

**A STUDY ON THE PROFILE OF INDUSTRIAL TRAINING IN
THE HOTEL MANAGEMENT COURSES**

ANIL CHANDHOK,
Professor, MM Institute of Management
MM University, Mullana.

ABSTRACT

The changes in the hotel industry are very fast and the course curriculum needs to be updated in accordance with the needs of the sector. The academic component of hotel courses are not uniform throughout the country. There are differences in the industrial training from academic program to academic program. The industrial training in the course curriculum of Hotel management course is widely recognized beneficial to all the stakeholders concerned. Students are benefited by the working in the real life situation which cannot be created in the classrooms where as , industry professional could identify potential employees by evaluating the performances of the trainee's. This paper is an attempt to find out the right time and duration of industrial training component in the course curriculum of hotel management course. The research instruments used in the study was questionnaires focused on student's industrial training component. Four different survey versions were created for each of the four groups surveyed for the study: Hotel management students pre-training, Hotel management students post-training, hotel management faculty members and hotel industry professionals. Universities offering hotel courses and other affiliated institutions needs to review prevailing industrial training component in their course curriculum to make it as effective as possible by adapting a uniform practice which would be beneficial to all stakeholders concerned

Introduction:

The success of any course lies on its course curriculum and contents. The changes in the hotel industry are very fast and the curriculum needs to be changed in accordance with the needs of the industry. Unfortunately, hotel syllabus is not uniform throughout the country. There is no perfect industrial training model for all hotel education programs.. This paper is an attempt to find the right time (in which semester students should go for the training) and right

duration (no .of weeks) of Industrial training component in the course curriculum of Hotel management course by examining the current opinions of the stakeholders.

Industrial Training Component:

There are differences in the industrial training from academic program to academic program. The industrial training in the course curriculum of Hotel management course is widely recognized beneficial to all the stakeholders concerned. Students benefited by working in the real life situation which cannot be created in the classrooms where as industry professional could identify potential employees by evaluating the performances of the trainee's .The academic institutions by incorporating the industrial training in their course curriculum leads to strengthen the employability skills of the students provided it should be a win –win situation to all concerned. However, when stakeholders reveal their perceptions of key factors of training experiences, different aspects might exist which often leads to challenge to all stakeholders involved in the training process. When all groups of stakeholders communicate the aspects that they value most in an industrial training experience and the goals that they wish to achieve, each group can better understand the other. Unfortunately, little research on topic has been performed. Present research is an attempt to find right time & duration of training.

***Research Question:** When is the right time for the students to send for industrial training experiences in terms of semester and for what duration?*

Research Methodology

Instruments

The research instruments used in the study was questionnaires focused on student's industrial training component. Four different survey versions were created for each of the four groups surveyed for the study: Hotel management students pre-training, Hotel management students post-training, hotel management faculty members and hotel industry professionals. Questions framed based on research questions. Apart from collecting information on duration and time respondents were also asked to give their opinions on category of assignments given during training duration, cooperativeness of industry professionals ,level of knowledge of the

trainees ,overall performance of the trainees, treatment of industrial professionals and rate the training experiences .Rating scale was used to gather the opinions of the respondents

The research objective

To find the right time and duration of industrial training component in the course curriculum of Hotel management course as per different stakeholders.

Participants

The sample population of the study includes four groups' .First and second one are hotel management students enrolled in three years degree courses of Hotel Management institutions in the region of Punjab, Haryana and Chandigarh. Students were further divided into Pre training students and Post training students .The pre training students are those who have not undergone industrial training and are in the initial phase of their course (I year students) where as Post training students are those who have completed their industrial training and are in the final phase of their course (III year). Both students groups were selected from various academic institutions such as 1) state university 2) deemed university 3) private universities 4) National council of hotel management institutions 5) central university. Third are the hotel industry professionals working in 3 or above three star approved Hotel (3, 4, and 5 star) Hotels employee working at Managerial, assistant managerial and supervisory level. Fourth were the hotel management faculty members working in various academic institutions in the region of Punjab, Haryana and Chandigarh.

Table shows in percentage the region wise stakeholders sample size

Respondents	Region (%)		
	Punjab	Haryana	Chandigarh
Industry Professionals	39	32	29
Faculty	49	15	35
Students –Pre Industrial Training	35	37	28
Students –Post	32	32	36

Table shows in percentage the respondent's further break up by institution wise

Respondents	inst type %			
	State	Deemed	Private	National Council
Faculty	51	9	22	18
Students –Pre Industrial Training	36	5	32	27
Students –Pre Industrial Training	36	5	32	27
Students –Post	50	4	27	19

Table shows in percentage the breakup of respondents by star category wise

Respondents	STAR (%)		
	3 Star	4 Star	5 Star
Industry Professionals	32	47	21
Students –Post	15	58	27

Response Rate

A total of 150 surveys were mailed to industry professionals working within the lodging industry. Of these mailed surveys, 100 were returned, with a response rate of 66.6%. A total of 300 surveys were distributed to post training students out of which 285 were found complete and useable for data tabulation, with a response rate of 95%. Similarly a total of 300 surveys were distributed to pre training students and there were 276 pre-training student respondents observed, with a response rate of 92 %. Surveys were distributed by faculty members to students enrolled in their hotel management courses. A total of 200 faculty members surveyed for this study using a mailed and personal approach method, out of which 150 questionnaire were found usable, with a response rate of 75 %. Table summarises the response rate of all focus group of respondents.

