graduate qualities, is not imparted by educational qualifications but embedded in the system of employers’ beliefs (Bailly, 2008, 2012). In other words, graduate qualities may not be conceptualised as a substance, but conventions set by employers’ judgments and evaluations.
2.6.1.2 HE credentials and employment outcomes

The above discussion of labour market entry, which centres on graduate quality and employment outcomes, has important implications for HE credentials. This has become a challenge due to the global expansion of HE, known as mass HE which has intersected with a shift towards the knowledge-driven economy (Amin, 1994; Drucker, 1993). Underpinning the structural framework of a mass HE system is “the spirit of competition, institutional diversity, responsiveness to markets and especially to the market for students, and institutional autonomy by strong leadership and a diversity of sources of support” (Trow, 2000, pp. 314-315).

Growth and expansion were considered to be underlying the pattern of transition from elite to mass HE (Trow, 2000). There are several important considerations associated with growth, including “the changing relation of HE to the occupational structure of advanced industrial societies” (Trow & Burrage, 2010, p. 89). Three aspects of growth include the rate of growth, size of the system, and proportions of age grade enrolled in HEIs (i.e., the growing population of matured age students). To successfully transition into a mass HE system, it is important to take into consideration several aspects of transition including (i) size of the system, (ii) attitudes toward access, (iii) functions of HE, (iv) the curriculum and forms of instruction, (v) the student academic career, (vi) institutional diversity, characteristics, and boundaries, (vii) the locus of power and decision making, (viii) academic standards, (ix) access and selection, (x) forms of academic administration, and (xi) internal governance (Trow & Burrage, 2010, pp. 94-103). The transition from an elite system to a mass form of HE has naturally evolved in developed countries as a result of the democratic education movement (Bai, 2006). In developing countries, this results in a dramatic growth in the number of HEIs and HE students at the expense of employment outcomes for HE graduates.
due to being underprepared for transition into mass HE (Altbach, Reisberg, & Rumbley, 2009; Bai, 2006).

HE credentials are considered to be of crucial importance in meeting the changing needs of a knowledge-driven economy (Bell, 1973; Castells, 1994), and are seen as a pathway for individuals to gain access to employment opportunities. However, the relationship between academic credentials and labour market outcomes is more complex in nature (Brown & Hesketh, 2004; Elias & Purcell, 2004; Keep & Mayhew, 2004). Although graduates are usually depicted in policy as ‘knowledge workers’, there exist inequalities among graduates in their employment outcomes (Brown & Hesketh, 2004). Brown and Hesketh (2004) reported that many graduates are not able to use knowledge and skills from HE and cannot get return on their investment in HE, and that ‘positional’ differences among graduates exist on the basis of social class, gender and ethnicity. Trajectories of different groups of graduates and labour market outcomes have been well documented with large-scale survey data, indicating unequal opportunities for high quality graduates to progress to managerial positions (Brennan, Lyon, McGeevor, & Murray, 1993; Elias & Purcell, 2004). As mass HE has created with an oversupplied labour market (Tomlinson, 2012), HE credentials are no longer perquisites for employment (Tran, 2016).

Extensive empirical research studies have also been conducted to explore students’ perceptions, understanding and managing their employability in the changing context of HE and labour markets (Rothwell & Arnold, 2007; Rothwell, Jewell, & Hardie, 2009; Rothwell, Herbert, & Rothwell, 2008; Tomlinson, 2008). Studies conducted by Rothwell and his colleagues include the development and validation of an employability scale to investigate students’ self-perceived employability. Tomlinson’s (2008) qualitative study was conducted with 53 final-year undergraduate students in a UK institution to investigate students’
perceptions of the role of HE credentials for employability. Results indicated that students were concerned about the role of utility of their university qualifications in securing the expected employment outcomes. They viewed themselves as being in competition with a growing supply of other graduates entering the labour market with similar profiles and aspirations.

Due to mass HE, an increased number of students have been positioned outside, and excluded from, graduate labour market opportunities (Leathwood & O’Connell, 2003; Reay, David & Ball, 2006). This suggests that hospitality students face challenges in gaining positional advantage in a labour market where academic qualifications are decreasingly valued by employers (Brown & Hesketh, 2004). It is likely that the patterns of labour market inequality are reinforced by the expansion of mass HE and the declined value of academic credentials (Tomlinson, 2008).

2.6.2 Current issues in Vietnam’s tertiary education system

Vietnam’s tertiary education system has experienced several issues in the last decade. The most significant issues identified that directly impact on effective education and training outcomes, especially vocational education, are the quality of HE graduates, the lack of cohesion between different stakeholders in HEIs and industry, and the mass enrolment into HE (Tran et al., 2014).

2.6.2.1 Quality

It has been recognised in the Government Resolution for the period 2005-2020 that the tertiary education system has serious quality issues with the education and training processes, diversity and practicality in curriculum design, teaching pedagogy, qualifications of teaching staff, and issues with educational leadership (MOET, 2005). Specific problems
reported across disciplines include paradoxes in the proportion of theoretical and practical training in program design (Do, 2009), and the inappropriate and outdated content of different subject areas (IIE, 2004; Oliver, 2002; Tran, Le, & Nguyen, 2014). Limitations in HE programs have been argued to result in high unemployment rate of graduates who are under-prepared in terms of skills (IIE, 2004; Oliver, 2002; Tran & Swierczek, 2009). Specifically, research indicates that the development of work-related skills for students has not been well formulated in HE programs (Bodewig et al., 2014; Montague, 2013; Oliver, 2002; Tran, 2013). After more than half a decade operating in nationwide educational reform, skill delivery and graduate quality are an ongoing concern as a consequence of the limited market-orientation in HE programs (Bodewig et al., 2014; Tran & Swierczek, 2009).

Widespread concern has been expressed in the literature with regard to graduates’ lack of skills and poor preparation for the workplace (Bodewig et al., 2014; Montague, 2013; Pham, 2008; Tran & Swierczek, 2009; Tran, 2013). Tran and Swierczek (2009) explored employers’ needs and assessed graduate quality and skill delivery in university courses. They surveyed 251 department managers, and 2,555 students, including 717 final-year students and 1,838 students in other years, from four universities. Results indicated that graduate quality and skill delivery were reported to be generally below standard, with a particular concern focused on interpersonal skills for effective teamwork. Interpersonal skills, problem-solving skills, and learning attributes were found to be the most three important qualities assessed by the industry employers.

In a 2010 study, Nguyen and Robinson interviewed managers across industries and found that Vietnam has experienced an oversupply of low-level labour, at the expense of an adequate supply of skilled workers and managers. They found that university graduates possessed limited skills and capacities for problem-solving, critical thinking and English
proficiency. Another study which included a large-scale survey of 234 recruiters and 3,364 graduates from 20 universities in Vietnam (Huynh, 2011), found that 50% of graduates needed to be retrained to effectively work in industry due to a mismatch between graduate professional skills and recruiters’ requirements. A recent survey by the Vietnam Student Association also reported 50% of graduates were unable to find a job in their area of specialisation, and re-training was required for a significant number of graduates (Giang, 2012). The employers’ unfavourable evaluation of student performances highlights the need for Vietnamese tertiary education to review its educational program.

### 2.6.2.2 System disconnects

Another major issue of concern is the lack of linkages or the ‘disconnects’ (Di Gropello, 2012) between the tertiary education system and employers which have impacted on the effective operation of the labour market in general, and hospitality industry, in particular. Five disconnects existing in East Asian tertiary systems were identified by Di Gropello (2012), with all five of these disconnects relevant in the Vietnamese context. Figure 2.4 illustrates these disconnects with dotted lines representing the absence of linkages.
The first disconnect is the linkage between HE and the industries who require skilled labour. Although vocational college degrees are designed to provide valuable occupational skills required to operate effectively in jobs in several fields such as hospitality and service (Smeaton & Hughes, 2003), Vietnam has a very limited focus on vocational education as opposed to academic education in HEIs (World Bank, 2008). The skill disconnect is postulated to be caused by the HEIs’ ineffective response to the labour market’s needs due to their lack of information on labour market demand (Di Gropello, 2012). Linkage between educational institutions and industry in Vietnam is virtually non-existent (Ashwill, 2010; Bilsland & Nagy, 2015; Ketels et al., 2010; Trinh, 2008; The World Bank, 2008). For example, although internships are considered an important component of hospitality programs, hospitality students in most HEIs are advised to proceed with applying for work internships on their own, with HEIs only providing administrative support. Figure 2.5 illustrates the process in which students are guided to arrange and organise their work.
internships after internship preparation courses at HEIs.

Interestingly while there are detailed instructions for students, the process includes no steps through which the hospitality HEIs are informed of the work undertaken nor any assessment from the work place provided for. This has resulted in a lack of monitoring of the delivery of workplace practices and professional development to students.

The second disconnect is the linkage between HE and the industries who constitute research users. An example of the lack of research linkage is the limited contribution of universities and research institutes to adaptation and upgrading of technologies in the industries (Di Gropello, 2012). One of the reasons for this disconnect in research collaboration are the weak incentives for HEIs-industry linkages (Tran, 2006). The
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**Figure 2.5. Process for work internships**

Interestingly while there are detailed instructions for students, the process includes no steps through which the hospitality HEIs are informed of the work undertaken nor any assessment from the work place provided for. This has resulted in a lack of monitoring of the delivery of workplace practices and professional development to students.

The second disconnect is the linkage between HE and the industries who constitute research users. An example of the lack of research linkage is the limited contribution of universities and research institutes to adaptation and upgrading of technologies in the industries (Di Gropello, 2012). One of the reasons for this disconnect in research collaboration are the weak incentives for HEIs-industry linkages (Tran, 2006). The
The third disconnect exists between universities and research institutes. Teaching and research are generally considered to be complementary in an academic environment (e.g., Houston, Meyer, & Paewai, 2006) but in Vietnam these activities are separated with teaching primarily undertaken in universities, whereas research is primarily conducted by separate research institutes (Di Gropello, 2012). The artificial separation between teaching and research (Tran et al., 2014) has further debilitated the Vietnamese universities’ capacity for undertaking research.

The fourth disconnect is identified among HEIs, and between HEIs and other vocational training providers, i.e., VET colleges. HEIs and VET colleges, which provide training at the same educational level, i.e., the diploma, are not well connected (Di Gropello, 2012). This lack of connection among institutions has led to inconsistent skills transfer to graduates. Part of the underlying problem of this fragmentation among skill providers is the lack of well-developed national qualification frameworks (Di Gropello, 2012). In lower- and middle- income East Asian countries such as Vietnam, these frameworks are at a preliminary stage in development in which inputs are emphasised, instead of an output focus and adherence to a market-oriented policy agenda (Di Gropello, 2012). Skills are taught independently in institutions without being related to industry to identify the skills needed for job mobility and labour market efficiency.
The fifth and final disconnect exists between different levels in the tertiary education system. In the Vietnamese context, there is no pathway from a vocational college degree to a university degree, as the transition is constrained by the separate supervision units, i.e., MOET and MOLISA, which mandate two different vocational frameworks on HEIs and VET colleges. Thus, students enrolled in a vocational college program have no capacity to upgrade to a university program.

2.6.2.3 Mass enrolment into HE

The massification of HE in Vietnam has posed several challenges to the HE system. The rapid expansion of the number of HE institutions, and dramatic increase in the number of student enrolments (Hayden & Lam, 2007; MOET, 2016) as illustrated in Figure 2.6, has been viewed as an achievement with respect to increasing enrolment numbers, yet a growing concern relates to graduate quality. The rapid expansion and growth in quantity have pushed Vietnam’s HE system towards a quality crisis (Vallely & Wilkinson, 2008), with the majority of universities exhibiting difficulties meeting minimum quality standards (Do & Do, 2014).

![Graph showing number of enrolments across academic years between 1987 and 2017](image)

*Figure 2.6. Number of student enrolments across academic years between 1987 and 2017*

HE systems and structures in developed countries have provided sound foundations to guide the transition for expansion in developing countries such as Vietnam. For example, by 1990 the United States’ HEIs already had a well organised structural framework for mass HE
before mass enrolment occurred in the country (Bai, 2006). Compared with the United States, Vietnam’s HE system, characterised as ‘education for examinations’ (i.e., teaching and learning to prepare students for success in examinations), and disadvantaged by quality issues, has not been well prepared for large-scale expansion.

2.7 Summary and research questions

The previous review highlighted the importance of examining the interrelationship between HE and industry needs, to ensure graduates are provided with the necessary knowledge and skills to effectively contribute to the profession. In order to effectively prepare students for hospitality professions, hospitality program development oriented towards industry requirements is therefore required. Such an orientation has been successfully adopted in many countries, but is virtually non-existent in the Vietnamese context. The increasing importance of hospitality/tourism as an important economic indicator highlights the need to review and reform Vietnam’s hospitality HE.

Importantly, the implementation phase of the Vietnam’s HERA is rapidly approaching. In order for institutional autonomy to occur in Vietnam’s HE system, a transformation at all institutional level is needed, including the evaluation of programs of study within each institution. This study proactively responds to the reform agenda with regard to tertiary hospitality education. First, it is important to assess the alignment between the education and training provided by tertiary education institutions, and the needs of the hospitality sector. This is the first study conducted to provide empirical evidence to explore this alignment in Vietnam. Second, although the importance of hospitality industry-education relationship is documented in the literature to be critical for students’ professional learning, there is limited research exploring the nature of this relationship in the Vietnamese context. This study contributes to this literature base by exploring Vietnamese tertiary hospitality
education students’ views of their programs, and hospitality workplaces. These aims were evidenced through the following research questions:

1. What are hospitality stakeholders’ (industry professionals, academics, and students) perspectives of Vietnamese tertiary hospitality education?
   a. What are stakeholders’ views of tertiary hospitality education preparation?
   b. What are stakeholders’ views of the suitability for the hospitality industry?

2. What are tertiary education students’ views of Vietnamese hospitality workplaces and professional development in the hospitality industry?
   a. What are higher education students’ perspectives?
   b. What are vocational college students’ perspectives?

3. What factors influence effective tertiary hospitality education in Vietnam?
Chapter 3 Methodology

3.1 Introduction

This study sought to explore factors that influence effective tertiary hospitality education in Vietnam. Additionally, various stakeholders’ perceptions and expectations of tertiary hospitality education and hospitality workplaces in Vietnam were examined. In this chapter, the mixed methods research design utilised in the study is outlined, along with the context describing the setting and participants. The purpose of the exploratory sequential mixed methods design (Creswell, 2013) adopted in the study is to support the exploration of hospitality industry professionals’, students’ and academics’ views of hospitality HE and hospitality workplaces to identify the factors that influence effective tertiary hospitality education in Vietnam.

3.2 Research design

This study adopted an exploratory sequential mixed methods design. Figure 3.1 summarises the methods associated with each research questions and sub-questions and the associated sequence of the exploration.

**Figure 3.1.** Exploratory sequential mixed methods design
The exploratory design was used to capture a richer understanding of Vietnamese tertiary hospitality education from two perspectives – a series of stakeholder interviews regarding, the preparedness of students for work in the hospitality industry, and the knowledge and skills required for working in the industry. This was followed by an online survey capturing the views of student experiences in hospitality workplaces by students from VET and HE programs. The collected data supported the exploration of (1) Vietnamese hospitality educators’ views of hospitality HE in Vietnam and issues with program development and improvement, (2) students’ views of the hospitality HE programs they are undertaking, and their internship experiences, and (3) hospitality professionals’ expectations of graduate/student interns’ abilities. Interpretation of the sequentially collected responses then facilitated a two-fold objective. It firstly provided the capacity to view the alignment of Vietnamese hospitality programs against the varying needs of industry employers and students. Then, from a consideration of the views of students after their industry internships, it allowed the identification of factors that may influence effective tertiary hospitality education in Vietnam.

The research methodology has been shaped by a philosophical stance of pragmatism. Pragmatists suggest the existence of a false dichotomy between quantitative and qualitative approaches (Newman & Benz, 1998). Pragmatist researchers contend to the epistemological and methodological pluralism as opposed to one-to-one relationship between epistemology and methodology (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004; Onwuegbuzie & Leech, 2005). Knowledge is viewed by pragmatists as being constructed and based on the reality of the world we live in and experience (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004). For those reasons, pragmatists advocate the integration of quantitative and qualitative methods within a single study (Creswell, 2013). In fact, pragmatist researchers ascribe to the philosophy that the use of methods should be driven by the research question, considering the fact that “research
methodologies are merely tools that are designed to aid to our understanding of the world” (Onwuegbuzie & Leech, 2005, p. 377). From this pragmatic standpoint, researchers are given an opportunity for “multiple methods, different worldviews, and different assumptions, as well as different forms of data collection and analysis in the mixed methods study” (Creswell, 2013, p.12). Researchers were, therefore, open to flexibility in deciding tools and methods that can best explore and provide insights into research problems (Creswell, 2013; Plano et al., 2008), and also address weaknesses from the individual quantitative or qualitative standpoints. This mixed methods research design, underpinned by a pragmatist paradigm, places the primary focus on the research problem (Creswell, 2013; Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009) – in this case the views and experiences of key stakeholders involved in the education and training of future hospitality professionals. Methodological choices were then driven by the selected response to the research questions and overall research problem (Creswell, 2013; Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009).

The decision to use quantitative or qualitative methods, or a combined approach is dependent on the research problem, the intended audience, and the experiences of the researcher. As stated by Narayan (1996), research methodology provides structured guidelines of activities to retrieve valid and reliable research results. A researcher is accountable for justifying the procedures of data collection, and the tools used for analysis. Certain types of research problems call for specific methodological approaches (Creswell, 2008). For example, a quantitative approach is the optimal choice where the views and experiences of a large group need to be elicited, with an online survey particularly appropriate where distance or timing of access is an issue. On the other hand, where it is intended to access in-depth views of a small number of participants, interviews are likely to provide the most effective means of data collection, with a qualitative approach used. Thus, in this mixed methods study, as suggested by Johnson and Onwuegbuzie (2004), the
combination of quantitative and qualitative data ensures a range of research questions are able to be effectively answered.

### 3.2 Research process

As the research was conducted sequentially the research procedures, including sampling, data collection, and data analysis are summarised in Table 3.1, then discussed under these phases throughout the chapter.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sampling</th>
<th>Phase 1 – Interviews</th>
<th>Phase 2 – Online survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>- Criterion-based</td>
<td>- HE students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Industry professionals from restaurants, hotels, and resorts in the south central area of Vietnam</td>
<td>- VET students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Hospitality academic from HEIs in Ho Chi Minh City (HCMC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Hospitality students from HEIs in HCMC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data collection</th>
<th>Phase 1 – Interviews</th>
<th>Phase 2 – Online survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>Interview protocols developed for</td>
<td>- Development of survey instrument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Industry professionals</td>
<td>- Translation of instrument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Hospitality academics</td>
<td>- Pilot testing of instrument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Hospitality students</td>
<td>- Refined instrument</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data analysis</th>
<th>Phase 1 – Interviews</th>
<th>Phase 2 – Online survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thematic analysis using manual coding of interview transcripts</td>
<td>Descriptive and multivariate analyses using SPSS version 24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethical considerations</th>
<th>Phase 1 – Interviews</th>
<th>Phase 2 – Online survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved by the Human Research Ethics Committees of Griffith University [EDN/BS/14/HREC]</td>
<td>Permission sought for using the scale developed by Kusluvan &amp; Kusluvan (2000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two phases were implemented in this study - Phase 1, in-depth interviews with stakeholders, namely (i) hospitality students from different HEIs in the south of Vietnam; (ii) with hospitality academics in these HEIs; and (iii) with professionals from different sectors within hospitality industry across the south central area of Vietnam. Phase 2 then involved the administration of an online survey to gauge the views of post-internship students of hospitality programs, both at HEIs and VET colleges. The aspects of each phase, including sampling and processes of data collection instruments and protocols, and the subsequent data analyses are detailed in the following sections.
3.3 Sampling

Criterion-based sampling approach was adopted for each data collection phase. In Phase 1, three different stakeholder groups were involved in interviews, namely industry professionals, hospitality academics and students. For the online survey in Phase 2, views from hospitality students from HEIs and VET colleges were investigated.

3.3.1 Interview participants

The interviewing samples are summarised in Table 3.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Researched issues</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Industry professionals</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>views of hospitality programs and student interns</td>
<td>Restaurants, hotel and resorts areas in the south central area documented in Table 3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality academics</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>views of hospitality programs and experience with hospitality program development</td>
<td>HEIs documented in Table 3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE Students</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>experience of professional development via internships and hospitality programs at HEIs</td>
<td>HEIs documented in Table 3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.1.1 Industry professionals

Criteria sampling was used to identify participants well positioned to provide detailed information on industry professionals’ views of hospitality education, and student intern/graduate abilities. In order to gain insights to adequately respond to the research questions, access to industry professionals with professional skills and experiences with student interns, and with an understanding of hospitality programs were required.

The process of recruiting industry professional participants was based on personal communications between the researcher and the hospitality enterprises, as there is no official partnership linkage between industry enterprises and educational institutions regarding work
internship arrangement for students in Vietnam (Ashwill, 2010; Bilsland & Nagy, 2015; Tran, 2012). The implemented procedure involved sending emails of invitation to the human resources departments of the identified hospitality enterprises documented in Table 3.3. The emails were prepared in Vietnamese with the English versions attached in Appendix A. Following screening against the identified criteria, interview appointments were then arranged with ten industry professionals, with interviews conducted at the participants’ offices of the relevant hotels, resorts, and restaurants.

Table 3.3
Summary of hospitality enterprises identified for sampling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry sector</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Location feature</th>
<th>Enterprise features</th>
<th># of enterprises</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>HCMC</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>4/5-star</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Da Nang</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>SME*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resort</td>
<td>Phu Quoc</td>
<td>Island</td>
<td>4/5-star</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vung Tau</td>
<td>Beach city</td>
<td>SME*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nha Trang</td>
<td>Beach city</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ba Na Hill</td>
<td>Highland city</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>HCMC</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Fine dining/</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>restaurant chain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Small and Medium Enterprise (SME)*

This sample included restaurants, hotels, and resorts at both high-end and medium-to-low-end markets. This was done to facilitate accessing a broad range of views across this group. Interviews in the restaurant and hotel sectors were conducted with industry professionals at relevant enterprises in HCMC and Da Nang, Vietnam. For the hotel and resort sectors, participants were drawn from two sources, including (1) internationally and nationally accredited acclaimed hotels and resorts, and (2) small and medium enterprises (SMEs) in the south central areas including HCMC, Phu Quoc Island, Nha Trang City, Da Nang and Ba Na Hill. The areas were selected due to their well-developed hotel and resort facilities.
3.3.1.2 Hospitality academics

Criteria sampling of hospitality academics from the HEIs profiled in Table 3.4 was used to identify participants approached for interviews. Academics with knowledge of hospitality programs and an understanding of practices in the hospitality industry were invited to participate.

Table 3.4
Summary of hospitality-related programs in nine HEIs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names of HEIs</th>
<th>Hospitality-related majors</th>
<th>Year of Establishment</th>
<th>Estimated annual intake</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open University (OP)</td>
<td>Hotel and Restaurant Management</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2,500 for 15 majors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho Chi Minh University of Foreign Languages and</td>
<td>Hotel and Restaurant Management</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technologies (HUFLIT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2,300 for 20 majors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Lang University (VLU)</td>
<td>Hotel management</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2,500 for 18 majors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho Chi Minh City University of Technology (HUTECH)</td>
<td>Hotel Management, Restaurant and Food Service</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>(3,500 for 22 majors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ton Duc Thang University (TDT)</td>
<td>Hotel and Restaurant Management</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3,160 for 30 majors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Bang University (HBU)</td>
<td>Hotel and Restaurant Management</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1,800 for 26 majors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Finance and Marketing (UFM)</td>
<td>Hotel Management, Restaurant and Food Service</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>(Upgraded from 1976</td>
<td>(3,900 for 11 majors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>College)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoa Sen University (HSU)</td>
<td>Tourism-Hotel Management, Restaurant and Food</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service Management</td>
<td>(Upgraded from 1991</td>
<td>(2,230 for 21 majors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>College)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nguyen Tat Thanh University (NTT)</td>
<td>Hotel Management, Restaurant and Food Service</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>(Upgraded from 2005</td>
<td>(3,500 for 24 majors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>College)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The HEIs selected in this study offer various disciplines/majors including hospitality-related majors, e.g., hotel and restaurant management. As each discipline/major is assigned equal student quota, the annual intake for the hospitality-related major/s of an HEI was estimated from the total annual intake in each institution. For example, OP offered 15 majors with a total annual intake of 2,500, which generated approximately 166 enrolments for the major “Hotel and Restaurant Management”. All the HEIs selected for this study have been operating for approximately ten years or more. During this time UFM, HSU and NTT were upgraded to university level (offering 4-year bachelor degrees) from their initial college level (offering 3-year diploma degrees). The hospitality-related programs offered at the HEIs have been well established over the operation period of each institution.

Hospitality/tourism faculties of the HEIs profiled in Table 3.4 were contacted via email invitations. Email and phone communications for interviews were directly arranged with the academics whose contact details were provided by the faculties responding to the invitations (see Appendix B). Seven academics agreed to participate in the study.

3.3.1.3 Hospitality HE students

In-depth, individual interviews were conducted with two groups of students who had undertaken work internships – in high-end enterprises or SMEs. Criteria sampling was applied to identify students who had completed their work internships, and would be well positioned to provide insights into their professional development journey experienced in both academic and industry environments. The recruitment process involved sending emails to the academic coordinators in the HEIs profiled in Table 3.4 to seek assistance in recruiting student participants for interviews. Email and/or phone communications were utilised with the identified students to arrange the interviews. The recruitment process resulted in nine student participants for the study.
The choice of surveying current students rather than those who had completed their education as the target for student perspectives was based on viability. While it would be desirable to survey, and interview, students who have completed their education, including those who had not had successful outcomes, this was seen as highly problematic, with the likely outcome being a biased sample of the more successful students. Thus, it was deemed more important to access the potentially larger group that included those who have not had a successful internship experience, thus covering a greater diversity of students, and their experiences.

