



# PERCEPTION OF FACULTY AND INDUSTRY REPRESENTATIVE TOWARDS HOTEL MANAGEMENT SUBJECTS: THE CASE STUDY OF NCHMCTSYLLABUS IN INDIA

<sup>1</sup>DR. RAKESH DANI, <sup>2</sup>MUKUL DIMRI

<sup>1</sup>Department of Hospitality and Hotel Management, Graphic Era (Deemed to be University), India

<sup>2</sup>Institute of Hotel Management, Kufri, Shimla, India

## ABSTRACT

Hospitality and tourism education is always viewed as a factor in the tourism development of any region (Bagri and Babu, 2009). Hospitality and tourism education is of vital importance in developing the right kind of manpower which in turn can make better planning and bring the required professionalism to the industry (Bhardwaj, 2002). The curriculum is the foundation of every course; it includes all of the learning opportunities offered by educational institutions as well as the overall experience that will help the student to develop the skills necessary to accomplish the job (Galle L.E & Pole, 1978). In 1984, the “Ministry of Tourism” (MOT) took over education pertaining to Hotel Management in India and established an autonomous body, “the National Council for Hotel Management and catering technology” (NCHMCT), which is anodal and affiliating organization regarding the setting of standards pertaining to the field of Hotel Management. The main objective was to have a common syllabus and norms and many of the Food Crafts Institutes were upgraded to the status of Hotel Management Institutes, according to (Almedia & Chaudhary, 2015).

In this research work, efforts were made to find out the perception of faculty and industry experts towards the syllabus of NCHMCT, which play a role of an apex body for more than 80 institutes affiliated with it. Therefore a sample of 350 respondents was collected and analyzed statistically with the help of descriptive analysis (mean, median, mode, standard deviation, etc.) and inferential statistics such as independent sample t-Test and Chi-Square test.

**Keywords:** Perception, Syllabus, Hospitality Education, Industry Representatives.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

(Tanner and Tanner, 2007) have extensive work in the field of education and gave the definition of curriculum as “that reconstruction of knowledge and experience that enable the learner to grow in exercising intelligent control of subsequent knowledge and experience”. According to (Bhardwaj, 2002) “there are several issues that need to be addressed while discussing the status of hospitality education in India. While hospitality management programs have existed in colleges and universities for over 75 years in India but the field of hospitality education has changed very fast and spread across several spheres”. It would be most appropriate to chart the differences in the perceptions on the mandated hospitality education by the stakeholders in hospitality (Cho, Erdem and Johanson, 2007). This would entail examining the gaps in the curriculum and determining the curriculum shortcomings and suggest their upgradation factors for the future managers of the industry (Tsai, Chen and Hu, 2004).

In 1984, the “Ministry of Tourism” (MOT) took over education pertaining to Hotel Management in India and established an autonomous body, “the National Council for Hotel Management” (NCHM), which is anodal and affiliating organization regarding the setting of standard pertaining to the field of Hotel Management. The main objective was to have a common syllabus and norms and many of the Food Crafts Institutes were upgraded to the status of Hotel Management Institutes, according to (Almedia & Chaud

hary, 2015).

According to (Dredge et al., 2013) very little work has been done on the scholarly investigations of curriculum design and review processes that can assist the various departments in meeting current and pending demands on curriculum. Therefore, the current research reviewed hospitality education in India and the applicability of the curriculum of the National Council for Hotel Management for meeting the growth in number of the jobs in this sector where several different stakeholders have entered the field.

## 2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The field of hospitality education has attained great significance in recent years when seen against the backdrop of tourism and travel worldwide. There has been subsequent demand for adequately trained hospitality professionals to meet international requirements and standards. It has been widely acknowledged that professionalism in the hospitality education field is essential for providing the right kind of manpower (Bhardwaj, 2002) and also there has not been adequate research in hospitality education (Bagri & Babu, 2009) while it has pointed out that the major issue is the lack of uniformity in the teaching of hospitality education among students (Amroah & Baum, 1997). There is a constant demand for students having the essential employable skills (Barrie, 2006). It has been suggested that a critical view be taken up by educational institutes of their programs to find out whether they are imparting the requisite competencies (Kember & Lung, 2005).

