

December 2021

Marketing tourism and hotel management schools in the context of higher education globalization and student mobility through improved curriculum and industrial training offerings

Ayse Bas Collins

Ihsan Dogramaci Bilkent University, collins@bilkent.edu.tr


Aysegul Gunduz Songur

University of South Florida, agsongur@usf.edu

Seden Dogan

Ondokuz Mayıs University, seden.dogan@omu.edu.tr

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarcommons.usf.edu/jger>

 Part of the [Curriculum and Instruction Commons](#), [Curriculum and Social Inquiry Commons](#), and the [Tourism and Travel Commons](#)

This Refereed Article is brought to you for free and open access by the M3 Center at the University of South Florida Sarasota-Manatee at Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Global Education and Research by an authorized editor of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact scholarcommons@usf.edu.

Recommended Citation

Bas Collins, A., Gunduz Songur, A., & Dogan, S. (2021). Marketing tourism and hotel management schools in the context of higher education globalization and student mobility through improved curriculum and industrial training offerings. *Journal of Global Education and Research*, 5(2), 121-135.
<https://www.doi.org/10.5038/2577-509X.5.2.1072>

Corresponding Author

Seden Dogan, Faculty of Tourism, Ondokuz Mayıs University, Çetinkaya Mahallesi Ada Sk. No:18, 55440 Bafra, Samsun, Turkey

Revisions

Submission date: Mar. 8, 2019; 1st Revision: Nov. 4, 2019; 2nd Revision: Feb. 17, 2020; 3rd Revision: May 20, 2020; 4th Revision: Nov. 15, 2020; 5th Revision: Dec. 3, 2020; Acceptance: Dec. 4, 2020

Marketing Tourism and Hotel Management Schools in the Context of Higher Education Globalization and Student Mobility Through Improved Curriculum and Industrial Training Offerings

Ayşe Bas Collins¹, Aysegül Gündüz Songur², and Seden Doğan³

School of Applied Technology and Management
İhsan Doğramacı Bilkent University, Turkey
¹collins@bilkent.edu.tr

College of Hospitality and Tourism Management
University of South Florida, USA
²agsongur@usf.edu

Faculty of Tourism
Ondokuz Mayıs University, Turkey
³sedn.dogan@omu.edu.tr

Abstract

Recent research from international statistics indicate an important flow of student mobility all over the world, creating a need to provide comprehensive information regarding educational institutions involved in the process. This study examines and compares tourism and hotel management (THM) programs at different levels, including the nature of programs offered, their curriculum, and internship components. A particular focus was given to the industrial training requirement as a core component of THM programs. Results showed both similarities and differences worldwide within the framework of the institutions compared. The findings may help all stakeholders in the education systems, including professionals, educators, students, and decision-makers alike.

Keywords: syllabus, tourism school, sector training, tourism education

Introduction

The most important debate of whether to globalize and internationalize has been one of the hottest issues in higher education within all programs and courses throughout the continents, countries, and cities and even on the same university campuses. World War II stands as one of the cornerstones of this debate because two essential changes were observed in higher education in the post-World War II period (Shin & Teichler, 2014): (a) University Education was transformed from elite education to mass education, and (b) High student enrollment experienced in 1960s and 1970s created more diversity across countries. These changes, in turn, led to the emergence of four phenomena in

contemporary higher education: (a) a connection between education and the business world, (b) the importance of research, (c) services in postmodern universities, and (d) competition between and internationalization of higher education institutions.

Sheldon et al. (2011) stated, “tourism is a hallmark activity of the postmodern world” (p. 3). The number of tourism programs and tourism courses has grown rapidly across all seven continents. However, it is confusing for stakeholders, students, employers, educational professionals, and government officials to understand what comprises a tourism program, curriculum, and degree and how they came to be different from other service sector programs (Middleton & Ladkin, 1996).

Studies in Higher Education have compared curricula focusing on stakeholders’ perception not what is offered on the websites. This study addressed this gap through the comparison of Tourism and Hotel Management (THM) programs worldwide by reviewing the data provided on the official websites of the programs. Research and design specialists regularly obtain product knowledge by using netnography to identify solutions for the innovative process of product development (Dhiraj, 2011). The findings of this study may help stakeholders of education systems such as professionals, educators, students, and decision-makers.

Literature Review

Recent research from international statistical reports show a noticeable flow of student mobility all over the world. This has created a sense of competition between nations and their higher education institutions who all want an opportunity to offer more affordable and relevant programs to these students.

According to Montoya (2018), approximately five million international students were observed globally in 2016. In 2017, that number rose to over 5.3 million students, more than doubling the figures from the year 2000 when the enrollment increased only 10% annually (International Consultants for Education and Fairs Monitor, 2014; Migration Data Portal, 2020). Moreover, projections indicate international student enrollment will reach 8 million international students annually by 2025 (Tremblay et al., 2012). Though the 2008 global financial crisis caused a slowdown in international student mobility, historically, the United States and the United Kingdom have always been the most popular host countries (Ortiz et al., 2015). According to Montoya (2018), the first five host countries for inbound international students are still the United States (19% of total mobile students), the United Kingdom (10%), Australia (6%), France (6%), and Germany (5%). However, the United Kingdom has experienced a decline since 2012 due mainly to the introduction of more stringent visa policies. On a different scale, most mobile students have always been mainly from Asia (53% of all students studying abroad), particularly from China, India, and South Korea. Lastly, a recent trend indicates more students want to stay closer to home while studying due to the lower travel costs and cultural familiarity. As a result, new regional hubs have arisen in booming destinations such as the Russian Federation (3%), Japan (3%), Canada (3%), China (2%), and Italy (2%) (OECD, 2014).