### 3.3.2 The survey participants

The online survey was conducted with current students from the subset from HEIs profiled in Table 3.4, and students from VET colleges documented in Table 3.5. Thus the study groups were referred to in this study as the HE and the VET.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names of VET colleges</th>
<th>Year of Establishment</th>
<th>Institutional feature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saigon Tourist Hospitality College (STHC)</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>A former Vocational School of Hotel and Tourism – the training centre for Saigontourist Holding Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saigon Tourism Vocational College (STVC)</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>A former Saigon tourism and hospitality training centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho Chi Minh City Technical and Economic College (HOTEC)</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Formally Phu Lam Vocational School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPT Polytechnic</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Member of FPT Corporation and Vocational College of FPT University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danang Vocational Tourism College</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Public college of the central area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students in these institutions are provided with easy and convenient access to computers, and as a part of their courses are required to use the internet on a regular basis to access information such as announcements, lecture notes and academic events. Emails are the preferred mode of communication in these institutions. As such, a link to an online survey
emailed out to participants/students was considered the most efficient strategy to collect survey responses.

Participants were informed of the purpose of the survey in the invitation email, and instructions were provided on completing specific sections throughout the survey. The invitation email was sent to the leader of each class, who had been asked to assist in raising awareness of the online survey with class members. A formal email was also sent to a group email site accessible to all students. Reminder emails were later sent to the group email site to encourage survey completion. To assist in the delivery process initial contact with academic coordinators in the target departments/faculties who had regular contact with the identified students was made early in the study seeking assistance in the surveying process. The coordinators’ email contacts were included in the recipient list throughout the communication process.

A good survey response rate is considered important (Creswell, 2008), thus attempts were made to obtain a high response rate to the survey in this study. Potential participants were informed of the intent of the survey and also the survey process, with this engagement also intended to encourage participation. The survey was open for sixteen weeks from the initial invitation with eight reminder emails scheduled every fortnight before the survey deadline. A snowballing technique was used to further increase the response rate. The students were asked to assist in circulating the link to the survey in other communication channels such as Facebook and personal emails. No mandatory responses were included in the survey, further encouraging participants to complete the survey. The process resulted in 253 valid survey responses.
3.4 Data collection

Data collection was conducted sequentially. The elements of data collection and analyses, summarised in Figure 3.2, are subsequently discussed under two phases.

![Figure 3.2. Elements of data collection and analyses of the current study](image)

### 3.4.1 Phase 1 – Interviews

For an educational program to be effective, responding to the needs of the industry where graduates seek their employment is of vital importance (Christou, 2002; Mayo, 2002; WTO, 2004; Yildirim & Simsek, 2001). Hence it is imperative for educators in the process of program development to gain understanding of industry needs to identify work-related knowledge and skills required by industry. Through participation in in-depth interviews, the views of industry professionals on the knowledge and skills of hospitality graduates or students undertaking work internships were explored to identify possible issues in the preparation of students in hospitality programs in Vietnam. Similarly, the views of academics and students were also accessed to provide multiple stakeholder perspectives on the issue of hospitality education and training.

In-depth interviews were conducted with hospitality students, hospitality academic representatives, and a diverse group of industry professionals. The interviews were conducted face-to-face at a venue chosen by the interviewees. Each interview was approximately 30-60
minutes in length to cover all the identified issues in the semi-structured interview protocol(s). The protocol(s) were presented to participants at the beginning of each interview with the direction that the participant did not need to follow the order of the issues, but to informally share his/her opinions around the questions/issues outlined in the protocol.

The interviews were recorded with the permission of the interviewees (as included on the signed informed consent form). As suggested by Kvale and Brinkmann (2009), recording interviews enables researchers to focus on the contents of the interviews then feed in questions or clarifications where necessary to avoid distraction for interviewees due to researchers’ continuous note-taking.

Given the advantages and disadvantages of each interview design, a qualitative semi-structured interview approach was considered most suited for exploring views and reflections on specific issues of research. This flexible approach is used for the purpose of “obtaining description of the [professional] life world of the interviewee with respect to interpreting the meaning of the described phenomena” (Kvale, 2007, p.11). It enables researchers to further explore issues as they arise (as in unstructured interviews), whilst providing a framework for discussion of issues (as in structured interviews). Moreover, guided questions and freedom to provide opinions in this approach can encourage participants to tell their story, most beneficial when seeking reflections from participants’ experiences and practices. The interview protocols for the three groups interviewed are presented and discussed below.

3.4.1.1 Industry professionals

The semi-structured interview protocol (see Table 3.6) was developed to identify issues associated with hospitality interns’ and graduates’ knowledge and skills. To facilitate an open discussion with participants regarding their opinions and experiences, the questions used in the protocol were aimed at three focus areas: (i) key issues of industry sector; (ii)
expectations of student interns; and (iii) additional comments. The goal was to begin broadly by asking general questions about key sector issues, and knowledge and skills needed by service workers to meet these challenges. This was followed by a focus on soliciting their views on interns’ abilities, their expectations of graduates’ skills, and their opinions of the relevance between hospitality HE and the actual requirements at the workplace in relevant sectors – restaurants, hotels and resorts.

Table 3.6

Semi-structured interview protocol for industry professionals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key issues of industry sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What are some of the current challenging issues of your hospitality sector?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How do these issues challenge people who work in the sector?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What kinds of knowledge and skills do they need to deliver high service quality?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Could you share some situations where specific skills are needed for good performances of the job?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expectations of student interns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. What do you think about student interns’ skills? How did they perform at their internships? Are they ready for internships?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. What did you expect from interns prior to their internships?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. What kinds of knowledge and skills are needed for graduates to start work in the sector?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. To what extent what has been taught at higher education institutions is relevant to the actual requirements at the workplace, particularly in your sector?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Please feel free to comment on other aspects (not mentioned/missed in the above discussion questions) that may assist in thoroughly understanding current issues of internships and graduate skills in your sector.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As discussed in the literature, for hospitality programs to be effective, responding to the needs of the industry where graduates seek their employment is of vital importance (Christou, 2002; Mayo, 2002; WTO, 2004; Yildirim & Simsek, 2001). Hence it is imperative for educators to understand industry needs to best identify work-related knowledge and skills, and contemporary demands of the industry. In the interview protocol for industry professionals, the first four questions sought their views of key issues of each sector, and required skills of service workers. The next four questions sought to ascertain their views of interns’ skills, their expectations of graduates in term of skills, how they reflected on the
relevance of hospitality programs’ content, and the requirements for work readiness in relevant sectors. The last question sought additional comments/opinions on skills which needed to be addressed in hospitality HE programs.

**3.4.1.2 Hospitality academics**

The semi-structured interview protocol for academics in Table 3.7 was employed to explore academics’ perceptions on important graduate skills, and their perceived contributions of academic courses to students’ professional learning development. To facilitate an open discussion with participants, the questions used in the protocol were aimed at three focus areas: (i) understanding of the hospitality industry; (ii) experience of hospitality program development; and (iii) additional comments.

Table 3.7

*Semi-structured interview protocol for hospitality academics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Understanding of the hospitality industry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What are some of the current challenging issues of hospitality industry?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How do these issues challenge people who work in the industry?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What kinds of knowledge and skills do they need to deliver high service quality?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience of hospitality program development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. How do universities prepare students with skills for work?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How do universities respond to industry needs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. What are some of the challenging issues facing academics in developing hospitality programs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. To what extent universities contribute to students’ professional learning in academic courses?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Please feel free to comment on other aspects (not mentioned/missed in the above discussion questions) that may assist in thoroughly understanding current issues of hospitality program development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As identified in the literature, there have been competing interests and dissatisfactions expressed among stakeholders involved in hospitality program development process, especially stakeholders from industry and educational institutions (Beddingfield, 2005; Hearns, Devine, & Baum, 2007; Jenkins, 2001; Purcell & Quinn, 1996; Rimmington, 1999;
Zopiatis & Constanti, 2007). Thus, it is important to gain insights from these key stakeholders.

In the interview protocol for academics, responses to broad questions about the hospitality industry (questions 1-3) were used to inform understanding of industry and enable comparison of stakeholders’ views in the analysis. Questions 4-7 were intended to solicit academics’ views on developing educational programs in hospitality, and their opinions on the programs’ contribution to students’ professional development. The last question was used to gain more information on issues relating to hospitality program development.

3.4.1.3 Hospitality students

As they experience both the academic and industry environments, students were considered to provide important practical insights into their professional development journey. Therefore, student participants were encouraged to informally share their professional learning from academic courses at HEIs and their internships in industry, by focusing on the questions outlined in the protocol presented in Table 3.8.

Table 3.8
Semi-structured interview protocol for hospitality students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiences during the internships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Positives?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Negatives?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Comments?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiences with your hospitality programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Preparations for internships?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To what extent do these programs prepare you for hospitality profession?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional comments

6. Please feel free to comment on other aspects (not mentioned/missed in the above discussion questions) that may assist in thoroughly understanding current issues of your professional learning and development.
The interviews with student participants commenced with questions regarding their experiences in their internships, where the researcher took a neutral position to elicit their responses and probe their experiences. Then the interview led into discussions of the hospitality programs they were undertaking, and their views on internships.

3.4.2 Phase 2 – Online survey

The survey sought to explore the attitudes of Vietnamese tertiary hospitality education students towards a career in the hospitality industry. The purpose of the survey was to ascertain student perceptions of different aspects of working in the hospitality industry. While the focus of the research is on the preparation of tertiary education students for a hospitality career, it became apparent from the Phase 1 interview process that those employed in this sector include both HE and VET students. The survey sought the views of both groups of future employees in this sector, thus providing a capacity to also compare their views and satisfaction with the process they experienced.

3.2.2.1 Survey design

An online survey of post-internship hospitality students at Vietnamese HEIs and VET colleges was used to ascertain their views of the hospitality workplaces in which they had undertaken internships, to prepare them with practical knowledge and skills for future hospitality careers. The use of an online survey of students provided a cost-effective mechanism with a rapid turnaround in data collection, with the capability to collect responses from a group of students administered at a distance (Sue & Ritter, 2012; Van Selm & Jankowski, 2006). Technological competence with the internet was not foreseen as a problem for the participants in this study as they were enrolled in programs where administrative and academic information was communicated electronically.
The issue of response rate, critical in the use of surveys, was considered in planning the data collection process. In an environment such as a tertiary institution where students have broad access to, and familiarity with information technology, online surveys are widely used to provide a quick and easy form of data collection, particularly where large numbers of participants are available, or where such participants are located at a geographically broad distance. However, response rates are an important consideration in online survey research with factors such as question length and type, and the personality of the recipients needing consideration (Kaplowitz, Hadlock, & Levine, 2004). The concern about low response rates from e-mail and web-based survey was also raised by Sills and Song (2002), who viewed the combination of web-based surveys and mailed surveys providing a good strategy through which to gain a high response rate. Accessibility is also a recognised issue with access to computers and technological competence (Mertler, 2001) an important consideration. For this study, contact was made with staff in each institution to ensure engagement with students was achieved, also providing the capacity to provide reminders to students to enhance response rates.

3.4.2.2 The survey instrument

The survey instrument was developed around a scale developed and used by Kusluvan and Kusluvan (2000) to investigate hospitality/tourism students’ perceptions of working in the hospitality/tourism industry. Permission was sought and approved by the author for the scale to be used and adapted in this study (see Appendix C).

This widely used scale has been validated with a large sample of Turkish tourism and hotel management students (Kusluvan & Kusluvan, 2000), indicating validity and reliability of the scale. Results indicated that all sub-scales were significantly correlated with each other (Kusluvan & Kusluvan, 2000). It is a multi-dimensional, multi-item attitude scale for
measuring students’ attitudes towards working in the hospitality and tourism industry. The original scale consisted of 79 attitudinal items under nine dimensions of tourism/hospitality workplaces: (i) Nature of work (12 items); (ii) Social status (4 items); (iii) Industry-person congeniality (11 items); (iv) Physical working conditions (5 items); (v) Pay/fringe benefits (4 items); (vi) Promotion (7 items); (vii) Co-workers (11 items); (viii) Managers (14 items); and (ix) Commitment to the industry (11 items).

The scale has been utilised and successfully validated in several studies investigating students’ perceptions of working in the hospitality/tourism industry in different contexts including Turkey (Aksu & Koksal, 2005; Kusluvan & Kusluvan, 2000), Australia (Richardson, 2009, 2010a), United States (Richardson & Thomas, 2012), Malaysia (Richardson & Butler, 2012), and China (Wang & Huang, 2014). Thus, it was deemed a suitable instrument for the current study through an initial matching of the themes identified in the preliminary findings from the interviews with three study groups, including industry professionals, hospitality students, and hospitality academics; with the items on the scale (see Appendix D).

3.4.2.2.1 Instrument development

In the current study, a three-part questionnaire was developed to measure how the perceptions and attitudes of hospitality students at HEIs and VET colleges in Vietnam were shaped by working in the industry, and what impact this had on students’ intentions of pursuing a career in the hospitality industry. Table 3.9 provides a summary of the survey structure with the full survey presented in Appendix E.
Table 3.9

*Summary of the survey structure*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Question groups</th>
<th>Question types</th>
<th>Question samples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Demographic and background</td>
<td>Closed options</td>
<td>Age, Gender, Education institution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2       | Views on working in the hospitality industry | 5-point Likert scale, level of agreement (from 1=strongly agree to 5=strongly disagree) | ‘Promotion opportunities are satisfactory in the hospitality industry’
|         |                                     |                         | ‘Managers delegate authority in order for employees to do their jobs better’      |
|         |                                     |                         | ‘I am very happy to have chosen hospitality as a vocation path’                  |
| 3       | Comments                            | Open-ended              | Examples of experiences of working in the industry                               |

Section 1 sought demographic information about participants including age, gender, current degree enrolled, and reasons for hospitality study. The section consisted of eight questions with a range of closed options.

In section 2, responses to attitudinal items were measured on a 5-point Likert scale, where ‘1 = strongly agree’, ‘2 = agree’, ‘3 = uncertain’, ‘4 = disagree’, and ‘5 = strongly disagree’ indicating the level of agreement. Modifications were made to the original 79-item scale to adapt it for this study. As a first screening step, items with corrected item correlation of less than .4 from the initial study (Kusluvan & Kusluvan, 2000) were not included, resulting in 61 items in the modified scale used in the pilot testing phase. Table 3.10 summaries the changes in the total of items across different dimensions in the scale.

This adaptation process resulted in small changes to eight of the nine dimensions, with major changes being made to the first dimension - ‘Nature of work’ – with only three of the original twelve items being included. While this meant that the “Nature of work” dimension would be weak, this was aligned with the main objective of the survey to gauge students’ views on the hospitality workplaces in which they experienced during their internships/ internships.
### Table 3.10

*Summary of changes in the item total in the modified scale*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Original scale</th>
<th>Modified scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nature of work</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social status</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry-person congeniality</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical working conditions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay/fringe benefits</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion opportunities</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to the industry</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>79</strong></td>
<td><strong>61</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Section 3, participants were asked to share any additional comments regarding their experiences in hospitality workplaces that were not addressed in the survey. This offered an opportunity for participants to provide further details on their experiences and also addressed a limitation with closed-ended questions, which can increase the risk of “reducing something that is rich and complex to a single index that assumes an importance out of all proportion to its meanings” (Eagly & Chaiken, 1993, p. 3).

#### 3.4.2.2.2 Translation of instrument

Translation of a research instrument into other languages is important in preparing instruments for use in different cultures (Hilton & Skrutkowski, 2002). The rigour of the translation process aims to ensure the equivalence of the meaning of the scale items in the translated version (i.e., Vietnamese), to the meaning in the original language (i.e., English) (Endacott, Benbenishty, & Seha, 2010). In this study, the translation of the questionnaire using the modified scale was performed in five steps using a blind, back-translation process. Figure 3.3 summarises the steps of the instrument translation process.
Step 1 involved a panel of three Vietnamese individuals with English linguistic backgrounds independently translating the original questionnaire into Vietnamese. The research team then integrated the three versions of translation to generate a consensus Vietnamese version (Step 2). In Step 3, to ensure the rigour of translation, three additional Vietnamese translators, blind to the original questionnaire, back translated the Vietnamese version into English. A second consensus step (Step 4) led to the research team generating a consensus English version. Finally, in Step 5, the research team checked the original and translated English versions of the scale for content matching and validity (Duffy, 2006), with discrepancies discussed and resolved, and the final Vietnamese version for pilot testing was finalised.
3.4.2.2.3 Pilot testing the instrument

A pilot test of a questionnaire or survey is “a procedure in which a researcher makes changes in an instrument based on feedback from a small number of individuals who complete and evaluate the instrument” (Creswell, 2008, p. 402). This is an important step for researchers to reflect on potential problems in the survey, and to make appropriate revisions before the final release. This process also provided a check on the translation process.

Electronic copies of the questionnaire using the modified scale were emailed to thirty Vietnamese hospitality students in Vietnam. They were asked to complete the survey and provide feedback on the comprehension and clarification of the items used in the modified scale. Modifications and changes were then made to reflect the feedback provided by the students on the survey. The summary of changes is shown in Table 3.11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Changes</th>
<th>Final scale (# of items)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nature of work</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social status</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry-person congeniality</td>
<td>Not relevant – 1 item ‘Working in hospitality contradicts to my religious values’</td>
<td>deleted</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical working conditions</td>
<td>Not relevant – whole dimension</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay/fringe benefits</td>
<td>Several statement of obvious and/or similar meaning</td>
<td>3 items deleted</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion opportunities</td>
<td>Dimensions combined and renamed ‘Pay/promotion opportunities’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to the industry</td>
<td>Items with similar meaning</td>
<td>Pairing</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The piloting process resulted in the final 54-item scale with seven dimensions: (1) Nature of work (2 items), (2) Social status (3 items), (3) Industry-person congeniality (9
items), (4) Pay/promotion opportunities (8 items), (5) Co-workers (9 items), (6) Managers (13 items), and (7) Commitment to the hospitality industry (10 items). Based on the feedback in the pilot, the questions/statements in dimension ‘physical working conditions’ were found to be not relevant to the Vietnamese context. The dimensions ‘pay/fringe benefits’ and ‘promotion’ in the original scale were combined and labelled ‘pay/promotion opportunities’ in the questionnaire for this study. Also, several questions/statements in the original scale, after being assessed against contextual relevance and linguistic nature, were omitted from the instrument. Examples of modifications/changes include the exempt of items of obvious meaning or commonly known features such as ‘Working hours are not suitable for a regular life in the hospitality/tourism industry’, or being irrelevant in the Vietnamese context such as ‘Working in hospitality contradicts with my religious values’; and pairing similar items such as ‘I would not want my son or daughter to study hospitality and work in the hospitality industry’ as a result of the pairing of ‘I would not want my son to study hospitality and work in the hospitality industry’ and ‘I would want my daughter to study hospitality and work in the hospitality industry’.

The final questionnaire, refined through pilot testing, was administered online using the Griffith University LimeSurvey tool – an online survey application supported by the Griffith University Research Survey Unit.

3.5 Data analysis

Following the sequential design process, data analyses were conducted sequentially commencing with the qualitative data set which informed the development and implementation of the quantitative phase. Details of data analysis in two phases are discussed in the following sections.
3.5.1 Qualitative phase

The interviews were fully transcribed for content analysis, and the process consisted of two coding cycles as shown in Figure 3.4.

![Figure 3.4. Process of interview data analysis](image)

The process started with first cycle coding (Matthew, Huberman, & Saldaña, 2014) using a descriptive coding method (Saldaña, 2013) in which labels were assigned to data summarised in a word or phrase. Emotion coding (Saldaña, 2013) was also used to label the emotions experienced by the participants, i.e., hospitality students in this study. This analysis process was applied to, and conducted separately, with the transcripts of each study group. The first cycle coding process resulted in the development of 26 lists of initial codes. In the second cycle coding (Matthew et al., 2014), pattern codes were generated for each list by grouping similar codes identified in the first stage, and the frequencies of emergence of each code were noted. These pattern codes were labelled ‘themes’ in this study. Themes were then compared among groups to identify common features which informed and justified the choice of instrument for Phase 2. For the purposes of presentation and interpretation, themes were grouped into categories. A matrix of categories, themes, and sample codes were developed for each participant group, and are presented in Chapter 4.
3.5.2 Quantitative phase

The analysis of the quantitative data in this study commenced with data cleaning through missing values analysis, followed by descriptive and multivariate analyses. All analyses were undertaken using SPSS Version 24.

3.5.2.1 Missing values analysis

Missing values analysis was conducted across 54 attitude statements to identify if there were missing values across the items in the scale. Cases with 20% or more missing values were deleted resulting in 253 remaining cases for the descriptive analysis.

Given that a small number of missing values from scale items would limit the calculation of scale values for survey participants, further consideration of missing values was undertaken for this analysis stage. The missing values in the remaining cases were analysed to identify the missing data patterns. The probability distribution of ‘missingness’ was considered, assuming that the missing data in this survey was missing completely at random (MCAR). The missing values were then replaced using SPSS missing values replacement method of mean of nearby points. This post-replacement data was utilised for the multivariate analyses discussed in the following section.

3.5.2.2 Data analyses

An initial descriptive overview of the demographic/background characteristics of the groups was tabulated. In this section, the responses to key questions regarding participants’ intent to undertake hospitality studies, and future plans for a career in the hospitality industry, were also provided, including a summary of short open response options.
The responses to the attitude statements regarding seven dimensions of hospitality workplaces were firstly summarised by response pattern (sample and percentage) and chi-squared statistics were used to explore the differences between the two study groups, i.e., HE students and VET students. Given the multiple tests used, a Bonferroni correction was applied. With 54 items being tested, significance was tested against \( p < 0.001 \) (0.05/54 hypotheses) (Cabin & Mitchell, 2000). Thus, where inferential statistics were used (chi-square test), an alpha of 0.001 was used to determine significance (i.e., if \( p > 0.001 \), significant), having met the condition for using a chi-square, with 20% or less of the cells having expected counts less than 5. The strength of the relationships, i.e., effect size, was also examined using Cramer’s \( \phi \). Interpretation of the strength of a relationship (effect sizes) was based on Cohen’s (1988) guidelines with regard to the \( r \) family values, i.e., \( \phi \)/Cramer’s \( V \) in this study, which is rarely above .70. These guidelines are based on effect sizes usually found in studies in education and behavioural sciences (Morgan, Leech, Gloeckner, & Barrett, 2011).

Following descriptive statistics, multivariate analyses were undertaken to explore differences in the views of the two student groups. Firstly, a Reliability Analysis of each dimension was undertaken to determine if there was a consistent response pattern across items in each dimension, and appropriate summated scores calculated. Subsequent testing of differences between participant groups was then undertaken using t-tests in which effect sizes were calculated using Cohen’s (1988) guidelines for eta squared.

As the sample size of 253 cases is considered to be fair (Comrey & Lee, 1992, cited in Tabachnick, Fidell, & Osterlind, 2001), a further view of the differences between the two student groups was captured through a logistic regression, conducted between the binary variable of student group, i.e., VET (recoded as 0) and HE (recoded as 1), with the attitudinal
statements being independent variables. The results of this analysis provide an assessment of the key items differentiating the two groups. Seven models (i.e., equations) were created for each of the dimensions with the independent (i.e., predictor) variables in each model being the attitude statements within seven dimensions. The assumptions of logistic regression (Osborne & Waters, 2002; Tabachnick, Fidell, & Osterlind, 2001) were checked and met for the data in the study. The full models containing all predictors were statistically significant with the \( p < .001 \), indicating that the models were able to provide a predictive measure of group status – whether VET student or HE student. For consistent interpretation, when a significance odds ratio (OR) < 1, it was inverted, i.e., 1/OR.

From a multiple methods design, the information from the three perspectives aimed to contribute to the reliability and validity of the findings through a level of triangulation.

**3.5.2.3 Data presentation**

Excel was also used for graphical presentations. Where logistic regression statistics were used, an alpha of 0.05 was used to determine significance (i.e., if \( p > 0.05 \), significant). Data were presented in summary tables, with additional histograms used to summarise differences between variables. Tables will be presented in 10-point font, single spaced, in line with conventions in APA 6th edition. Results were presented to 2 decimal places throughout.

**3.6 Ethical considerations**

This research was approved by the Human Research Ethics Committees of Griffith University and was carried out in accordance with the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research [EDN/B5/14/HREC]. Permission for the survey scale used and adapted in this study was provided by the survey developer (see Appendix C).
Prior to conducting the interviews, emails of invitation with attached informed consent package and semi-structured interview protocols were sent to target participants to gain permission and agreement to participate in the study. The informed consent package was prepared in both English and Vietnamese. The English versions of the information sheets and Consent forms for the three groups of participants are included in Appendices F and G. Upon receiving consent from the participants, the researcher travelled to Vietnam to conduct the interviews over a three-month period. The informed consent form was signed by each participant prior to taking part in the audio-recorded interviews.

The survey designed using LimeSurvey was activated in Production Environment with the provided ethics approval number. In order to gain consent from participants, the informed consent information was also presented in the introduction page of the survey. This information assured participants that the survey responses were anonymous and confidential, and participants had freedom to decide whether to participate in the research. Participants were advised to print the informed consent page for their future reference.

3.7 Summary

This chapter has presented the study’s sequential exploratory mixed methods design, and justifications for its suitability for this study. As the design involved two phases, interviewing and an online survey, the research design including sampling, data collection, data analysis, and ethical considerations, were discussed under these phases. Phase 1 was conducted via in-depth interviews with hospitality industry professionals, hospitality academics, and hospitality students, providing evidence to address Research question 1, with regards to stakeholders’ perspectives of Vietnamese tertiary hospitality education. Phase 2, which was informed by findings from Phase 1, involved the administration of an online survey to post-internship students of HEIs and VET colleges for their perceptions of working
in the hospitality industry, providing evidence to address Research question 2. The data collected in Phase 1 was analysed using thematic analysis, and the data analysis in Phase 2 was conducted with descriptive and multivariate analyses using SPSS version 24.
Chapter 4 Results – Phase 1

4.1 Introduction

This study sought to explore the factors influencing effective tertiary hospitality education in Vietnam. To accomplish this purpose, the study examined various stakeholders’ perceptions and expectations to provide insights into current tertiary hospitality education, and hospitality workplaces where student performances are assessed.

As a sequential mixed methods design was applied in the study, this chapter presents the research findings from Phase 1 of data collection through in-depth interviews with hospitality stakeholders – industry professionals, hospitality academics and hospitality students. Results from analysis of interviews with the three groups of participants are provided in the following sections.

4.2 Views of hospitality industry professionals (IP)

RQ1. What are hospitality industry professionals’ perspectives of Vietnamese tertiary hospitality education?
   a. What are hospitality industry professionals’ views of tertiary hospitality education preparation?
   b. What are hospitality industry professionals’ views of the suitability for the hospitality industry?

Interviews were conducted with ten managers at different management levels at hotels, resorts and restaurants where the majority of students attended internships. Table 4.1 provides demographic information of the industry professional participants.