The definition of hospitality education has been subject for debates among researchers since (Wisch, 1991). Wisch argued that career oriented programs like Hotel Management should be heavily specialized and (Reigel, 1995) suggested that hotel management education should have a more all-encompassing rather than being focused only on a specific industry. Several researchers are of the view that hospitality management is not merely about the skill and knowledge employed in the hotel and catering operations but also encompasses a much wider field. According to (Godman and Spague, 1991), hospitality education must also help students to develop communications and interpersonal soft skill to enable them effectively lead others.

(Raybould and Wilkins, 2006) reported a significant gap between the expectations of the hospitality employers and academicians' perceptions of the required skills that graduate need. (Lin, 2011) also reported that there were gaps between the Industry and academicians' perception about the skill that are required from fresher entering the hospitality industry. Most recruiters desire the institutional output to maintain professional standards, have high levels of commitment, be hard-working, have exceptional communications skills, and be directly focused on service quality and a high level tolerance towards guest services.

(Reynolds et al., 2009). To make use of the resources and also to provide a sustained thrust to the program, the Ministry of Tourism, Govt. of India established in 1982, "The National Council of Hotel Management and Catering Technology" (NCHMCT) to standardize the hospitality education (Dahiya, 2013). The syllabus of the NCHMCT can be said to be somewhat standardized as compared to the other bodies in the field of hospitality management. It must be highlighted that (Mahesh Kumar, 2014) noted that several faculty members of hospitality education institutions felt that the hotel's lobby should co-operate increasingly with the institutions in the specialized areas like curriculum development, guest lectures and training of faculty members in the hotels. To be able to supply skilled and efficient human resource for the industry most of the hospitality schools in India need to revisit the challenges facing the industry and attract the optimally skilled talent with the right attitude (Almedia and Chaudhary, 2015).

Due to existing design of the hospitality education curriculum the students find that despite their expectations they are not considered fully qualified to be promoted to management positions because they lack essential practical skills and do not have a positive attitude towards the service



oriented industry and the managers have the perception that students from some of the top-ranked universities tend to be motivationally deficient and lack the zeal to compete in the fast paced hospitality industry (Zhang and Wu, 2004; Yu, 2005). The flipside is that most hospitality graduates seem to carry a negative view of their future careers in the hospitality industry.

### 3. THE RESEARCH GAP

Gap analysis has entailed comparisons of actual performance when contrasted with expected output performance. It can also be referred to as the need-gap analysis, need assessment, or need analysis. Gap analysis has been used in this study to assess the significance of the curriculum suitability to the needs of the learners and the employers. There exists a vast gap between practitioners and academics in most fields of education. The field of hospitality education had made great strides against the backdrop of boom in the hospitality as well as tourism sector. Subsequent increased demand from this industry for the hospitality professionals had pressurized hospitality institutions to produce pass-outs who were well equipped to meet the needs of this industry due to the fast paced demand. The educators in the hospitality industry were unable to provide quality education and adequately prepared students for the purpose of employment according to the hospitality doyens. The lament of the hospitality educators was lack of uniformity in curriculum, lack of requisite infrastructure and the overall lacunae in recruitment and retention of qualified professionals.

### 4. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

1. To find out the skills imparted in the syllabus being perceived as important by hospitality academician and the industry experts.
2. To assess the current requirements in the syllabus according to the emerging hospitality needs world wide and in India.

### 5. RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS

**H<sub>0</sub>1:** There is no significant difference in the opinion of Faculties and Industry Representatives about significance of subjects taught under NCHMCT curriculum.

**H<sub>0</sub>2:** There is no significant difference in opinion of Faculties and Industry Representatives about changes required in subjects of NCHMCT curriculum.