Student mobility opens a debate about the strong need for improved coordination between the countries attempting to attract these students, the policymakers in different government bodies, educators, and even local entities. Various reports and studies (OECD Innovation Policy Platform,

2010; Verbik & Lasanowski, 2007) have provided examples of the coordination and alignment required between (a) higher education policy and particular dimensions of immigration policy (student and faculty visas and conditions of stay after studying), (b) trade policy (coherence of commitments on education services in the context of bilateral and multilateral agreements), (c) developmental policy (consistency of aid development policy in higher education), and (d) labor market policy (coordination between professional bodies and higher education institutions, notably for regulated professions). Those concerns are the same for each field of study in higher education and affect the choices of student mobility when deciding which country to study in and which higher education institution to attend. Furthermore, complex issues exist related to the structure of each institution, and the institutional requirements and globally competitive offerings available.

Tourism degree programs can be dated to the early 1930s (Jafari, 1990) and the 1940s (Majò, 2004). However, a few pioneering universities in Europe started the real boom in the 1960s and 1970s. This expanded to the United States, Canada, and then Australia and New Zealand (Jenkins, 1997). This historical evolution has led to differences between countries and even between institutions within the same country. Besides, the worldwide mobility of students and faculty will never cease to exist.

Several university programs have been designed for those hoping to have a career in the tourism and hospitality field. The goal of these programs is to attract students for full time or shorter exchange courses. The recent body of research shows that hospitality courses become more popular since the exchange student market increases (Hjalager, 2003; Richards, 2001) since there is a noticeable need for qualified staff in the sector (International Labor Organization, 2001; Leslie, 1993; Lillo-Bañuls & Casado-Díaz, 2010; Zehrer & Mössenlechner, 2009). The antecedents of THM research focused mostly on curricula comparison based on the stakeholders' perception, but not on what the programs provided on their websites, and similarly, what is happening in real-life settings (Felisitas & Clotildah, 2012; Gross & Manoharan, 2016; Gursoy et al., 2012; Teng et al., 2013). Sheldon et al. (2008) proposed, "the world is experiencing seismic changes. Society and tourism are being shaken by these external shocks and need to adjust to the impacts and prepare to act, think, and plan differently" (p. 62). Given this uncertain tourism environment, newly employed graduates need different skills, aptitudes, and knowledge compared to the earlier times, which calls for an urgent change in educational systems to meet this need (Wallis & Steptoe, 2006) by implementing new approaches (Fidgeon, 2010) and also by taking into consideration the advances in information technologies (Buhalis & Law, 2008).

The twenty-first century has been marked by the proliferation of international systems shaping today's society. Termed *globalization*, this process has both pros and cons concerning the cultivation of knowledge and the benefits provided. As in other fields of business, a global marketplace also exists for higher education, which obliges higher education institutions to create competitive advantages to cater better to students and the THM professionals alike, in a very challenging business world. Higher education marketing can be one of these competitive advantages. There are opportunities, especially for universities, to capitalize on honing their offerings to promote themselves better to the outside world.

Methods

The purpose of this study is to provide insights for this gap through the comparison of information provided by THM programs about the following areas: (a) the nature of the institutions, (b) the nature of offered curricula, (c) the nature of their industrial training and hands-on experience offerings. Moreover, interview data and observational notes were combined to give a more detailed picture specifically for the *industrial training* component of the programs.

To analyze and compare the THM programs worldwide, the Council on Hotel, Restaurant, and Institutional Education (CHRIE), an organization with a large member base comprising THM schools from around the world, was chosen as best option for the school sampling. The goal of the study is to provide a clear picture of the current state in terms of student mobility and to show where the field of THM stands regarding education and training. The study employed both qualitative and quantitative research strategies. A combination of analysis and descriptive analysis was followed, with the former was used to analyze the data obtained from the websites. The latter was conducted to analyze the data obtained from the students. Frequency tables were then used to show the results.

The Case

CHRIE was formed in 1946 as a non-profit organization by a group of hospitality professionals. One group member, Howard Bagnall Meek, is considered the father of hospitality education (Hotel Business, 2009). At first, there were only twenty bachelor degree programs classified under home economics programs. All had hotel and restaurant classes with a nutrition perspective. Since then, numerous educational institutions have introduced their own specific hotel and restaurant programs.

The general purpose of CHRIE is to improve education, training, and research in the hotel and restaurant industry (Bosselman, 1996) through the exchange of information among educational institutions and the hotel and restaurant industry. Membership is open to everyone, namely from the industry, educational institutions, and associations interested in making an impact on the future of the hospitality and tourism industry.

CHRIE has almost 1,500 members from about 60 countries which have been grouped into six geographic regions and federations: (a) the Federation for Europe (EuroCHRIE), (b) the Pacific Rim (APAC CHRIE), and four federations for the Americas—(c) Northeast North America, (d) Southeast Central and South America, (e) Central, and (f) West.

Data Sources and Sampling

CHRIE has information about 344 institutions on its website (at the time of this research) which is known as Guide to College Programs (<https://www.guidetocollegeprograms.com>). Listed alphabetically under six federations the size of the list and resource constraints required the implementation of a systematic sampling process according to the alphabetical ordering scheme. A random start was chosen from each federation list and then continued with the selection of every other institution, resulting in a sample of 257 institutions for comparison.