All of the managers were aware of the of hospitality programs at HEIs and VET colleges through direct interactions with student interns. Thus, they were well positioned to provide insights into Vietnamese tertiary hospitality education, through students’ performances at hospitality workplaces where they undertook their internships.
### Table 4.1

**Demographics of industry professionals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant ID</th>
<th>Industry sector</th>
<th>Managerial role</th>
<th>Enterprise features</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>No of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IP1</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>Front office Manager</td>
<td>4-star</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP2</td>
<td>Resort</td>
<td>Deputy General Manager</td>
<td>4-star</td>
<td>Island</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP3</td>
<td>Resort Hotel</td>
<td>Front office and Human Resources Manager</td>
<td>4-star</td>
<td>Island</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP4</td>
<td>Resort</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>SME*</td>
<td>Island</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP5</td>
<td>Resort</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>SME*</td>
<td>Island</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP6</td>
<td>Resort</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>4-star</td>
<td>Beach city</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP7</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>Sales and Marketing Manager</td>
<td>5-star</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP8</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>Human Resources Manager</td>
<td>4-star</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP9</td>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>Fine dining restaurant chain</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP10</td>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>Sales and Marketing Manager</td>
<td>Fine dining</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*SME and Medium Enterprise (SME)*

Before seeking participants’ insights into tertiary hospitality education and student performances, industry professionals were asked to discuss how the industry is changing and subsequently, how these changes impact on people working in the industry. Results indicated industry challenges found to exist included economic issues, a decline in customer demand for leisure products, greater competition, and problems with human resources in service industry. Participants commonly cited the pressures on managers as a result of employee commitment and turnover, especially with young people and new graduates. In addition to economic and personnel challenges, many of the participants at hotels felt that dealing with customers from different cultural backgrounds was an ongoing issue, requiring staff with well-developed communication skills. In terms of challenges when dealing with service employees, participants’ comments focused on how employees are changing. Many managers specifically commented on an entitlement attitude with many young employees, especially HE graduates. This was compounded by the desire to be quickly promoted to higher positions in the organisation without the willingness to put in more time and effort at the lower level.
For these reasons, many managers expressed concern regarding the ability to find employees with the necessary communication skills to engage and commit to customer service work. Both economic and personnel issues discussed by the participants provided some context for the issues associated with student interns and hospitality education that emerged in the analysis.

The participants were then asked to comment on the knowledge and skills of student interns or graduates at their organisations. Themes derived from the analysis of these interviews included their expectation of students prior to internships, their perceptions towards student interns, and their views of undergraduate hospitality programs, and are presented in Figure 4.1, and discussed below.
Figure 4.1. Industry professionals’ views - core categories and sub-categories

Impact on students prior to internships

- Knowledge
  - Details of service goods
  - Reservation and booking software
  - Western foods and beverages
- Skills
  - Customer service (including problem solving)
  - English communication
  - Organisational skill
- Attitudes/Personal Attributes
  - Active, Approachable, Committed, Compassionate, Passionate, Honest, Positive Attitude, Open to Learning, Culturally Sensitive, Good Manner
- Strengths
  - Hard working
  - Obedient
  - Enthusiastic
- Weaknesses
  - Unrealistic expectations
  - Lack of practical experience, job commitment, career plan
  - Limited flexibility, professional/business-like manner
- Hospitality HE programs
  - Insufficiency of practical hospitality work-related components
  - Imbalance between occupation-specific skills and management knowledge
4.2.1 Category 1 – Expectations of students prior to internships

These expectations were grouped into three components relating to intern quality: knowledge, skills, and attributes (KSAs). This category reflected industry expectations of students before they came to the organisations for internships. Since practical experiences during internships are essential for students, an understanding of the expectations of employers who can primarily influence the quality of such experiences is of vital importance. When industry expectations are met, the willingness of student admissions into the organisations for internships will be enhanced:

We are willing to receive students for internships but we expect them to be prepared with certain knowledge and skills to engage in the jobs of our hotel because we don’t have time to teach them to do things. (IP 8)

We do have student interns in our hotel but they don’t seem to know what to do. I was wondering what they have been studying at universities. (IP 2)

A competitive education system relies on the identification of the needs and expectations of those involved. The quality of an education system is therefore validated through graduates’ abilities to meet the requirements of the industry where they seek employment. Results indicated that the industry expectations were centred on KSAs in which ‘attributes’ was considered to be an essential component.

The findings indicate that among the three quality components considered necessary for a hospitality job, personal attributes were expressed by all industry professionals to be important, and a necessary pre-requisite for student interns. When asked to comment on the most important features needed from a student intern, all participants concurred that possession of certain attributes was critical for an individual to be successful in the hospitality industry:

Honesty is a must. (IP 4)
Enthusiasm is essential for working in our resort. (IP 3)
As long as they [student interns] have passion for working in hotels, other skills can be trained when they come in here. (IP 9)

These comments from the industry participants show that positive attitudes towards working in the hospitality industry were viewed as a stepping stone to successful internships.

In response to questions regarding the knowledge necessary for students to undertake an internship at hospitality organisations, three types of knowledge were cited as pre-requisites for students to start their internships including: understanding of services provided by the organisations, familiarity with reservation and booking software, and knowledge of western foods and beverages. A comprehensive understanding of these three dimensions of hospitality businesses was considered an effective starting point to enable positive experiences for both student interns and industry professionals:

It would be easier for us if they [the students] know what services we offer here, e.g., how a standard room is different from a deluxe, or what type of restaurant, I mean the theme whether European or Asian, is offered in our hotel. (IP 1)

We do need interns to be familiar with reservation systems at lodging enterprises. I think it’s easy these days for them to experience these systems before they start their internships at hotels or resorts. (IP 3)

For fine-dining restaurants or hotels/resorts whose food services have a strong focus on Western and European cuisines, basic knowledge of various ingredients, including the experience of tasting the foods, was cited as important:

We do mostly French cuisine here so several ingredients used may not be popular here [Vietnam]. I don’t think many students have experienced that. I don’t know if it is expensive for schools to run courses of French food tasting and cooking. (IP 9)

They [students] seemed to be simple minded in terms of food service at 4-5 star hotels/resorts whose majority of guests are foreigners, especially western and European guests. Knowledge of western foods is a must for doing catering jobs. (IP 2)

Additionally, participants indicated that the skills required for student interns in the hospitality industry were customer service-related skills, English language fluency and organisational skills. For example, customer service including problem solving and handling guests’ complaints was perceived as important for internship experience to be effective:
It is not about how you can greet guests but also how you interact with guests in a way they feel welcomed and comfortable during their stay at the resort. (IP 3)

Difficult guests are worst but there are several ways to handle them and we need those interns with such skill. (IP 5)

As interactions with foreign guests mainly occur at the Front Office (FO) or Food and Beverages (F&B) departments, the majority of interviewees concurred that English language fluency was essential for interns in these departments:

Communication, I mean not just understand but respond to guests’ requests or comments in an interactive manner. (IP 6)

They [interns] seem to be scared of foreigners. They need to talk. Some of them have good English but they don’t speak it out. (IP 10)

Another skill mentioned by many participants was organisational skills. These skills were perceived to be strategically important for student interns to manage their practical experiences at a hospitality enterprise:

Have you ever observed a taxi driver loading shopping bags and boxes in the trunk? They normally threw all the bags in before loading the big boxes. Similar things happen here with some of my interns. It’s hard to predict how they can actually manage their work in our restaurants, which requires multitasking. (IP 9)

We don’t have time to show them every single thing but we want them to experience as much as they want in 2-3 months of their internship so they have to be organised to manage their work to benefit themselves. (IP 8)

These participants’ responses indicated heightened concerns around student interns’ preparation for, and initiative during, internships with a particular concern about the potential impact on customers from such interactions.

4.2.2 Category 2 – Industry’s perceptions towards student interns

The second core category identified in the analysis was labelled Perceptions towards student interns. The related sub-categories focussed on students’ specific strengths and weaknesses as perceived by the industry professionals.
Many participants acknowledged student interns’ effort and initiative in completing work assignments. Students were generally perceived to have demonstrated a high level of engagement in the professional environment:

The thing that we most appreciate about them [student interns] is that they don’t mind any work given to them. They just went in and did their job. (IP 10)

They are really hard workers, especially those who really wanted an opportunity to be employed later upon graduation. (IP 6)

Participants noted that many interns demonstrated a sense of conformity during their internships, which was perceived as a strength. Some participants complimented these interns on their progress in their work assignments, and their disciplined manner:

They were very good at following orders. They were trying to stick to what their supervisors told them. Maybe they were afraid of making mistakes during their internships but that’s good for us, especially during high season. (IP 9)

It was nice in the way that they were doing things exactly the way you wanted them to. (IP 4)

Some of the participants commented on their interns’ enthusiasm with regard to working in hotels and resorts. Student interns were observed to demonstrate a high level of motivation during internships in hospitality organisations:

Most of them came in with an enthusiastic attitude for a job in the hotel industry. It seems to be a good quality of young people. (IP 1)

They all seemed to be excited to be here [at the resort] for their internships. I think they expected this to be the best part of their learning. (IP 2)

Although the characteristics of being hard working, conforming, and enthusiastic, were reported, student interns were also perceived to have limited abilities to engage professionally in the hospitality environment. The most undesirable characteristic of interns reported by industry professionals was that student interns generally had unrealistic expectations of the level of work they would be doing during their internships. They expected to be given tasks at a managerial level, and some participants indicated that student interns showed reluctance in taking basic operational level skilled jobs. These attitudes were
perceived to negatively impact on student internship experiences, and the willingness of hospitality enterprises in receiving interns:

It was disappointing for me when they [students] came in [the hotel] with an expectation that they would be supervising or managing others. When I first came in the field, it was never the thing I ever thought of. (IP 7)

They all thought that they would be managers or supervisors after they graduate. They were taught that way at universities I guess. They should be more realistic about real world scenarios. (IP 8)

In addition to unrealistic expectations, other perceived weaknesses included a lack of practical work experience, job commitment and career planning, highlighting that student interns were not highly regarded by the industry:

Some of them were never in a working environment before so they were lack of practical insights into the workplace. (IP 2)

They didn’t seem to take their internships seriously. They just needed a statement of internship signed. These students saw no future in the hospitality industry. (IP 8)

Whereas obedience was seen as a strength by some participants, it was interpreted as a weakness by others. Student interns were expected to be more reflective and proactive with their work performances:

It was good to follow what was told but sometimes to get things done; they should be more flexible rather than relying too much on their supervisors’ instructions. (IP 2)

We’re all very busy here but they were just waiting for people to show them to their jobs instead of working it out what they can help. (IP 8)

Lack of professionalism was viewed as a shortcoming which needed to be improved to appropriately work in the hospitality industry. One participant recalled a situation which was not effectively dealt with by a student intern:

I don’t know why this is a case but... e.g., there was a situation where one of our customers accidentally spilled hot soup on her white dress. Instead of an immediate response in a helpful way, they came to access the situation, went back into the kitchen to discuss with others before coming up with some solution. And that’s not professional at all. (IP 9)

While another participant pointed out the importance of professionalism in interacting with guests in the hospitality industry, noting:
Some of them were very shy and always avoided eye contact with guests. Sometimes they didn’t speak loud enough in responding guests’ greetings, which might be misinterpreted to be rude. (IP 3)

Findings in this category indicated that the industry professionals recognised and appreciated student interns’ qualities contributing to successful internships. On the other hand, concern was also expressed with regard to their limited abilities to engage professionally in the hospitality industry due to their unrealistic expectations and lack of professionalism.

4.2.3 Category 3 – Industry’s views of hospitality HE programs

Complementary to industry expectations and perceptions of student interns is the third category identified in the analysis, ‘industry’s views of undergraduate hospitality programs’. The sub-categories in this category included lack of career orientations for hospitality students, insufficient practical components available, and the perceived imbalance between professional skills and management knowledge.

It was a shared view among the industry professionals that the lack of understanding of career orientations in hospitality HE programs resulted in student interns’ unrealistic expectations of working in the industry. Awareness of career scenarios in the hospitality industry was considered to be essential, and the nature of hospitality jobs was recommended to be communicated to students from the early stages of their studies. This was needed to facilitate the interaction between student interns and the hospitality enterprises, in addition to enhancing interns’ experiences during their internships:

I think the teachers didn’t tell them [students] hospitality work would be mostly at low skill level. They didn’t accept the fact that they had to start from that level to move up the scale. (IP 1)

They were taught management at universities and during those years they were fancy of such a dream job so they were shocked and some even devastated when coming for internships. (IP 8)

Subsequently due to the lack of career orientations, hospitality HE programs were perceived by the industry professionals to include limited workplace environment and
practices. The traditional theory-oriented HE programs were considered not well suited to the requirements of the hospitality industry. Work-related practices were expected to be major components in a hospitality HE program:

From interviewing student interns, I realised that they were provided with pretty good basic knowledge of the industry but limited work-related practices. (IP 4)

I think universities should provide their students with training in work-related skills, e.g., familiarity with hospitality reservation system, which are basic and essential. (IP 6)

Hospitality HE programs were compared with those at vocational colleges. In terms of practical components included in relevant programs, those at vocational colleges were favoured by industry professionals, who recommended hospitality HE programs should be referenced to college counterparts for improvement:

I was working with a college before. They are running a training model which is in close interaction with the industry to include up-to-date practices. If university [HE] programs could take such approach, it would be very useful and effective. (IP 6)

I’m not aware of the teaching content of university [HE] hospitality programs but I know that of a few vocational colleges. They’re doing a very good job and have produced ready graduates for the industry. (IP 2)

One of the downsides of hospitality HE programs perceived by the industry professionals was a heavy emphasis on management knowledge, with less emphasis on occupation-specific skills. Practice-oriented approaches to these hospitality work-related skills, particularly at Front Office, and Food and Beverages, were expected to be the primary focus in hospitality programs, with a focus on Management overstated across hospitality HE programs:

I’ve been working with many tourism educational institutions and I realised that tourism education in our country is majorly themed under management – tourism and hospitality management. (IP 7)

This imbalance between theory and practice was perceived by industry professionals as a major weakness in hospitality HE programs. This finding facilitates understanding of industry perceptions with regard to student interns’ unrealistic expectations of work assignments during their internships.
4.2.4 Summary

From an industry perspective, personal attributes such as positive attitudes towards hospitality work were perceived to be essential to commencing a hospitality job. Knowledge of hospitality services, reservation systems, and Western cuisines were expected to be taught at HEIs. Although it was indicated that the training of occupation-specific skills could be provided during internships, the industry professionals expressed preferences for student interns with readiness of these skills. Industry professionals stated their preference for VET student interns, due to their more developed work-related skills. This evidence, from the views of industry professionals, of a potential misalign between the HE content and the needs of the industry, provides valuable insights for this study.

4.3 Views of hospitality academics (A)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RQ1</th>
<th>What are hospitality academics’ perspectives of Vietnamese tertiary hospitality education?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>What are hospitality academics’ views of tertiary hospitality education preparation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>What are hospitality academics’ views of the suitability for the hospitality industry?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interviews were conducted with seven academics at faculties of hospitality/tourism at various HEIs in HCMC. All academics were professionally and actively engaged in the review and development of hospitality programs at their institutions, and indicated they held informed understandings of practices in the hospitality industry through their teaching experience and professional engagement in the industry. Background demographics of the hospitality academic participants are provided in Table 4.2.
Table 4.2

Demographics of hospitality academics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant ID</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Faculty/Department</th>
<th>Role in program development</th>
<th>Years of experience</th>
<th>No of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Hospitality</td>
<td>Leading role</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>Tourism and Hospitality</td>
<td>Implementing role</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*A3</td>
<td>Head and Lecturer</td>
<td>Marketing and Hospitality</td>
<td>Implementing role</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>Coordinator and Lecturer</td>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>Consulting and Implementing</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>Implementing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Tourism and Hospitality</td>
<td>Leading role</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*A7</td>
<td>Head and Lecturer</td>
<td>Tourism and Hospitality</td>
<td>Leading and Implementing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Hospitality academics who were involved in both VET and HE hospitality programs.*

Hospitality academics were firstly asked to share their knowledge and understanding of current issues in the Vietnamese hospitality industry. They were also asked to provide their opinion on how these issues challenge people working in the industry in terms of the knowledge and skills needed for success in the industry. From an academic perspective, the industry challenges were centred on problems with human resources, particularly with highly skilled labour. The hospitality academics stated that the challenge became obvious with the establishment of the ASEAN Economic Community in 2015, which allows mutual arrangements of labour transfer among ASEAN countries. The hospitality labour market was perceived to become more competitive, with staff turnover a major issue. This concern was also raised by the industry professionals in this study. These comments from the hospitality academics provide some context for the issues associated with current hospitality HE programs and program development that emerged in the following analysis.

The semi-structured interview protocol specifically asked hospitality academics to comment on the hospitality programs and current practices at their faculties, with respect to
industry requirements. The interviews also sought their views on issues associated with program development and improvements. Data analysis resulted in the identification of eight sub-categories under two core categories (refer to Figure 4.2).
Figure 4.2. Hospitality academics' views - core categories and sub-categories

Chapter 4 Results – Phase 1
4.3.1 Category 1 – HE hospitality programs

The hospitality academics concurred that current HE hospitality programs experienced a gap between theory and practice, which was considered to be a weakness with respect to internship components. Hospitality HE was perceived to have failed to prepare students to be ‘work-ready’:

Our [higher] education is aimed to have all-in-one, a bit of everything, which has resulted in graduates weak in both theory and practice. They couldn’t either write a basic marketing plan or design a leaflet. (A1)

HE hospitality programs were acknowledged to be heavily skewed towards the development of theoretical components, including managerial knowledge, which hospitality academics stated has failed to equip students with the practical skills required by the hospitality industry. This was considered to be a major issue with hospitality HE in Vietnam:

The labour market is generally in need of entry level of specialised skills, not general management knowledge. For example, there are only 4-5 marketing subjects in a Vietnamese marketing-related discipline compared to 16 subjects in a similar discipline in the US. (A3)

Too much time has unnecessarily spent on management theories and non-disciplinary subjects mandated by the national framework. (A5)

Hospitality academics noted that efforts had been made to narrow the gap, but had not been undertaken in a systematic manner. Such efforts were predominantly made at an individual institutional level, thus there was a lack of mechanism by which to reflect industry needs in the development of educational programs:

We have invited industry professionals to join our teaching team at our faculty. However, sometimes they could only come to do one-day workshop for students. But we do have our academics to teach preparation courses for internships, i.e., front office, housekeeping, and food & beverage. (A4)

We have consulted with industry professionals to be updated with current demand in the industry then discussed the strategies to modify the enacted program accordingly. (A7)

Apart from occupation-specific skill sets needed for hospitality jobs, limitations in generic, ‘soft’ skill development were also acknowledged by hospitality academics as an issue that has broadened the gap between theory and practice in hospitality HE:
We do provide students with professional skills like customer service, checking in and out guests at the hotel and so on. But students are usually weak in other skills like communication or people skill but we don’t have formal courses for these skills in our program. (A4)

Sometimes we include topics on soft skills in students’ weekend clubs, e.g., English Club and Professional Skills Club. (A5)

Many hospitality academics asserted that inclusive components of internships have become a growing focus in most hospitality HE programs. These components were believed to achieve balance between theory and practice in hospitality HE programs:

It’s part of our programs that students are going on field trips at the end of their first year then start their first formal industry internship. (A4)

We have consulted with industry professionals to be updated with current demand in the industry then discussed the strategies to modify the enacted program accordingly. (A7)

Although internship components included in HE hospitality programs were an attempt to balance classroom and practice-based training, the time allocation to internship preparation courses was limited. These courses were reported to provide training in basic skills for hospitality jobs such as check-in and check-out procedures (Front Office) in a hotel/resort, table setups at restaurants (Food & Beverages), or hotel bed making procedure (Housekeeping). However, a concern was raised by hospitality academics regarding the insufficiency of time for practicing these skills:

We have simulation rooms for three departments in a hotel/resort, i.e., FO, F&B, and HK. We provide basic and advanced courses on professional skills needed in these departments. (A6)

We have 60 hours allocated for each professional course but we have like 250 students so students have limited opportunities to practice their skills in these courses. (A5)

Apart from the perceived lack of time for training in preparation courses for internships, it was also reported that HEIs had little, and in some cases, no control over their students’ industry internships. In most cases, the institutions could only record the departments of the hospitality enterprises in which their students were attending internships. Hence, there were few mechanisms to adjust the degree to which prior knowledge and skills gained at HE could facilitate students’ internships in hospitality environments:
It depends on which hotel department students can apply for to do their internships. They are mostly accepted at F&B, very few at FO. (A5)

We provide them [students] with guidelines for which they can apply for internships. They are then required to submit their internship reports and their supervisors’ evaluation reports at the end. (A4)

Hospitality academics indicated that student-institution interaction was limited. In fact, it was not until after the internship period that assigned tasks completed by student interns were recorded on their supervisors’ reports, and then made known to the institutions. In this regard, one hospitality academic who was involved in both HE and VET hospitality programs indicated a different mechanism at VET colleges regarding industry-education linkages:

We have connections with a few 4-5 star hotels so I believe our students are doing their internships in good environment. […] I am also a sessional lecturer at a HEI […] not sure about the [internship] management there. (A7)

This finding in terms of industry-education linkage differences between HEIs and VET colleges provides further insights into industry preferences for VET student interns reported in this study.

Other issues reported by hospitality academics included the rapid development of hospitality-related majors and sub-majors in both mainstream and non-mainstream HEIs. Thus, there was an oversupply of hospitality programs at HEIs:

Almost every HEI wants to have hospitality major set up at their institutions even those who didn’t have any experiences re business/hospitality education. (A4)

Hospitality academics indicated that educational quality in hospitality HE programs was a major concern due to increasing competition among institutions, and pressure for student enrolments. The subsequent compromise of several aspects, including program structure, facilities for internship preparation courses, and qualified teaching staff, was reported:
They are trying to develop industry-oriented programs by incorporating internship components originally developed in diplomas, which may impact on the sustainable development of [higher] hospitality education. (A1)

It’s easy to develop or design a hospitality program but it’s hard to find qualified teaching team to deliver it. (A7)

Another feature commonly perceived as a disadvantage with most hospitality HE programs was the lack of career orientations for students. Hospitality academics stated that as the majority of the hospitality degrees are management degrees, students had the expectation that they would secure jobs at managerial level upon graduation. The message of career opportunities and career prospects was reported to be vaguely delivered to students:

There have been several cases where newly hospitality graduates were employed as managers but they are rare, not reflecting the common trend. We’ve found it hard to deliver the message to the students that they somehow have to start at the low skill level then move up the ladder. (A5)

These responses indicated a shared view between hospitality academics and industry professionals regarding concerns about career orientations for students.

4.3.2 Category 2 – Program development/improvements

The second core category was labelled Program development/improvements, and the related sub-categories which reflected issues or difficulties associated with program development. These issues include the constraint to align with national frameworks, subjective initiative of program leadership roles, limited facilities for professional skill development courses, the need for a qualified program development board, and industry’s perceptions of HE.

It was indicated by many hospitality academics that the MOET framework placed a constraint on hospitality HE program modifications. It should be noted that the mandated program content does not include core subjects associated with the hospitality discipline. This mandatory national framework on HE programs was perceived to be a competitive disadvantage in hospitality education:
There is very limited time allocated to core subjects in hospitality in the first two years of a university [HE] program. (A5)

The current hospitality programs are not effective because we have to align with the national framework on programs at HEIs. (A6)

However, in order to enhance the competitiveness of their hospitality programs, some hospitality academics revealed that some HEIs compromised program content, including modifying the content of some courses in the programs to make them more relevant and specific to hospitality-related majors. Although this was on an individual institution basis, the initiative to compromise the content of hospitality HE programs was argued to bring about positive change to hospitality HE, to make programs more practical and motivating for students:

Students were confused and always complained about the courses that are neither relevant to their major nor beneficial to their future hospitality jobs. So we thought we must do something about it. (A5)  
They [students] skipped classes if the course didn’t interest them. We do think this practice benefits both students and institutions because we’re making our programs more industry-oriented. As a result, our students are favoured by the industry. (A6)

Passive leadership was perceived to be another limitation in HE hospitality programs. Hospitality academics stated that it was the responsibility of the head of the department or the dean of the faculty to initiate and lead program change:

Any change in the programs or even just change in the content of certain course needs support and approval from the Dean before forwarding to the department of training of the university [HEIs]. Normally it is the Dean who initiates that change. (A5)  
We consult and update with the industry re current demand and requirements once a year. We then organise meetings with our teaching team every semester to reflect on their teaching practices re the core courses for hospitality and discuss the possibility to reflect industry needs in these courses. (A7)

Leadership roles were reflected by most hospitality academics to be critically important in driving program change, developing institutional practices associated with program improvements, and motivating academics to enact positive changes.