Response Rate			
Respondent	Survey distributed	Survey returned	Response Rate %
Industry professionals	140	100	71.4
Faculty members	200	150	75
Post training students	300	285	95
Pre training students	300	276	92

All four survey focus groups were asked existing course curriculum of Hotel Management course require any changes for Industrial Training component, in terms of right time (in which semester students should go for training) and duration (for how many no. of weeks)

Out of total responses, 71%(n=71) industry professional, 62 %(n=93) faculty members,45 % (n=125)pre industrial training students and 54%(n=154) post industrial training students were agreed yes course requires changes .It was found that majority all focus groups except pre students heavily admit that existing course pattern require changes in terms of industrial training structure . Low percentage of agreement was observed in case of pre to training students for changes required in the course curriculum. This might be due to reason that they are in first year of their course structure and not in a position to evaluate the effectiveness of the training by changing the current practice.

Out of total responses, 71%(n=71) industry professional, 62 %(n=93) faculty members,45 % (n=125)pre industrial training students and 54%(n=154) post industrial training students were agreed yes course requires changes .It was found that majority all focus groups except pre students heavily admit that existing course pattern require changes in terms of industrial training structure . Low percentage of agreement was observed in case of pre to training students for changes required in the course curriculum. This might be due to reason that they are in first year of their course structure and not in a position to evaluate the effectiveness of the training by changing the current practice. In terms of different types of universities ,only private56% (n=111)and national council 58% (n=91)agrees to changes however state51%(n=152) ,deemed 62%(n=24) does not agreed to changes require in the course curriculum in terms of time and duration of industrial training component. *It was found that most of academic institutions have a way of reviewing and assessing the industrial training component as per the observed results.* Chi square test applied and it was found that there is **significant** difference exist among stakeholders, region and Type of institution in terms of opinions regarding changes requires in course curriculum for industrial training component. The significance level $p < .05$ is for stakeholders, .000, for region .018 and for institution .0045.

Pearson Chi-Square Tests		
Require Changes		
Stakeholders	Chi-square	23.854
	df	3
	Sig.	.000*
Designation	Chi-square	9.202
	df	7
	Sig.	0.238
SEX(1M,2F)	Chi-square	1.291
	df	1
	Sig.	0.256
Experience	Chi-square	3.147
	df	3
	Sig.	0.369
STAR	Chi-square	0.73
	df	2
	Sig.	0.694
Region	Chi-square	7.993
	df	2
	Sig.	.018*
Inst type	Chi-square	8.0062
	df	3
	Sig.	.00459*

Those respondents marked yes, course structure require changes were further asked to provide information on right duration and time of training in terms of weeks that best represent the right duration of the training and right time which means in which semester students should go for training

Table shows in percentage the right duration preferred by stakeholders

Responses are in %		First time Duration								Total
		4	8	12	16	20	24	28	48	
Stakeholders	Industry Professionals	3	6	7	4	20	48	7	6	100
	Faculty	0	2	11	8	76	3	0	0	100
	Students –Pre	10	18	24	18	19	10	0	0	100
	Students –Post	14	12	21	25	22	7	0	0	100
Designation	Principal	0	17	0	0	83	0	0	0	100
	HOD	0	0	7	7	86	0	0	0	100
	Sr. Lecturer	0	6	12	6	71	6	0	0	100
	Lecturer	0	0	17	9	71	3	0	0	100
	Instructor	0	0	5	10	81	5	0	0	100

	Manager	0	17	8	0	8	42	17	8	100
	Assistant Manager	0	0	4	4	33	46	4	8	100
	Supervisory	6	6	9	6	14	51	6	3	100
SEX(1M,2F)	Male	8	10	17	15	34	14	1	1	100
	Female	8	12	19	18	28	13	1	0	100
Experience	0-5 yrs	2	0	7	6	52	28	4	2	100
	6-10 yrs	2	5	11	8	47	25	0	3	100
	11-15 yrs	0	3	9	6	65	15	3	0	100
	Above 15 yrs	0	17	8	0	42	8	17	8	100
STAR	3 Star	9	15	9	7	13	33	9	7	100
	4 Star	15	8	15	20	24	17	0	1	100
	5 Star	2	9	26	25	21	16	2	0	100
Region	Punjab	8	10	16	18	31	14	1	2	100
	Chandigarh	11	14	19	13	30	12	1	1	100
	Haryana	5	7	17	17	38	14	2	0	100
inst type	State University	10	14	22	15	30	8	0	0	100
	Deemed University	0	13	27	13	47	0	0	0	100
	Private University	5	11	23	22	32	8	0	0	100
	National Council	13	8	10	20	44	5	0	0	100

Table shows in percentage duration preferred by stakeholders for second time

		4	8	12	16	20	24	Total
Stakeholders	Industry Professionals	100	0	0	0	0	0	100
	Faculty	26	6	29	3	26	10	100
	Students –Pre Industrial Training	90	10	0	0	0	0	100
	Students –Post	77	0	14	0	9	0	100
Designation	Principal	0	0	0	0	100	0	100
	HOD	50	0	20	0	10	20	100
	Sr. Lecturer	25	0	25	0	50	0	100
	Lecturer	11	0	67	0	11	11	100
	Instructor	14	29	0	14	43	0	100
	Manager	100	0	0	0	0	0	100
	Assistant Manager	100	0	0	0	0	0	100
SEX(1M,2F)	Male	68	4	15	0	9	4	100
	Female	65	4	12	4	15	0	100
Experience	0-5 yrs	43	14	7	7	21	7	100
	6-10 yrs	44	0	38	0	19	0	100
	11-15 yrs	64	0	14	0	7	14	100
	Above 15 yrs	0	0	0	0	100	0	100