Research Instrument

A checklist was developed for the desk research by examining both a literature review and website documents of various educational consultancy companies within the scope of the comparison. There are several academic studies on topics such as *How to choose a college or a university*, *Factors behind university students choosing an international higher education institution*, and *Factors on choosing a THM program in particular* (Drewes & Michael, 2006; Lee et al., 2013; O'Mahony et al., 2001; Pyvis & Chapman, 2007; Riley et al., 2002; Tribe, 2005a; Tribe, 2005b; Wang et al., 2010). Pyvis and Chapman (2007) found out that some of the factors triggering the choice of one program over others included cost, personal interest, program resources, reputation of the university, and comparisons made on the syllabi. Drewes and Michael (2006) showed that applicants favored universities closer to their homes and which tended to spend more on scholarship and teaching along with having more satisfactory non-academic student services. The choice factors seem to be no different when it comes to THM. O'Mahony et al. (2008) emphasized the *industrial training requirement* as a leading choice factor for a hospitality program at a higher education institution as it provides valuable work experience, followed by the reputation of the university's teaching staff and the recognition of hospitality courses previously taken on both national and international scales.

There have also been numerous websites with application guidelines showing the prospective students how to choose a university program by suggesting the primary factors to impact their decision-making process. Most of the suggested factors impacting the decision making support the available body of research such as admission rate, graduation rate, student to faculty ratio, school size, curriculum, quality of professors, quality of department to study, study abroad options, location, accreditation, course of study, extracurricular activities, cost, financial aid qualifications, application fees and so on (Slide, 2014).

Therefore, the research instrument included most factors gathered from the review of literature. As for the curriculum comparison of the THM programs, different studies used different categories (Lee, 2013; Wang et al., 2010). For example, Wang et al. (2010) compared Australian and Chinese undergraduate courses in tourism management by using six categories: Accounting/Finance/Economics, Business Management, Marketing, Tourism Theory, Tourism Management, and Others. In this study, the information about the curriculum of the sample schools was collected through this developed checklist.

To provide a detailed insight into the industrial training component, one higher education institution from each of the five countries as a case (Spain, Germany, Netherlands, Turkey, and the UK) was chosen through convenience sampling. The reasons for choosing convenience sampling were that European countries were easy to reach and researches had opportunity to visit tourism and hotel management higher education institutes in those counties. First, the industrial training documents from those schools ($n = 75$) were reviewed. Second, randomly selected students ($n = 25$) and faculty staff responsible for the industrial training ($n = 15$) were interviewed. Lastly, a *casual observation* was conducted at two institutions to observe the interns and the process. The data were analyzed using quantitative (frequency) and qualitative (descriptive) data analysis methods.

Findings

The results of the data gathered through document analysis, interview, and observation suggest that although a certain degree of progress has been achieved towards having up to date THM programs, much progress can still be made as the THM programs create organizational and personal challenges for graduates. The title of this paper mentions two primary marketing channels: the official website of any given higher education institution and the industrial training component. The official websites serve as primary marketing tools, displaying the curriculum for both the prospective students and the industry; while the industrial training provides the students with opportunities to see the real world. In return, the ability and skills of the students and graduates alike become visible to the industry through the industrial training.

Three main challenges emerged from the study: (1) confusing information regarding the nature of the higher education institutions, (2) non-standardized curriculum offerings on institutional websites, and (3) an unclear industrial training component.

Challenge 1: Confusing Information Regarding the Nature of the Institutions

The analysis showed variety regarding (a) affiliation, (b) program name, (c) duration, and (d) total credit hours, which are the first piece of information prospective students and sector representatives consider for school choice and employment. THM programs were housed in different schools and faculties—Business/Management (38.3%), Humanities (13.7%), Economics (8.6%), and Agriculture (4.6%), respectively. The combined schools of Public Health, Professional Studies, Resource Engineering, Education, Environmental Sciences, and even Law housed 15.2% of the THM programs at different institutions. The only affiliation related to the field of THM was Tourism/Hospitality, with only 19.8%.

As for the program names, only 17.5 % of the programs were named *Tourism and Hotel Management (THM)*, whereas the rest had multiple combinations coming from the field (45 %) or different names such as Consumer & Family Sciences and Human Ecology & Science (23 %) (see Table 1).

Table 1. Various Titles of the Tourism and Hotel Management (THM) Programs

Program Name	<i>n</i>	%
Tourism & Hotel Management	45	17.5
Multiple Combination of Restaurant, Hotel, Tourism, Travel and Leisure Fields	116	45.0
Restaurant, Hotel, Tourism (Travel) Management/Administration		
Hospitality Management		
Tourism & Hospitality Management		
Tourism & Leisure Management		
Hotel Management		
International Tourism		
Tourism Management		
Management Studies	37	14.5
Other Combinations	59	23.0
Consumer & Family Sciences		
Human Ecology & Science		
Nutrition & Food Etc.		
Total	257	100

As for the duration of the programs, 19.2% did not provide any information on their websites. The programs that did provide this information indicated a duration of up to three years (33%) and three to four years (47.8%). Similarly, total credit hours required for graduation were not standardized; 43.9% required 121-135 credits. Of the sample studied, 31.9% required fewer credits and 17.8% required more.