A concern, specifically relating to courses to develop professional skills for hospitality, was raised regarding supporting facilities for these courses. Hospitality academics
reported that limited funding was available for the set-up of 4/5-star hotel simulation environments, including Front Office, Food & Beverages, and guest rooms. At some faculties there was a need to compromise on basic facilities which led to the perception of a lack of authenticity in student preparation for industry internships in high-end market hotel environments:

We have concrete structures of basically three hotel departments but the appliances for these departments are too expensive. I mean those at 4-5 star standards. We don’t have budget. (A4)

Students are not really engaged with these courses if the demo classes don’t resemble the actual workplace environment. (A6)

Apart from concrete facilities, the lack of hotel reservation system and hotel management software in these demonstration classes also limited the practicality and effectiveness of these skill preparation courses:

Students are shown demo of the software in class but have no access for hands-on experiences. (A7)

Teaching qualifications in hospitality were reported to be a major issue by hospitality academics:

Some senior academics in the faculty were not formally trained in tourism and hospitality. Some came from social science background then upgraded their teaching eligibility with some business degree. (A5)

In most institutions, industry professionals were invited to join academic teaching teams. This practice was designed to enhance the programs with real-world industry experiences. However, most of these professionals were not academically qualified, which hospitality academics reported to be ineffective in linking academic and work-related knowledge and skills:

These professionals hold mid to senior management positions in the industry but they’ve moved up the scale with effort and experiences. Very few of them hold bachelor degrees either in hospitality or other discipline. (A4)

The most notable reflection was related to the quality of program development boards. Hospitality academics expected that a qualified program development board would
ideally include both academically qualified and professionally qualified members. It was indicated that academically qualified member needed to be research active while professionally qualified members were required to be actively involved in the industry, including having higher degrees and holding senior management positions in hospitality enterprises. Hospitality academics reported issues with these expectations:

We do have qualified academics but they’re not active, neither in research nor in the industry. (A3)
Most of the academics didn’t have a degree or working experiences in hospitality. (A5)

Hospitality academics perceived systematic errors in Vietnam’s educational management, especially in business-related degrees, in that PhD holders were promoted to dean positions and were heavily involved in program development, with management roles and program developers meant to be mutually exclusive:

We do have qualified academics but they’re not active, neither in research nor in the industry. (A3)
I think Dean should focus on management and empower teaching academics on program development. (A4)

Interestingly, the most challenging issue for developing an industry-oriented program was reported to be the misalignment in views between the industry and hospitality academics in terms of expectations of HE. In this study, the hospitality academics viewed HE graduates to be overqualified for industry’s needs, including the perception that most hospitality jobs required basic operational level skills, thus VET students were perceived to be more competitive in terms of required work-related skills:

Newly HE graduates are usually employed doing manual jobs. Unfortunately, VET students are much better because they were intensively trained with hands-on skills in vocational colleges. (A3)
We got complaints from the industry that HE students were not ready for work but the truth is they were not assigned the right jobs. (A1)
Unlike VET students, HE students are not equipped with work-related skills at lower levels so they are not work ready during internships. (A7)

These comments highlight that in undertaking internships HE students were less prepared with specific skills for internships tasks than VET students.
4.3.3 Summary

Hospitality academics indicated that hospitality HE currently experience a theory-practice imbalance. HEIs have attempted to close the gap through inclusive internship components but they have had insufficient time allocated to internship preparation courses, and limited control over the training delivered to students during their industry internships. Other issues hospitality academics highlighted that had negatively affected the competitive advantage of hospitality HE included the oversupply of hospitality-related programs. As a result of competing for student enrolments, educational quality had reportedly been compromised, and career orientations not clarified.

Constraints to program development/improvements were noted from national, institutional and industry levels. National frameworks did not allow more than 30% of the content to be flexibly altered or used for the development of core courses for hospitality-related majors. At an institutional level, the program development process was restricted by leadership roles predominantly taken by heads or deans of the hospitality/tourism departments or faculties. Attempts to improve professional skill preparation courses were limited due to insufficient funding for investing in facilities for these courses. The overarching institutional issue was perceived to be a lack of a qualified program development board, including a combination of research active and industry active teaching representatives.

4.4 Views of hospitality students (S)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RQ1</th>
<th>What are hospitality students’ perspectives of Vietnamese tertiary hospitality education?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>What are hospitality students’ views of tertiary hospitality education preparation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>What are hospitality students’ views of the suitability for the hospitality industry?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ2a</td>
<td>What are higher education students’ views of professional development in the hospitality industry?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interviews were conducted with nine hospitality students from various HEIs in HCMC, with their demographic information summarised in Table 4.3. These students, who were undertaking degrees in hospitality-related programs, had recently completed their first and/or final industry internship(s) at the time of the interviews. All students had experienced their internships in two different departments of hospitality enterprises. They were therefore considered to be able to provide informed insights into diverse work-related matters across various hospitality enterprise departments. Due to high levels of engagement, the students spoke at length about their experiences.

Table 4.3
Demographics of hospitality student participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant ID</th>
<th>Industry sector for internships</th>
<th>Sector features</th>
<th>Industry department/s for internships</th>
<th>Months of experience</th>
<th>No of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>5-star Food and Beverage</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Business centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>Fine dining Japanese cuisine Customer service/ Food catering</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>4-star Food and Beverage</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>Vietnamese cuisine Customer service/ Food catering</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>5-star Food and Beverage</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>Restaurant chain</td>
<td>Fine dining and drink club Customer service/ Food catering</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>5-star Front office</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S7</td>
<td>Restaurant chain</td>
<td>4-star Housekeeping</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S8</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>5-star Food and Beverage</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S9</td>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>Fine dining Chinese cuisine Customer service/ Hostess</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The students were asked to share their internship expectations and experiences, hospitality career path intentions, and the impacts of industry internships on their career
decisions. Data analysis resulted in the identification of two core categories and six sub-categories or related issues (see Figure 4.3).
Figure 4.3. Hospitality students' views - core categories and sub-categories
4.4.1 Category 1 – HE hospitality programs

There was strong agreement by students that there was a mismatch between classroom learning and workplace requirements in terms of the knowledge and skills needed for industry internships and future hospitality jobs. Students expressed their concern over the usefulness of knowledge taught in HEIs to their future workplaces. In particular, they commented on several features of the internship preparation courses and industry internships they were undertaking:

We don’t know why we have to study those courses. There are obviously no opportunities for us to make use of such knowledge unless one day we get to management level. We may not remember anything by then. (S8)

I got my internship at Business Centre of Sheraton, sort of paperwork and I could manage that but it would be more useful if I got some teaching in this area at uni. (S1)

Students specified that these programs provided high levels of preparation in areas of knowledge, such as management skills, that were of limited use at the workplace, but under-prepared them in areas such as administration, customer service and undertaking bookings that were required by industry:

Except for customer service skills taught during internship courses like FO or F&B, I can see nothing else I could use at work. (S5)

We didn’t have the opportunity to learn anything about booking applications. They are used in any hotels, restaurants, even cafes. (S6)

We didn’t get to study about ingredients or wines in fine-dining establishments. We need this kind of knowledge to communicate with guests when they’re placing an order. (S7)

The concern was also raised with regard to the limited practicality of much of the academic knowledge delivered in HE hospitality programs. HE hospitality programs were reported to focus on the development of managerial knowledge, have a more theoretical focus that was viewed as less adaptable to the workplace:

HR people at the hotel where I was doing my internships were talking about developing job descriptions and preparing pay slips, etc. They were all strange to me. I only recalled of different management theories when I was doing HRM subject at uni. (S1)
I don’t know when I can use management knowledge I learned at uni. It’s sort of disappointing to do all manual jobs during internships. (S7)

With regard to skill development, students expressed concern about the facilities and equipment available for authentic simulation of workplace environments, including typical departments in a hospitality enterprise, for example Front Office/reception, Food & Beverages/restaurant, or a standard hotel guest room. The degree to which these simulation facilities represented and reflected real-life workplaces was reported to be low, which did not make these practice-based or professional skills courses effective in preparing students to transfer into working environments during industry internships:

We were not introduced to reservation applications which are required in any hospitality enterprises I’ve been working with. (S6)
The cutlery sets in our simulation F&B room are not typically used in 4-5 star hotels. They have more varieties there. (S4)
I don’t know how to say but our simulated guest room and a real hotel guest room, even at 3 start hotel, are completely two different scenarios [laugh]. (S7)

In addition to limited facilities, the opportunity given to practice professional skills was reported to be insufficient in terms of length and frequency. The reported short exposure to skills practice was considered to significantly affect their readiness to complete even basic operational level skill jobs required during internships, such as dinner table set-up or making beds for guest rooms. Industry expected students to have fully developed these skills prior to their internships:

Most of time was to observe the instructor’s demonstration of the tasks then practice in groups within the allocated time. We didn’t have enough time to practice individually. (S3)
We only had two semesters of the skill preparation courses. Time given to practice was so limited that we had to practice those tasks in a racing manner. (S5)

Students indicated that the gap between classroom instructions and workplace scenarios was a result of the limited practical knowledge of academics. Some students commented on this aspect when mentioning their preferred lecturers/instructors of specific subjects they undertook at HEIs:
Last semester we studied with Mr X. He’s nice but he didn’t seem to know much about hospitality. I guess he’s good in English so he was chosen to lecture the course [hotel operation management]. (S1)

We all like Ms Y. She worked for Z hotel before so she gave us good advice and some tips for working in a hotel. Wish we could have more instructors like her. (S2)

Another aspect underlying the theory-practice gap was the lack of information about career orientations in HE hospitality programs. Students revealed that they were not made aware of actual work situations in industry internships. They were led to believe that internship components featured in hospitality programs would effectively prepare them to transfer seamlessly from an academic environment to an industry environment. Students were not provided with straightforward information about the work they would be doing during their industry internships, often resulting in unrealistic expectations. Such ambiguity resulted in students’ disappointment with both educational institutions and industry:

I should have been aware of what I was going to do during internships so no expectations no disappointment. (S9)

That’s okay to do this manual work because I think I have learned a lot but it would be more helpful to know about it in advance so I could be better prepared myself. (S2)

When asked to comment on the internship components in the HE hospitality programs they were undertaking, the students firstly reported issues relating to the learning objectives of the internship components. They expressed confusion over the purpose of internships due to the misalignment between classroom teaching and workplace requirements during internships. They reported negative experiences at hospitality enterprises, and did not interpret the learning objectives of these internships positively:

I don’t know if I had learned anything but I was so stressed at work. They overworked us with no pay or incentives. (S5)

I did learn a lot but in a hard way. I would prefer a paid job then file an internship report at the end. I was stuck with the fact that if I quit I wouldn’t get the report of my internship completion and that would be a disaster. (S1)

The overall structure of internship components was perceived to be poorly managed by students. For example, the length of industry internships varied across different HEIs, ranging from two to six months. The students stated that the field trips in the first year of
their study were not helpful since they were not yet prepared with either theoretical or practical knowledge of the hospitality enterprise:

We were given the opportunity to visit hotels and resorts in Year 1 but not until Year 3 we started studying our first professional skills preparation courses to prepare for an internship at the end of Year 3. By that time, we couldn’t recall any experience during field trips. (S8)

We went on the field trips in a touring mood. No learning actually happened at that time. I feel it was really a waste. (S9)

I don’t think we need to start our field trips to hotels and resorts that early. (S4)

In line with perspectives from the industry professionals, students also expressed their concern over the timing of internships. They were required to complete their internships during summer semesters between June and September, the peak season for tourism. However, limited guidance or mentorship could be provided to student interns at hospitality enterprises during this high season due to the lack of availability of staff:

They were so busy to show me anything so I tried to ask the senior interns there or worked things out myself. (S3)

They asked me to do a lot of things without instructions or explanation. But I was required to complete those tasks in a short time otherwise I would be scolded for being slow and inefficient. (S1)

The timing of internships in peak seasons was perceived to be a pressure for both student interns and industry. This has important implications for institutions in terms of program structure.

Apart from the lack of awareness of the seasonal nature of the hospitality industry, HEIs were perceived to lack control over the internship content and support for students during their internships. There was a disconnect between the industry and the HEIs with respect to what students were supposed to learn during internships:

I wasn’t informed of the tasks I would be doing at all. I wasn’t provided with any skill training but was laboured like osin [a maid]. (S3)

We had to apply for an internship ourselves… They just randomly assigned different tasks to me, and not until at the end of my internship, they gave me a list and ticked the boxes of skills trained. (S4)
HEIs were also reported to not provide support or intervention when students experienced problems during their internships:

The faculties wouldn’t do and actually couldn’t do anything about it. It’s our problems. We had to sort them out ourselves. (S9)

We see no point to report the problems we encountered at work, even in the final internship report. (S8)

The inability to respond to student issues during internships suggests that HEIs did not successfully contribute to the assessment process during these internship components.

4.4.2 Category 2 – Internship/work experiences

The second core category focused on students’ experiences during internships. Many students reported that they began their internship experiences with the concern that they were not given the opportunity to propose or negotiate their preferred learning experiences during their internships. Catering or housekeeping jobs were reported to be default positions for student interns. On one hand, it was preferred or even required by some educational institutions to secure an internship at high standard hospitality enterprises, including 4-5 star hotels or resorts and/or multinational hotel enterprises. Student interns accepted at these enterprises therefore felt obliged to accept any tasks assigned to them. Further, as discussed in the previous section, time pressures for both students and industry in undertaking internships during the peak season, reportedly resulted in negative experiences for student interns:

Front desk positions are not normally available for trainees. If we’re lucky, we may be allowed to work there doing some simple task like data entry. (S1)

My friends thought I was lucky to work as a hostess in a fine dining restaurant but basically only four pre-formulated statements are repeatedly required in my role. And only when it was busy; other time I had to do washing and cleaning. (S9)

A central contributor to negative experiences reported by students related to their frustration regarding feeling overworked, with eight of the nine students expressing their...
resentment that they were required to fulfil a full-time workload with no pay or incentives, and gained little in terms of skills development:

I had to work 9-10 hours a day and 6 days per week. (S1)
They thought I know everything because I’m a uni student so I was given all the tasks of a full-time staff without instructions. (S8)

Four and five-star hotel chains, including multinational hotel enterprises, were perceived by students to incorporate unfavourable policies for interns, with many students reporting monetary issues associated with their internships:

I got fine for being 5-min late at work the other day. (S7)
I also had to pay for my health check as part of the procedure to be accepted in the internship of hotel X. (S1)
It was expensive to pay for motorbike parking in downtown where the hotel is located. I didn’t have that incentive support from the hotel. (S4)

A perceived lack of support in the working environment was a major issue in the hospitality workplaces shared by all students. There were internal conflicts among full-time staff, and between staff and managers. Student interns were sometimes viewed as ‘threats’ at the workplaces, and they were pressured to fulfil the duties of their supervisors or senior colleagues. Some of the students revealed high levels of personal stress during their internships because of being “bullied” or “excluded”:

I had to do all the work of my supervisor and she got credit for that. (S1)
It was the policy not to bring food into the office but the other day I was in the elevator with my supervisor and she passed me her food. Unfortunately, the manager stepped in. Although I was trying to hide it under the folder file, I got caught and I couldn’t defend myself. It was terrible. (S1)
It was a nightmare for me to work in that restaurant. Even now I sometimes woke up in the middle of the night because I had a dream of those days. (S5)

The working environment was also reported to be poor in terms of teamwork and interaction among staff. The co-workers were perceived to display inconsistency between their words and their actions. “By face, not by heart” was the mutual expression used by many of the students to describe the limited congeniality at hospitality workplaces.
Little guidance to students was available during internships. Students were supposed to be mentored by supervisors; however this was rarely the case. As such, students did not perceive their work supervision positively, and expressed a lack of interest in, or expectation of, work supervision:

I was asked to operate the coffee machine which I’ve never experienced before. I couldn’t ask them because I would get scolded. (S3)
You would work out what to go when you were there. They didn’t tell you what to do but you got scolded if you did it wrong. (S7)
Sometimes they left you do all the work yourselves. The other day, all the staff including the manager went out for an afternoon tea, leaving me alone at the restaurant. (S8)

In addition, students highlighted there were no consistent procedures in place for receiving student interns in many hospitality enterprises. Experiences during internships, as a result, were often reported to be negative:

I had my internship at hotel X. I was given a list of all skills (including cleaning and washing) I would be trained on the first day of internship. (S1)
I had my internship at hotel X… They just randomly assigned different tasks to me, and not until at the end of my internship, they gave me a list and ticked the boxes of skills trained. (S4)

These findings indicate heightened concerns about the impact of the negative internship experiences on student motivation and commitment to their continued learning at HEIs, and their future careers in the hospitality industry.

4.4.3 Summary

Interviews with hospitality students indicated that hospitality programs at HEIs exhibited some theory-practice gaps, as well as limited control over internship components. The gap was reported to exist in terms of knowledge taught at HEIs, and knowledge required by industry, resulting in fragmented skills development due to limited facilities and time allocated for skill practice. Other factors which were argued to widen this gap included the limited practical knowledge and experience of teaching staff, and the lack of career
orientations for students. Internship components were perceived to be ineffective due to the poorly arranged structure of field trips and internships, and the lack of input into the content of workplace learning, as well as support for students during their internships.

Students also expressed there were limited choices of hospitality work available to them during their internships, with catering jobs the dominant option. Additional issues of concern included excessive assigned work, an unsupportive working environment, and limited availability for guidance and mentorship. These factors highlighted the negative aspects of working in the industry as a student intern.

4.5 Chapter summary

This chapter presented the results obtained from interviews with hospitality industry professionals, HE students, and hospitality academics. The findings from the interviews highlight the views of three primary groups of stakeholders involved in the development of hospitality programs. Interestingly, there were some commonalities across the views, for example, seeing both hospitality academics and industry professionals expressing concern at the practical skills preparation of HE students prior to their internships.

From an industry perspective, a successful candidate for hospitality jobs was viewed to possess certain personal attributes well suited to work in the industry, which were considered to be more important than knowledge and skills. Personal attributes were essential to enhance the employability of hospitality graduates, whereas other knowledge and skills were believed to be sufficiently catered for during on-the-job training. Industry professionals were concerned about student interns’ limited abilities to effectively join the workforce in the hospitality industry, even though they expected interns to be immediately ‘work ready’. HEIs were perceived to be accountable for these weaknesses with the view that hospitality HE programs had failed to prepare students with appropriate work-related components, and up-
to-date practices required by industry. Thus, realistic career orientations for students were not effectively achieved.

The hospitality academics expressed concern regarding various constraints on HEIs and limited control over program content due to the national frameworks across disciplines in HE. While internships attempted to provide a balance between theory and practice in several HE hospitality programs, they resulted in a compromise between content and the underlying principles of HE. Some concern was also expressed regarding constraints in the HEI program development process including consistent qualifications and experience at individual institutions. The hospitality academics expressed some criticisms of the view of industry professionals regarding interns, and a preference towards the more practice-based, vocational education students.

The views from hospitality HE student completed this picture, revealing many negative aspects from their experience of working in the hospitality industry as an intern. Consistent areas of concern included limited guidance and/or supervision provided during the internships and extensive work hours, with no pay or incentives to support students during this period. Following the internship there was limited capacity for students to reflect on their internship experiences within the HEIs, and thus learn from this practical component of their education program. The students revealed their disappointments with the current HE hospitality programs and the industry internships. They expected more work-related content in HE hospitality programs and a greater exposure to a variety of professional learning opportunities at hospitality workplaces.

An emerging perspective from this first phase of the research focusing on the HEI hospitality internship process, was a continued comparison between HE and VET hospitality students in terms of their performances during work internships. In order to further
understand the student internship experience of hospitality HE students, the second research phase enabled an in-depth exploration of student perceptions, extended to include both HE and VET hospitality students. This exploration of the perceptions of a larger sample of students, enrolled at HEIs and VET, was conducted through an online survey. The findings from the survey are presented in Chapter 5.
Chapter 5 Results – Phase 2

5.1 Introduction

This chapter reports on Phase 2 of the study, focused on the survey findings exploring tertiary education students’ views on working in the hospitality industry, addressing research question 2.

**RQ2.** What are tertiary education students’ views of Vietnamese hospitality workplaces?

a. What are higher education students’ perspectives?
b. What are vocational college students’ perspectives?

The design of the survey was informed by the findings from the first qualitative phase. Additionally, given the strong focus raised through the interviews regarding the comparison of VET and HE students, the views of both groups of students were accessed, thus allowing a comparison of HE participants who are undertaking their degrees (bachelor/diploma) in hospitality in HEIs, with those of vocationally focused college (VET) participants undertaking their vocational diplomas.

5.2 Characteristics of the participants

5.2.1 Background demographics and experience

This section presents the results of the 253 responses from the survey, including those who were enrolled in the HE (n = 149, 58.9%) and VET (n= 104, 41.1%) programs. Table 5.1 summarises the demographic features of the two study groups (the HE and VET participants) including details of their gender, age groupings, completed internship duration, and the hospitality areas of their internships.

Of the 242 who indicated gender, 86 were males (34.1%) and 156 were females (61.9%). Ten did not specify their gender (4%). The VET participants were balanced in terms of gender with 42.7% of males and 50.5% of females, compared to a higher proportion of
female HE participants (69.8%). Such a gender distribution well represents the overall hospitality workforce which is also predominantly female, and is also representative of the gender distribution across Vietnamese hospitality HE, which has a ratio of 2:1 (VLU, 2015).

Table 5.1
Background and demographic characteristics of 253 participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>VET (%)</th>
<th>HE (%)</th>
<th>Total (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>85.6</td>
<td>95.3</td>
<td>91.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;30</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>61.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internship Duration</td>
<td>&lt;3 months</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3-6 months</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-9 months</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;9 months</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas of internships</td>
<td>Front Office</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Food and Beverages</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housekeeping</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sales &amp; Marketing</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The participants reported to be of relatively young age between 18 and 24 (91.3%), the typical age range of tertiary students in Vietnam (Do & Do, 2014). Whilst only 4% of the HE participants were at the age of 25 to 30, a slightly higher 14.4% of the VET participants were in this older age group. This representation across age groupings between the two participant groups likely captures participation in tertiary education for both academic preparation (via HE programs), and ongoing vocational development (via VET programs). Hence the age groupings are suggested as broadly representative of Vietnamese tertiary education student populations.
All participants had completed internships in industry. The greater majority (67.2%) had six months or less experience, while 13% reported having more than nine months’ work experience in industry. More VET participants (43.3%) reported completing longer internship periods (6 months or more) than did their HE counterparts (25.5%).

The participants were asked to indicate the departments/areas in which they had their longest work/internship experience. The major areas in a hospitality enterprise include occupation-specific areas such as front office, food and beverages, kitchen, house-keeping, and general areas such as human resources, and sales and marketing. Of 248 responses, for both groups the main activity was food and beverages (54.8% and 60.2% for VET and HE respectively). However, while the next most frequent activity for VET students was the front office (20.2%) followed by kitchen (12.5%) and housekeeping (11.5%), the pattern was somewhat different for HE students with a lesser 12.5% in the front office, but a higher 21.5% doing housekeeping.

5.2.2 Reasons for study choice and career options

In addition to the personal details discussed in the previous section, participants also provided details of the reasons they chose their hospitality studies, and their career plans upon graduation. The reasons for undertaking hospitality study, reported by 104 VET and 148 HE participants were varied (Figure 5.1).

More HE than VET participants (63.5% to 49%) indicated that they chose the hospitality major because of a preference for working in luxurious enterprises such as 4-5 star hotels and resorts. On the other hand, more VET participants indicated an objective was to meet new people (VET 27.9% to HE 19.6%). The HE responses on this question suggest that many HE participants had high expectations of hospitality workplaces.
Other reasons reported from open comments by both groups included: developing communication skills; meeting and serving foreign tourists; following career advice from their father; or taking hospitality study as secondary option due to falling short of scores in the university entrance examination.

Participants were asked about their plan for work after graduation. Of 103 responses, 79.6% of the VET participants indicated that they planned for a career in the hospitality industry whether applying for a job in hospitality (67%) or setting up a business (12.6%) (see Figure 5.2). On this aspect, HE counterparts (n = 141) were less decisive with 24.8% indicating a direction to industries other than hospitality.
Eight HE participants indicated that an alternative career option would include finding ways into the service industry in general, and tourism areas such as Meetings, Incentives, Conferences, and Events (MICE) where they could employ their customer service skills. This implied that these participants thought that the skills developed in hospitality could be applied across interrelated disciplinary areas.

5.3 Views of hospitality workplaces

The survey explored the views of hospitality workplaces by the both VET and HE participants during their internship experiences through responses to the attitudinal scale modified from the original scale developed by Kusluvan and Kusluvan (2000) to examine hospitality students’ perceptions of working in the hospitality industry. This included their views across seven dimensions of working in the hospitality industry: (i) nature of work, (ii) social status, (iii) industry-person congeniality, (iv) pay/promotion opportunities, (v) co-workers, (vi) managers, and (vii) commitment to the hospitality industry. The initial descriptive analysis is followed by further analysis of the seven individual dimensions, and
finally a multivariate assessment seeking to identify key differences in the views of the two
groups.

5.3.1 Descriptive analysis

The following section presents the tabulated results of the seven dimensions
describing hospitality workplaces. To investigate whether VET and HE participants differ in
their attitudes towards different facets of hospitality workplaces, cross-tabulations were
conducted across the attitudinal statements with chi-square statistics used to assess levels of
difference. Phi and Cramer’s V were also documented to assess the strength of the
relationships, or effect size of any statistical significance found. Assumptions were checked
and were met.

5.3.1.1 Dimension 1 – Nature of work

The dimension ‘nature of work’ refers to the generic features of hospitality work,
focusing on two facets assessing the interesting nature of the work and its negative impacts
on the worker’ family life. Detailed responses to the statements describing the dimension are
presented in Table 5.2.

Table 5.2
Results of responses to attitude statements describing dimension ‘Nature of work’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I find jobs in the hospitality industry interesting.</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>11.20</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Family life is negatively affected for people working in the industry.</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>27.81</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *Due to Bonferroni correction of multiple testing, significance is tested against $p<0.001$.

On this dimension, strong overall agreement from all participants on item 1, regarding
interest in working in the hospitality industry, was apparent with a slightly higher level of
agreement from the VET than HE participants (88.4% to 84.5%). When examining the second item regarding ‘Impact on family life’, the VET and HE participants differed significantly ($\chi^2 = 27.81, df = 4, N = 252, p = .000, V = .34$), with VET participants more likely to disagree with the statement about family impact of hospitality jobs (48.6% VET participants, compared to 22.7% of the HE participants). The effect size of this assessment (Cramer’s V) indicates a moderate strength of the association.

### 5.3.1.2 Dimension 2 – Social status

The dimension ‘Social status’ assesses the perceived status of hospitality jobs in Vietnamese society, featured in three attitude statements focusing on ‘family pride’, ‘beneficial social service’, and ‘occupational pride’. Results of frequency and chi-square statistics are presented in Table 5.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>My family is proud of my profession in hospitality.</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>21.69</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Working in hospitality is regarded as an important and beneficial service.</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I talk to relatives and friends with pride about my vocation in the industry.</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.53</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: *Due to Bonferroni correction of multiple testing, significance is tested against $p<0.001$

Overall, there was a more positive view expressed by the VET participants than HE participants on all three items assessed with a significant difference, with moderate effect size, between the groups on the first item ‘family pride’ reflecting a far stronger agreement by the VET than HE participants on this statement ($\chi^2 = 21.69, df = 4, N = 252, p = .000, V =$
.29). On this item, 72.2% of the VET participants indicated their agreement towards this feature in comparison to 36.5% of their HE counterparts. While slight differences were noted on the other two items, these were not significant.

5.3.1.3 Dimension 3 – Industry-person congeniality

The dimension ‘Industry-person congeniality’ assesses the self-perceived hospitality or friendliness of hospitality workers. Nine attitudinal statements described different feelings and perceptions of the service jobs and the interactions with their customers. Full statements and their results from chi-square statistics are presented in Table 5.4.