STAR	3 Star	60	0	20	0	20	0	100
	4 Star	82	0	14	0	4	0	100
	5 Star	94	0	0	0	6	0	100
Region	Punjab	66	2	12	2	15	2	100
	Chandigarh	71	6	10	0	10	3	100
	Haryana	64	4	21	0	7	4	100
inst type							0	
	State University	55	7	17	3	17	0	100
	Deemed University	0	0	50	0	50	0	100
	Private University	61	5	16	0	13	5	100
	National Council	82	0	12	0	0	6	100

Industry Professionals:

First time duration: Among industry professionals, out of total responses 48% of the sample preferred industrial training to be of 24 weeks, 20% of the sample preferred training should be of 20 weeks, 7% preferred training to be of 12 and 28 weeks, 6% of sample preferred training to be of 8 and 48 weeks, remaining 3 % of the sample preferred training to be of 4 weeks. Hence *majority of the sample preferred training duration should be of 24 weeks.*

For second time: 100% of the sample preferred training to be of 4 weeks.

Faculty members

First time duration: Among faculty members *majority (76%) of respondents preferred training to be of 20 weeks* followed by 11% preferred 12 weeks

Second time: Out of total responses 29% of the sample preferred training to be of 12 weeks, followed by 26 % of sample preferred 4 weeks and 20 weeks duration.

Pre Students

First time duration: In case of Pre to training students, 24 % of the sample preferred 12 weeks of training and 19% of the sample preferred it should be of 20 weeks

Second Time: Majority of the sample 75% preferred training to be of 4 weeks duration

Post students

First time duration: Among Post to training students, 25 % of the sample preferred training duration of 16 weeks, 22% preferred it should be of 20 weeks

Second time: Majority of respondents (74%) preferred 4 weeks duration for second time.

Designation wise: In terms of designation wise, Principal preferred training to be of 20 weeks duration for the first time and 100% response was for 20 weeks duration for second time. Similarly in case of H.O.D, majority (86%) of the sample preferred training duration of 20 weeks for first time and 50 % of the sample preferred 4 weeks duration for second time. Sr.Lecturer (71%) also preferred 20 weeks duration for first time and preferred same duration of 20 weeks in the second time. Out of total responses 71 % Lecturer preferred 20 weeks duration in training for first time and 67% preferred 16 weeks duration in the second time. Among Managers of Hotel operation, 42% of the sample, preferred 24 weeks for first time and 100% of the sample, preferred 4 weeks duration for second time, similar preference was marked by assistant managers and supervisory level employees.

In terms of star category of hotels, 33% of the sample, preferred to be of 24 weeks duration in first time training and 60% of the sample, preferred 4 weeks duration in second time. Among 4 star hotels, 24% of the sample, preferred 20 weeks duration in first time and 82% preferred 4 weeks duration in the second time, whereas among 5 star hotels preferred 12 weeks duration in the first time and 63 % of the sample preferred 4 weeks duration in second time

Among universities ,all preferred 20 weeks duration in the first time of training (30% (n=46)state,47% (n=7)deemed,32%(n=35) private,44% (n=40)national council and 56 % of the sample in case of state universities preferred 4 weeks duration in second time,50 % of sample in case of deemed university preferred 12 weeks and 20and 53% of the sample in case of private universities preferred 4 weeks for second time ,similarly 82% of the sample in case national council also preferred 4 weeks .

Right Duration: Among stakeholders, different opinions were expressed in terms of duration of the training .By comparing the median value of all stakeholders opinions for first time training, it was observed that right duration of training for first time in the course curriculum as per **industry professionals is of 24 weeks**, where as **faculty members preferred, that it**

should of 20 weeks, post to training students preferred it should be of 16 weeks and pre students preferred 16 weeks. The duration of training was found in decreasing order starting from 24 weeks to 16 weeks. Consensuses among stakeholders were found for second time duration that is of 4 weeks, however the median value of faculty members is 12 weeks.

		Stakeholders			
		Industry Professionals	Faculty	Students –Pre Industrial Training	Students – Post
1st Time Duration	Mean	22.20	18.71	13.92	13.95
	Median	24.00	20.00	12.00	16.00
	Mode	24.00	20.00	12.00	16.00
	Maximum	48.00	24.00	24.00	24.00
	Minimum	4.00	8.00	4.00	4.00
	Standard Deviation	8.55	3.18	6.02	5.88
	Total N	100	150	276	285
2nd Time Duration	Mean	4.00	12.97	4.05	6.46
	Median	4.00	12.00	4.00	4.00
	Mode	4.00	12.00	4.00	4.00
	Maximum	4.00	24.00	6.00	20.00
	Minimum	4.00	4.00	3.00	2.00
	Standard Deviation	.00	7.06	.76	5.09
	Total N	100	150	276	285

Statistical significant differences exist among stakeholders ($p=.000$, $p=.000$) revealed by chi square test in terms of duration of training preferred by stakeholders for both the times. In terms of designation of faculty members and industry professional significant differences exist in terms of training duration ($p=.000$, $p=.038$).