Challenge 2: Non-Standardized Curriculum Offerings on Institutional Websites

As for the analysis of the curriculum comparison, the results showed 2016 courses offered by the 261 sample institutions based upon the names on the websites. Table 2 shows the results of the analysis regarding the course names, frequencies, and percentages. Second, similar courses were put into 97 subject groups. Third, the courses were narrowed down to 12 categories of study areas: Introduction (6.9%), Hotel (4.5%), Restaurant (11.1%), Travel (3.6%), THM (12.6%), General Management/Business (9.0%), Finance/Cost/Accounting (7.4%), Marketing/Sales (8%), Law (8.0%), Analytical (14.8%), work-related courses (6.9%), and others (7.1%).

Lastly, the result of the descriptive analysis was presented in five broad categories: (a) tourism/hospitality/travel related courses (47.5%), (b) management/business related courses (34.4%), (c) research related courses (4%), (d) industrial training related courses (6.9%), and (e) others such as second language courses, literature and history courses, and so on (11.2%).

Table 2. Analysis of Courses Offered

Areas of Study	Main Subject Areas	Courses Offered	<i>n</i>	%
1		Introduction	139	6.9
	1	Introduction to Tourism	46	
	2	Introduction to Travel & Tourism	44	
	3	Introduction to Hospitality	27	
	4	Introduction to Management	17	
2	5	Introduction to Casino Industry	5	4.5
		Hotel	90	
	6	Front Office	25	
	7	Housekeeping	22	
	8	Laundry	16	
	9	Hotel Gaming Industry	13	
	10	Facilities Maintenance & Systems	5	
	11	Facility Operations	4	
	12	Rooms Division	3	
3	13	Hotel Gaming Operations	2	11.1
		Restaurant	223	
	14	Nutrition & Sanitation	42	
	15	Health & Gastronome	42	
	16	Food Production	36	
	17	Food & Beverage	36	
	18	Wine Related	35	
4	19	Catering	32	3.6
		Travel	72	
	20	Tourist Attraction	17	
	21	Cruise & Entertainment Operations	13	
	22	Event Industry Operations	12	
	23	Event Sponsorship & Fund Raising	12	
	24	World Geography	9	
	25	Tour Guiding	6	
	26	Ecotourism & Heritage Tourism	3	

Areas of Study	Main Subject Areas	Courses Offered	n	%
5		Tourism & Hospitality Management	254	12.6
	27	Hotel Management	39	
	28	Tourism & Hospitality Management	39	
	29	Event Management	27	
	30	Rooms Division Management	22	
	31	Beverage Management	19	
	32	Front Office and House Keeping Management	14	
	33	Leadership in Hospitality Management	14	
	34	Tourism Policy, Planning & Development	13	
	35	Travel Management	13	
	36	Service Management	11	
	37	Tourism Entrepreneurship	9	
	38	Meeting & Convention Management	8	
	39	Management of Engineering Systems in the Hospitality Industries	7	
6	40	Club Management	6	
	41	Equipment for Restaurants Hotels & Institutions	5	
	42	Hospitality & Facility Management	5	
	43	Layout & Design	3	
		General Management/Business	181	9.0
	44	Human Resources	22	
	45	Organizational Behavior	19	
	46	Business Communication	18	
	47	Social Sciences	17	
	48	Applied Management	17	
	49	Managerial Skills & Communication	15	
	50	Professional Development	15	
	51	Strategic Management	15	
	52	Organizational Design & Effectiveness	14	
53	Risk Management & Insurance	9		
54	Loss Prevention Management	9		
55	Real Estate	4		
56	Human Relations & Occupational Professionalism	4		
7	56	Multinational Business Operations	3	
		Finance/Cost/Accounting	150	7.4
	57	Financial Accounting	27	
	58	Hospitality Industry Managerial Accounting	27	
	59	Finance	26	
	60	Hospitality Finance	25	
	61	Cost Control	24	
8	62	Hospitality Financial Management	21	
		Marketing/Sales	166	8.2
	63	Marketing Principles	32	
	64	Hospitality Marketing	27	
	65	Market Analysis	25	
	66	Marketing Strategies in Hospitality Industry	21	
	67	Entrepreneur & Business Growth	19	
	68	Consumer Behaviors	17	
	69	Service Sector Marketing	12	
	70	Professional Selling	9	
9	71	Front Office Psychology & Sales	4	
		Law	161	8.0
	72	Tourism & Hospitality Law	32	
	73	Business Law	28	
	74	Employment Law	26	
	75	Global Legal Issues	23	
	76	Consumer Law	22	
	77	Law for Managers	18	
78	Ethics	12		

Areas of Study	Main Subject Areas	Courses Offered	<i>n</i>	%
10		<i>Analytical</i>	298	14.8
	79	Computer Applications	41	
	80	Computer Science Management / Information Systems	34	
	81	Economy	34	
	82	Statistics	32	
	83	Business Mathematics & Calculus	29	
	84	Tourism Industry Data Analysis	29	
	85	Information Technology	29	
	86	Computerized Reservation Systems	25	
	87	Operational Research	21	
11		<i>Work-related courses</i>	139	6.9
	91	Seminars	57	
	92	Senior Projects	43	
	93	Internship	39	
	12	<i>Others</i>	143	7.1
	94	Languages	57	
	95	American Thoughts & Languages	43	
	96	History	28	
	97	Others	15	
Total	97		2016	100

Challenge 3: Unclear Industrial Training Component

The official websites of 261 universities were reviewed and the findings showed different applications of industrial training experiences in terms of (a) the name given to industrial training component, (b) whether or not it is compulsory, (c) frequency, (d) whether or not it is accredited, (e) location, (f) duration, and (g) assessment procedure.