Table 5.4
Results of responses to attitude statements describing dimension 3 ‘Industry-person congeniality’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Dimensions/Statements</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I find serving foreign tourists degrading.</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>7.83</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I am well suited to working in the hospitality industry.</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>41.40</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I find serving Vietnamese tourists degrading.</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>11.34</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I can use my abilities and skills in hospitality jobs.</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I get pleasure while working in the hospitality industry.</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>21.29</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I believe that my moral values will degrade if I work in the industry.</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.280</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I like to see satisfied customers when I serve them.</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>.266</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>It is not nice to serve people while they are enjoying their holiday.</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>19.13</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>It is a very nice feeling to serve those who are enjoying their holiday.</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>38.51</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *Due to Bonferroni correction of multiple testing, significance is tested against p<0.001
On this dimension, significant differences were observed on three items 2, 5 and 9, with details discussed below. While there were varying levels of difference on the other items, none of these were significant at the level defined for this study.

For item 2, relating to whether participants found ‘their personality well suited’ to the industry, there was a significant between group difference ($\chi^2 = 41.40$, $df = 4$, $N = 251$, $p = .000$), with the HE participants indicating a more positive view, with mean scores of 2.23 compared to a less positive 2.99 for the VET participants. For item 5, ‘pleasure with work’ again with a significant difference ($\chi^2 = 21.29$, $df = 4$, $N = 252$, $p = .000$), the HE participants indicated a less positive view ($M = 2.55$), compared to a more positive view ($M = 2.11$) for the VET participants. For item 9, ‘pleased to serve tourists’, the significant difference ($\chi^2 = 38.51$, $df = 4$, $N = 253$, $p = .000$) reflects a less positive view ($M = 2.93$) by VET participants, with a more positive view ($M = 2.32$), but a higher level of uncertainty by the HE participants (33.6% compared to a lower 20.2% by VET participants).

### 5.3.1.4 Dimension 4 – Pay/promotion opportunities

The dimension ‘Pay/promotion opportunities’ assessed the views of the perceived pay rate of hospitality work and different aspects of the promotion scheme in the industry. It consists of eight attitudinal statements with two statements focused on pay rate, and six statements focused on promotion opportunities. Table 5.5 shows the results of chi-square statistics and frequencies of responses to these items.
Table 5.5
Results of responses to attitude statements describing dimension 4 'Pay/promotion opportunities'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>% of responses</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The pay for most hospitality jobs not sufficient to lead a satisfactory life.</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>18.3 26.9 39.4 11.5</td>
<td>42.73</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>14.1 30.9 40.9 12.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Considering the long hours and work load I find the pay low.</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>26.5 25.5 32.4 10.8</td>
<td>49.62</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>49.7 26.5 8.2 0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Promotion is based on merit.</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>72.1 6.7 2.9 0.0</td>
<td>21.64</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>48.6 23.6 9.5 1.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Promotion opportunities are satisfactory.</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>51.0 26.0 4.0 0.0</td>
<td>34.09</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>34.2 46.3 12.8 3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The opportunity of getting promoted to managerial positions is limited.</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>33.0 24.0 29.0 12.0</td>
<td>41.30</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>47.0 32.2 7.4 1.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Number of years worked in the industry is considered in promotion decisions.</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>18.4 33.0 27.2 11.7</td>
<td>52.44</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>49.7 32.2 4.0 1.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>It is very difficult to get promoted if you do not 'have an uncle in the court'.</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>5.8 24.0 47.1 14.4</td>
<td>74.28</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>38.3 36.2 10.1 2.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Promotions are not consistent.</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>14.4 26.9 41.3 16.3</td>
<td>55.71</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>36.2 37.6 12.8 2.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Due to Bonferroni correction of multiple testing, significance is tested against $p<0.001$

This dimension clearly demonstrated strong areas of difference between the two participant groups, with significant differences seen on all eight items of this dimension ($p < .001$). The participants, on average, showed contrasting views on four items 2, 4, 5, and 6 among the eight items, recording statistically significant differences.

Thus, looking at items where there was a level of difference in the views, on item 2 ‘low pay’, 65.3% of the HE participants ($M = 2.27$) were in agreement that the pay was low for long hours of work, while only 31.4% of the VET participants indicated this view ($M = 3.18$). The clearly different mean scores indicated these different positions, with the effect
size ($V = .45$) indicating a strong level of association. Another differing response pattern was item 6 ‘experience-based promotion’. Whereas 59.1% of the HE participants showed agreement ($M = 2.32$) on the feature of experience-based promotion, i.e., number of years working in the industry taken into consideration for promotion decision making, only 28.1% of the VET participants expressed a similar view ($M = 3.13$). The HE participants, on average, showed a higher degree of agreement ($M = 2.39$) with promotion being limited in the hospitality industry as opposed to the VET counterparts ($M = 3.16$).

### 5.3.1.5 Dimension 5 – Co-workers

The dimension ‘Co-workers’ included descriptive statements on different characteristics of hospitality workers. The characteristics focused on the cooperative nature of workers, as well as the behaviour at the workplaces of these workers. The full statement items, and results of chi-squares and frequencies conducted across these items are presented in Table 5.6.

Table 5.6
Results of responses to attitude statements describing dimension 5 ‘Co-workers’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>χ²</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>There is no team spirit amongst co-workers.</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>17.44</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>There is cooperation amongst employees.</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>13.60</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Employees are generally uneducated.</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>14.11</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I can make friends easily with people working in the hospitality.</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>43.92</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>It is not easy to get along with people working in the hospitality.</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>19.54</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Most employees are highly motivated and enthusiastic.</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>27.29</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>14.63</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Chapter 5 Results – Phase 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>HE</th>
<th>VET</th>
<th>HE</th>
<th>VET</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I think there are good relationships amongst employees.</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I find people working in the hospitality industry boring.</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>70.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *Due to Bonferroni correction of multiple testing, significance is tested against p<0.001*

On this dimension, the participants on average showed contrasting views on the four items 4, 5, 6, and 8, recording statistically significant differences. Looking at item 4, 79.7% of the HE participants (M = 2.03) were in agreement that it was easy to make friends with people working in the hospitality industry, while only 55.5% of the VET participants indicated this view (M = 2.82). The clearly different mean scores demonstrate different positions, with the effect size (V = .42) indicating a strong level of association. Another different response pattern was observed with item 6 ‘motivated and enthusiastic’ and item 8 ‘good employee relationships’, indicating different views between the two groups, with fairly strong levels of association (V = .33 and V = .32 respectively). Whereas 54.8% of the VET participants agreed that hospitality workers were motivated and enthusiastic (M = 2.32), only 30.4% of the HE participants exhibited similar attitudes (M = 2.89). Similarly, 63.5% of the VET participants perceived good relationships amongst employees in the hospitality industry (M = 2.19), while only 46.6% of the HE participants indicated this view (M = 2.65).

### 5.3.1.6 Dimension 6 – Managers

The 6th dimension ‘Managers’ considered different aspects of the management team in hospitality workplaces, for example, managers’ behaviour and attitudes towards employees, their valuing of employees’ ideas and suggestions, or their assistance with
employees’ problems. There were thirteen statements in this dimension. Table 5.7 provides frequencies and chi-square statistics conducted on these items.

Table 5.7

Results of responses to attitude statements describing dimension 6 ‘Managers’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Managers value to employees.</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>24.07</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Managers do not encourage commitment of employees.</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>32.94</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Managers delegate authority in order for employees to do their jobs better.</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>22.60</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Most managers do not have an educational background in hospitality.</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>46.45</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Managers value employees’ suggestions.</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>33.60</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Managers do not reward employees who are doing a good job.</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>17.90</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Managers behave respectfully to employees.</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>31.88</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Managers ensure to involve employees in decisions affecting their job.</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9.62</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>There is no good relationship between managers and employees.</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>18.23</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Managers do not help solve employees' personal problems.</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>37.74</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Managers do provide vocational training when necessary.</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>23.70</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Managers behave in a fair way to employees.</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>28.78</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Managers do not put great effort making employees satisfied from their jobs.</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>33.35</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *Due to Bonferroni correction of multiple testing, significance is tested against $p<0.001$
The chi-squared results indicated that the two participant groups were statistically different on 10 out of 13 items on this dimension \( (p < .001) \). Interestingly, whilst the majority of the VET participants (80.2%) showed disagreement towards item 4 with regard to most managers having no educational background in hospitality, almost half of the HE participants expressed uncertainty (45.3%), and 38.7% expressed an opposite view. The effect size of this difference was typical, to larger than typical, with Cramer’s V of .37.

The strength of the association between the two variables was also found typical, and larger than typical, for item 10 with Cramer’s V of 3.91 and item 13 at .37. In particular, whilst 64% of the VET participants indicated disagreement towards managers’ not helping employees with personal problems, only 27.9% of the HE participants expressed this attitude. Similarly, 73.5% of the VET participants indicated managers put great effort into making sure employees were satisfied with their jobs, as compared to 38.6% of their HE counterparts.

### 5.3.1.7 Dimension 7 – Commitment to the hospitality industry

The dimension ‘Commitment’ was used to examine the participants’ views on their decisions to commit to working in the hospitality industry, and assess their experience and perceptions of several dimensions of hospitality workplaces, as outlined in the previous six dimensions. It consisted of ten statements focused on their personal plans for work in the industry, and recommendation of hospitality as a career to others, such as their own son/daughter, their friends, relatives, or other participants. Frequencies and chi-squared results across these items are provided in Table 5.8.
Table 5.8

Results of responses to attitude statements describing dimension 7 ‘Commitment to the industry’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The disadvantages outweigh the advantages.</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>30.31</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I am very happy to have chosen hospitality as a vocation path.</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>29.05</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I would not want my son or daughter to study and work in hospitality.</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>12.46</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I would like to work in the hospitality industry after graduation.</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>43.26</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I will definitely not work in the hospitality industry after graduation.</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>24.55</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I recommend first year students choose a different career path than hospitality.</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>8.73</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>It was a mistake to choose hospitality as a career path.</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>8.08</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I recommend a job in the hospitality industry to my friends and relatives.</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>40.97</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I don’t plan to work in other industry than the hospitality industry.</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>44.51</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I see my vocational (professional) future in the hospitality industry.</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>40.08</td>
<td>.000*</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *Due to Bonferroni correction of multiple testing, significance is tested against p<0.001

It was shown in the chi-squared p value at level .001 that the HE and the VET participant groups were significantly different on seven out ten items on this dimension.

Firstly, 65.4% of the VET participants were in disagreement that a career in hospitality was outweighed with disadvantages, while only 34.9% of the HE participants indicated this view.

The effect size of the significance on this item was medium to typical (Cramer’s V = .35).

Therefore, hospitality was viewed as being a satisfactory career path by 87.5% of the VET participants as compared to 59.1% of the HE participants, and being a promising vocational
future perceived by 81.6% of the VET participants and 48.3% of the HE participants. The relationship strength was medium to typical in both items with Cramer’s V = .34 and .40.

Whilst many participants in both groups were uncertain about whether they had a definite plan for working in the hospitality industry, 49.5% of the VET participants expressed the attitude of being keen on a hospitality job as compared to only 15.5% of the HE participants displaying a similar attitude. This different response pattern was of typical to larger than typical effect size at .42. Apart from having a hospitality career plan for themselves, the VET participants (86.4%) also expressed the intention to recommend hospitality work for friends and/or relatives, whereas only 53.8% of the HE participants displayed this intention.

5.3.1.8 Summary

Marked differences between the views of the HE participants and the VET participants were noted on several aspects of hospitality workplaces, including the industry-person congeniality, pay and promotion opportunities, co-workers, managers, and commitment to the hospitality industry. Notably, on these issues the HE participants appeared less positive than the VET participants. For example, while HE participants (in contrast to the VET participants) perceived their personality to be well suited to working in the hospitality industry and were pleased to serve tourists, they did not find pleasure in their hospitality work. They expressed negative attitudes towards pay rate and promotion issues and felt that their chances of being promoted to managerial levels were limited. While they found it easy to make friends with people working in the industry, they did not perceive the relationships amongst employees positively. They were critical across many aspects of management including their background and generally, they expressed the view that the managers did not put great effort into ensuring employees were satisfied with their jobs.
Overall, they indicated a lower commitment to a future in the hospitality industry than the VET participants.

5.3.2 Multivariate analyses of the seven dimensions

The previous analysis indicates a number of key areas of difference in views between HE and VET participants on individual strategies under the seven dimensions considered. This section moves from the item level approach to a multivariate approach to take into account interrelationships between variables.

Two strategies were applied in this section. Firstly, a reliability analysis was conducted on all of the scales embedded in the 54-statement survey. Following this assessment, appropriate scale scores were calculated and a comparison of results on the seven dimensions provided. A second comparison of the views of VET and HE participants was then undertaken using logistic regression to identify predictive factors differentiating between HE and VET participants.

5.3.2.1 Reliability

To measure the internal consistency of the attitude scales used in the survey, a reliability assessment was conducted for each of the dimensions. Table 5.9 provides details of reliability results showing the Cronbach alphas for each dimension, as well as those for HE and VET participants.
### Table 5.9

**Results of reliability by participant groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension (# of items)</th>
<th>No items</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nature of work</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>.462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>.348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social status</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>.767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry-person congeniality</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>.582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>.741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay/Promotion opportunities</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>.887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>.737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>.432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>.799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>.889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>.681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>.789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.757</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In examining the individual dimensions, four of the seven dimensions/sub-scales, i.e., ‘social status’, ‘pay/promotion opportunities’, ‘managers’ and ‘commitment’, had reliabilities above the standard .7 threshold, with α’s ranging from .795 (Social Status) to .902 (Managers). Dimensions ‘industry-person congeniality’ and ‘co-workers’ had reliabilities slightly below .7 (α = .651 and .693 respectively). Interestingly, in both these cases the reliabilities for HE participants exceeded .7 with lower values for the VET group, suggesting a greater consistency in this group than with VET participants for these items. Given that the reliability of these dimensions have been established in the initial scale, and they are very close to the .7 threshold, these two dimensions have been included for the remainder of the analysis.

The reliability for dimension ‘nature of work’ was relatively low (α = .430), and given the small number of items in this subscale due to limited inclusion of items from the original
scale, a dimension score was not calculated. This dimension’s items were included in the following logistic regression analysis.

It was indicated that the Cronbach’s alphas for six dimensions, excluding dimension 1 ‘nature of work’ as discussed above, from the HE participants were all well above .7, suggesting acceptable consistency of responses among this participant group. The VET results, on the other hand showed greater variability with the value of Cronbach’s α markedly lower than .7 for dimension 3 ‘industry-person congeniality’ (α = .582), dimension 5 ‘coworkers’ (α = .432) and dimension 7 ‘commitment’ (α = .681), but well above .825 for the other three dimensions, suggesting relatively good to high consistency of responses among this group.

5.3.2.2 Comparing means

In this section, averaged mean scores of individual dimensions were calculated. The scores for each dimension of hospitality workplaces for the HE and the VET participants are presented in Table 5.10, along with results from independent t-tests conducted to assess differences.

Table 5.10
Results of t-test comparing the two study groups across seven dimensions of attitudinal scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Eta squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social status</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>-3.58</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry-person congeniality</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>29.20</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>27.51</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay/promotion opportunities</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>24.09</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>7.87</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>19.69</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>20.04</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>28.68</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>36.29</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>-.144</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>.886</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>36.35</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>VET</td>
<td>28.86</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>-4.03</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HE</td>
<td>30.45</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Cohen’s (1988) guidelines for eta squared: .01=small effect; .06=moderate effect; .14=large effect*
Significance differences were found for four dimensions, i.e., social status, industry- 
person congeniality, pay/promotion opportunities, and commitment to the industry. Table 
5.10 shows there were significance differences in scores with regard to pay/promotion 
opportunities for the HE group (\( M = 19.69, SD = 3.21 \)) and the VET group (\( M = 24.09, SD = 4.90; t(245) = 7.89, p = .000, \) two-tailed). The magnitude of the difference in the means 
(mean difference = 3.29, 95\% CI: 3.29 to 5.50) was moderate (eta squared = 0.06).

With regard to commitment, a significance difference in scores was found for the HE 
group (\( M = 30.45, SD = 2.85 \)) and the VET group (\( M = 28.86, SD = 3.27; t(244) = 4.03, p = .000, \) two-tailed) participants. The magnitude of the difference in the means (mean difference 
= 1.59, 95\% CI: .81 to 2.36) was moderate (eta squared = 0.06).

5.3.2.3 Logistic Regression

Moving from the focus on the reliability of dimensions, a direct logistic regression 
was performed to identify items on each dimension that provided a predictive measure of 
group status – whether HE participant or VET participant. This provides an alternative 
perspective, answering the question of how one might profile the two different groups from 
their views.

To undertake this analysis seven models (i.e., equations) were created for each of the 
dimensions with the independent (i.e., predictor) variables in each model being the attitude 
statements within seven dimensions. Note that for consistency, the reverse coding used in the 
reliability assessment was also used in this analysis, thus a low score indicates strong 
agreement. The interpretation of the models is presented in the following sections.
5.3.2.2.1 Dimension ‘Nature of work’

The results for the analysis of the model containing two predictor variables (‘interesting jobs’ and ‘impact on family life’) are presented in Table 5.11. The full model containing all predictors was statistically significant ($\chi^2 (2) = 17.15, p < .001$), indicating that the model was able to distinguish between participants who reported to be enrolled in a HE program or a VET program. The model correctly classified 67.2% of cases.

Table 5.11
Logistic Regression ‘Nature of work’ predicting likelihood of reporting the participant group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B (SE)</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Odds Ratio</th>
<th>Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I find jobs in the hospitality industry interesting.</td>
<td>.27 (.22)</td>
<td>.224</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#Family life is negatively affected for people working in the industry.</td>
<td>.42 (.13)</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-1.37 (.49)</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $R^2 = .04$ (Hosmer & Lemeshow), .07 (Cox & Snell), .09 (Nagelkerke). Model $\chi^2 (2) = 17.15, p < .001$

# reversed coding item

While only one independent variable (‘impact on family life’ of hospitality career) made a unique statistically significant contribution to the model ($p = .001$), this had an OR of 1.52. This suggests that an HE participant would be approximately one and a half times more likely to agree that their job in the hospitality industry negatively affected their family life.

5.3.2.2.2 Dimension ‘Social status’

This model contained three predictor variables (‘family pride’, ‘beneficial social service’, and ‘impact on family life’), presented in Table 5.12. The full model containing all predictors was statistically significant, $\chi^2 (3) = 21.10, p < .001$, indicating that the model was able to distinguish between participants who reported to be enrolled in a HE program or a VET program. The model correctly classified 61.7% of cases.
Table 5.12
Logistic Regression ‘Social status’ predicting likelihood of reporting the participant group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B (SE)</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>95.0% CI for Odds Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My family is proud of my profession in hospitality.</td>
<td>.77 (.21)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working in hospitality is regarded as an important and beneficial service.</td>
<td>-.02 (.24)</td>
<td>.928</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I talk to relatives and friends with pride about my vocation in the industry.</td>
<td>-.09 (.24)</td>
<td>.708</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-1.24 (.46)</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $R^2 = .30$ (Hosmer & Lemeshow), .08 (Cox & Snell), .11(Nagelkerke). Model $\chi^2 (3) = 21.10$, $p < .001$

The logistic regression results showed that only one of the independent variables, item 1 ‘family pride’ made a significant contribution to the model ($p = .000$, $OR = 2.16$). This indicates that HE participants were around twice as likely to indicate that their family was proud of their hospitality career. However, there was no difference in the responses regarding either item 2 ‘beneficial social service’ or item 3 ‘occupational pride’.

5.3.2.2.3 Dimension ‘Industry-person congeniality’

The model contained eight independent variables with details provided in Table 5.13. The full model containing all predictors was significant ($\chi^2 (9) = 61.47$, $p < .001$), indicating that the predictors as a set reliably distinguished between the participant being a HE participant or a VET participant. The model correctly classified 67.2% of cases.
Table 5.13

Logistic Regression ‘Industry-person congeniality’ predicting likelihood of reporting the participant group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B (SE)</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>95.0% CI for Odds Ratio</th>
<th>Odds Ratio</th>
<th>Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I find serving foreign tourists degrading.</td>
<td>.18 (.31)</td>
<td>.559</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am well suited to working in the hospitality industry.</td>
<td>-.61 (.21)</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find serving Vietnamese tourists degrading.</td>
<td>-.02 (.24)</td>
<td>.941</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can use my abilities and skills in hospitality jobs.</td>
<td>.18 (.25)</td>
<td>.471</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I get pleasure while working in the hospitality industry.</td>
<td>.63 (.21)</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that my moral values will degrade if I work in the industry.</td>
<td>.14 (.24)</td>
<td>.569</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to see satisfied customers when I serve them.</td>
<td>-.54 (.27)</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is not nice to serve people while they are enjoying their holiday.</td>
<td>.31 (.20)</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is a very nice feeling to serve those who are enjoying their holiday.</td>
<td>-.50 (.21)</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1.11 (.73)</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $R^2 = .02$ (Hosmer & Lemeshow), .22 (Cox & Snell), .29 (Nagelkerke). Model $\chi^2 (9) = 61.47$, $p < .001$

$^a$ reversed coding item

The logistic regression results showed that four of the independent variables made significant contributions to prediction. Notably, of these three had OR below 1 indicating, for example, that for these items HE participants were less likely to agree than VET participants. For these, the level of disagreement of the HE participants can be identified by a reciprocal calculation, thus for the OR of .54 (thus reciprocal of 1.85), this can be interpreted as the VET participants being around twice as likely to be negative about the fit of their personality with the job.

Similar patterns of findings were found on the three other significant items. The OR value of 1.87 recorded for ‘work pleasure’ indicates that the HE participants were almost twice as likely to have negative feeling at work. For the OR of .58 (reciprocal of 1.72)
recorded for item 6 ‘pleased to satisfy customers’, this can be interpreted as the VET participants being around twice as unlikely to feel pleased to satisfy customers. The last significant predictor recording an OR of .61 (reciprocal of 1.64) suggests that the VET participants being over one and a half times less likely to be pleased to service tourists.

5.3.2.2.4 Dimension ‘Pay/promotion opportunities’

The model contained eight independent variables presented in Table 5.14. A test of the full model against a constant only model was statistically significant, indicating that the predictors as a set reliably distinguished between the participant being a HE participant or a VET participant ($\chi^2$ (8) = 91.70, $p < .001$). Prediction success overall was 76.7% (84.6% for the HE and 65.4% for the VET).

Table 5.14
Logistic Regression ‘Pay/promotion opportunities’ predicting likelihood of reporting the participant group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B (SE)</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>95.0% CI for Odds Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$^a$The pay for most hospitality jobs not sufficient to lead a satisfactory life.</td>
<td>.26 (.22)</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>0.85 1.29 1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^a$Considering the long hours and work load I find the pay low.</td>
<td>.20 (.23)</td>
<td>.394</td>
<td>0.77 1.22 1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion is based on merit.</td>
<td>-.19 (.28)</td>
<td>.499</td>
<td>0.48 0.83 1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion opportunities are satisfactory.</td>
<td>.70 (.28)</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>1.18 2.02 3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^a$The opportunity of getting promoted to managerial positions is limited.</td>
<td>-.20 (.23)</td>
<td>.604</td>
<td>0.57 0.89 1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^b$Number of years worked in the industry is considered in promotion decisions.</td>
<td>.46 (.20)</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>1.07 1.58 2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^a$It is very difficult to get promoted if you do not ‘have an uncle in the court’.</td>
<td>.33 (.21)</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>0.92 1.39 2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$^b$Promotions are not consistent.</td>
<td>.54 (.21)</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>1.14 1.72 2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-6.18 (1.04)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $R^2 = .10$ (Hosmer & Lemeshow), .30 (Cox & Snell), .41 (Nagelkerke). Model $\chi^2$ (8) = 91.70, $p < .001$

$^a$reversed coding item
It was shown in the model that there were three independent variables (‘satisfactory promotion’, ‘experience-based promotion’, and ‘inconsistent promotion’), which made significant contributions to prediction ($p = .011$, $p = .023$ and $p = .009$). The first predictor recorded an OR of 2.02 in item 4 ‘satisfactory promotion’. This indicated that the less a participant agreed that the promotion opportunities were satisfactory in the hospitality industry, it was almost twice as likely they were a HE participant. The OR value of 1.58, which was recorded for the second predictor variable, indicated that the less a participant agreed that number of years worked in the industry was considered in promotion decisions, around one and a half times more likely they were a HE participant. The third predictor with an OR of 1.72 indicated that the more a participant showed their agreement towards the fact that promotions in the hospitality industry were not consistent, over one and a half times more likely they were a HE participant.

5.3.2.2.5 Dimension ‘Co-workers’

The model contained eight independent variables with details provided in Table 5.15. The full model containing all predictors was statistically significant, $\chi^2 (9) = 87.18$, $p < .001$, indicating that the model was able to distinguish between participants who reported being a HE or a VET participant. The model correctly classified 72.3% of cases.
The logistic regression results showed that three of the independent variables made significant contributions to prediction. The first significant predictor ‘easy making friends with’ \( (p = .000) \) recorded an OR of .28 (reciprocal of 3.57). This indicates that the more a participant agreed it was easy to make friends with workers in the hospitality industry, over three and a half times more likely they were a VET participant. ‘Easy getting along with’ was the second significant predictor \( (p = .002) \). The OR value of 2.34 indicates that the response to the Likert scale is raised by one point, i.e., the less they agreed that it was easy to get along with people working in the hospitality industry, the participant is over twice as likely to be a HE participant.

---

**Table 5.15**

Logistic Regression ‘Co-workers’ predicting likelihood of reporting the participant group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B (SE)</th>
<th>( p )</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Odds Ratio</th>
<th>Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#There is no team spirit amongst co-workers.</td>
<td>-.35(.23)</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is cooperation amongst employees.</td>
<td>.45(.36)</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#Employees are generally uneducated.</td>
<td>.22(.21)</td>
<td>.293</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can make friends easily with people working in the hospitality.</td>
<td>-.27(.27)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is not easy to get along with people working in the hospitality.</td>
<td>.85(.27)</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most employees are highly motivated and enthusiastic.</td>
<td>.35(.23)</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#Most people working in the hospitality industry are rude people.</td>
<td>.35(.27)</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think there are good relationships amongst employees.</td>
<td>.37(.25)</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#I find people working in the hospitality industry boring.</td>
<td>-.07(.27)</td>
<td>.790</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-1.37(0.87)</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: \( R^2 = .32 \) (Hosmer & Lemeshow), .29 (Cox & Snell), .39 (Nagelkerke). Model \( \chi^2 \) (9) = 87.18, \( p < .001 \). # reversed coding item
5.3.2.2.6 Dimension ‘Managers’

The model contained thirteen independent variables with detailed results presented in Table 5.16. The full model containing all predictors was statistically significant, \( \chi^2 (13) = 75.94, p < .001 \), indicating that the model was able to distinguish between participants who belonged to the HE or the VET participant group. Prediction success overall was 78.7% (81.9% for the HE group and 74% for the VET group).

