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ABSTRACT

In hospitality courses at the undergraduate level a learners is required to study a variety of subjects ranging from core hotel management subjects, Management subjects and Language subjects. In today’s scenario there is a need of using innovative teaching methods for enhancing employability skills of the students. Limited studies have been conducted in context of exploring what types of teaching methods hospitality educators are using in their classes. Present study aims to identify and rate teaching activities adopted by hospitality faculty members in teaching core subjects. A total of 21 faculty members were approached for purpose of data collection. Faculty members were asked to rate the various various teaching techniques in terms of their usage ranging from 1- Never, 2-Rarely, 3-Occasionally, 4-Frequently and 5-Very Frequently. Results revealed that Field exercise: Majority of faculty members rated that rarely they adopt field exercises. Small Group Activity: It was found that small group activities were frequently adopted in teaching Production and Service subjects. Role Play: Majority of faculty members engaged in teaching front office are mostly using role play sessions. Presentation very commonly applied by faculty members and mostly front office trainers are mostly associated. Case Studies: Earlier it was perceived that case studies are mostly used in MBA courses but nowadays usage in undergraduate’s courses was also in practice. Majority of the faculty members rated that frequently they are using case studies in their teaching methodology. There is no significant difference was found among faculty members rating on usage of case studies. Quiz activity was rated occasionally. Assignment: It was found that assignment activity was frequently used by all faculty groups and hence there is no difference exists among faculty members on its usage. Group Project It was found that majority of faculty members rated frequently they are engaged in assigning group projects to the students. Demonstration: Majority of the faculty members rated rarely they apply demonstration. Hospitality trainer should apply mix of teaching activities in his or her pedagogy. As it was perceived that certain activities are mostly associated in teaching a particular area but that perception is changing among trainers. Hospitality faculty members are incorporating all innovating teaching techniques for overall understanding of the concepts and its applicability in the long run.
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INTRODUCTION:

Hospitality education basically it is a content which is blend of industry information and the acquisition of managerial and technical skills and abilities Cynthia, Deale et al (2013). In hospitality courses at the undergraduate level a learners is required to study a variety of subjects ranging from core hotel management subjects (Food Production, Food & Beverage Service, Front office and Housekeeping) Management.
subjects (Accounting, Mgt, Finance, Economics, Marketing, HR, Statistics etc) and Language subjects such as English, French, German and Regional language. Teaching methods used by core subject educators might be different from noncore subject teachers. As Smey (1996) found that while educators in different fields varied slightly in their use of instructional delivery techniques. Although core subjects educators are considered to be technically sound and qualified in their forte areas however in terms of teaching ability they requires regular faculty development programs in line with what current is happening in the industry. Several academic institutions have taken the initiatives to send their faculty members during summer and winter vacations to get acquainted with the emerging trends happening in the industry. In today’s scenario there is a need of using innovative teaching methods for enhancing employability skills of the students. Limited studies have been conducted in context of exploring what types of teaching methods hospitality educators are using in their classes. Present study aims to identify and rate teaching activities adopted by hospitality faculty members in teaching core subjects.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE:

Zwaal and Otting (2007) emphasised that ‘the focus of education has shifted from a traditional teacher-centred approach to a constructivist and student-centred orientation’. At present there are various methods of teaching are available and are directly guided by the module content and learners group (Macellan 2008). Faculty members should incorporate multi modal teaching approaches ranging from sensory simulation theory, Reinforcement theory, Cognitive approaches, Holistic learning, Facilitation theory, Experimental learning and Action learning. Table given below shows teaching theories and implications for hospitality and tourism

| Learning Theory   | Implication for Hospitality & Tourism                                      |
|-------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Sensory Stimulation | Presentation & Case Studies                                              |
| Reinforcement     | Presentation, Group Work and Class discussion                           |
| Cognitive-Gestalt | Field Trips, Industrial Placements, Practice                            |
| Holistic Learning | Lecturers, Tutorial and Presentations                                    |
| Experimental      | Internships                                                              |

Source: Sotiroula Liasidou (2016).