The results showed that the industrial training component was given 21 different names such as Apprenticeship, Co-Op Operations, Cooperative Education Internship, Co-Up Management, Field Studies, Hospitality Internship, Hotel Internship, Industrial Experience, Industrial Internship, Industrial Training, Industry-Based Training, Internship, Practicum and Infield Training, Sandwich Mode, Sandwich Placement, Summer Training, Supervised Field Training, Undergo Internship, Work Experience, and Work Field. It is either the students or universities responsibility to find or provide internship institutions.

Also, 94.5% of the institutions stated industrial training component as compulsory. The detailed information about the frequency of the industrial training experiences showed that during their entire program, most of the institutions (75%) offered at least one industrial training experience. At the same time, 12% required it twice a year. The rest offered industrial training more often. Among the reviewed institutions, only one institution offered industrial training experience five times during their entire program. The duration of the industrial training experiences was given in different time periods such as hours, weeks, months, semesters, and years. Although they were designated for differing durations. The comparison showed that the minimum requirement was 100 hours, and the maximum was 30 weeks. To be more precise, 29.7% of the surveyed institutions offered six months of industrial training experience, followed by 300-600 hours (14.2%), 700-1000 hours (13%), 2 to 6 months (10.7%), and 100-300 hours (9.5%), with the remaining 9.5% offering 16-30 weeks of industrial training experience. The results showed that most institutions (64.2%) preferred to credit

the industrial training experience. Concerning location of the industrial training experience, a very small number of institutions (3.8%) did not accept the industrial training experience if it was completed out of the country.

Finally, the assessment system used to evaluate the industrial training experience was reviewed. Results showed 4.7% of the institutions provided limited information on their websites as to whether it is the internship coordinator or the instructor of the course who is directly in charge of organizing the industrial training. Hence, interviews were conducted with students, faculty members, and the professionals to obtain detailed information. The analysis of institutional websites showed insufficient and irrelevant information regarding how the assessment will be made and how the grade distribution will be, though industrial training is counted as a core module as per the curriculum. The most detailed information provided in this sense was that industrial training assessment would be done by an industrial training coordinator or assigned instructor. Interviews with students and faculty showed that each institution had its own set of regulations, forms, and procedures to assess the success of their interns regarding (a) who will evaluate and (b) how they will be evaluated.

Descriptive analysis showed that interns were evaluated by their institutions through a twofold process: first by their assigned instructor and then by the supervisor of the department where they had their internship., both utilizing the required institutional forms and procedures. The interns were visited once or twice by the assigned instructor during their internship. They were graded regularly by the employer during their internship and were required to give a presentation or answer questions in front of a committee upon completing their internship.

Some contradictory remarks were noted among the instructors, students, and supervisors regarding this evaluation system. Interns did not see any benefit in the *instructor's visit to the company for evaluation*. One intern said that "Instructor spent only a very limited time during their visits, and this is not enough to see the real situation both for the intern and the company employees". On the other hand, one instructor said, "When I was at the company, I could not find the intern and the responsible supervisor created an excuse to protect the intern", and added, "later it was discovered that the supervisor was a relative of the intern". The study presents some real-life examples demonstrating how the industrial training rules and regulations should be devised by the higher education institutions to prevent such issues. For example, it was evident in one of the sample institutions as it is prohibited by law in Germany to have an internship in a company owned or managed by a relative, and it was communicated directly to the students to put the liability upon students themselves.

One institution in the study emphasized that they did not provide their students with the opportunity of internship abroad since they did not have any particular system in place to control or inspect neither the company nor the student. One instructor emphasized that it was a matter of finances to send an instructor or supervisor to inspect the company and the interns in another country. Another industrial training coordinator added that "It is more than finances. . . We even have the problem of required visa to send both the interns and the assigned instructor to another country for industrial training".

However, the results show that all interns and assigned instructors had communication regularly through emails. Interns were required to write reports or fill out a standard document on a weekly or monthly basis and send them to the assigned instructor for review and feedback. One student said: “After all, it feels like an artificial process since what has been written in those forms may not show precisely what we face here in the real world”.

Another intern hesitatingly explained:

There was one question in my standard monthly report: Have you observed any weaknesses in the organization? and Have you suggested a solution? . . . I completed the report but could not send it since I was concerned that the content of my emails might have been easily seen by my supervisor, and it may not be suitable for my internship.

The results showed that most interns had enough industrial experience for both their professional and personal development. However, contradictory remarks were noted among interns regarding their professional development. Some interns thought the responsibilities they were assigned were not enough for them to learn the basics of the sector. Another group of interns, on the other hand, happily said they were even offered a job upon their graduation during their internship. One company supervisor explained this dilemma:

As everything, industrial training experience depends on what the intern expects out of that period. Some put their all enthusiasm to learn as much as they could. Some just think that it just stands as the perfect opportunity to be out of the school environment for a certain time.

One instructor’s answer supported this as follows: “Even if interns do not experience all the components of the operation as they are in the work environment, they practically comprehend the subordinate/superordinate relationship which they only read in course books, thus only know on a theoretical basis”.

Various suggestions were provided by the students and instructors regarding a better internship system that all students can benefit from, for their future both professionally and personally. Some of these suggestions include the following:

- Require the companies to cross-train students in different departments.
- If possible, increase the number of inspection visits by the faculty members.
- Have departmental *financial allowance* for industrial training.
- As another alternative to inspection, create an intranet, where the company managers, instructors, and students can all have access and share information without the need for a physical inspection. This network would be secure and access management would be used.
- Create more partnerships with companies abroad for student placement for internship purposes. This will allow them to react globally in today’s highly competitive marketplace.
- Interns should be paid a minimum wage.
- Industrial training needs to move beyond education toward employment.