Pearson Chi-Square Tests			
		1st Time Duration	2 ND time duration
Stakeholders	Chi-square	254.906	45.244
	df	21	15
	Sig.	.000*	0.0001
Designation	Chi-square	107.702	59.653
	df	49	35
	Sig.	.000*	0.0058

SEX(1M,2F)	Chi-square	4.739	4.6821
	df	7	5
	Sig.	0.692	0.4559
Experience	Chi-square	26.566	19.201
	df	21	15
	Sig.	0.186	0.02048
STAR	Chi-square	43.951	4.9677
	df	14	4
	Sig.	.000*	0.2906
Region	Chi-square	15.158	0.8983
	df	14	10
	Sig.	0.367	0.8983
inst type	Chi-square	20.805	13.943
	df	15	15
	Sig.	0.1432	0.5298

In terms of **experience** wise there is **no** statistical difference among respondents for the first time duration ($p=0.186$), whereas difference exists for the second time duration ($p=0.02$). In terms of star hotel wise there is significant difference exists for the first time duration ($p=.000$) whereas no difference exists for the second time duration ($p=0.2906$).

In terms of regions wise there is no differences were observed for both the duration of the training ($0.367, p=0.898$) and similarly there is no significant difference exists among universities in the duration of training preferences for both time ($p=.143$ and $p=0.529$). Table summarises the results of Chi-square test.

An ANOVA was performed on all stakeholder opinions regarding right duration of training in terms of weeks. Significant differences were found between stakeholders opinions in terms of right duration of training for both the times. For first time $F(3, 437) = 42.127, p=.000$ and for second time $F(3, 96) = 18.398, p=.000$.

Table summarises the results of ANNOVA on duration of training (stakeholders)

		Descriptive						ANOVA	
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Minimum	Maximum	F	Sig.
1st Time Duration	Industry Professionals	71	22.20	8.547	1.014	4	48	42.127	.000

	Faculty	93	18.71	3.185	.330	8	24		
	Students – Pre Industrial Training	125	13.92	6.024	.539	4	24		
	Students – Post	152	13.95	5.877	.477	4	24		
	Total	441	16.27	6.796	.324	4	48		
2nd Time Duration	Industry Professionals	14	4.00	.000	.000	4	4	18.398	.000
	Faculty	31	12.97	7.059	1.268	4	24		
	Students – Pre Industrial Training	20	4.05	.759	.170	3	6		
	Students – Post	35	6.46	5.089	.860	2	20		
	Total	100	7.65	6.162	.616	2	24		

Table shows pair wise comparisons results of duration of training among stakeholders.

Tukey HSD					
Dependent Variable	(I) Stakeholders	(J) Stakeholders	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
1st Time Duration	Industry Professionals	Faculty	3.488	.946	.001
		Students –Pre Industrial Training	8.277	.892	.000
		Students –Post	8.250	.863	.000
	Faculty	Industry Professionals	-3.488	.946	.001
		Students –Pre Industrial Training	4.790	.822	.000
		Students –Post	4.762	.791	.000
	Students –Pre Industrial Training	Industry Professionals	-8.277	.892	.000
		Faculty	-4.790	.822	.000
		Students –Post	-.027	.725	1.000
	Students –Post	Industry Professionals	-8.250	.863	.000
		Faculty	-4.762	.791	.000
		Students –Pre Industrial Training	.027	.725	1.000
2nd Time Duration	Industry Professionals	Faculty	-8.968	1.606	.000
		Students –Pre	-.050	1.737	1.000

		Industrial Training			
		Students –Post	-2.457	1.577	.407
Faculty		Industry Professionals	8.968	1.606	.000
		Students –Pre Industrial Training	8.918	1.430	.000
		Students –Post	6.511	1.230	.000
Students –Pre Industrial Training		Industry Professionals	.050	1.737	1.000
		Faculty	-8.918	1.430	.000
		Students –Post	-2.407	1.398	.318
Students –Post		Industry Professionals	2.457	1.577	.407
		Faculty	-6.511	1.230	.000
		Students –Pre Industrial Training	2.407	1.398	.318

Pair wise comparisons were made between stakeholders. There is a significance difference exist in the opinion between pre , post students and faculty members in comparison to industry professionals $p=.000, p=.000$ and $p=.001$ for the first time duration ,However there is no significant difference exist between the opinions of pre and post students ($p=1.000$)

For the second time duration of the training, there is a significant difference between faculty members and post students ($p=.000$) in comparison to industry professionals. There is no significant difference between pre and industry professional .There is significant difference in the opinion among industry professionals, pre and post students in comparison to faculty members. There is no significant difference exist between pre and post students opinion in comparison to industry professionals .Similarly there is no significant difference between industry professionals and pre students in comparison to post students.

An ANOVA was performed on all types if academic institutions opinions regarding right duration of training in terms of weeks. Results are shown in Table. Significant differences were not found between all universities opinions in terms of right duration of training for both the times. For first time $F(3,366) = 0.952, p=.415$ and for second time $F(3, 82) = 1.769, p=.159$.