Cynthia, Deale et al (2013) conducted a research study to examine current hospitality and tourism teaching methods. Questionnaire was administered using online survey. The Sample Information on teaching styles was collected from 196 members of the ICHRIE. Findings revealed that the lecture method was the most frequently used teaching method reported by educators in the study. While this might not be very innovative or exciting as a method, to abandon the lecture may not be wise or efficient. With class sizes increasing and resources becoming scarce, the lecture (with discussion) method offers a means to present content material to large numbers of students and, therefore, is efficient as a teaching method (American Hotel and Lodging Association, 2004). However, a teaching method needs to be used because it enhances learning and to ensure that their lectures involve students and contribute to the learning process, educators need to evaluate how effective their lectures and discussions are as vehicles for student learning.

Yu-Lun Hsu et al (2013) attempted to study Effective Teaching Strategies in Hospitality & Tourism Coursework Setting for Enhancing Student’s Involvement and Presentation Skill Development. Study concluded that activity-based teaching made a strong impression on students by providing a new and alternative experience to change their outlook towards the class and the learning process. Activity-based teaching can improve learning outcomes in hospitality and tourism courses to ensure strong technical and practical knowledge of students in transitioning to professional work. As to the future suggestions for teachers in higher education level, especially in Asia countries, the educators should consider the way of bringing learners to engage in activity-based teaching through in-class activities, and help learners preparation, not just doing the lectures while learners could possibly loss their attentions easily.

Sotiroula Liasidou (2016) concluded that incorporation of various methods enhances the learning experience and makes the student more eager to be involved. Educators should take into consideration and understand the needs of the students. This will enable them to be more proactive and adaptive to offer a better learning experience. Thus, focusing on experience and based on the research results, academic institutions can develop the curriculum and module content in such way that it can be enriched with various methods of learning and teaching.
Research Objective:
- To identify and rate teaching activities adopted by hospitality faculty members in teaching core subjects (Food Production, Services, Front office and Housekeeping operations).

Hypothesis:
- There is no significant difference exist among faculty members department wise in their usage of teaching techniques (Field Exercise, Small Group Activity, Role Play, Presentation, Case Studies, Quiz, Assignment, Group Project & Demonstration)

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY:

Profile of the Respondents:
A total of 21 faculty members were approached for purpose of data collection. Out of total, 52% was male faculty and rest 48% was comprises of female faculty members. Majority of them belongs to housekeeping department followed by 33% front office and very less almost one faculty member of each of production and service have filled the questionnaire.

Survey faculty members were approached during the students final practical exam was scheduled. Exam was scheduled for front office and housekeeping subjects that is why majority of faculty members associated in these two subjects and only one each faculty member of production and service was approached. Although present paper is basically a initial step to explore teaching techniques adopted was faculty members and followed up in depth study will be conducted with larges sample size comprises of both public and private institutions and inclusion of both core and non core hospitality subjects trainers. After the exam faculty members were asked to rate the various various teaching techniques in terms of their usage ranging from 1- Never, 2- Rarely, 3- Occasionally, 4- Frequently and 5- Very Frequently.

Table 1: Shows Profile of the Respondents

| Gender    | f   | %     |
|-----------|-----|-------|
| Male      | 11  | 52.4  |
| Female    | 10  | 47.6  |
| Total     | 21  | 100%  |

| Department     | f   | %     |
|----------------|-----|-------|
| Production     | 1   | 4.8   |
| Service        | 1   | 4.8   |
| Front office   | 7   | 33.3  |
| Housekeeping   | 12  | 57.1  |
| Total          | 21  | 100%  |

Table 2: Shows (Frequency) Rating of faculty members on teaching techniques

| Teaching Activity | Never | Rarely | Occasionally | Frequently | Very Frequently | Total |
|-------------------|-------|--------|--------------|------------|----------------|-------|
| Field Exercise    | 3     | 8      | 6            | 3          | 1              | 21    |
| Small Group Activity | 2   | 4      | 6            | 6          | 3              | 21    |
| Role Play         | 2     | 6      | 4            | 8          | 1              | 21    |
| Presentation      | 1     | 0      | 1            | 11         | 9              | 21    |
| Case Studies      | 3     | 6      | 4            | 8          | 0              | 21    |
| Quiz              | 2     | 5      | 10           | 4          | 0              | 21    |
| Assignment        | 0     | 0      | 1            | 14         | 6              | 21    |
| Group Project     | 1     | 5      | 3            | 9          | 3              | 21    |
| Demonstration     | 1     | 9      | 8            | 2          | 1              | 21    |
FINDINGS:

Teaching Techniques:

• **Field exercise:** Majority of faculty members rated that rarely they adopt field exercises and assign tasks to the learners by way of getting solutions from the field activity. The mean score among faculty members of core subjects was 2.5 that mean occasionally they assign field exercises to the learners and Annova results revealed that there is no significant difference exists among faculty members in terms of giving field exercises to hospitality learners.

• **Small Group Activity:** It was found that small group activities were frequently adopted in teaching Production and Service subjects. However, the overall mean value was 3.1. There is a significant different exist among faculty members in terms of assigning small group activities in their theory and practical sessions. Due to availability of infrastructure resources in practical labs of production and services, faculty members have the option to assign small group activities to the learner’s. This can be apply in front office and housekeeping subjects by giving some situations and tasks to the learners.

• **Role Play:** Majority of faculty members engaged in teaching front office are mostly using role play sessions. In the present study also it was found that role play activities are frequently used and specially by front office faculty members. Similarly production faculty members rated rarely use of role play sessions in their teaching methodology. There is no significant difference was found among faculty members on adopting role play sessions in their teaching pedagogy.

• **Presentation:** Presentations is nowadays very commonly applied by faculty members and mostly front office trainers are mostly associated due to their technology or IT Savvy experiences. In the present study most of the faculty members rated that occasionally and followed by frequently they use presentations in their pedagogy.

• **Case Studies:** Earlier it was perceived that case studies are mostly used in MBA courses but nowadays usage in undergraduate’s courses was also in practice. Majority of the faculty members rated that frequently they are using case studies in their teaching methodology. There is no significant difference was found among faculty members on rating usage of case studies.

• **Quiz:** It was found that there is a difference exists among faculty members on the usage of quiz activity. Quiz activity was rated occasionally but it was frequently used by production and services sessions. There is wide quiz material available on cookery and food services, wines, cuisines etc but limited material is found in front office area.

• **Assignment:** It was found that assignment activity was frequently used by all faculty groups and hence there is no difference exists among faculty members on its usage. This is also due to the fact that majority of course evaluation include internal assessment marks and that component has marks for the assignments.

• **Group Project:** It was found that majority of faculty members rated frequently they are engaged in assigning group projects to the students. Mean score of front office faculty members was found to be higher than production and services and there is a significant difference exists in the usage of group projects.

• **Demonstration:** Majority of the faculty members rated rarely they apply demonstration however mean score was high in case of production and services. As it was also seen having demonstration kitchen infrastructure in most of the institutes but not for other areas. Although nowadays towel art, flower arrangements etc are demonstrated to students and even in applicability is also seen in training front office operations also by showing PMS transactions etc.

| Teaching Technique      | Production | Service | Front office | Housekeeping | Total | Annova Results |
|-------------------------|------------|---------|--------------|--------------|-------|----------------|
| Field exercise          |            |         |              |              |       | F .128         |
| Never                   | 0          | 0       | 0            | 3            | 3     |                |
| Rarely                  | 0          | 1       | 4            | 3            | 8     |                |
| Occasionally            | 1          | 0       | 2            | 3            | 6     |                |
| Frequently              | 0          | 0       | 1            | 2            | 3     |                |
| Very Frequently         | 0          | 0       | 0            | 1            | 1     | Sig. .942      |
| Mean                    | 3          | 2       | 2.5          | 2.5          | 2.5   |                |