Conclusions

As a result of the globalization process, more diversity is increasing at each level of higher education, and higher education in tourism is no different. Thus, this globalization should have its fair share in the process of internationalization of higher education institutions. This paper analyzed the programs offered by CHRIE member institutions regarding (a) the nature of the institutions, (b) the nature of the offered curricula, and (c) the nature of their industrial training/hands-on experience offerings by reviewing the information provided on their official websites. Furthermore, the results from the interviews, document analysis, and observations reflected the current state of industrial training experience in the context of six higher education institutions offering THM programs (Findlay et al., 2011; Rumberger, 2003).

Supported by previous research, tourism study programs still do not have homogeneity nor a common orientation (Cooper 2002; Jafari, 1990; 1997; Majò, 2004; Westlake 1997). This may be because (a) statistical sources devoted to employment (Pérez, 1995), (b) differences between the business-oriented or non-business oriented tourism curricula (Tribe, 2006), (c) the confusing list of international qualifications (Cooper, 2002), and (d) the diversity of the tourism industry (Jafari, 1997). Although this diversity may be interpreted as a form of multiplicity in the higher education system, it may also lead to low employability levels in the labor market and a relatively low social image for such degrees, which eventually confuse employers, students, and also the faculty who have to deal with the quality policies and recognition or accreditation (Churchward & Riley, 2002; Fayos-Solá, 1997; Jafari, 1997).

The findings point out important diversity among the institutions in terms of the institutional nature, curriculum offered, and industrial training experiences, and have similarities with its antecedents. First, they have more affiliation with business schools (Lee, 2013; Morrison & O'Mahony, 2003; Rappole, 2000) than non-business ones. Secondly, almost half of the courses are from the tourism, hospitality, or travel fields, followed by analytical courses (14.8%) such as the computer-based courses, statistics, research methodology, and so on. Lastly, the importance of *work-related experience* had been emphasized in most of the earlier studies (Collins, 2002; Fong et al., 2014; Stansbie et al., 2016; Yiu & Law, 2012), and this study shows that almost all THM programs require industrial training to provide students with opportunities to enable experiences in real-life settings before they graduate at different levels and durations.

More data on website and interface designs will increase the need (Kozinets, 2010; Lindars, 2019) to be applied in higher education marketing to facilitate the decision-making process of the prospective students to choose respective institutions. Some questions about higher education marketing remain, such as: Which factors are more important for prospective students for the application? How many students are asking themselves whether attending a higher education institution is the right decision for them? How vital are tuition fees? What are the students' opinions about the provided value? What is the reality compared to expectations?—a question posed by Annandale (2013). Overwhelming evidence indicates a high need exists for universities to position themselves for their specific target audience and to communicate that need clearly and accurately to all the stakeholders involved. This could be achieved through methods such as receiving the help of world university classifications and rankings; and organized informative channels of communication, such as visible and easily identifiable internet sites (Nicolae & Marinescu, 2010).

Although recent studies (Masterson, 2011) showed that university administrators realize the importance of the university websites to develop and increase their global reputation and image, few studies exist on web visibility of universities (Lee & Park, 2012).

This study aimed to provide a comparison of THM programs regarding the nature of the institutions, offered curricula, and industrial experiences by reviewing the information provided on the websites and data gathered from interviews and observational notes. The findings may contribute to the initiatives of university administrators regarding the importance of web visibility of their respective institutions to properly brand, promote, and market themselves among critical stakeholders, such as prospective students and faculty, peer institutions, and funding bodies (Masterson, 2011). The findings of this study also provide some insights and recommendations for the THM Higher Education system.

The implications of this study may include providing incentives for further, more intensive studies to be carried out by the institutions themselves or by CHRIE. Since this study was only conducted on a limited number of institutions, further studies may be conducted with other institutions or a larger number of institutions to collect more data on this issue. CHRIE could also use the results of this and other similar studies, existing or prospective, to improve the programs and increase the compatibility of its member institutions. Further studies could also be conducted to reveal the practical implications of such improvements and their reflections on the tourism sector at large. Thus, not only would the institutions be more compatible, but the sector would also benefit from the studies conducted and their results.