Table summarises the results of ANNOVA on duration of training (type of institutions)

Descriptives							ANOVA				
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Minimum	Maximum	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1st Time	State	153	14.5359	5.97806	0.4833	4	24	3	31.584	0.952	0.415
	Deemed	15	15.7333	4.65168	1.20106	8	20	366	33.171		

Duration	Private	111	15.4955	5.34258	0.5071	4	24	369			
	National Coun	91	15.6044	6.0238	0.63147	4	24				
	Total	370	15.1351	5.75828	0.29936	4	24				
2nd Time Duration	State	29	8.8276	6.26822	1.16398	4	20	3	70.449	1.769	0.159
	Deemed	2	16	5.65685	4	12	20	82	39.814		
	Private	38	8.6316	6.74004	1.09338	4	24	85			
	National Coun	17	6.1176	5.31369	1.28876	4	24				
	Total	86	8.3721	6.39494	0.68958	4	24				

Findings –Right Duration

Based on data analysis it is concluded that right duration in terms of weeks for industrial training as per industry professional is 24 weeks, where as faculty members opinions regarding right duration is of 20 weeks .In the opinions of pre to training students it is of 12 weeks and by post to training students it is of 16 weeks (10 weeks preferred by 3 star hotel ,where as 16 weeks each preferred by both 4 and 5 star hotel students.

For second there is similarity exist in the opinions of pre ,post and industry professional that is for second time training should be 4 weeks ,where as faculty members mean value is 12 weeks. However similarity exists in the opinions of industry professionals, pre and post students towards right duration in terms of weeks for second time training in the course curriculum is of 4 weeks where as faculty members ideal duration for second time training is of 12 weeks.

Right time (when students should go for training in the course curriculum)

Table shows in percentage preferences of stakeholder's time for training

%		1st time Change (in Sem)					
		1st Sem	2nd Sem	3rd Sem	4th Sem	5th Sem	6th Sem
Stakeholders	Industry Professionals	0	10	8	21	20	41
	Faculty	2	5	17	16	13	46
	Students –Pre Industrial Training	10	22	22	14	20	13
	Students –Post	5	24	11	18	8	35
Designation	Principal	17	0	0	17	50	17
	HOD	0	0	50	21	7	21

	Sr. Lecturer	0	6	18	6	35	35
	Lecturer	3	11	14	11	6	54
	Instructor	0	0	5	29	0	67
	Manager	0	8	8	25	25	33
	Assistant Manager	0	4	4	21	13	58
	spervisory	0	14	11	20	23	31
SEX(1M,2F)	Male	5	15	15	19	15	31
	Female	5	20	14	13	13	34
Experience	0-5 yrs	0	6	7	24	17	46
	6-10 yrs	2	11	11	11	11	55
	11-15 yrs	0	3	32	21	18	26
	Above 15 yrs	8	8	0	25	33	25
STAR	3 Star	2	22	9	13	22	33
	4 Star	4	22	12	21	9	33
	5 Star	2	12	7	21	9	49
Region	Punjab	4	18	17	14	15	32
	Chandigarh	7	17	14	18	15	28
	Haryana	3	15	13	20	13	36
inst type							
	STATE UNIVERSITY	7	20	15	19	10	29
	Deemed	7	27	13	0	13	40
	Private UNIVERSITY	1	21	20	16	15	27
	NATIONAL COUNCIL	9	11	14	14	16	35

		2nd time Change (in Sem)					
		1st Sem	2nd Sem	3rd Sem	4th Sem	5th Sem	6th Sem
Stakeholders	Industry Professionals	0	0	0	0	7	93
	Faculty	0	0	0	0	19	81
	Students –Pre Industrial Training	0	0	0	5	30	65
	Students –Post	0	0	0	0	23	77
Designation	Principal	0	0	0	0	0	100
	HOD	0	0	0	0	30	70
	Sr. Lecturer	0	0	0	0	25	75
	Lecturer	0	0	0	0	11	89
	Instructor	0	0	0	0	14	86
	Manager	0	0	0	0	0	100
	Assistant	0	0	0	0	0	100

	Manager						
	spervisory	0	0	0	0	11	89
SEX(1M,2F)	Male	0	0	0	0	19	81
	Female	0	0	0	4	27	69
Experience	0-5 yrs	0	0	0	0	14	86
	6-10 yrs	0	0	0	0	6	94
	11-15 yrs	0	0	0	0	29	71
	Above 15 yrs	0	0	0	0	0	100
STAR	3 Star	0	0	0	0	0	100
	4 Star	0	0	0	0	18	82
	5 Star	0	0	0	0	25	75
Region	Punjab	0	0	0	2	27	71
	Chandigarh	0	0	0	0	26	74
	Haryana	0	0	0	0	7	93
inst type	STATE UNIVERSITY	0	0	0	3	28	69
	Deemed UNIVERSITY	0	0	0	0	50	50
	Private UNIVERSITY	0	0	0	0	18	82
	NATIONAL COUNCIL	0	0	0	0	24	76

Industry professionals: First time among industry professionals 41 % of the sample marked 6 semester, followed by 21% for 4 semester, 20 % preferred in 5 semester for the first time. Second Time: 18% of the sample, preferred in 6 semester for the second time.

Faculty members: Among faculty members, 46% of the sample, preferred in 6 semester, followed by 17% in 3 semester for the first time .Second time out of total, 27% of the sample preferred in 6 semester.