Table 3: Shows Responses – Department Wise
| Teaching Technique | Production | Service | Front office | Housekeeping | Total | Annova Results |
|--------------------|------------|---------|--------------|--------------|-------|----------------|
|                    | f          | f       | f            | f            |       | Sig.           |
| Frequently         | 1          | 0       | 0            | 5            | 6     | F 2.741        |
| Very Frequently    | 0          | 1       | 0            | 2            | 3     | Sig. .075      |
| Mean               | 4          | 5       | 2.1          | 3.5          | 3.1   | Sig. .013      |
| Role play          |            |         |              |              |       |                |
| Never              | 0          | 0       | 0            | 0            | 0     |                |
| Rarely             | 1          | 1       | 1            | 3            | 6     | F 8.244        |
| Occasionally       | 0          | 0       | 0            | 4            | 4     | Sig. .001      |
| Frequently         | 0          | 0       | 5            | 3            | 8     |                |
| Very Frequently    | 0          | 0       | 1            | 0            | 1     | Sig. .075      |
| Mean               | 2          | 2       | 3.8          | 2.6          | 3     | Sig. .013      |
| Presentation       |            |         |              |              |       |                |
| Never              | 1          | 0       | 0            | 0            | 1     | F 3.208        |
| Rarely             | 0          | 0       | 0            | 0            | 0     | Sig. .050      |
| Occasionally       | 0          | 1       | 5            | 5            | 6     |                |
| Frequently         | 0          | 0       | 2            | 7            | 9     | Sig. .918      |
| Very Frequently    | 0          | 0       | 0            | 0            | 0     |                |
| Mean               | 1          | 2       | 3.8          | 2.6          | 3     | Sig. .013      |
| Case studies       |            |         |              |              |       |                |
| Never              | 0          | 0       | 2            | 1            | 2     | F 1.65         |
| Rarely             | 1          | 0       | 1            | 4            | 6     | Sig. .918      |
| Occasionally       | 0          | 1       | 0            | 3            | 4     |                |
| Frequently         | 0          | 0       | 4            | 4            | 8     | Sig. .050      |
| Very Frequently    | 0          | 0       | 0            | 0            | 0     |                |
| Mean               | 2          | 3       | 2.8          | 2.8          | 2     | Sig. .013      |
| Quiz               |            |         |              |              |       |                |
| Never              | 0          | 0       | 0            | 2            | 2     | F 3.208        |
| Rarely             | 0          | 0       | 0            | 5            | 5     | Sig. .050      |
| Occasionally       | 0          | 1       | 5            | 4            | 6     |                |
| Frequently         | 0          | 1       | 2            | 1            | 3     | Sig. .050      |
| Very Frequently    | 0          | 0       | 0            | 0            | 0     |                |
| Mean               | 3          | 4       | 3.2          | 2.3          | 2.7   | Sig. .050      |
| Assignment         |            |         |              |              |       |                |
| Never              | 0          | 0       | 0            | 0            | 0     | F .775         |
| Rarely             | 0          | 0       | 0            | 0            | 0     | Sig. .522      |
| Occasionally       | 0          | 0       | 0            | 1            | 1     |                |
| Frequently         | 1          | 0       | 6            | 7            | 8     | Sig. .522      |
| Very Frequently    | 0          | 1       | 1            | 4            | 5     |                |
| Mean               | 4          | 5       | 4.1          | 4.2          | 4.2   | Sig. .522      |
| Group project      |            |         |              |              |       |                |
| Never              | 0          | 0       | 0            | 1            | 1     | F 3.677        |
| Rarely             | 1          | 1       | 0            | 3            | 5     | Sig. .033      |
| Occasionally       | 0          | 0       | 1            | 2            | 3     |                |
| Frequently         | 0          | 0       | 3            | 6            | 9     | Sig. .033      |
| Very Frequently    | 0          | 0       | 3            | 0            | 3     |                |
| Mean               | 2          | 2       | 4.2          | 3            | 3.3   | Sig. .033      |
| Demonstration      |            |         |              |              |       |                |
| Never              | 0          | 0       | 0            | 1            | 1     | F 4.250        |
| Rarely             | 0          | 0       | 3            | 6            | 9     | Sig. .021      |
| Occasionally       | 0          | 1       | 2            | 5            | 7     |                |
| Frequently         | 0          | 0       | 2            | 0            | 2     | Sig. .021      |
| Very Frequently    | 1          | 0       | 0            | 0            | 1     |                |
| Mean               | 5          | 3       | 2.8          | 2.3          | 2.6   | Sig. .021      |

SUGGESTIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS:

- **Field exercise**: For overall concept understanding faculty members should assign field exercises to the learners ranging from first to final year. Mostly final year students must have at least one session in the time table for field activity usually on Friday or at the last hour of the day. For example exercises such as comparison of a five star restaurant and coffee shop set up, ambience and service style could be given to first
year student so that they can understand the differences among various F & B Outlets and similarly final year students for housekeeping can study different floorings exist in various areas of the hotel as well as other sectors of the hospitality.

- **Small Group Activity**: Students should try to think and find out the solutions to the various difficult situations that may arise in hotel operations and how to tackle them with diplomacy and how to win the guest back instead of losing him. Faculty members should make list of small group of students and assign them with tasks in their practical session’s. For example in production a group of students try to find out the ingredient quantities required to make murgh makhni for 100 pax and similarly how to plan lobby layout and design.

- **Role Play**: Although role play sessions are typically applied in teaching front office operations however could be used in teaching food production concepts. Faculty chefs can use role play sessions also in making understanding the concept of live cooking and ask the budding chefs to conduct role play sessions for interacting with the guest, while taking orders and how to take feedback during and after dinning out. This practice will also enhance communication skills of the budding chefs. As industry is changing at a rapid pace and nowadays chefs are coming in front for the sole purpose of finding out the core needs and wants of the diners and how chefs can make their dinning out as a memorable experience.

- **Presentation**: Faculty members could assign small group of students various topics on which they have to make presentations. Even a session or seminar presentation session could be included once in a month for presenting presentations on particular topics. Topics can be emerging trends and practices, cost cutting measures, innovative recipes, leading hospitality players and popular hospitality entrepreneurs etc.

- **Case Studies**: Although limited number of books are available on all core departments related to case studies however most of the books are giving some case scenarios at the end of each chapters. Faculty members can form their groups included other core area teachers also in order to prepare case studies for the overall understanding of the concepts. Institutions apart from organising student competition events should also make platforms in their events for faculty members to present their case studies and scenarios. There is also need of including case study questions in the student’s evaluations especially in theory exams instead of framing direct theoretical questions.

- **Quiz**: Institutes can form core students clubs along with the assigned mentor wherein they can design and make quiz contents and must conduct once in a month for all semester’s. This kind of activities will also break the monotony of daily class room teaching also.

- **Assignment**: Faculty members instead of giving direct assignment like food and wine paring should prepare worksheet and then distribute or upload on the websites. For example in context of food and wine harmony worksheet includes questions related to several options by asking wine harmony for Chinese dishes, Indian tandoori items, draft paring menu of five courses continental, Mexican etc.

- **Group Project**: Nowadays few faculty members are giving basket cookery practical’s to small group of students specially the final years so that they can prepare a suitable menu items out of given ingredients in the basket. Same way innovative cocktails, mocktails etc can be planned out. For accommodation small group projects on revenue management, interior designing can be assigned to students for better understandings of the concepts.

- **Demonstration**: In the practical sessions faculty members first try to demonstrate the practical task with all standard procedures and then ask to students to do it. At the end of practical session of a day must evaluate their performances by forming students teams and proper feedback should be given for enhancing their competencies.

**CONCLUSION:**

Hospitality trainer should apply mix of teaching activities in his or her pedagogy. As it was perceived that certain activities are mostly associated in teaching a particular area but that perception is changing among trainers. Hospitality faculty members are incorporating all innovating teaching techniques for overall understanding of the concepts and its applicability in the long run. UGC is also focusing on use of innovative teaching methodology adopted by teachers in their assessments for further promotions. Use of varied techniques also bring in new ideas and create more interest among learners to apply the theoretical knowledge learned in the classrooms. Faculty members should be praised and awarded who are engaged in applying relevant teaching techniques for the betterment of the students. Similarly, hotel industry should also devise certain training strategies to be adopted during student’s industrial training programmes for overall win-win situation.
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