References

- Annandale, W. (2013, February 4). Higher education marketing: What a difference a year makes – or does it? *The Guardian*. <https://www.theguardian.com/higher-education-network/blog/2013/feb/04/higher-education-marketing-predications-2013>
- Bosselman, R. H. (1996). Foundations of a professional organization: The birth of CHRIE. *Hospitality & Tourism Educator*, 8(2-3), 9-13.
- Buhalis, D., & Law, R. (2008). Progress in information technology and tourism management: 20 years on and ten years after the Internet—The state of eTourism research. *Tourism Management*, 29(4), 609-623.
- Churchward, J., & Riley, M. (2002). Tourism occupations and education: An exploratory study. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 4(2), 77-86.
- Collins, A. B. (2002). Gateway to the real world, industrial training: Dilemmas and problems. *Tourism Management*, 23(1), 93-96.
- Cooper, C. (2002). Standard creation in tourism education and training-GTAT. In P. F. Juan Carlos I (Ed.), *Human resources in tourism: Towards a new paradigm* (pp. 89-98). CABI.
- Dhiraj, H. (2011, November 29). *What is netnography, the effects it places on the web and social media industry*. Open Business Council. <http://openbusinesscouncil.org/2011/11/what-is-netnography-the-effects-it-places-on-the-web-and-social-media-industry/>
- Drewes, T., & Michael, C. (2006). How do students choose a university? An analysis of applications to universities in Ontario, Canada. *Research in Higher Education*, 47(7), 781-800.
- Fayos-Solá, E. (1997). Education and training in the new era of tourism: The UNWTO vision. In E. Fayos-Solá (Ed.), *Human capital in the 21st century tourism industry* (pp. 59-79). WTO.
- Felisitas, C., & Clotildah, K. (2012). The hospitality and tourism honours degree programme: Stakeholders perceptions on competencies developed. *Journal of Hospitality Management and Tourism*, 3(1), 12-22.
- Fidgeon, P. R. (2010). Tourism education and curriculum design: A time for consolidation and review? *Tourism Management*, 31(6), 699-723.
- Findlay, A. M., King, R., Smith, F. M., Geddes, A., & Skeldon, R. (2011). World class? An investigation of globalisation, difference and international student mobility. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 31(1), 118-131. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-5661.2011.00454.x>

- Fong, L. H. N., Luk, C., & Law, R. (2014). How do hotel and tourism students select internship employers? A segmentation approach. *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport & Tourism Education*, 15, 68-79.
- Gross, M. J., & Manoharan, A. (2016). The balance of liberal and vocational values in hospitality higher education: Voices of graduates. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Education*, 28(1), 44-57.
- Gursoy, D., Rahman, I., & Swanger, N. (2012). Industry's expectations from hospitality schools: What has changed? *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Education*, 24(4), 32-42.
- Hjalager, A. M. (2003). Global tourism careers? Opportunities and dilemmas facing higher education in tourism. *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport & Tourism Education*, 2(2), 26-37.
- Hotel Business. (2009, June 21). *Marriott appropriate first recipient of icon award*. Hotel Business. <https://www.hotelbusiness.com/marriott-appropriate-first-recipient-of-icon-award/>
- International Consultants for Education and Fairs Monitor. (2014, February 13). *Summing up international student mobility in 2014*. International Consultants for Education and Fairs Monitor. <http://monitor.icef.com/2014/02/summing-up-international-student-mobility-in-2014/>
- International Labor Organization. (2001, March 1). Human resources development, employment and globalization in the hotel, catering, and tourism sector. International Labor Organization https://www.ilo.org/global/publications/ilo-bookstore/order-online/books/WCMS_PUBL_9221123537_EN/lang-en/index.htm
- Jafari, J. (1990). Research and scholarship: The basis of tourism education. *Journal of Tourism Studies*, 1, 33-41.
- Jafari, J. (1997). Tourismification of the profession. Chameleon job names across the industry. *Progress in Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 3(2), 175-181.
- Jenkins, C. L. (1997). Tourism education systems, institutions and curricula: Standardisations and certification. In E. Fayos-Solá (Ed.), *Human capital in the tourism industry of the 21st century* (pp. 215-221). WTO.
- Kozinets, R. V. (2010, March). *Netnography: The marketer's secret weapon: How social media understanding drives innovation*. NetBase. https://www.etnografiadigitale.it/wp-content/uploads/2012/05/NetBase_Netnography_Kozinets_Paper.pdf
- Lee, C. (2013). What curriculum differences exist between hospitality programs: A case study of selected hospitality programs in the US. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Systems*, 6(2), 1-11.
- Lee, M. J., Olds, D. A., & Lee, C. (2013). Why students choose a hospitality and tourism program: A pilot study of US undergraduate students. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Education*, 22(3), 20-26.
- Lee, M., & Park, H. W. (2012). Exploring the web visibility of world-class universities. *Scientometrics*, 90(1), 201-218.
- Leslie, D. (1993). Higher education for hospitality and tourism: A European dimension. *International Journal for Hospitality Management*, 12(1), 101-107.
- Lillo-Bañuls, A., & Casado-Díaz, J. M. (2010). Rewards to education in the tourism sector: One step ahead. *Tourism Economics*, 16(1), 11-23.
- Lindars, R. (2019, May 2). *Using netnography in 2019 to engage & convert*. NetBase. <https://netbasequid.com/blog/netnography-engage-convert/>
- Majó, F. J. (Ed.). (2004). *Grado de Turismo* [Tourism Degree]. http://www.aneca.es/modal_eval/docs/libroblanco_jun05_turismo.pdf
- Masterson, K. (2011, January 30). *Can new online rankings really measure colleges' brand strength? Unlikely, experts say*. Chronicle of Higher Education. <http://chronicle.com/article/Can-New-Online-Rankings-Really/126083/>
- Middleton, V. T., & Ladkin, A. (1996). *The profile of tourism studies degree courses in the UK: 1995/6 summary report of a survey undertaken by the NLG*. National Liaison Group for Higher Education in Tourism.
- Migration Data Portal. (2020, June 9). *International students*. Migration Data Portal. <https://migrationdataportal.org/themes/international-students>
- Montoya, S. (2018, September 3). *From brain drain to gain: The benefits arising from international knowledge networks*. UNESCO Institute for Statistic Blog. <https://sdg.uis.unesco.org/2018/09/03/from-brain-drain-to-gain-the-benefits-arising-from-international-knowledge-networks/>
- Morrison, A., & O'Mahony, G. B. (2003). The liberation of hospitality management education. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 15(1), 38-44.
- Nicolae, M., & Marinescu, R. (2010). University marketing—Innovative communication for effective international survival. *Journal for Communication Studies*, 3(1/5), 1-22.
- O'Mahony, G. B., McWilliams, A. M., & Whitelaw, P. A. (2001). Why students choose a hospitality-degree program: An Australian case study. *The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 42(1), 92-96.
- O'Mahony, G. B., McWilliams, A. M., & Whitelaw, P. A. (2008). The drivers of program selection in hospitality management at Victoria University. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Education*, 20(3), 5-10.
- OECD. (2014). *Indicator C4: Who studies abroad and where? Education at a glance 2014: OECD indicators*. OECD Publishing. [http://www.oecd.org/education/EAG2014-Indicator%20C4%20\(eng\).pdf](http://www.oecd.org/education/EAG2014-Indicator%20C4%20(eng).pdf)
- OECD Innovation Policy Platform. (2010, n.d.). *International mobility in higher education*. OECD Innovation Policy Platform. <http://www.oecd.org/innovation/policyplatform/48137663.pdf>