### 6. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The research study reflects the general technique that any researcher decides to incorporate in the various parts of his investigation in a reasonable and intelligent manner. In this way, it assures the researcher about addressing the research study in an effective way and also establishes the roadmap for the assortment, estimation, and investigation of research information. Keeping all this things in mind, descriptive research design has been adopted. Therefore a sample of 350 respondents was collected and analyzed statistically with the help of descriptive analysis (mean, median, mode, standard deviation, etc.) and inferential statistics such as independent sample t-Test and Chi-Square test.

#### 6.1 SAMPLING

The target population of the present study covered the industry experts who are senior managers in the hotel industry and hospitality academicians who are faculty members in the NCHMCT affiliated Institutes. The geographical area of the research was thirty North India Institutes and thirty Hotels of North India were considered to select the sample. The sample of these respondents has been selected by using purposive sampling method. From each population frame respondents have been



contacted and asked to participate in the study. Those who agreed and actively participated in study were considered as final sample unit. In total 153 faculties and 198 industry representatives were included in sample. The final sample was ascertained as follows:-

Description	Faculties	Industry Representatives	Total
Questionnaires Distributed	179	237	416
Questionnaires Received Back	162	213	375
Questionnaires Discarded	09	15	24
<b>Eligible Subjects</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>198</b>	<b>351</b>

**Table 6.1: Procedure of Sample Selection**

## 6.2 SOURCES OF INFORMATION

The study has used the data collected from primary as well as secondary sources. The secondary data has been utilized in introduction and review of literature whereas the analysis and interpretations have been made on the basis of primary data. Information regarding sources is given below in detail:

### 6.2.1 Primary Sources

The respondents have been interviewed with the help of semi-structured questionnaires.

### 6.2.2 Secondary sources

This secondary data has played an important role in identification of research gap and finalization of research objectives. This secondary data for this study has been collected from following sources:

- A. Journals of Hospitality Sector.
- B. Newspapers & Magazines.
- C. Hotel Websites
- D. Annual Reports of Hotels.

## 6.3 TECHNIQUES OF GATHERING INFORMATION

The primary data has been collected with the help of semi-structured questionnaires especially designed for this study. The questionnaire designed for faculties and industry representatives was having three sub-sections as follows:-

- Section I: Demographic Profile / Personal Details (Nominal Scale)
- Section II: Significance of Subjects Taught under NCHMCT curriculum (Ordinal Scale)
- Section III: Modification required in curriculum (Nominal Scale & Open Ended questions)

## 7. DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

### 7.1 Gender of Respondents

Table 7.1 is presenting the gender bifurcation of respondents. As per the data majority of respondents (N=300, Percentage=85.47) were males whereas rest 16.24% respondents (N=57) were females.



Gender	N	Percentage
Male	300	85.47
Female	51	14.53
<b>Total</b>	<b>351</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 7.1: Gender of Respondents

## 7.2 Age of Respondents

As per the age of respondents they were classified into four categories as represented in table 7.2. It was seen that maximum number of respondents were from age group of 41 to 50 years (N=102, Percentage=29.06) followed by 28.21% respondents (N=99) who were from the age category of up to 30 years. There were 22.22% respondents (N=78) from the age group of above 50 years and 20.51% respondents (N=72) were of 31 to 40 years age.

Age	N	Percentage
Upto 30 Years	99	28.21
31 to 40 Years	72	20.51
41 to 50 Years	102	29.06
Above 50 Years	78	22.22
<b>Total</b>	<b>351</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 7.2: Age of Respondents

## 7.3 Qualification of Respondents

As per highest qualification of respondents they were divided into groups as presented in table 7.3. According to figures shown in table it can be observed that 60.68% respondents (N=213) were postgraduate whereas 22.22% respondents (N=78) were undergraduate. Out of rest 4.27% respondents (N=15) were graduate and 8.55% respondents (N=30) were holding PhD degree.