Pre students : Among Pre students 22% each of the sample, preferred in 2 and 3 semester, followed by 20 % for 5 semester for first time and Second Time ,out of total 10 % of the sample ,preferred in the 6 semester.

Post Students: Among post students 35% of the sample preferred in 6 semester, followed by 24 % in 2 semester for the first time and 18 % of the sample preferred in the 6 semester for the second time.

Right Duration

As per the opinions of industry professionals regarding the right duration of industrial training that is of 24 weeks have a rationale and coincides with the earlier research studies (Oliver, 2010; Mihail, 2006) that interns conveyed, internship duration were too short and the majority of interns think the most right internship period should be of **six months**, whereas Mihail (2006) also found in his study that most of the interns favoured to have internship periods ranging from six to nine months instead of three months. This indicated that interns are ready to have a longer internship period and believe that they can learn more within a six month period. Oliver (2010) remarks that the short amount of time an internship lasts really never lets the student become a **fully functional employee** because there is not so much to take in for them. In the present study results post training students preferred that the right duration of training should be of **16 weeks is almost sufficient** to cover four core areas of the industry that is Front office, Food and Beverage Service, Food and Beverage Production and House Keeping operation, by working **4 weeks** per area and later on they could go for **specialised training of 4 weeks in the area of interest**. The other core areas such as Accounts, Sales & Marketing etc. do not allow students to fully access the different components. Students found this unfair though managers argued that allowing students full access can be quite risky when it comes to strategic areas. The mean of industry professional is 4.26, that the **industry professionals** suggests training duration should be **longer** period that is of 24 weeks due to **high task clarity reason and better job rotation of the trainee** within the hotel operation, for overall success of the training. The mean of faculty members is 3.9 that is **faculty members** preferred **20 weeks** training due to reason that students get to **know the operations of hotel and later they can go for specialised training in their area of interest in the higher semesters**. The mean of **pre students** is 3.02, where the reason is similar to faculty members however the mean of **post students** is 2.61 that is mostly **irrelevant tasks** were provided to the trainees and it should be of shorter duration (16 weeks).

Further **type of institution wise**, all universities of the sample given the similar reason of the training duration that is students get **to know the operations of hotel and later they can go for specialised training in their area of interest in the higher semesters**. Whereas designation wise reason marked by principal, Sr Lecturer, Lecturer and Instructor is that high

task clarity and better job rotation of the trainee within the hotel operation factor must be consider in the duration of the training for overall success of the training, where as H.O.D, Mangers and Supervisory recommends that students get to know the operations of hotel and later they can go for specialised training in their area of interest in the higher semesters

Right time

It is concluded that the right time for training is 4 semesters for the first time and 6 semesters for the second time as per State, Private and Central Universities .As per Deemed and National council, right time for training is 5 semester for the first time and 6 semester for the second time. The rationale behind is that students must **complete required course modules** before taking the industrial training. Industrial training also help schools resolve the high expenses involved in providing needed facilities and equipment (Krasilovsky and Lendt, 1996; Hodgson, 1999). According to Krasilovsky and Lendt (1996), the students also get the chance to meet their future bosses, and have a higher chance of finding a job through the industrial training component.

Frequency and mean of the selected reason for time are given in table in number. The mean of **industry professional** is 4.44 that means, the industry professionals suggest training time should be in fourth semester as it would be a beneficial experience which bridges the gap between university and the workplace where trainees would **be fully academically prepared** to face real work encounters. The mean of **faculty members** is 3.99 that, **to foresee area of interest**, by this time, it will help in **Solving confusion about career choice's** The mean of **pre students** is 3.19, where the reason is similar to faculty members however the mean of **post students** is 2.97 that is **To see that chosen course matches with aspirations and better to change the career choice in the initial phase.**

Further among **type of institution** wise, Majority universities of the sample had given the similar reason of the training time that **to foresee area of interest, by this time**, it will help in solving confusion about career choices. Whereas designation wise reason marked by principal, ,Sr Lecturer , Instructor ,Manager ,asstt manager and supervisor is that Beneficial experience which bridges the gap between university and the workplace where trines would

be Fully academically prepared to face real work encounters factor must be consider in the time of the training for overall success of the training.

Category of assignments (respondent faculty members& Post students)

5	4	3	2	1
Important and valuable experience	Less than important, but valuable experience	Relevant, but often busy work and menial tasks	Mostly irrelevant to career goals	Totally irrelevant to career goals

The **difference** were found between **faculty and post students** responses regarding category of assignments given during the training duration ($M=2.95$, $SD=.89$) and post students ($M=3.43$ $SD=1.24$), as per **Faculty members** category of assignments were usually **Relevant ,but often busy work and menial task** where as **post students** admits that mostly **irrelevant to career goals** .The post students who have completed their training from **3 star** hotels has a mean value of 4 that means they felt that assignments were **less than important but valuable experience** ,whereas those who have completed training in **4 star** hotels has mean value of 3,which means **Relevant ,but often busy work and menial task** and those who have completed training in **5 star** have mean value of 2 which means **Mostly irrelevant to career goals** .