Table 5.16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Description</th>
<th>B (SE)</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>95.0% CI for Odds Ratio</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Odds Ratio</th>
<th>Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managers value to employees.</td>
<td>.24 (.30)</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers do not encourage commitment of employees.</td>
<td>.49 (.27)</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers delegate authority in order for employees to do their jobs better.</td>
<td>.50 (.28)</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most managers do not have an educational background in hospitality.</td>
<td>.60 (.22)</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers value employees' suggestions.</td>
<td>.21 (.30)</td>
<td>.480</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers do not reward employees who are doing a good job.</td>
<td>.02 (.21)</td>
<td>.910</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers behave respectfully to employees.</td>
<td>.42 (.36)</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers ensure to involve employees in decisions affecting their job.</td>
<td>-.29 (.23)</td>
<td>.190</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no good relationship between managers and employees.</td>
<td>-.18 (.26)</td>
<td>.274</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers do not help solve employees' personal problems.</td>
<td>.17 (.21)</td>
<td>.431</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers do provide vocational training when necessary.</td>
<td>-.35 (.29)</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers behave in a fair way to employees.</td>
<td>.22 (.29)</td>
<td>.443</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers do not put great effort making employees satisfied from their jobs.</td>
<td>.23 (.22)</td>
<td>.298</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-4.88 (.89)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: \( R^2 = .08 \) (Hosmer & Lemeshow), .26 (Cox & Snell), .35 (Nagelkerke). Model \( \chi^2 (13) = 75.94, p < .001 \).

*reversed coding item
As shown in the model, only one independent variable (‘with no hospitality background’) made significant contributions to prediction ($p = .006$). The predictor recorded an OR of 1.82 suggested that the HE participants were almost twice as likely to be negative about the educational background in hospitality of managers.

5.3.2.2.7 Dimension ‘Commitment’

The model contained ten independent variables presented in Table 5.17. The full model containing all predictors was statistically significant, $\chi^2 (10) = 90.77, p < .001$, indicating that the model was able to distinguish between participants who reported to be a HE or a VET participant. The model correctly classified 74.7% of cases (79.9% of the HE group and 67.3% of the VET group).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B (SE)</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>95.0% CI for Odds Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. The disadvantages outweigh the advantages.</td>
<td>.69 (.20)</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am very happy to have chosen hospitality as a vocation path.</td>
<td>-.67 (.38)</td>
<td>.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. I would not want my son or daughter to study and work in hospitality.</td>
<td>-.23 (.20)</td>
<td>.266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to work in the hospitality industry after graduation.</td>
<td>1.198 (.32)</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. I will definitely not work in the hospitality industry after graduation.</td>
<td>-.08 (.17)</td>
<td>.614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. I recommend first year students choose a different career path than hospitality.</td>
<td>.17 (.28)</td>
<td>.535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. It was a mistake to choose hospitality as a career path.</td>
<td>-.43 (.30)</td>
<td>.157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I recommend a job in the hospitality industry to my friends and relatives.</td>
<td>.53 (.31)</td>
<td>.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. I don’t plan to work in other industry than the hospitality industry.</td>
<td>-.67 (.20)</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I see my vocational (professional) future in the hospitality industry.</td>
<td>.35 (.33)</td>
<td>.280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>- .93 (1.21)</td>
<td>.442</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: $R^2 = .05$ (Hosmer & Lemeshow), .30 (Cox & Snell), .41 (Nagelkerke). Model $\chi^2 (10) = 90.77, p < .001$. 

Chapter 5 Results – Phase 2
Three independent variables (‘outweigh of disadvantages’, ‘wanting hospitality work’, and ‘no plan for hospitality work’) were found in this model to make significant contributions to prediction ($p = .001$, $p = .000$, and $p = .001$, respectively). The OR value of 2.0 recorded for the first predictor suggested that the more a participant agreed that the disadvantages outweighed the advantages in the hospitality industry, two times more likely they were a HE participant. The second predictor variable which had an OR of 3.31 indicated that the less a participant agreed that they wanted to work in the hospitality after graduation, over three times more likely they reported to be a HE participant. The third significant predictor’ OR of .513 (reciprocal of 1.95) indicated that the more a participant agreed that they did not want to work in any other industry than hospitality, around twice as likely they were a VET participant.

5.3.2.3 Summary

Results from logistic regression indicated that there were particular aspects in each dimension which differentiated between the two participant groups (HE and VET). Table 5.18 provides a summary of logistic results of significant predictors reporting the participant group.
Table 5.18

Summary of logistic regression results of predictors reporting the participant group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension/Statement</th>
<th>B (SE)</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>95.0% CI for Odds Ratio</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Odds Ratio</th>
<th>Upper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nature of work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Impact on family life</td>
<td>.42 (.13)</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family pride</td>
<td>.77 (.21)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry-person congeniality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality well suited jobs</td>
<td>-.61 (.21)</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work pleasure</td>
<td>.63 (.21)</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleased to satisfy customers</td>
<td>-.54 (.27)</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleased to serve tourists</td>
<td>-.50 (.21)</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay/Promotion opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory promotion</td>
<td>.70 (.28)</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Experience-based promotion</td>
<td>.46 (.20)</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Inconsistent promotion</td>
<td>.54 (.21)</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy making friend with</td>
<td>-.27(.27)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy getting along with</td>
<td>.85(.27)</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*with no hospitality background</td>
<td>.60 (.22)</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Outweigh of disadvantages</td>
<td>.69 (.20)</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wanting hospitality work after graduation</td>
<td>1.198 (.32)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>6.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*No plan for hospitality work</td>
<td>-.67 (.20)</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * reversed coding item

As indicated in Table 5.8, HE participants were concerned that their jobs in the hospitality industry may negatively affect their family life, and their family was unlikely to be proud of their hospitality career. Similar sentiments were shown in this group’s attitudes towards pay/promotion opportunity, co-workers, and managers. Whilst the VET participants expressed high level of satisfaction with promotion mechanism in the hospitality industry, the HE participants felt less satisfied regarding the level and consistency of promotion opportunities. Similarly, the VET participants were more likely to agree that it was easy to
get along with people working in the hospitality industry, and they viewed the educational background of managers positively in comparison to the different positions taken by the HE participants. Generally, unlike the VET group, the HE group was more likely to indicate that the disadvantages outweighed the advantages in the hospitality industry, and unlikely that they wanted to work in the hospitality industry after graduation. Results suggested that the HE participants had high expectations that were not met, indicated by their negative perceptions of the promotion opportunities, as well as the management practices in hospitality workplaces, whereas the VET participants were more contented to their status quo in hospitality workplaces.

5.4 Chapter summary

The online survey was developed to further explore and explain the findings from the initial interview phase, and utilised an attitudinal scale to examine the views of two groups, the HE students, and VET students, across seven dimensions of working in the hospitality industry: (i) nature of work, (ii) social status, (iii) industry-person congeniality, (iv) pay/promotion opportunities, (v) co-workers, (vi) managers, and (vii) commitment to the hospitality industry. Descriptive results comparing responses from the scale items indicated marked differences between the two groups. Opposing views were found in many aspects of the hospitality workplaces, with the HE participants specifically indicating negative attitudes towards pay/promotion opportunities and managers, evidenced by the results of independent t-tests.

To provide an alternative perspective, answering the question of how one might profile the two different groups, and thus the profile differences, a direct logistic regression was performed to identify items in each scale that provided a predictive measure of group status – whether VET or HE participant. Results indicated that responses to several items
associated with promotion opportunities, industry-person congeniality, and commitment were significant predictors of group status. Whilst the VET indicated a positive view with these aspects of hospitality workplaces, the HE participants were more likely to express a negative view. Results suggested that the VET participants’ expectations were met, indicated by their positive perceptions of several aspects of hospitality workplaces, and they found their pleasure at work, as opposed to the negative perspectives from the HE participants. Results indicated that the HE participants were uncertain whether they would choose to work in the hospitality industry in comparison to a more vested interest in hospitality careers expressed by the VET participants.

5.5 Summary of findings of Phases 1 and 2

In the Vietnamese context, the relationship between the industry and HE system is a complex network, with existing tensions as each sector progresses their own objectives. The relationships within this network involve different stakeholders, including a diverse range of industry professionals, hospitality students, and hospitality academics. In this study, the views and observations of the preparation of tertiary hospitality students, and their experiences in hospitality workplaces during internships provided insights to aid in understanding this system, identified possible constraints, and provided evidence to support recommendations for enhancing the preparation of HE hospitality education students/graduates as future professionals in this field.

A key focus provided by industry professionals’ regarding their expectations of HE students was on particular personal attributes which made them well suited to work in the industry. These attributes included attitudes and behaviours, including activeness, approachability, commitment, honesty, positive attitude, and good manners. They expressed pleasure with HE student interns for being hard working, obedient and enthusiastic. However,
they also criticised HE students for having unrealistic expectations, and limited practical experience, feeling they had come to their internship experience with limited preparation. In terms of performance, the industry professionals indicated their preferences for VET students as compared to their HE counterparts as they generally felt they were better prepared for the work environment. There was some contrast in the views of hospitality academics who felt the industry professionals’ expectations of HE students to be unrealistic, and their preferences for VET students to be shaped by the immediate needs of industry, and limited employment opportunities.

Students’ views on their completed internships added a different perspective. Many HE students indicated disappointment in the limited choices of hospitality work assigned to them during internships. Most available opportunities were basic operational level skill jobs including catering assistants, kitchenhands or room attendants. Evidence indicated that HE students felt overworked, undertaking unpaid, full-time jobs in a working environment that lacked support and guidance, and did not provide significant learning towards their future. Findings did, however, indicate key differences in the views of VET and HE students, with HE students often expressing negative views of specific aspects of the industry, including pay/promotion opportunities and management. As a result, HE students expressed a low level of commitment to future hospitality careers.

In comparing the three groups, the results indicated agreement that there was a theory-practice imbalance in the content of hospitality HE programs, which was viewed as limited in practical knowledge integration, and the development of professional skills. As research highlights the importance of involving the three primary stakeholders (the industry, students and institutions) in the development of hospitality programs, an understanding of their different needs, expectations and interests is essential to close the gaps (if any), and find
common ground. In the Vietnamese context, findings from this study highlight that there are indeed gaps in views and competing interests among these stakeholder groups offering scope for future refinements to continue to develop the hospitality industry, and its economic contribution to Vietnam.
Chapter 6 Discussion and Conclusion

6.1 Introduction

The current study explores the factors influencing effective tertiary hospitality education in Vietnam through an examination of the views of key stakeholders. In this chapter, the first section provides a critical analysis of the factors influencing effective tertiary hospitality education in Vietnam. The implications for stakeholders and policy makers, and strategies for change are then discussed, followed by an overview of the theoretical and practical contributions of the study. Finally, a discussion of recommendations for future research directions and a consideration of limitations stemming from the study are presented.

6.2 Factors influencing effective tertiary hospitality education

The social employer-employee network in the field of hospitality involves different stakeholders which have been examined in this study, including the hospitality industry represented by hospitality enterprises, and tertiary hospitality education system where students are undertaking their studies. There are several factors driving the findings including:

*Economic factors*: The hospitality industry in Vietnam, characterised by multinational hotel companies, has been one of the major generators of job opportunities at differing skill levels. However, the policy of recruiting expatriates for higher and more strategic skill levels, i.e., managerial positions, has limited opportunities for higher education (HE) graduates. This is the one of the key reasons why industry preferences for vocational education (VET) students/graduates, whose skills are not relevant to the positions that are available in the industry, were found in this study.
**Political factors:** As Vietnam is working towards the development of its economy in which the hospitality industry is one of the driving forces, the involvement of multinational hotel companies has contributed to accelerating this process. However, in developing this sector towards the more mature tourism market seen in other countries it is important that local expertise plays an increasing role in and contribution to the sector. For this to occur greater partnerships between the individual players – businesses, multinational companies and also the different education providers will need to occur. As has been seen in this research there are limited interactions between these players, and little intervention by the Vietnamese Government in this market has been seen. Thus, as documented above, the internship component in HE tourism training is in its early stage of development, with the limited engagement between the university and the hospitality providers where the internships take place, limiting the effectiveness of such a skill development strategy. This factor contributed to HE students’ disappointment with industry in terms of the relevant job opportunities, as well as the HE institutions (HEIs) with respect to the relevance of academic credentials and labour market outcomes.

**Educational factors:** The massification of HE in Vietnam has resulted in an oversupply of hospitality graduates from both the VET and HE systems. Findings from this study indicate that VET and HE students/graduates are competing for the same positions in industry. In addition, the lack of industry-education linkage in the Vietnamese context has been found to be a significant factor driving these findings, especially with respect to a lack of initiative found by HEIs to negotiate the provision of professional development for HE students during internships. This highlights the importance of policy initiatives to facilitate and support industry-education interaction, taking in account the economic and political factors discussed above.
Underpinned by the sociological perspective on the interactions in the higher education market place, a critical analysis of the findings of this study, examining the links to the fields (i.e., hospitality education and industry) of the hospitality market, identified three major factors requiring consideration: (1) the current employment demand in the Vietnamese hospitality industry; (2) the suitability of HE hospitality programs in preparation for hospitality careers; and (3) the reality of Vietnamese hospitality workplaces for tertiary students. These factors are discussed in the following sub-sections.

6.2.1 The current employment demand in the Vietnamese hospitality industry

The hospitality industry is an important subsidiary of the travel and tourism sector, which has become an increasingly important driver of growth and prosperity for many countries. Compared to the developed sectors in Asia-Pacific region such as Australia which is ranked 1st in the region, and 7th internationally, the formal hospitality sector in Vietnam is relatively underdeveloped. While this sector makes a significant contribution to Vietnam’s economy, namely 4.6% of 2013 GDP (Crotti & Misrahi, 2015), this level is surpassed by that of neighbours such as Thailand with a contribution of 9% of GDP (Crotti & Misrahi, 2015), and a ranking of 29th internationally with regard to overall performance in the area of human resources (HR), compared to Vietnam, ranking 55th. In recognition of the potential contribution of the sector, and HR as a key aspect of the Asia-Pacific region’s strategy to develop the travel and tourism sector (Crotti & Misrahi, 2015), the Vietnamese Government has released an initiative in which strengthening of HR is positioned as one of the three breakthrough objectives in Vietnam’s ten-year (2011-2020) socioeconomic development strategy (Bodewig et al., 2014; Boothroyd & Pham, 2000; Ha, 2012).

As in other developing economies, the Vietnamese hospitality sector includes both small and medium enterprises (SMEs), and high-end hospitality service providers. However,
this sector also includes many large, multinational hotel enterprises. In developing countries such as Vietnam, these enterprises are usually positioned at the highest end of the scale in terms of size and prestige, and hold senior positions in the labour market (Fligstein, 1996; Podolny, 1993). With significant market power and large scale of operation, these organisations are major sources of employment across different skill levels; however, their recruitment policy which is primarily directed towards expatriates for the majority of management positions (Fortanier & Van Wijik, 2010; Kusluvan & Karamustafa, 2001; Mowforth & Munt, 2003), offers limited opportunities for participants from the indigenous labour force to enter these positions.

There is little empirical evidence of the diffusion of knowledge and skills at the managerial level in multinational hotel enterprises in developing countries (Andriotis, 2002; Fortanier & Van Wijik, 2010; Kusluvan & Karamustafa, 2001). Such key management positions are generally outsourced to maintain firm specific advantages (Andriotis, 2002; Dunning, 1988), and only basic operational level skill personnel are trained locally to assure service quality and performance (Ascher, 1985; Dunning, 1988; Kusluvan & Karamustafa, 2001). This also limits both potential upskilling for local HE trainees and graduates as they potentially transition from their academic learning environments into industry practice. Evidence in this study confirms this phenomenon, with HE students expressing concern regarding promotion opportunities in the Vietnamese hospitality industry. They perceived their future chances of being promoted to the managerial level as limited, and reported that they felt mechanisms for promotion lacked consistency in the industry. Similar findings have been found in previous research on HRM strategies of multinational companies, with outsourcing strategies for management positions found to jeopardise employment.
opportunities in the local community (Fortanier & Van Wijik, 2010; Kusluvan & Karamustafa, 2001; Mowforth & Munt, 2003).

Another important issue is the shift to mass higher education. As Vietnamese HE has taken a very rapid step towards mass HE with little transition (Hayden & Lam, 2007; MOET, 2016; Vallely & Wilkinson, 2008), the large-scale expansion of HE has resulted in an oversupply of HE graduates. In hospitality workplaces, HE graduates compete with VET graduates for the same basic operational level skill positions with limited higher level positions available. Some research in developing nations has focused on the growth of over-education in unskilled jobs, which is underlined by the weak demand for skilled labour, and slow expansion of education-intensive occupations (Mehta et al., 2009). The hospitality industry is generally characterised as comprising a workforce with relatively basic level skills (Jensen, 2001), and as such, entrants into these basic level skill jobs in the industry are likely to be sustained in these positions (Scherer, 2004). This situation poses a challenge for HE credentials and employment outcomes in Vietnam, and also the long-term contribution of HE in this area. For such benefits to be captured, broader career pathways and opportunities are needed for higher skilled local workers, including positions with supervisory, managerial and policy and planning responsibilities.

While there are developed training schemes to provide both basic operational level skilled personnel through the VET system, and also the more strategic skilled personnel through the HE system in Vietnam, the range of career pathways are not as accessible for indigenous employees as they would be in more developed nations such as in Australia. As noted, multinational hotel enterprises tend to source externally the labour force for managerial level positions thus offering limited opportunities for highly skilled graduates.
Thus, the pathways from education to employment more limited than in more developed hospitality systems.

The situation in the Vietnamese context also aligns with research elsewhere reporting the inability of many HE graduates to apply their knowledge and skills in their workplaces (Elias & Purcell, 2004; Keep & Mayhew, 2004). This has important implications for a clear differentiation between VET and HE in terms of academic and professional preparation for students at relevant levels. This confirms the importance of a differentiated career path for VET and HE graduates which is recognised by the hospitality industry. Attempts to develop and improve the education system are dependent on a collective response from three primary stakeholders, including government agencies, educational institutions, and industry (Jafari, 2002; Tran, 2015). However, research indicates the limited collaboration to accommodate the competing interests of these stakeholders (Jafari, 2002; Tran, 2015; Tran & Swierczek, 2009), and results from this study highlight the tensions existing between hospitality industry and HEIs. Such tensions have posited some constraints in the suitability of current HE programs in preparation for hospitality careers.

6.2.2 The suitability of HE programs in preparation for hospitality careers

A second factor focuses on the suitability of tertiary hospitality programs in preparing students for careers in the hospitality sector. In HE hospitality programs in Vietnam, a focus on preparing human resources for the hospitality industry in terms of quantity, rather than addressing industry demand for high quality human resources, is an ongoing concern (Nguyen & Chaisawat, 2011), with educational quality recognised as a major issue (Do, 2009; IIE, 2004; Oliver, 2002; Tran et al., 2014) which can be influenced both by the formal design of the program and also in the quality of delivery by the teaching staff. In program development, the current standards for hospitality HE have not been fully formulated and
consistently applied in program development across educational providers (VNAT, 2012). In addition, there are quality related issue such as qualifications of teaching academics. Finally, there are additional constraints on the development of HE hospitality programs in preparation for hospitality careers, including skill preparation in HE programs compared to VET programs, and the current labour force demand in the Vietnamese hospitality industry.

Previous research indicated that some HEIs experienced pressures of limited resources resulting in programs being delivered by teaching staff with non-relevant academic backgrounds (Cavlek, 2002, 2008). This is an important factor influencing the development of high quality HE hospitality programs, as research indicates that the production of quality graduates requires highly qualified teaching staff with relevant academic qualifications and sufficient practical experience in the discipline (Qiu Zhang, Lam & Bauer, 2001). Findings from this study suggested that in some cases both teaching academics and program designers exhibited a lack of practical experience in the hospitality industry, which potentially impacted on the practicality of HE hospitality programs in terms of content and professional practices. The lack of integration of academic knowledge and industry experience of program development teams in this study suggested limitations in the theory-practice nexus of the implemented HE hospitality programs. This finding aligns with research reporting the gap between theory in HE hospitality programs, and practice in the industry (Jiang & Tribe, 2009).

Compared to the HE programs, the VET programs are based on students undertaking work in the industry without any expectation of training or mentorship provided by industry. Thus as the program undertaken by VET students explicitly trains students in developing skills for basic operational level jobs, rather than the broader academic curricula received by HE students who are prepared with more strategic skills at supervisory/managerial level,
VET students are more aligned with industry expectations for basic operational jobs. Occupation-specific skills at basic operational level are taught in the first year of a VET college program. These skills are formulated into practice-based courses, simulating scenarios in various areas of hospitality enterprises, including front office, food and beverages, as well as kitchen/cooking. The development of these skills is often not officially included in several HE programs. Thus, VET programs are more skill-oriented compared to the more theoretical orientation of HE programs (Tran, 2012; Tran & Swierczek, 2009). This differs to the learning in more developed programs such as those delivered in Australia (Bilsland et al., 2014) or the UK (Busby & Gibson, 2010), where there is a focused industry initiative whereby individual enterprises implement specific targeted training programs for students. Evidence in this study confirms the situation in Vietnamese hospitality workplaces where the VET students acquired more developed basic operational work skills.

As industry requirements, or employability skills and knowledge do not appear to be well covered in the development of HE hospitality programs, the relevance of program content to the reality of the hospitality jobs is limited. Additionally, as these programs are overseen by different governance departments, MOET and MOLISA, the VET and HE programs have been developed separately with no focus on complementarity. This situation may have led to the “inequalities in opportunities that did not reflect differences in the abilities” of graduates in their employment outcomes (Brown & Hesketh, 2004, p. 16). The mismatch between the knowledge and skills provided at HEIs, and those required by industry had an impact on the HE students in this study, resulting in lower levels of satisfaction and commitment expressed by the HE students compared to the VET students.

A final constraint on the development of HE hospitality programs relates to the current demand in the hospitality industry. Research indicates the relationship between
academic credentials and employment outcomes is complex (Brown & Hesketh, 2004; Elias & Purcell, 2004; Keep & Mayhew, 2004). Although HE graduates are usually described as ‘knowledge workers’ in policy, there exist inequalities among graduates in their employment outcomes (Brown & Hesketh, 2004). Many graduates, who are not able to translate their knowledge and skills into employment in the industry, fail to get a return on their investment in HE, resulting in positional differences among graduates (Brown & Hesketh, 2004). Evidence in this study indicated a lack of differentiation between the HE and the VET graduates in employment opportunities. The two levels of education and training, i.e., the VET and the HE programs, are expected to result in two largely differentiated employment pathways. However, the HE students in this study were concerned about the role of their HE qualifications in securing expected employment outcomes.

6.2.3 The reality of Vietnamese hospitality workplaces for tertiary students

The third factor focuses on the experiences of hospitality students from HEIs and VET colleges as they undertook internships, with their experiences in workplaces yielding differences in attitudes and expectations. While the HE students generally expressed negative attitudes, the VET students generally expressed positive attitudes towards different aspects of working in the hospitality industry. This finding contrasts with previous studies in other countries such as Turkey, the United States, and Australia, which identified a relationship between students’ direct experience with the industry, and their attitudes towards hospitality jobs (Aksu & Koksal, 2005; Barron & Maxwell, 1993; Getz, 1994; Kusluvan & Kusluvan, 2000; Pavesic & Brymer, 1990; Richardson, 2010a). Findings from this study indicate that the results from the VET students align with the view that direct interaction with hospitality industry workplaces leads to more favourable evaluations of careers in the industry, a finding also reported in the US by Murphy (1985), Richardson and Thomas (2012); and in Australia
by Ross (1992, 1994). However, other findings from this study found less positive views from the HE students. Interestingly, these HE students also reported less successful internship experiences, citing being more likely to do less valued activities. This finding suggested that the VET students were more prepared for internships thus resulting in better learning experiences in which their skills were well utilised, and thus they felt more positive about hospitality as a career option. In contrast, the HE students expressed feeling unprepared for available jobs, which reinforced negative stereotypes.

Results in this study highlighted the mismatch between HE students’ expectations on entering the industry, and the realities of working in the industry. These findings have been reported in previous studies (Jenkins, 2001; O’Leary & Deegan, 2005; Raybould & Wilkins, 2005), and this mismatch may consequently result in graduates leaving the industry. Since student expectations may be re-aligned through internships (Barron & Maxwell, 1993; Harris & Zhao, 2004; Waryszak, 1999), this also has important implications for collaborative efforts between the industry and HEIs to enable these expectations to be re-aligned in a positive manner. This issue can be addressed via career orientations at institutions, and re-arranged internship practices in the industry. In other words, students should be adequately prepared at institutions to transition into the hospitality work environment. They should be presented with realistic view of the conditions of working in the industry so that they can accurately envision the benefits and demands of a hospitality career.

Other findings indicated that HE students’ desire to work in the hospitality industry were decreased and weakened by their internship experiences. The majority of hospitality opportunities available to student interns were basic operational level skill jobs, including catering assistants, kitchenhands or room attendants. In addition, results also showed that student interns were expected to commit to a full-time workload, without clarification of
associated learning opportunities. This finding aligns with a number of studies investigating the impact of internships on career intentions and motivation to work in the hospitality industry (Barron & Maxwell, 1993; Kusluvan, Kusluvan, & Eren, 2003; Leslie & Richardson, 1999; Purcell & Quin, 1995; West & Jameson, 1990). However, it should be noted that the finding regarding HE student experiences with industry in this study contrasts to some extent with several previous studies in the United States, the United Kingdom, and Australia which found that workplace experiences within the hospitality industry led to favourable intentions for careers in the industry (Choy, 1995; Murphy, 1985; Purcell & Quinn, 1996; Ross, 1992, 1994). The HE students’ resultant low level of commitment to the industry found in this study aligns with other research in the Netherlands and China indicating hospitality students’ ambitions for future careers tends to decline as they gain experience, and become aware of the actual circumstances of working in the industry (Blomme et al., 2009; Jenkins, 2001; Wang & Huang, 2014). These findings suggest that whilst the VET students have more realistic expectations, the HE students have inflated expectations, and poor preparation for workplaces.