Qualification	N	Percentage
Higher Secondary	3	0.85
Undergraduate	78	22.22
Graduate	15	4.27
Postgraduate	213	60.68
Doctoral	30	8.55
Other	12	3.42
<b>Total</b>	<b>351</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 7.3: Qualification of Respondents

## 7.4 Monthly Income of Respondents

Table 7.4 is depicting the qualification of respondents. As per the data majority of respondents (N=117, Percentage=33.33) were earning more than Rs. 1,00,000 per month followed by 29.91% respondents (N=105) who were getting Rs. 20,000 to Rs. 40,000 per month. 13.68% respondents (N=48) indicated monthly income of Rs. 40,000 to Rs. 60,000 followed by Rs. 60,000 to Rs. 80,000 (N=45, Percentage=12.82) and Rs. 80,000 to Rs. 1,00,000 (N=36, Percentage=10.26).



Income	N	Percentage
Rs. 20,000to 40,000	105	29.91
Rs. 40,000to 60,000	48	13.68
Rs. 60,000to 80,000	45	12.82
Rs. 80,000to 1,00,000	36	10.26
Morethan Rs. 1,00,000	117	33.33
<b>Total</b>	<b>351</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 7.4: Monthly Income of Respondents

### 7.5 Type of Respondents

The research has focused on two types of respondents i.e. Faculty teaching in the various hotel management colleges and employees working in hotel industry. It can be seen from table 7.5 that 43.59%

respondents (N=153) were faculty members, and 56.41% respondents (N=198) were industry representatives.

Type	N	Percentage
Faculty	153	43.59
Industry Representative	198	56.41
<b>Total</b>	<b>351</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 7.5: Type of Respondents

Table 7.6 is presenting the results of t-test applied to measure significant difference in the opinion of faculties and industry representatives about overall significance of food production subject. It can be observed that at 5% level of significance the value of t-statistic is not significant so it can be concluded that there is no significant difference in the opinion of faculties and industry representatives about the overall significance of food production subject.

Type of Respondent	Importance of Food Production		t-value	p-value	Result
	Mean	S.D.			
Faculty	52.12	7.702	1.10	0.272	Not Significant
Industry Representative	51.12	8.924			

Level of Significance = 5%

**Table 7.6: Independent Sample t-test results to measure Significant difference in opinion of Faculties and Industry Representative about Overall Significance/Importance of Food Production Subject**

Table 7.7 is presenting the results of t-test applied to measure significant difference in the opinion of faculties and industry representatives about overall significance of Food & Beverage Service Subject. It can be observed that at 5% level of significance the value of t-statistic is not significant so it can be concluded that there is no significant difference in the opinion of faculties and industry representatives about the overall significance of Food & Beverage Service Subject.

Type of Respondent	Importance of Food & Beverage Service		t-value	p-value	Result
	Mean	S.D.			
Faculty	32.96	6.232	0.075	0.534	Not Significant
Industry Representative	33.36	5.84			

Level of Significance = 5%

**Table 7.7: Independent Sample t-test results to measure Significant difference in opinion of Faculties and Industry Representative about Overall Significance/Importance of Food & Beverage Service Subject**

Table 7.8 is presenting the results of t-test applied to measure significant difference in the opinion of faculties and industry representatives about overall significance of Front Office Management Subject. It can be observed that at 5% level of significance the value of t-statistic is not significant so it can be concluded that there is no significant difference in the opinion of faculties and industry representatives about the overall significance of Front Office Management Subject.

Type of Respondent	Importance of Front Office Management		t-value	p-value	Result
	Mean	S.D.			
Faculty	24.67	4.171	1.65	0.100	Not Significant
Industry Representative	23.82	5.197			

Level of Significance = 5%

**Table 7.8: Independent Sample t-test results to measure Significant difference in opinion of Faculties and Industry Representative about Overall Significance/Importance of Front Office Management Subject**

Table 7.9 is presenting the results of t-test applied to measure significant difference in the opinion of faculties and industry representatives about overall significance of Housekeeping Subject. It can be observed that at 5% level of significance the value of t-statistic is not significant so it can be concluded that there is no significant difference in the opinion of faculties and industry representatives about the overall significance of Housekeeping Subject.