Industrial training experience (respondent faculty members& Post students)

Respondent	1	2	3	4	5
	“Below expectation “	“average expectation”	Neutral	“met expectation”	“exceeded expectation”

The mean value of **faculty members** is ($M=2.55$, $SD=1.00$) that means **average expectation** where as **post students** have mean value of ($M=3.39$ $SD=1.21$) means **neutral** to the training experiences. It was a important fact to note it down that the level of overall experiences was found significant different among hotels type where in post students have completed their training .In case of post students who had completed their training in **3 star** ($M=4.277$, $SD=.76$) means **met expectation**, followed by **4 star hotel** ($M=3.70$, $SD=.94$) means over all **neutral response** and 5 star hotel have ($M=2.18$, $SD=1.04$) means value of means

average expectation .In terms of type of academic institutions ,it was found among demand and private universities ,it was average expectation and in remaining universities it was neutral over all experience.

To be successful in extending right kind of exposure to the students in their industrial training, all stakeholders put efforts to achieve positive results by establishing pre performance objectives which in themselves should be related to the organisational goals. Although *3 star hotels are attentive to the conditions that enable or empower trainees to perform well at their training by giving them valuable experience and opportunity to deal with their guest which in return* justifiably be claimed to have resulted the increased commitment towards industry after graduation. **Findings have contrary observation** of the

Curriculum Preparedness for industrial training exposure (respondent Pre and Post Students)

Respondent	1	2	3	4	5
	“unprepared”	“to some extent prepared”	“neither unprepared nor prepared”	“prepared”	“well prepared”

Both pre and post students felt that they are “neither unprepared nor prepared” ($M=3.67$, $SD=1.21$) for pre students and ($M=3.2$ $SD=4.71$) post students.

Among post students differences were found .Those students who have completed their training in **3 star hotels** felt “**prepared** for industrial training exposure ($M=4.16$, $SD=6.87$) ,where as those who have completed their training in **4 star** hotels felt to **some extent prepared** curriculum wise for exposure($M=2.67$, $SD=2.69$) and those completed in **5 star** hotels felt “ **neither unprepared nor prepared**”($M=3.8$, $SD=6.29$).

Results coincides with Amoah and Baum (1997,p.6) highlighted that when there is no consensus between the two features of tourism environment and tourism education ,problems arise for those on the receiving end of the tourism education .Curricula should to some extent includes training in specific skills and competencies that are vital for the real working world and been shaped by the needs of the industry

Cooperativeness of Industry professionals (respondent faculty members & Post students)

RESPONDENTS	1	2	3	4	5	Total
	"difficult"	"Not cooperative"	Neutral	"Cooperative"	"Very cooperative"	

Faculty members and post students were asked to rank the cooperativeness of the industry professionals that oversee your trainee. The **Faculty members** experienced that industry professionals who oversee trainees were **not cooperative** ($M=2.5, SD=1.15$) where as **post students** were reported **neutral** response ($M=3.62, SD=2.57$)

Among post students, different experiences were reported by students in relation to their training hotel star category. Those students who had completed their training in **3 star hotels** reported that industry professional were **very cooperative** ($M=5, SD=4.4$). Those who have completed their training in **4 star hotels** were reported **neutral** responses ($M=3.7, SD=1.3$). Post students who completed their training from **5 star hotels** rank industry professionals **not cooperative** ($M=2.2, SD=2.5$)

Among type of institutions, it was found that all academic institutions rank the industry professionals not cooperative except the state universities responses.

Results are consistent with the general findings of Bukaliya and Richard. (2012) identified a number of challenges militated against the effectiveness of the internship programmes in his study, challenges include some fulltime employees being reluctant to disclose important information to students. A number of supervisors are too busy to provide effective supervision. Current duration of attachment is not sufficient for all the disciplines. Moreover, some employees regard interns as a threat to their position and in some cases some supervisors possess inferior qualifications than the student interns. Though at times complaints have been raised employers for treating the interns as cheap labour.

Overall performance of the trainees (Industry professionals)

1	2	3	4	5
"Poor"	"Average"	Neutral	"Good"	"Excellent"

The **industry professionals** reported **average** overall performance of the trainees ($M=2.94$, $SD=1.24$). Different opinions were found among industry professionals working at different star hotels. In case of **3 star hotels**, it was found **good overall performance** of the trainee ($M=4$, $SD=0.88$). In case of **4 star hotels**, it was found **average** performance ($M=2.66$, $SD=1.01$) and **5 star hotels** reported **poor performance** of the trainees ($M=1.95$, $SD=1.02$)

The performance of trainees may depend upon the level of knowledge they have received and their ability to apply the learning in the real working environment during their training. Great percentage agreeing with this statement that students are not very knowledgeable observed by the industry professionals during their training which means that *institutional training results in half-baked products that are not compatible with the needs of industry*

Industry professionals treat trainees (Faculty members & Post students)

Respondent	1	2	3	4	5
	“Treated very poorly”	“Treated poorly”	“neither poorly nor fairly”	“Treated fairly”	“Treated very fairly”

The **faculty members** reported that industry professionals **treat poorly** the trainees during their training period ($M=2.51$, $SD=1.19$). **Post students** expressed **neither poorly nor fairly**, treatment by the industry professionals ($M=3.35$, $SD=1.21$). Different opinions were found among post students at various star hotel levels, wherein they had completed their training. In case of post students who had completed their training in **3 star hotels** were **treated fairly** by the industry professionals ($M=4.45$, $SD=0.73$). In case of **4 star hotels**, it was found **neither poorly nor fairly response** ($M=3.66$, $SD=0.95$). Those students completed their training in **5 star hotels** have reported **treated poorly** ($M=2.01$, $SD=0.7$).