Industry expectations for student interns and/or graduates did not differentiate between HEIs and VET colleges, and these expectations appeared to be focused on the immediate needs of workplaces. These expectations also appear to be shaped by the reality of hospitality workplaces where most of the available jobs require workers with well-developed basic operational level skills. In this sense, industry employers may view vocational education as more effective in providing education and training at this level in terms of immediate work-readiness; however, it does not recognise longer-term needs of the developing sector. As such, undertaking industry internships did not result in the expected learning outcomes for HE students.
Evidence from this study suggested that internship components which were supposed to bridge theory and practice often failed to achieve their objectives due to the absence of a mechanism in which HEIs consulted with industry in their curriculum planning, resulting in a lack of clearly defined roles and responsibilities for both stakeholders. The lack of industry-education collaboration in Vietnam (Ashwill, 2010; Bilsland & Nagy, 2015; Tran, 2012), leveraged HE students’ negative internship experiences since there was no mechanism for students to debrief, and reflect on their experiences. The lack of opportunities for critical reflection negatively impacted HE students in this study, in addition to HEIs having no control over the content delivered during industry internships. As a result, the skills targeted during the internships were basic operational level skills, and while important for an appreciation of hospitality services, provided limited practical extension to students’ academic learning at HEIs.

The inclusion of adapted internship components that are not underpinned by a well-grounded rationale, with links to the overall program, runs the risk of these HE hospitality programs being downgraded in terms of educational quality. Interestingly, in viewing the design of internship programs, it was also revealed through interviews with hospitality academics in this study that internship components in Vietnamese HEIs were not considered in the original program design, but subsequently added during the implementation stage to demonstrate institutional attempts to balance the theory-practice nexus. While the need for a link between the theory and practice components of the HE program is recognised, and widely applied in most hospitality HE programs, a well-structured design of such programs is essential for the longer term contribution from such a component.

6.3 Implications
The findings of this study with regard to HE students’ low career commitment confirm previous research indicating the transient nature of hospitality/tourism careers (e.g., Bednarska & Olszewski, 2013; Jiang & Tribe, 2009; Kusluvan and Kusluvan, 2000; Richardson, 2010a; Richardson & Butler, 2012). Dissatisfaction with hospitality workplaces, as a result of unmet expectations, may result in a lack of return on students’ investment in education in terms of money, effort and time, with the associated loss of these students from the industry reflecting an inefficient HE system. Thus, labour market entry and HE credentials become an issue for students.

Results also indicated that industry professionals reported being satisfied with their student interns for being hard working, obedient and enthusiastic. Interestingly, being ‘obedient’ instead of ‘compliant’ was considered as a desired attribute. Such an expectation from employers reflects one of the key principles of teaching in a Confucian culture such as Vietnam in which juniors (student interns) owe seniors (managers, supervisors, or senior co-workers), respect and obedience (Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov, 2010). This raises a concern over the non-traditional view of hospitality/tourism HE which is considered to produce graduates who become the so-called “philosophic practitioner(s)” being able to challenge the status quo and influence/change the future (Tribe, 2002), rather than being viewed as “servants” of the current environment (Morgan, 2004; Morrison & O’Mahony, 2003). This also suggests that the current management practices in Vietnamese hospitality workplaces may have some negative impact on students’ motivation and career perceptions.

For the industry employers, preferences for interns with well-developed basic level skills may result in the employers’ failure to prepare, recruit and retain highly skilled graduates for the future, and reinforce the practice by multinational companies of sourcing higher level skill staff from international bases, thus not developing skills and generating
employment for Vietnamese graduates. The lack of highly skilled and motivated local personnel may have a negative impact on service quality, potentially resulting in negative consequences on customer satisfaction and loyalty, and ultimately impacting on the economic competitiveness of the sector. In addition, without a shift in approach the current practice of outsourcing highly skilled hospitality staff to work in high-end hospitality operations is likely to continue, with associated long-term costs and implications for Vietnam. Interestingly, some research has suggested that increased exposure to hospitality/tourism working environment tends to bring about positive change to student commitment to the industry (Bednarska & Olszewski, 2013); however, the results of this study indicated that such change is not currently occurring in Vietnam, due to student perceptions of their limited future career paths in the industry.

Additionally, most enterprises were not aware of either the educational programs the students were undertaking in HEIs, or the differences in content and career orientations between HE and VET programs. In this study, industry professionals were critical of the level of skill preparation in HE programs. This has important implications for HEIs to plan internships involving greater awareness and negotiated roles and responsibilities between industry and HEIs. In this regard, internships in Vietnamese HE hospitality programs are at an early stage of development in which communicative and collaborative links between the industry and HEIs are under-developed (Tran, 2012, 2014; Vallely & Wilkinson, 2008). There is an opportunity for Vietnamese hospitality HE to reflect on, and learn from, successful practices in more advanced systems, such as work-related learning in Australia (see Nagy, Bilsland, & Smith, 2013), or work placement in the United Kingdom (see Busby & Gibson, 2010).
For policy makers, students’ reduced motivations to study due to the current industry-education mismatch may be an indication of the inefficiency of government expenditure on hospitality HE. Results in this study indicated the limited opportunities for more strategic skill jobs in the hospitality industry for HE students. These findings suggested that the operation of the hospitality industry is shaped by industry preferences for vocational education students, a group who are considered to be work ready for the positions available. As the hospitality industry in Vietnam is in the early stages of development, effective linkages between industry providers, and HE and VET institutions, are still being established. Further, while significant high-end hospitality services are delivered by multinational providers, these groups appear to have limited involvement in the preparation of future workers, with many of their more skilled positions being recruited elsewhere.

As patterns of labour market entry and job quality are underpinned by the occupational structure of the labour market (Gangl, 2002), results from this study posit a heightened need for policy interventions in the Vietnamese hospitality industry to bring about positive change to the occupational structure of the hospitality labour market. Since national institutional settings, with regard to the education/training system and the employment system shapes the structure of opportunities for entrants into the labour market (Kerckhoff, 1995), it is important that these interventions are formulated to support HE students, and protect HE graduate work rights in the hospitality industry.

The HE students in this study had high expectations of hospitality workplaces but were not aware of the reality of working in the hospitality industry, which resulted in disappointment with both the industry, and HEIs. These findings highlight the need for diverse and realistic career orientations for students if Vietnam is to realise benefits from its investment in HE. It is also important to recognise that students’ decisions regarding career
choices may change over time (Wang & Huang, 2014). In reality, since an individual career choice can be influenced by interactions, turning points and transformations throughout the individual’s lifetime (Öhman & Stenlund, 2001; Tanova, Karataş-Özkan, & İnal, 2008), an awareness of students’ perceptions, and understanding students’ perspectives towards career decisions, can make those turning points and transformations more positive for the individual, as well as stakeholders involved.

6.4 Strategies for change

For tertiary hospitality education to be effective in Vietnam, the identified issues need to be addressed. These issues occur at different levels, including national, institutional, and program levels thus requiring strategies aimed at both strategic and operational levels. Hence, three strategies for change addressing issues at each level are discussed in this section, including strategies to engage hospitality enterprises in training students, strategies to enhance the linkages between HEIs and industry, and strategies to address student expectations and skills preparations.

The current focus on training in supporting the emerging needs of workplaces has important economic implications for policy as Vietnam aims at progressing economically and lifting the skill levels of workers in the hospitality industry. To achieve such change, a shift in strategy associated with a greater appreciation of, and involvement by, hospitality enterprises, especially multinational hotel companies, would have value. One important avenue that could assist would be changes in the hospitality/tourism policy that could consider industry structure and employment incentives. In this regard, the policy area of supporting indigenous training proposed by Kusluvan and Karamustafa (2001) could be considered in the Vietnamese context. The policy involves negotiations and contracts with multinational hotel companies regarding professional training and development for local employees, such as HE
students, to develop higher level skills. To encourage the process of engaging these enterprises in training of local human resources, incentives such as tax reductions or training allowances to encourage employment and development of local staff are recommended as part of the policy initiative (Kusluvan & Karamustafa, 2001).

With regard to industry-education linkages, HEIs should seek to make greater use of the training expertise of the diverse range of hospitality enterprises available, from SMEs to multinational hotel companies. Thus, the establishment of strong links between the HE system and workplaces is required. This suggests two-way roles and responsibilities for both industry and HEIs, however more strategic involvement from a government policy perspective would also be important in negotiating such agreements. A meaningful mechanism is needed through which internships can be negotiated with hospitality enterprises, and training during internships to be reflected in academic courses at HEIs. Both stakeholders have vested interests in the success of the internships, with industry gaining significant resourcing through the process, while the practical exposure and associated skills development is critical to the HE system as well as the future of the sector.

Feedback from the industry to educational providers should close the loop and provide greater direction for continued study. This may address students’ reduced motivations towards their study, with clearer links between the learning objectives of internships in terms of enhanced professional learning for students and their overall HE study. This process may also start to address the mismatch between the knowledge taught at HEIs, and what skills and capabilities are required by the industry. As students’ satisfaction with their studies helps promote their long-term engagement in the hospitality industry (Bednarska & Olszewski, 2013), it highlights the need for HEIs to improve and update their educational programs to consider student interests and expectations. To reduce the
expectation-perception gap, students need to be informed of employment opportunities for their career decision making to be “based on choice rather than chance” (Kusluvan & Kusluvan, 2000, p. 96), and career orientations for students to be provided early in their programs (Richardson, 2010b).

A strategy that could be developed in cooperation with industry relates to the development of employability skills for HE students during internships. Limited industry-education communication was found to be a major concern during internships. One recommendation for a possible collaboration between industry and HEIs is to conduct negotiated internship components as part of professional development programs at hospitality companies, which focus on the development of both basic operational level skills, and more strategic level skills development. As industry needs were found to focus on the retention of a basic operational level skilled labour force, which dominates the hospitality industry in Vietnam (Jensen, 2001), it is important to include basic operational level skill training as part of internships as exposure to basic level skill jobs during internships will help HE students appreciate the nature of hospitality workplaces. As a result, students would be able to narrow the expectation-perception gap to develop a more realistic view of working in the hospitality industry.

6.5 Contributions

This study significantly contributes to the understanding of the hospitality HE in Vietnam through the capture of the views of those involved in the sector – students, academics, industry professionals, and the other workforce participants – those being trained though the VET sector. This study provided evidence of stakeholders’ perceptions and expectations of graduate knowledge and skills for hospitality careers in Vietnam, with the results supporting findings highlighted in previous studies in other countries with respect to
the lack of industry-education linkage in HE, and its impact on students’ learning and professional development (e.g., Lam & Xiao, 2000; Sheriff, 2013; Zopiatis & Constanti, 2007). Thus it contributes to scholarship investigating hospitality industry-education linkage in an Asian context.

Central to the transformation proposed by the HERA for the 2006-2020 period is the emergence of institutional autonomy (Hayden & Lam, 2007), which provides HEIs with the ability to make decisions about their own frameworks including program content and structure, instead of the current centralised framework mandated by the MOET. This autonomy, forecast to be introduced in 2020, is expected to transform Vietnamese HE (Hayden & Lam, 2007). This study offered evidence-based insights into key factors influencing high quality contributions of HE to an expanding hospitality industry. The assessment of the status of the industry is presented through three factors that focus at three industry levels. The first factor involved the current employment demand in the Vietnamese hospitality industry which is in the early stages of development. The Vietnamese hospitality industry, with a particular focus on high-end service providers, i.e., multinational hotel companies, often has highly skilled personnel in which most management positions are outsourced. The second factor involves the challenges for HEIs to develop HE hospitality programs to prepare students for hospitality careers, including balancing between meeting industry needs and maintaining the hospitality programs at HE level. And finally, the realities of Vietnamese hospitality workplaces for tertiary students were complex, having limited employment opportunities for highly skilled staff. There also exists a lack of effective communication and collaboration between the industry and HEIs, with a lack of strategies to engage industry in the development of HE hospitality programs evident.
The findings in this study contribute to the knowledge and awareness of issues around over-education in developing countries, as it is the first study identified in the literature that has examined hospitality education-occupation matching in the Vietnamese context. Findings from this study confirm the results from other studies (Mehta et al., 2009, 2011), which indicate growth of over-education is underpinned by weak demand for skilled labour in many developing countries. This also was indicated in the lower level of practical learning and support that the HE students in this study experienced during internships. In terms of employment outcomes, the hospitality industry is characterised by a workforce possessing relatively low level skills (Jensen, 2001). In addition, in developing countries such as Vietnam, the hospitality industry is dominated by multinational hotel companies whose recruitment strategies for more strategic level skill positions, i.e., supervision or management, are predominantly filled by external sources, i.e., expatriates, or internally sourced from experienced senior employees (Kusluvan & Karamustaf, 2001). Hence, entrants into educationally mismatched positions tend to be sustained in these positions (Marchante et al., 2007), thus creating long-lasting negative consequences for highly skilled workers (Scherer, 2004). Findings from this study offer empirical evidence to inform policy development mediating the hospitality-education linkage, and managing the phenomenon of over-education.
6.6 Recommendations for research

Recent changes in educational policy anticipated to take effect in 2017 which see MOLISA being the sole governance body of vocational education, and MOET for HE (Ha, 2016), will require future research to be conducted to assess the effect these changes may exert on tertiary hospitality education in Vietnam. This study will thus provide a valuable point in time assessment of the views of students, academics and industry representatives before that change occurs. Thus future studies will be able to assess changes in the system. Additionally, such studies could identify additional factors impacting on the sector then develop and implement methodological tools to measure the degree of impact of these factors on the Vietnamese hospitality HE system. Further studies could provide evidence-based recommendations for resolving issues associated with these impacts, with the ultimate aim of influencing government policies mediating hospitality industry-education relationships.

Another future research direction involves investigating possible cultural implications for the use of the scale measuring hospitality students’ perceptions of hospitality workplaces (Kysluvan & Kusluvan, 2000) in different contexts. In this study, the high percentages of uncertain responses suggest a dilemma in each participant’s decision making of responses to the attitudinal statements. One possible explanation for this phenomenon relates to behaviours commonly exhibited by citizens in collectivist cultures, such as Vietnam. When processing information, these citizens tend to look for contextual cues and view themselves to be mutually reliant on each other within the immediate social environment (Kagitcibasi, 1997; Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Triandis, 1995, 1998). In other words, the participants in this study may have viewed themselves “in-groups” (Bhagat et al., 2002, p. 208). Participants responding in this manner may be typical of collectivists who emphasise context-specific information over logical reasoning when processing information related to personal attributes.
such as beliefs, feelings, and attitudes towards an event or person (Bhawuk, 2001; Triandis, 1998). With regard to the vertical/horizontal nature of cultures, citizens in vertical cultures, such as Vietnam, consider themselves to be in hierarchical arrangements with others in social status, whereas in horizontal cultures people consider themselves to be more or less equal in status with others (Bhawuk, 2001; Chen, Meindl, & Hunt, 1997; Triandis, 1995, 1998; Triandis & Bhawuk, 1997). For example, in workplaces, it is not appropriate for employees, especially junior workers or interns, to speak up against senior co-workers, or people at management level. Further understanding of this cultural element, central to the Vietnamese work setting, may help explain the conflicting nature of attitudinal response patterns exhibited by some participants in this study.

6.7 Limitations

There are some limitations identified in this study related to sampling, and the survey-based data collection method. The sample of tertiary hospitality students was predominantly obtained in Ho Chi Minh City (HCMC), located in South Vietnam. As such, the findings of this study are not generalisable to other populations; however the findings are suggestive of possible patterns in HCMC and other regions across Vietnam. The findings in this study have significance as HCMC is considered the educational centre of the country with the most developed private HE sector, where the majority of hospitality HE programs are provided. In addition, student enrolments in these programs are sourced from regions all over Vietnam, thus providing additional evidence to address the scarcity of research in HE in the Vietnamese context. This study was also limited by the use of a web-based survey which placed restrictions on the length and types of questions that could be asked, in addition to making assumptions about the technological confidence of participants. Future empirical studies are recommended to further confirm the validity and reliability of the scale measuring
hospitality students’ attitudes of hospitality workplaces in the Vietnamese context, on a larger sample.

6.8 Conclusion

This study confirmed the lack of industry-education linkage in the field of hospitality in the Vietnamese context. It identified the key factors behind an enhanced contribution of HE to an expanding hospitality industry. The findings demonstrated that there were conflicts of interest among hospitality stakeholders, including the industry, HEIs, and HE students. The industry-education relationship was found to be predominantly economically driven, with the operation of the hospitality industry dominated by preferences for students sourced from vocational education in relation to satisfying the immediate needs of the workplaces, i.e., students with well-developed basic operational level skills. The results of this study have important implications for the three stakeholder groups, and also for policy makers. Students’ negative perceptions, associated with their internship experiences in different aspects of hospitality workplaces, currently appear to result in detrimental consequences for HE students, with many not planning on remaining in the hospitality sector. This has both short-term and long-term implications for hospitality employers, hospitality educational providers, and Vietnam’s HE system. These implications result in immediate workforce issues, limiting the higher level skills available in the sector, and also pressures on the HE system to contribute to an increase in the international competitiveness of its sector – thus having implications for government and policy makers.
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Appendices

Appendix A Letter of invitation to industry professionals

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am a doctoral candidate at School of Education and Professional Studies, Griffith University, Australia. I am also a lecturer in tourism and hospitality at Tourism Faculty of Van Lang University, Vietnam. I am asking for your help in my research contributing to finding out if the knowledge and skills we have delivered in university hospitality programs prepare our graduates adequately for employment at managerial level in your industry. The purpose of the research is to engage industry in the development of university hospitality curricula which will be improve to tailor to the needs of industry. The research has been approved by Griffith University with Human Research Ethics Reference Number EDN/B5/14/HREC. Three stakeholders including industry professionals, hospitality academics, and university students are invited for interviews in this study.

Thank you in advance for agreeing to participate. Your participation is voluntary. The interview should take about 30 minutes. The interview will be audio-recorded with your permission. Electronic data files of recordings will be password encrypted and stored in a confidential electronic drive that one of the named researchers will have access to. Audio data from interviews will be retained until data analysis is complete. Once data analysis is completed, all audio recordings will be permanently destroyed. The recordings will be used for the sole purpose of data analysis and will not be utilised for any other purposes, including conference presentations, or for instructional purposes.

If you have any questions regarding the study, I can be reached at leah.le@griffith.edu.au or by phone at +61 (0) 490 042 416.

Thank you for assisting me in completing my data collection for my study.

Yours sincerely,

LE Hai Anh (Leah)
Appendix B Letter of invitation to hospitality academics

Dear Colleagues,

I am a doctoral candidate at School of Education and Professional Studies, Griffith University, Australia. I am also a lecturer in tourism and hospitality at Tourism Faculty of Van Lang University, Vietnam. I am asking for your help in my research contributing to understanding challenging issues facing academics in university hospitality curriculum development, especially in response to industry requirements. The research has been approved by Griffith University with Human Research Ethics Reference Number EDN/BS114/HREC. Three stakeholders including industry professionals, hospitality academics, and university students, are invited for interviews in this study. This aims to provide insights the issues of hospitality curriculum development from different perspectives.

Thank you in advance for agreeing to participate. Your participation is voluntary. The interview should take about 30 minutes. The interview will be audio-recorded with your permission. Electronic data files of recordings will be password encrypted and stored in a confidential electronic drive that one of the named researchers will have access to. Audio data from interviews will be retained until data analysis is complete. Once data analysis is completed, all audio recordings will be permanently destroyed. The recordings will be used for the sole purpose of data analysis and will not be utilised for any other purposes, including conference presentations, or for instructional purposes.

If you have any questions regarding the study, I can be reached at leah.le@griffith.edu.au or by phone at +61 (0) 406 042 416.

Thank you for assisting me in completing my data collection for my study.

Yours sincerely,
LE Hai Anh (Leah)
Appendix C Permission to use the survey scale

Dear Prof. Dr. Kusluvan,

I am a doctoral student at Griffith University. I am writing to you to ask for your permission to use the scale for measuring students’ attitudes towards working in the tourism industry from the following work:


I would like to use the scale developed in the material as part of my doctoral research on university hospitality education in Vietnam. In other words, I would like to duplicate your study in the Vietnamese context.

I have made some modifications to the scale to fit in with the Vietnamese context in my study, which include the following:
+ Leave out the dimension of Physical working environment
+ Not include those items with low total correlation as indicated in the material
+ Change all the word ‘tourism’ to ‘hospitality’ which is the main focus of my study

Finally, while I would intend to refer to the full questionnaire, in which the scale items would be embedded, in my dissertation. I also intend to publish from this work and thus would wish to further refer to the detail of this scale in subsequent publications.

I would be very grateful for your permission. If you require any additional information, do not hesitate to contact me.

Thank you and look forward to hearing from you.

Kind regards,

Leah Le
Griffith University

---

Dear Leah,

You can freely use the scale. Good luck with your studies.

Best regards

Dear Leah,

You can freely use the scale. Good luck with your studies.

Best regards

---

Dear Prof. Dr. Kusluvan,

Thank you very much for that. Very much appreciated!

Kind regards,

Leah

---
Appendix D Matching interview findings with the survey scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions and Items</th>
<th>Employers</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Academics</th>
<th>Notes / Themes from the Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nature of work</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stressful working atmosphere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 I find jobs in the tourism industry interesting</td>
<td>(\checkmark)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stressful working atmosphere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 I can feel independent and free in tourism jobs</td>
<td></td>
<td>(\checkmark)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Too hard work, especially for female interns / graduates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Jobs in tourism are generally boring</td>
<td></td>
<td>(\checkmark)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Time inflexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 I think that jobs in tourism are worth doing</td>
<td></td>
<td>(\checkmark)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Seasonality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Jobs in tourism are stressful</td>
<td>(\checkmark)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Limited full-time positions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 I can use my personal authority in jobs in the tourism industry</td>
<td>(\checkmark)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Working hours are too long in the tourism industry</td>
<td>(\checkmark)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Family life is negatively affected for people working in the tourism industry due to the nature of work</td>
<td>(\checkmark)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 To me, jobs in tourism are exhausting</td>
<td>(\checkmark)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 There is always something new to learn each day in tourism jobs</td>
<td>(\checkmark)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Working hours are not suitable for a regular life in the tourism industry</td>
<td>(\checkmark)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 It is very difficult to find a stable job in tourism due to seasonality</td>
<td>(\checkmark)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mismatch between personality and service jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 My family is proud of my profession in tourism</td>
<td>(\checkmark)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Regional preferences to service jobs (e.g. not a preference of Northerners)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Working in tourism is a respected (prestigious) vocation in the Vietnamese Society</td>
<td>(\checkmark)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Working in tourism is regarded as an important and beneficial service to the society in Vietnam</td>
<td>(\checkmark)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 I talk to my relatives and friends with pride about my vocation in the tourism industry</td>
<td>(\checkmark)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Industry-person complementarity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>(\checkmark)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 I find serving foreign tourists degrading</td>
<td></td>
<td>(\checkmark)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Struggling with stress management in dealing with difficult guests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 My character fits to working in the tourism industry</td>
<td></td>
<td>(\checkmark)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Difficulties with communication skills including English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 I find serving Vietnamese tourists degrading</td>
<td></td>
<td>(\checkmark)</td>
<td></td>
<td>communication with guests from different English backgrounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 I can use my abilities and skills in tourism jobs</td>
<td></td>
<td>(\checkmark)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Limited professional / business-like manner in delivering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Working in tourism contradicts with my religious values</td>
<td></td>
<td>(\checkmark)</td>
<td></td>
<td>service and handling customer complaints or solving customer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 I feel as a slave while working in the tourism industry</td>
<td></td>
<td>(\checkmark)</td>
<td></td>
<td>problems - one of the weaknesses of student interns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 I get pleasure while working in the tourism industry</td>
<td></td>
<td>(\checkmark)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 I believe that my moral values will degrade if I work in the tourism industry</td>
<td></td>
<td>(\checkmark)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 I like to see satisfied customers when I serve them</td>
<td></td>
<td>(\checkmark)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 It is not nice to serve people while they are on holiday and enjoying</td>
<td></td>
<td>(\checkmark)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 It is a very nice feeling to serve those who are there in order to spend a good time</td>
<td></td>
<td>(\checkmark)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pay/benefits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>(\checkmark)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Low pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 I think the pay is low for most jobs in the tourism industry</td>
<td></td>
<td>(\checkmark)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 I think that the pay for most tourism jobs not sufficient to lead a satisfactory life</td>
<td></td>
<td>(\checkmark)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Considering the long hours and work load I find the pay low in the</td>
<td></td>
<td>(\checkmark)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
tourism industry
4 The level of fringe benefits (bonuses, leisure, holidays, meals, etc.) is insufficient in the tourism industry

Promotion opportunities
1 Promotion is based on merit in the tourism industry
2 Promotion opportunities are satisfactory in the tourism industry
3 Promotions are not handled fairly in the tourism industry
4 The opportunity of getting promoted to managerial positions is limited in the tourism industry
5 Number of years worked in the industry is taken into consideration in promotion decisions
6 It is very difficult to get promoted if you do not 'have an uncle in the count' in the tourism industry
7 Promotions are unsystematic in the tourism industry

Co-workers
1 There is no team spirit amongst co-workers in the tourism industry
2 There is cooperation amongst employees in the tourism industry
3 Employees are generally uneducated in the tourism industry
4 I can make friends easily with people working in the tourism industry
5 It is not easy to get along with people working in the tourism industry
6 Most employees are highly motivated and enthusiastic about working in the tourism industry
7 I think that employees without degrees from university are jealous of graduates with a degree from tourism schools
8 Generally, people with an educational background in tourism work in the tourism industry
9 Most people working in the tourism industry are rude people
10 I think there are good relationships amongst employees in the tourism industry
11 I find people working in the tourism industry boring

Managers
1 Managers give due value to employees in the tourism industry
2 Managers do not spend much effort for the organizational commitment of employees in the tourism industry
3 Managers delegate authority in order for employees to do their jobs better
4 Most managers do not have an educational background in tourism in the tourism industry
5 Managers value employees' suggestions
6 Managers do not reward employees who are doing a good job
7 Managers behave respectfully to employees in the tourism industry
8 Managers are jealous of university graduates with a degree in tourism
9 Managers make sure that employees participate in decisions affecting their job

<p>| Limited opportunities for promotion |
| Opportunities given to candidates with cruise ship experience |
| Academic qualifications / degrees not prioritised |
| Promotion mechanism: experience-based and other 'unofficial' pathways |
| Unsupportive working environment (major issues shared by several student participants – A CASE of being mildly mentally tortured) |
| Internal conflicts with full-time / casual staff / colleagues |
| Isolated from team work |
| Being 'bullied' by intern supervisors / senior colleagues |
| Competing instead of team / supporting work environment |
| High expectations of interns' abilities resulting from overestimation of university education |
| Limited choices of work placements, mostly catering service (e.g. Food &amp; Beverage, Restaurants) |
| Low level jobs |
| Innovation restricted |
| Inconsistent procedures of receiving interns in the same hospitality enterprise |
| Undertaking brand-new start of on-the-job training which is little relevant to what have been taught in undergraduate programs |
| Inadequate supervision / guidance given to interns |
| Lack of fairness in terms of work given to interns from different educational institutions |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>There is no good relationship between managers and employees in the tourism industry</th>
<th>Evident trainee exploitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Managers do not help solve employees' personal problems</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Managers do not provide vocational training when necessary in the tourism industry</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Managers behave in a fair way to employees in the tourism industry</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Managers do not put great effort into making employees satisfied from their jobs</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commitment to the tourism industry</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>In my opinion, the disadvantages of working in the tourism industry outweigh the advantages</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I am very happy to have chosen tourism as a vocation path</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I would not want my son to study tourism and work in the tourism industry</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I would like to work in the tourism industry after graduation</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>It is definite that I will not work in the tourism industry after graduation</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I recommend first year students to sit in the university exam and choose another career path other than tourism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>It was a big mistake to choose tourism as a career path</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I would want my daughter to study tourism and work in the tourism industry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I recommend a job in the tourism industry to my friends and relatives because it is very nice to be part of this industry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I do not plan to work in another industry other than the tourism industry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I see my vocational (professional) future in the tourism industry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E Questionnaire

VIEWS ON WORKING IN THE HOSPITALITY INDUSTRY IN VIETNAM

This survey seeks to explore Vietnamese students’ attitudes towards a career in the hospitality industry in Vietnam. We are interested in ascertaining your perceptions of different aspects of working in the hospitality industry. Responses from the survey will make a contribution to understanding students’ views towards hospitality careers, which has important implications for the hospitality industry and hospitality education institutions. As such, your responses are highly appreciated.