Type of Respondent	Importance of House Keeping		t-value	p-value	Result
	Mean	S.D.			
Faculty	38.04	6.407	1.268	0.206	Not Significant
Industry Representative	37.03	8.071			

Level of Significance = 5%

**Table 7.9: Independent Sample t-test results to measure Significant difference in opinion of Faculties and Industry Representative about Overall Significance/Importance of Housekeeping Subject**

Table 7.10 is presenting the results of t-test applied to measure significant difference in the opinion of faculties and industry representatives about overall significance of Other Subjects. It can be



observed that at 5% level of significance the value of t-statistic is not significant so it can be concluded that there is no significant difference in the opinion of faculties and industry representatives about the overall significance of Other Subjects.

Type of Respondent	Importance of Other Subjects		t-value	p-value	Result
	Mean	S.D.			
Faculty	58.03	10.145	0.48	0.632	Not Significant
Industry Representative	58.59	11.297			

Level of Significance = 5%

**Table 7.10: Independent Sample t-test results to measure Significant difference in opinion of Faculties and Industry Representative about Overall Significance/Importance of Other Subjects**

To identify the difference in opinion of Faculties and Industry Representatives independent sample t-test was applied, and the results are presented in table 7.11. It was observed that all the subjects taught to hotel management students are important or significant. At 5% level of significance the values of t-statistics were not found significant which means null hypothesis is accepted, so it can be concluded that there is no significant difference in the opinion of Faculties and Industry Representatives about significance of subjects taught under NCHMCT curriculum. For faculty members and industry representatives the subjects taught under NCHMCT curriculum are equally important. Therefore, Hypothesis  $H_0$  which states that there is no significant difference in the opinion of Faculties and Industry Representatives about significance of subjects taught under NCHMCT curriculum is accepted and its corresponding objective to find out the skills imparted in the syllabus being perceived as important by hospitality academicians and the industry experts is achieved.

Subjects	Faculty (N=153)		Industry Representative (N=198)		t-value	p-value	Result
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.			
Food Production	52.12	7.702	51.12	8.924	1.1	0.272	Not Significant
Food & Beverage Service	32.96	6.232	33.36	5.84	0.622	0.534	Not Significant
Front Office Management	24.67	4.171	23.82	5.197	1.65	0.100	Not Significant
House Keeping	38.04	6.407	37.03	8.071	1.268	0.206	Not Significant
Other Subjects	58.03	10.145	58.59	11.297	0.48	0.632	Not Significant

Level of Significance = 5%



**Table 7.11: Independent Sample t-Test results to measure significant difference in the opinion of Faculties and Industry Representatives about significance of subjects taught under NCHMCT curriculum**

To test this hypothesis the opinion of respondents was cross-tabulated with respect to the type of respondents i.e. Faculty and Industry Representative and then chi-square test was applied. The results presented in table 7.12 indicate that all the chi-statistics are significant at 5% level of significance

which lead to the acceptance of hypothesis. So it can be concluded that there is no significant difference in opinion of Faculties and Industry Representatives about changes required in subjects of NCHMCT curriculum, or in other words faculties and industry representatives have indicated similar modification required in subjects of NCHMCT curriculum. Therefore, Hypothesis  $H_02$  which states that there is no significant difference in opinion of Faculties and Industry Representatives about changes required in subjects of NCHMCT curriculum is **accepted** and it corresponds to the objective to assess the current requirements in the syllabus according to the emerging hospitality needs worldwide and in India is achieved.