Results coincides with Rothman (2007) Cannon and Arnold (1998) at times complaints have been raised against employers for treating the interns as **cheap labour**. For WIL to be successful, each stakeholder has a specific role to play. Nicolaidis (2006, p. 7) agrees with Moody (1997) that the best type of placement program is the one which involves the hosting business from the outset and where it demonstrates a genuine commitment to student learning. Students are not to be regarded as “cheap sources of labor” by their hosts.

Nicolaides (2006, p. 4), believes that industry needs to play a greater role in encouraging WIL experience for students as this provides an ideal opportunity for academics and employers to build long-term relationships and a greater potential for working together to meet industry needs and wants, as in the tourism and hotel sector. Treating an intern like a part-time employee will compromise the internship experience for the intern (Rothman, 2007).

There is relationship exist between training experiences and category of assignment $r(434)=.351, p<0.0001$ and also between the training experiences and category of assignments given to trainees $r(435)=0.266, p<0.0001$

		Category of Assignment	Cooperativeness of Industry
Rate Training Ex per	Correlation Coefficient	0.351	0.266
	Significance Level P	<0.0001	<0.0001
	n	434	435

It means that important and valuable assignments provided to students will lead to exceed the expectation of the students training experiences and in case totally irrelevant to career goals kind of assignment given to students will lead to below expectation experience of the training. Similarly very cooperative approach extended by the industry professionals will lead to exceed the expectations of the training experiences. In case difficult approach provided by industry professionals to the trainees will lead to below expectation experiences of the students

It was found that there is relationship exist between cooperativeness of industry professionals and category of assignments given to students during the training duration $r(434)=0.234, p<0.0001$

Correlation Matrix		Category of Assignment
Cooperativeness of Industry	Correlation Coefficient	0.234
	Significance Level P	<0.0001

n	434
---	-----

Hence all determinants of industrial training effectiveness are associated with right time and duration factor.

Conclusion

One of the primary benefits of industrial training for students is that students with industrial training experience supposedly have an advantage in the job market, which can translate into their being hired more readily for subsequent jobs. It is a fact that every educational system needs constant review since everything in the world is dynamic (Gothard W. P. 1987) and the industrial attachment exercise is by no means an exception. A number of institutions in the country need to review their industrial attachment training programs to make them as effective as they should be, eradicating any grey areas which hinder the success of this very necessary component. The general view is that industry and training institutions need to work together in the formulation of training programs to make the partnership fruitful and reasonably meaningful to all stakeholders (Harrison, G. 2010). Most institutions have a way of reviewing and assessing the industrial attachment program. Rittichainuwat, Worth, Hanson and Rattanapinanchai (2010), focus the attention on reinforcing the importance of integrating the industry and the academic worlds by collaborating on issues such as curriculum, instruction, and industrial training. The employability of the students could be enhanced by way of rotational training, by assigning valuable tasks to the trainees, extending cooperative hand during the training. All academic institutions must re-examine their industrial training component in their course curriculum, because majority of all stakeholders in this study admit that training should be of 20 weeks for the first time and 4 weeks in the second time and the right time of sending students for first time training is in 4 semester and second time is in 6 semester for their specialisation training. Hence sending students in the right time and duration will be beneficial to all stakeholders and will enhance the employability of the students. Moreover programs should provide students with needed tools and educate them to take responsibility in future work life, thus bridging the gap, as one of

the findings of this study. Trainees tried to test career choices during the training period; however duration was very short to actually test career choices, the moment they test career choices in a particular department, may be moved to another. Some of them are not adequately rotated in all the departments. On the other hand it was observed that one time practice of industrial training was found in the most of the curriculum of Hotel management institutions and very few institutions have later on specialisation training component in the course curriculum. Hence industrial training has been identified as a major tool in enhancing employability among students provided at the right with right duration and having similar outcomes of training as perceived important by stakeholder's leads to extending quality experiences to the future job prospects and increase their transition rate from academics to chosen industry work environment for the overall development of the economy.

References:

- Baum, T. (2007). Human resources in tourism: Still waiting for change. *Tourism Management*, 28(6), 1383-1399.
- Cannon, J.A., and Arnold, M.J. (1998). Student expectations of collegiate internship programs in business: A 10- year update. *Journal of Education for Business*, 73, 202-205.
- Cho, M. (2006). Student perspectives on the quality of hotel management internships. *Journal of Teaching in Travel & Tourism*, 6, 61—76.
- Collins, A. B. (2002). Gateway to the real world, industrial training: dilemmas and problems. *Tourism Management*, 23(1), 93-96.
- Hodgson, P. (1999) "Making internships well worth the work". *Techniques: Making Education and Career Connections*, Vol. 74, pp. 38-39.
- Spowat, J. (2009, June). Hospitality management competencies: Do faculty and students concur on employability skills? Paper presented at The World Association for Cooperative Education Sixteenth World Conference, Vancouver, Canada.
- Lam, T., Ching, L. (2006). An exploratory study of an internship program: The case of Hong Kong students. *Hospitality Management*, 26, 336-351.
- Mihail, D.M., (2006) "Internships at Greece Universities: An exploratory study", *Journal of Workplace Learning*, Vol. 18 No. 1, pp.28-41.