This survey is being conducted as part of the doctoral research of LE Hai Anh (Leah) titled Tertiary hospitality education in Vietnam: An exploratory study, supervised by Dr. Helen Elisee and Dr. Christine McDonald at Griffith University. This research has been approved by the Human Research Ethics Committee of Griffith University and will be carried out in accordance with the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research [HREC/15/HEC07]. This statement has been developed to protect the interests of people who agree to participate in human research studies. If you have any concerns or complaints about the ethical conduct of the research project, please contact the Manager, Research Ethics on +61 7 3735 4375 or research-ethics@griffith.edu.au.

SECTION 1 – DEMOGRAPHIC AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION
This section seeks information about your background and your work experience in the hospitality industry.

Q1. Age
- 18-24
- 25-30
- >30

Q2. Gender
- Male
- Female
- Not specified

Q3. In which tertiary institution are you currently enrolled as a student?
- Vocational college (3-year vocational diploma)
- Higher education institution (3-year diploma or 4-year bachelor degree)

Q4. Why did you choose your current hospitality study?
- I was attracted by hospitality work featured in movies
- I liked to see myself working in the luxurious atmosphere of 4-5 star hotels/resorts
- I like meeting new people.
- I enjoy serving people.
- I have relatives in the hospitality industry
- Other – Please specify ________________

Q5. How would you rate your understanding of employer requirements in the hospitality industry on a 1-5 scale? (1 is a very low understanding, and 5 is a very high understanding)
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Q6. How long have you been working/ doing internships in the hospitality industry?
- Less than 3 months
- 3 to less than 6 months
- 6 to less than 9 months
- More than 9 months

Q7. In which departments have you had the main work/internship experience?
- Front Office
- Human Resources
- Food and Beverages
- Sales and Marketing
- Kitchen
- Other – Please specify ________________
- Housekeeping

Q8. What is your career plan upon graduation?
- Apply for a job in the hospitality industry
- Apply for a job in any industry
- Set up a business in hospitality
SECTION 2 – VIEWS ON WORKING IN THE HOSPITALITY INDUSTRY

The following questions ask about your views on a range of areas associated with your experiences in working in the industry. Please indicate your level of agreement on each of the statements below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of work</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 I find jobs in the hospitality industry interesting</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Family life is negatively affected for people working in the hospitality industry due to the nature of work</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social values</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 My family is proud of my profession in hospitality</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Working in hospitality is regarded as an important and beneficial service to the society in Vietnam</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 I talk to my relatives and friends with pride about my vocation in the hospitality industry</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry-person congruity</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 I find serving foreign tourists degrading</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 I am well suited to working in the hospitality industry</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 I find serving Vietnamese tourists degrading</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 I can use my abilities and skills in hospitality jobs</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 I get pleasure while working in the hospitality industry</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 I believe that my moral values will degrade if I work in the hospitality industry</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 I like to see satisfied customers when I serve them</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 It is not nice to serve people while they are on holiday and enjoying themselves</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 It is a very nice feeling to serve those who are on holiday and enjoying themselves</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pay/ Promotion opportunities in the hospitality industry</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 I think that the pay for most hospitality jobs not sufficient to lead a satisfactory life</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Considering the long hours and work load I find the pay low in the hospitality industry</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Promotion is based on merit</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Promotion opportunities are satisfactory</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 The opportunity of getting promoted to managerial positions is limited</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Number of years worked in the industry is taken into consideration in promotion decisions.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 It is very difficult to get promoted if you do not ‘have an uncle in the court’</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Promotions are not consistent</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coworkers</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 There is no team spirit amongst co-workers in the hospitality industry</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2 There is cooperation amongst employees in the hospitality industry
3 Employees are generally uneducated in the hospitality industry
4 I can make friends easily with people working in the hospitality industry
5 It is not easy to get along with people working in the hospitality industry
6 Most employees are highly motivated and enthusiastic about working in the hospitality industry
7 Most people working in the hospitality industry are rude people
8 I think there are good relationships amongst employees in the hospitality industry
9 I find people working in the hospitality industry boring

Managers in the hospitality industry
1 Managers value employees
2 Managers do not make an effort for the organisational commitment of employees
3 Managers delegate authority in order for employees to do their jobs better
4 Most managers do not have an educational background in hospitality
5 Managers value employees' suggestions
6 Managers do not reward employees who are doing a good job
7 Managers behave respectfully to employees
8 Managers make sure that employees participate in decisions affecting their job
9 There is no good relationship between managers and employees
10 Managers do not help solve employees' personal problems
11 Managers do provide vocational training when necessary
12 Managers behave in a fair way to employees
13 Managers do not put great effort into making employees satisfied from their jobs

Commitment to the hospitality industry
1 In my opinion, the disadvantages of working in the hospitality industry outweigh the advantages
2 I am very happy to have chosen hospitality as a vocation path
3 I would not want my son or daughter to study hospitality and work in the hospitality industry
4 I would like to work in the hospitality industry after graduation
5 I will definitely not work in the hospitality industry after graduation
6 I recommend first year students choose a different career path than hospitality
7 It was a mistake to choose hospitality as a career path
8 I recommend a job in the hospitality industry to my friends and relatives because it is very nice to be part of this industry
9 I do not plan to work in another industry other than the hospitality industry
SECTION 3 – COMMENTS
Can you give any examples of your personal experiences of working in the hospitality industry? Please provide them below.

Are there any other comments you would like to make regarding working in the hospitality industry? Please provide them below.

Thank you for completing the survey
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F1. Industry professionals

Tertiary hospitality education in Vietnam: An exploratory study

INFORMATION SHEET

Research Team
Senior investigators
Dr. Christine McDonald
School of Education and Professional Studies
Griffith University
Contact Phone +61 7 3735 5831
Contact Email c.mcdonald@griffith.edu.au

Dr. Helen Kieye
School of Education and Professional Studies
Griffith University
Contact Phone +61 7 3735 5925
Contact Email h.kieye@griffith.edu.au

Doctoral Candidate
LE Hai Anh (Leah)
Contact Email leah.le@griffith.edu.au

Why is the research being conducted?

The research will examine hospitality professionals’ views of hospitality student interns’ and graduates’ knowledge and skills, and the relevance and the quality of Vietnam’s hospitality tertiary education. In addition to examining academics’ experience of hospitality program development in higher education (HE), the study also investigates hospitality students’ views on the efficiency of hospitality HE programs, and the relevance of professional skills embedded in these programs and the actual requirements at the workplace. From the data obtained, the research will identify factors that influence effective tertiary hospitality education in Vietnam by exploring the alignment between knowledge and skills delivered in Vietnamese hospitality HE programs and the varying needs of industry employers and students. The published findings will make a contribution to identifying factors that influence effective tertiary education in Vietnam through specific modifications to the internship components in HE hospitality programs to moderate the needs and interests of primary stakeholders, i.e., hospitality employers, hospitality students and educators.

This research is conducted as a doctoral dissertation in fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of Doctor of Education at Griffith University.

What you will be asked to do?

As a professional working in hospitality industry in Vietnam, we invite you to participate in our analysis of current issues of student internships/work placements, in regard to employers’ needs and relevance to local labour market. From this analysis, we aim to determine possibilities to improve the content of hospitality programs tailored to industry needs.

You will be asked to participate in an audio-recorded interview of approximately one hour in length. A member of the research team (LE Hai Anh) will seek your viewpoints and reflections on student interns’ qualities and hospitality HE programs. Interviews will be audio-recorded and fully transcribed, and a copy will be provided to you towards the end of the study. Transcripts will be analyzed thematically, and techniques to enhance trustworthiness and credibility of data (e.g., member checking, peer review,
and the use of an audit trail) will be employed.

Please note you will not be paid or remunerated in other ways for your participation in this research.

Risks to you
The risks involved in participating in this research are no greater than that arising from daily living.

Your confidentiality
Any information obtained in connection with this research project can be identifiable at the organisational or key stakeholder level only. Pseudonyms will be used in the reporting of the results of this research.

Electronic data files of recordings will be password encrypted and stored in a confidential electronic drive that one of the named researchers will have access to. Audio data from interviews will be retained until data analysis is complete. Once data analysis is completed, all audio recordings will be permanently destroyed. The recordings will be used for the sole purpose of data analysis and will not be utilized for any other purposes, including conference presentations, or for instructional purposes.

Your participation is voluntary
Participation in this research project is entirely voluntary. If you do not wish to take part, you do not have to. Your decision whether to take part or not, or to take part and then withdraw, will have no bearing on your relationship with Griffith University, the universities in Vietnam, or the members of the research team whatsoever.

Questions / further information
If you require any further information concerning this research project, or if you have any questions or concerns about participation, please contact:

**Senior investigator:** Dr Christine McDonald
School of Education and Professional Studies
Griffith University
Contact Phone +61 7 3735 5831
Contact Email c.mcdonald@griffith.edu.au

Dr Helen Klieve
School of Education and Professional Studies
Griffith University
Contact Phone +61 7 3735 5925
Contact Email h.klieve@griffith.edu.au

**Doctoral Candidate:** LE Ha Anh (Leah)
Contact Email leah.lee@griffith.edu.au

Ethical conduct of this research
This research has been approved by the Human Research Ethics Committees of Griffith University and will be carried out in accordance with the *National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research*. This statement has been developed to protect the interests of people who agree to participate in human research studies.

If you have any concerns or complaints about the ethical conduct of the research project, please contact the Manager, Research Ethics on +61 7 3735 4373 or research-ethics@griffith.edu.au.
If you have problems communicating in English, please contact member of the research team LE Hai Anh on +61 490 042 416 or leah.ie@griffith.edu.au for concerns or complaints about the ethical conduct of the research project.

Feedback to you

The report of this research will be emailed to participants at the conclusion of the study.

Privacy statement

The conduct of this research involves the collection, access and / or use of your identified personal information. As outlined elsewhere in this information sheet, your identified personal information may appear in the publications/reports arising from this research that may be available to overseas recipients. This is occurring with your consent. Any additional personal information collected is confidential and will not be disclosed to third parties without your consent, except to meet government, legal or other regulatory authority requirements. A de-identified copy of this data may be used for other research purposes. However, your anonymity will at all times be safeguarded, except where you have consented otherwise. For further information, consult the University’s Privacy Plan at http://www.griffith.edu.au/about-griffith/plans-publications/griffith-university-privacy-plan or telephone (07) 3735 4375.
F2. Hospitality academics

Tertiary hospitality education in Vietnam: An exploratory study

INFORMATION SHEET

Research Team

Senior investigators

Dr Christine McDonald
School of Education and Professional Studies
Griffith University
Contact Phone +61 7 3735 5831
Contact Email c.mcdonald@griffith.edu.au

Dr Helen Klieve
School of Education and Professional Studies
Griffith University
Contact Phone +61 7 3735 5925
Contact Email h.klieve@griffith.edu.au

Doctoral Candidate

LE Hai Anh (Leah)
Contact Email leah.le@griffith.edu.au

Why is the research being conducted?

The research will examine hospitality academics’ views and experience of hospitality program development in higher education (HE), and its contribution to developing students’ professional learning. In addition to examining industry professionals’ perceptions of hospitality student interns’ and graduate knowledge and skills, the study also investigates hospitality students’ views on the efficiency of hospitality HE programs, and the relevance of professional skills embedded in these programs and the actual requirements at the workplace. From the data obtained, the research will identify factors that influence effective tertiary hospitality education in Vietnam by exploring the alignment between knowledge and skills delivered in Vietnamese hospitality HE programs and the varying needs of industry employers and students. The published findings will make a contribution to identifying factors that influence effective tertiary education in Vietnam through specific modifications to the internship components in HE hospitality programs to moderate the needs and interests of primary stakeholders, i.e. hospitality employers, hospitality students and educators.

This research is conducted as a doctoral dissertation in fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of Doctor of Education at Griffith University.

What you will be asked to do?

As a Vietnamese hospitality academic, we invite you to participate in our analysis of current issues of hospitality program development in HE, in regard to employers’ needs and relevance to local labour market. From this analysis, we aim to determine possibilities to improve the content of hospitality programs tailored to industry needs.

You will be asked to participate in an audio-recorded interview of approximately one hour in length. A member of the research team (LE Hai Anh) will seek your viewpoints and reflections on the development of hospitality programs in HE. Interviews will be audio-recorded and fully transcribed, and a copy will be provided to you towards the end of the study. Transcripts will be analysed thematically, and techniques to enhance trustworthiness and credibility of data (e.g., member checking, peer review, and
the use of an audit trail) will be employed.

Please note you will not be paid or remunerated in other ways for your participation in this research.

Risks to you
The risks involved in participating in this research are no greater than that arising from daily living.

Your confidentiality
Any information obtained in connection with this research project can be identifiable at the organisational or key stakeholder level only. Pseudonyms will be used in the reporting of the results of this research.

Electronic data files of recordings will be password encrypted and stored in a confidential electronic drive that one of the named researchers will have access to. Audio data from interviews will be retained until data analysis is complete. Once data analysis is completed, all audio recordings will be permanently destroyed. The recordings will be used for the sole purpose of data analysis and will not be utilised for any other purposes, including conference presentations, or for instructional purposes.

Your participation is voluntary
Participation in this research project is entirely voluntary. If you do not wish to take part, you do not have to. Your decision whether to take part or not, or to take part and then withdraw, will have no bearing on your relationship with Griffith University, the universities in Vietnam, or the members of the research team whatsoever.

Questions / further information
If you require any further information concerning this research project, or if you have any questions or concerns about participation, please contact:

Senior investigators
Dr Christine McDonald
School of Education and Professional Studies
Griffith University
Contact Phone +61 7 3735 5831
Contact Email c.mcdonald@griffith.edu.au

Dr Helen Klieve
School of Education and Professional Studies
Griffith University
Contact Phone +61 7 3735 5925
Contact Email h.klieve@griffith.edu.au

Doctoral Candidate
LE Hai Anh (Leah)
Contact Email leah.ie@griffith.edu.au

Ethical conduct of this research
This research has been approved by the Human Research Ethics Committees of Griffith University and will be carried out in accordance with the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research. This statement has been developed to protect the interests of people who agree to participate in human research studies.

If you have any concerns or complaints about the ethical conduct of the research project, please contact the Manager, Research Ethics on +61 7 3735 4375 or research.ethics@griffith.edu.au.

If you have problems communicating in English, please contact member of the research team LE Hai Anh.
Feedback to you
The report of this research will be emailed to participants at the conclusion of the study.

Privacy statement
The conduct of this research involves the collection, access and / or use of your identified personal information. As outlined elsewhere in this information sheet, your identified personal information may appear in the publications/reports arising from this research that may be available to overseas recipients. This is occurring with your consent. Any additional personal information collected is confidential and will not be disclosed to third parties without your consent, except to meet government, legal or other regulatory authority requirements. A de-identified copy of this data may be used for other research purposes. However, your anonymity will at all times be safeguarded, except where you have consented otherwise. For further information, consult the University’s Privacy Plan at http://www.griffith.edu.au/about-griffith/plans-publications/griffith-university-privacy-plan or telephone (07) 3735 4375.
Tertiary hospitality education in Vietnam: An exploratory study

INFORMATION SHEET

Research Team

Senior investigators
Dr Christine McDonald
School of Education and Professional Studies
Griffith University
Contact Phone +61 7 3735 3831
Contact Email c.mclaren@griffith.edu.au

Dr Helen Kliese
School of Education and Professional Studies
Griffith University
Contact Phone +61 7 3735 3923
Contact Email h.kliese@griffith.edu.au

Doctoral Candidate

L.F. Hai Anh (Leah)
Contact Email leah.1c@griffith.edu.au

Why is the research being conducted?
The research will examine higher education (HE) students’ views of hospitality programs, and their experience of professional learning at higher education institutions (HEIs) and during work placements. In addition to examining academics’ experience of hospitality program development, the study also investigates hospitality professionals’ views of hospitality student interns’ and graduates’ knowledge and skills, and the relevance and the quality of Vietnam’s hospitality HE. From the data obtained, the research will identify factors that influence effective tertiary hospitality education in Vietnam by exploring the alignment between knowledge and skills delivered in Vietnamese hospitality HE programs and the varying needs of industry employers and students. The published findings will make a contribution to identifying factors that influence effective tertiary education in Vietnam through specific modifications to the internship components in HE hospitality programs to moderate the needs and interests of primary stakeholders, i.e. hospitality employers, hospitality students and educators.

This research is conducted as a doctoral dissertation in fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of Doctor of Education at Griffith University.

What you will be asked to do?

As a current student of a Vietnamese hospitality HE program, we invite you to participate in our analysis of current issues of students’ professional development, in regard to employers’ needs and relevance to local labour market. From this analysis, we aim to determine possibilities to improve the content of hospitality programs tailored to industry needs.

You will be asked to participate in an audio-recorded interview of approximately one hour in length. A member of the research team (L.F. Hai Anh) will seek your viewpoints and reflections on different issues of the internships. Interviews will be audio-recorded and fully transcribed, and a copy will be provided to
you towards the end of the study. Transcripts will be analysed thematically, and techniques to enhance trustworthiness and credibility of data (e.g., member checking, peer review, and the use of an audit trail) will be employed.

Please note you will not be paid or remunerated in other ways for your participation in this research.

Risks to you
The risks involved in participating in this research are no greater than that arising from daily living.

Your confidentiality
Any information obtained in connection with this research project can be identifiable at the organisational or key stakeholder level only. Pseudonyms will be used in the reporting of the results of this research.

Electronic data files of recordings will be password encrypted and stored in a confidential electronic drive that one of the named researchers will have access to. Audio data from interviews will be retained until data analysis is complete. Once data analysis is completed, all audio recordings will be permanently destroyed. The recordings will be used for the sole purpose of data analysis and will not be utilised for any other purposes, including conference presentations, or for instructional purposes.

Your participation is voluntary
Participation in this research project is entirely voluntary. If you do not wish to take part, you do not have to. Your decision whether to take part or not, or to take part and then withdraw, will have no bearing on your relationship with Griffith University, the universities in Vietnam, or the members of the research team whatsoever.

Questions / further information
If you require any further information concerning this research project, or if you have any questions or concerns about participation, please contact:

**Senior investigators**

Dr Christine McDonald
School of Education and Professional Studies
Griffith University
Contact Phone  +61 7 3735 5831
Contact Email  c.mcdonald@griffith.edu.au

Dr Helen Klieve
School of Education and Professional Studies
Griffith University
Contact Phone  +61 7 3735 3925
Contact Email  h.klieve@griffith.edu.au

**Doctoral Candidate**

LE Hai Anh (Leah)
Contact Email  leah.le@griffith.edu.au

Ethical conduct of this research
This research has been approved by the Human Research Ethics Committees of Griffith University and will be carried out in accordance with the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research. This statement has been developed to protect the interests of people who agree to participate in human research studies.

If you have any concerns or complaints about the ethical conduct of the research project, please contact the Manager, Research Ethics on +61 7 3735 4373 or research-ethics@griffith.edu.au.
If you have problems communicating in English, please contact member of the research team LE Ha Nhi on +61 490 042 416 or leanh.nhi@griffith.edu.au for concerns or complaints about the ethical conduct of the research project.

Feedback to you

The report of this research will be emailed to participants at the conclusion of the study.

Privacy statement

The conduct of this research involves the collection, access and/or use of your identified personal information. As outlined elsewhere in this information sheet, your identified personal information may appear in the publications/reports arising from this research that may be available to overseas recipients. This is occurring with your consent. Any additional personal information collected is confidential and will not be disclosed to third parties without your consent, except to meet government, legal or other regulatory authority requirements. A de-identified copy of this data may be used for other research purposes. However, your anonymity will at all times be safeguarded, except where you have consented otherwise. For further information, consult the University’s Privacy Plan at http://www.griffith.edu.au/about-griffith/plans-publications/griffith-university-privacy-plan or telephone (07) 3735 4375.
Appendix G Informed consent forms

G1. Industry professionals

CONSENT FORM
GU Ref No: EDN/B5/14/HREC
Tertiary hospitality education in Vietnam: An exploratory study

Research Team
Dr Christine McDonald
School of Education and Professional Studies
Griffith University
Contact Phone +61 7 3735 5831
Contact Email c.mcdonald@griffith.edu.au
LE Hai Anh (Leah)
Contact Email leah.le@griffith.edu.au

By signing below, I confirm that I have read and understood the information package and in particular have noted that:

- I understand that my involvement in this research will include participation in an interview of approximately 30-45 minute duration concerning my viewpoints and reflections on hospitality student interns' and graduate qualities in Vietnam of which I have reasonable knowledge of and managerial interactions with;
- I have had any questions answered to my satisfaction;
- I understand the risks involved;
- I understand that there will be no direct benefit to me from my participation in this research;
- I understand that my participation in this research is voluntary;
- I understand that if I have any additional questions I can contact the research team;
- I understand that I am free to withdraw at any time, without comment or penalty;
- I understand that I will be able to access the written summary of the results of the research; (The report will be emailed to the participants at the conclusion of the study);
- I understand that I can contact the Manager, Research Ethics, at Griffith University Human Research Ethics Committee on +61 7 3735 4372 or research.ethics@griffith.edu.au if I have any concerns about the ethical conduct of the project;
- I understand that if I have problems communicating in English, I can contact member of the research team LE Hai Anh on +61 490 442 416 (Australia) or +84 905 507 380 (Vietnam) or leah.le@griffith.edu.au for concerns or complaints about the ethical conduct of the research project; and
- I agree
  □ to participate in the project, and
  □ to make the audio recording of the interview.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONSENT FORM
GU Ref No: EDN/B3/14/HREC

Tertiary hospitality education in Vietnam: An exploratory study

Research Team
Dr Christine McDonald
School of Education and Professional Studies
Griffith University
Contact Phone +61 7 3735 5831
Contact Email c.mcdonald@griffith.edu.au
LE Hau Anh (Loa)
Contact Email lea.h.lo@griffith.edu.au

By signing below, I confirm that I have read and understood the information package and in particular have noted that:

- I understand that my involvement in this research will include participation in an interview of approximately 30-45 minute duration concerning my viewpoints and reflections on Vietnamese hospitality programs in higher education of which I have had demonstrated expertise;
- I have had any questions answered to my satisfaction;
- I understand the risks involved;
- I understand that there will be no direct benefit to me from my participation in this research;
- I understand that my participation in this research is voluntary;
- I understand that if I have any additional questions I can contact the research team;
- I understand that I am free to withdraw at any time, without comment or penalty;
- I understand that I will be able to access the written summary of the results of the research; (The report will be emailed to the participants at the conclusion of the study);
- I understand that I can contact the Manager, Research Ethics, at Griffith University Human Research Ethics Committee on +61 7 3735 4575 (or research-ethics@griffith.edu.au) if I have any concerns about the ethical conduct of the project;
- I understand that if I have problems communicating in English, I can contact member of the research team LE Hau Anh on +61 400 042 416 (Australia) or +84 909 507 389 (Vietnam) or lea.h.lo@griffith.edu.au for concerns or complaints about the ethical conduct of the research project;
- I agree
  - [ ] to participate in the project, and
  - [ ] to make the audio recording of the interview.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signature</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
G3. HE students

CONSENT FORM
GU Ref No: EDN/BS/14/HREC
Tertiary hospitality education in Vietnam: An exploratory study

Research Team
Dr Christine McDonald
School of Education and Professional Studies
Griffith University
Contact Phone +61 7 3735 5831
Contact Email e.mcdonald@griffith.edu.au
LE Hai Anh (Leah)
Contact Email leah.le@griffith.edu.au

By signing below, I confirm that I have read and understood the information package and in particular have noted that:

- I understand that my involvement in this research will include participation in an interview of approximately 30-45 minute length concerning my viewpoints and reflections on my professional development journey at the educational institution in which I am currently enrolled, and during my work placements in the hospitality industry;
- I have had any questions answered to my satisfaction;
- I understand the risks involved;
- I understand that there will be no direct benefit to me from my participation in this research;
- I understand that my participation in this research is voluntary;
- I understand that if I have any additional questions I can contact the research team;
- I understand that I am free to withdraw at any time, without comment or penalty;
- I understand that I will be able to access the written summary of the results of the research; (The report will be emailed to the participants at the conclusion of the study);
- I understand that I can contact the Manager, Research Ethics, at Griffith University Human Research Ethics Committee on +61 7 3735 4375 or (research.ethics@griffith.edu.au) if I have any concerns about the ethical conduct of the project;
- I understand that if I have problems communicating in English, I can contact member of the research team LE Hai Anh on +61 490 042 416 (Australia) or +84 309 507 380 (Vietnam) or leah.le@griffith.edu.au for concerns or complaints about the ethical conduct of the research project; and
- I agree

☐ to participate in the project, and
☐ to make the audio recording of the interview.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>