Subject	Type of Respondent	Change Required			Chi-Square Value	p-Value	Significance
		No	Yes	Total			
Hotel Engineering	Faculty	78	75	153	0.145	0.703	Not Significant
	Industry Representative	105	93	198			
	<b>Total</b>	183	168	351			
Nutrition	Faculty	93	60	153	1.373	0.241	Not Significant
	Industry Representative	108	90	198			
	<b>Total</b>	201	150	351			
Hotel Accountancy	Faculty	99	54	153	3.683	0.055	Not Significant
	Industry Representative	108	90	198			
	<b>Total</b>	207	144	351			
Communication	Faculty	84	69	153	0.397	0.528	Not Significant
	Industry Representative	102	96	198			
	<b>Total</b>	186	165	351			
Food & Beverage Control	Faculty	90	63	153	0.269	0.604	Not Significant
	Industry Representative	111	87	198			
	<b>Total</b>	201	150	351			
Food Safety & Quality	Faculty	93	60	153	0.367	0.545	Not Significant
	Industry Representative	114	84	198			
	<b>Total</b>	207	144	351			
	Faculty	108	45	153			

Financial Management	Industry Representative	123	75	198	2.75	0.097	Not Significant
	Total	231	120	351			
Strategic Management	Faculty	90	63	153	0.003	0.960	Not Significant
	Industry Representative	117	81	198			
	Total	207	144	351			
Facilities Planning	Faculty	93	60	153	2.11	0.146	Not Significant
	Industry Representative	105	93	198			
	Total	198	153	351			
Research Projects	Faculty	81	72	153	0.00	0.987	Not Significant
	Industry Representative	105	93	198			
	Total	186	165	351			
Principles of Food Science	Faculty	105	48	153	0.151	0.697	Not Significant
	Industry Representative	132	66	198			
	Total	237	114	351			
Application of Computer	Faculty	66	87	153	2.428	0.119	Not Significant
	Industry Representative	102	96	198			
	Total	168	183	351			
Industrial Training	Faculty	72	81	153	3.832	0.052	Not Significant
	Industry Representative	114	84	198			
	Total	186	165	351			
Food & Beverage Management	Faculty	102	51	153	0.775	0.379	Not Significant
	Industry Representative	123	75	198			
	Total	225	126	351			
Overall Change	Faculty	99	54	153	1.15	0.284	Not Significant
	Industry Representative	117	81	198			
	Total	216	135	351			

Level of Significance=5%

**Table 7.12: Chi-Square test Results to measure Difference in opinion of Faculties and Industry Representatives about changes required in subjects of NCHMCT curriculum**

## 8. Conclusions

- (i) First of all the significance of food production subject has been studied. The food production subject has been divided into 12 units, the respondents were asked to indicate the significance of each unit on



five point likert scale ranging from extremely significant (5) to not significant (1). It was observed that according to respondents all the units of food production subject are extremely significant except Hierarchy Area of Department and Kitchen, which has been marked as very significant. The three most important units of food production subject identified by respondents were Methods of Cooking Food, Stocks: Definition, Types, Preparation Storage and Soups: Definition, Types, Preparation. In this context no significant difference was observed in the opinion of faculty members and

industry representatives. Overall it was found that according to 96.08% faculties and 90.91% industry representatives the food production subject is important for hotel management students. This importance was equally perceived by faculties and industry representatives.

(ii) The next subject taken under study was food & beverage service, which was divided into 8 units. Respondents indicated the significance of each unit on five point scale ranging from not significant to extremely significant. According to respondents Managing Food & Beverage Outlet, Bar

Operations, Cocktails & Mixed Drinks, Planning & Operating Various F&B Outlet and Function Catering Banquets are extremely important whereas Food & Beverage Staff Organisation, Function Catering and Guerdon Service are very important. The overall mean score (33.19) indicated that Food & Beverage Service Subject is important for hotel management graduates. Overall both the faculties (Mean=32.96) and Industry Representatives (Mean=33.36) have considered Food & Beverage Service Subject important. Results of t-test indicated that there is no significant difference in the opinion of faculties and industry representatives about the importance of food & beverages services subject.

(iii) The third primary subject considered for study was Front Office Management. This subject is divided into 6 units. On the five point significant scale it was found that Planning & Evaluating Front Office Operations, Budgeting, Property

Management System, Yield Management are extremely significant, Timeshare & Vacation Ownership is very significant whereas French is significant component of this subject. While accessing the difference in opinion of faculties and industry representatives it was observed that t-statistic values were not significant except t-value for Timeshare & Vacation Ownership. Overall 90.20% faculties and 83.33% industry representatives have considered front office management subject important. However t-test results did not

indicated any significant difference in the opinion of faculties and industry representatives about the importance of front office management subject.