- Ortiz, A., Chang, L., & Fang, Y. (2015, February 2). International student mobility trends 2015: An economic perspective. *World Education News + Reviews*. <https://wenr.wes.org/2015/02/international-student-mobility-trends-2015-an-economic-perspective>
- Pérez, S. A. (1995). *Educando Educadores en Turismo* [Educating the educators in tourism]. Organización Mundial del Turismo
- Pyvis, D., & Chapman, A. (2007). Why university students choose an international education: A case study in Malaysia. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 27(2), 235-246.
- Rappole, C. L. (2000). Update of the chronological development, enrolment patterns, and education models of four-year, master's, and doctoral hospitality programs in the United States. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Education*, 12(3), 24-27.
- Richards, G. (2001). *Mobility in the European tourism sector. The role of transparency and recognition of vocational qualifications*. European Communities.
- Riley, M., Ladkin, A., & Szivas, E. (2002). *Tourism employment: Analysis and planning*. Channel View.
- Rumberger, R. W. (2003). The causes and consequences of student mobility. *Journal of Negro Education*, 72(1), 6-21.
- Sheldon, P. J., Fesenmajer, D. R., & Tribe, J. (2011). The tourism education futures initiative (TEFI): Activating change in tourism education. *Journal of Teaching in Travel & Tourism*, 11(1), 2-23.
- Sheldon, P., Fesenmaier, D. R., Woeber, K., Cooper, C., & Antonioli, M. (2008). Tourism education futures, 2010–2030: Building the capacity to lead. *Journal of Teaching in Travel & Tourism*, 7(3), 61-68.
- Shin, J. C., & Teichler, U. (2014). The future of university in the post-massification era: a conceptual framework. In J. C. Shin, & U. Teichler (Eds.), *The future of the post-massified university at the crossroads: Restructuring systems and functions* (pp. 1-9). Springer.
- Slide, C. (2014). *33 Factors for how to choose a college*. Money Crashers. <http://www.moneycrashers.com/factors-choose-college/>
- Stansbie, P., Nash, R., & Chang, S. (2016). Linking internships and classroom learning: A case study examination of hospitality and tourism management students. *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport & Tourism Education*, 19, 19-29.
- Teng, C. C., Horng, J. S., & Baum, T. (2013). Academic perceptions of quality and quality assurance in undergraduate hospitality, tourism and leisure programmes: A comparison of UK and Taiwanese programmes. *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport & Tourism Education*, 13, 233-243.
- Tremblay, K., Lalancette, D., & Roseveare, D. (2012). *Assessment of higher education learning outcomes feasibility study report, design and implementation*. OECD. <http://www.oecd.org/education/skills-beyond-school/AHELOFSReportVolume1.pdf>
- Tribe, J. (2005a). Overview of research. In D. Airey, & J. Tribe (Eds.), *An international handbook of tourism education* (pp. 25-43). Elsevier.
- Tribe, J. (2005b). Tourism, knowledge, and the curriculum. In D. Airey, & J. Tribe (Eds.), *An international handbook of tourism education* (pp. 47–60). Elsevier.
- Tribe, J. (2006). The truth about tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 33(2), 360-381.
- Verbik, L., & Lasanowski, V. (2007, September). *International student mobility: Patterns and trends*. The Observatory on Borderless Higher Education. https://nccastaff.bournemouth.ac.uk/hncharif/MathsCGs/Desktop/PGCertificate/Assignment%20-%202002/International_student_mobility_abridged.pdf
- Wallis, C., & Steptoe, S. (2006, December 9). How to bring our schools out of the 20th century. *Time*. <http://content.time.com/time/nation/article/0,8599,1568429,00.html>
- Wang, J., Huyton, J., Gao, X., & Ayres, H. (2010). Evaluating undergraduate courses in tourism management: A comparison between Australia and China. *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sports & Tourism Education*, 9(2), 46-62.
- Westlake, J. (1997). Hotel and tourism training: Case studies from the University of Surrey. In E. Fayos-Solá (Ed.), *Human capital in the tourism industry of the 21st century* (pp. 269-282). WTO.
- Yiu, M., & Law, R. (2012). A review of hospitality internship: Different perspectives of students, employers, and educators. *Journal of Teaching in Travel and Tourism*, 12(4), 377-402.
- Zehrer, A., & Mössenlechner, C. (2009). Key competencies of tourism graduates: The employers' point of view. *Journal of Teaching in Travel and Tourism*, 9(3-4), 266-287.