(iv) The last primary subject of the study was housekeeping. The syllabus of housekeeping was divided into 9 units and respondents were asked to indicate the significance of each unit on five point likert scale ranging from extremely significant (5) to not significant (1). According to respondents Planning and Organizing the House Keeping Department, Energy and Water Conservation in Housekeeping Operations, Safety and Security, Layout of Guest Rooms are extremely significant, whereas Housekeeping in Institutions & Facilities Other Than Hotels, Contract Services, First Aid, Interior Decoration and New Property Countdown are very significant. The overall mean score (37.47) indicated that Housekeeping Subject is important for hotel management graduates. According to faculty members and industry representatives the most important component of Housekeeping Subject is Planning and Organizing the House Keeping Department followed by Safety and Security and Energy and Water Conservation in Housekeeping Operations. As per the opinion of 88.24% faculties and 86.36% industry representatives the housekeeping subject is important in hotel management curriculum.

(v) According to respondents Communication, Food & Beverage Control, Food Safety & Quality, Food & Beverage Management and Industrial training are extremely significant subjects whereas rests of the subjects are very significant. Independent sample t-test was applied to measure the difference in opinion of faculties and industry representatives. As per results faculty members have given more importance to Nutrition and research projects as compared to the industry representative and on



the other side industry representatives have found hotel engineering more significant as compared to the faculties. For rest of the subjects no significant difference was observed in the opinion of faculties and industry representatives. Overall 86.27% faculties and 87.88% industry representatives have considered the other subjects important for hotel management students. Results of t-test concluded that there is no significant difference in the opinion of faculties and industry representatives about the overall significance of Other Subjects.


## 9. RECOMMENDATIONS:

In the light of the findings and conclusion of the study the following general & specific recommendations are made

- (i) In Food Production subject the unit “Hierarchy Area of Department and Kitchen”, was considered as least significant topic, but this topic has been given 10% weightage. So keeping the results in mind it is suggested to reduce the weightage of this unit up to 5%. The remaining weightage can be allotted to top three significant units i.e. Methods of Cooking Food, Stocks: Definition, Types, Preparation Storage and Soups: Definition, Types, and Preparation.
- (ii) The 9% industry representatives did not find food production subjects significant for hotel management students, so suggestions of these respondents should be addressed to make the subject more industry oriented.
- (iii) According to industry representatives the unit “Cocktails & Mixed Drinks” has least significance in Food & Beverage Subject, whereas faculties have considered this unit as second most important topic of subject. Here it is suggested to academicians to redesign this unit as per the industry requirements.
- (iv) In front office management subject the French is found to be least significant topic by faculties as well as by industry representatives. So it is suggested to reduce the weightage of French and add some more languages as per the global trends.
- (v) Almost 1/6<sup>th</sup> of the industry representative (16.67%) didn't find front office management subjects significant for hotel management students, so focus group interviews of these respondents should be conducted to get their suggestions about the improvement required in this subject.
- (vi) In housekeeping subject the faculties considered interior decoration as 4<sup>th</sup> important unit but for industry representatives it was the least significant unit of this subject. As the objective of research is to make the curriculum industry oriented so it is suggested to reduce the weightage of interior decoration in housekeeping subject.
- (vii) Hotel engineering, Principles of food science and Research projects were found to be three least important other subjects. So it is suggested to either remove these subjects from curriculum or revise the content to make them significant as per industry requirements.
- (viii) In many subjects content is too old, so it is suggested to go for drastic update as per current market situations.
- (ix) Lectures from industry experts should be organized on regular basis to keep the students aware of recent trends.
- (x) The lab machineries need to be upgraded regularly as per current technology.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Hussain S. and Soni G. (2019). Challenges faced by Hospitality Industry in India. *The Pacific Review*. 7(12):7-20
- [2] Almedia, S., & Chaudhary, D. (2015). An overview of research in Hospitality Education. *The Social Onlooker, International Journal Of Social Science, Journalism And Mass Communication*, 2(1/2015).
- [3] Amoah, V., & Baum, T. (1997). Tourism Education , policy versus practice. *International Journal Of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 9(1), 5-12.

- 
- [4] Bagri, S., & Suresh Babu, A. (2009). Career in Tourism Administration. *Employment News*, xxx111(46).
- [5] Bhardwaj, D. (2002). Manpower development for tourism sector in India. *Tourism In The New Millenium, Challenges And Oppurtunities*, 418-428.
- [6] Barrie, S. (2006). Understanding what we mean by the generic attributes of graduates. *Higher Education*, 51, 215-241.
- [7] Cho, S., Erdem, M., & Johanson, M. (2007). Hospitality graduate education: A view from three different stakeholder perspectives. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Education* 4, (18) 45-55.
- [8] Christou, E. (1998). Hospitality Management Education in Greece ( An exploratory study). *Tourism Management*, 20(683-691).
- [9] Dahiya, A. (2013). Hospitality & Tourism Education in India. In search of innovative programmes. *Productivity*, (4), 358-370.
- [10] Dredge, D., Benkerdroff, P., Day, M., Gross, M., Walo, M., & Weeks, P. (2013). Drivers of change in Tourism hospitality and event management education ; An Australian perspective. *Journal Of Hospitality And Tourism Education*, 25, 89 -102.
- [11] Goodman, J., & Sprague, L. (1991). The future of hospitality education ,Meeting the industry need. *The Cornell Hotel And Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 32(2), 66-69 public good?. *International Journal Of Lifelong Education*, 25(2), 157-172.
- [12] Goh, B. (2001). *Realignment of hospitality management curriculum; Hospitality skill assessment* (Doctoral Dissertation). Nova Southeastern University, Florida, United States. Ganguli, L., & Kumar, A. (2018). An empirical study on the academic perception towards certified learning facilitator (CLF). *Pusa Journal Of Hospitality And Applied Sciences*, 1v(issn 2395-020x).
- [13] Kember and Doris Y. P. Leung (2005). The influence of active learning experiences on the development of graduate capabilities, *Studies in Higher Education* Vol. 30, No. 2, April 2005, pp.155-170
- [14] Lin, S.-P. C.-Y. (2011). Study on risk perception of international tourists in India. *African Journal of Business Management* Vol. 5(7), 2742-2752
- [16] Riegel, C. (1995). Purpose, Perspective and Definition: Toward an Encompassing View of HRI Education. *Hospitality & Tourism Educator*, 3(1), 18-32. doi:10.1080/23298758.1990.10685406
- [17] Rivera, M., & Upchurch, R. (2008). The role of research in hospitality Industry. A content analysis of the IJHM between 2000-2005. *IJHM*, 27(4), 632-640.
- [18] Raybould, M., & Wilkins, H. (2006). Generic Skills for Hospitality Management: A Comparative Study of Management Expectations and Student Perceptions. *Journal Of Hospitality And Tourism Management*, 13(2), 177-188. doi: 10.1375/jhtm.13.2.177
- [19] Reynolds, S., Ryan, B., & Halsell, S. (2009). A comparison of skills considered important for the success as an entry level manager in the hospitality industry versus the skills recent graduates possess. Hospitality and Tourism Management paper presented in the international CHRIE Conference. In *International CHRIE Conference*. Amkus: University of Massachusetts
- [20] Tsai, H., Chen, S., & Hu, C. (2004). Academia Meet Industry: A need analysis of course contents in U.S. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Education*, 16(3), 32-39.
- [21] Tanner, D., & Tanner, L. (2007). *Curriculum Development, Theory into Practice* (pp. 99-121). United States of America: Pearson Education.
- [22] Wisch, R. (1991). The General Education vs. Careerism Debate: Developing a Hospitality Education Perspective. *Hospitality & Tourism Educator*, 4(1), 65-68. doi:10.1080/23298758.1991.10685439