

Mentorship of Hospitality Management students during work-integrated learning

KARLA KEATING¹

Cape Peninsula University of Technology, South Africa

Work Integrated Learning (WIL) with specific reference to students in the field of Hospitality Management, is an essential component of the diploma courses offered at the Cape Town Hotel School, a department at the Cape Peninsula University of Technology. Industry mentors responsible for students on WIL programs must understand the significance of student mentorship and guidance, and the impact this can make on the trainee. The literature review highlights the definition of mentorship in the workplace, its importance, and suggestions on what constitutes best practice in the field of mentorship of WIL students. Surveys were conducted among students and industry members and results used to ascertain whether students found the industry mentorship beneficial. On the basis of this investigation, solutions were sought to assist in eliminating problems so far specified and to make recommendations for future study to ensure improvement in the quality of students' experiences whilst on WIL programs. (*Asia-Pacific Journal of Cooperative Education*, 2012, 13(2), 89-102)

Key words: work-integrated learning; Cape Town Hotel School; mentoring; hospitality studies; co-operative education

THE IMPORTANCE OF WORK INTEGRATED LEARNING

The origin of Work-Integrated Learning (WIL) is an important starting point when investigating factors such as the mentorship of students while placed in industry. Although Co-operative Education has been around for most of the twentieth century, it was not until the 1960's that "more co-operative Education programs started to appear, and many educators became involved in the creation of these programs" (Haddara & Skanes, 2007, p. 68). Haddara and Skanes also noted that most of the early studies that exist in the literature from the 1960, 70 and 80 have limited scope. It was only toward the latter part of the 90's that research in the area of Co-operative Education was properly examined. During these decades there was a prevalence of articles about what is believed about co-op but has not been validated by research or supported by theory (Finn, 1997, p. 38).

The importance of Co-operative Education is highlighted by numerous authors throughout the world. Abeysekera, (2006, p. 7-15), provides a comprehensive definition of Co-operative Education, and views it as work-integrated learning in which the time spent in the workplace forms an integrated part of an academic program of study. Sovilla and Varty (2004, p. 3), quote *The International Handbook for Co-operative Education* where it emphasizes that the primary mission of Co-operative Education is to enhance student learning, i.e. the quality of teaching. Rittichainuwat, Worth, Hanson and Rattanapninanchai (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 internship. Pratt (1996), argues that Co-operative Education is an educational philosophy where the formal integration of work experience into the theoretical curriculum is imperative. This is supported by Cates and Jones (1999) who suggest that Co-operative education is a structured educational strategy that progressively integrates academic study with learning

¹ Corresponding Author: keatingk@cput.ac.za

through productive work experiences in a field related to a student's academic or career goals.

Literature often describes WIL in two different terms: work-based learning (Wagner, Childs, & Houlbrook, 2001, p. 314), and experience-based learning (Beard & Wilson, 2002). Reeders (2000, p. 205), states that the term WIL was coined to encompass the increasing diversity in the modes of vocational learning. Spowat (2009), suggests that the vocational nature of hospitality management is ideal to utilize work-integrated learning as a method of transferring classroom activities to the workplace. In addition she quotes Crebert, Bates, Bell, Patrick and Cragolini (2004, p. 47), and Fleming and Eames (2005, p. 26) in that these technical skills are then transferred to the real work environment by the students having a compulsory semester of work-integrated learning.

Alderman and Milne (2005, p. 1), developed a model for WIL and at its core the model features the links between three worlds of learning, namely interactions between academics, students and mentors.

This view is supported by higher education institutions in South Africa, who are obliged, in accordance with the South African Higher Education Qualifications Framework (HEQF), Department of Education Government Notice No 928, gazetted (No. 30353) 5 October 2007 as policy in terms of the Higher Education Act, to place students for prerequisite WIL: "It is the responsibility of institutions that offer programs requiring WIL credits to place students into WIL programs. Such programs must be appropriately structured, properly supervised and assessed" (Department of Education [DoE], 2007, p. 9). Work-integrated learning is not an add-on to the curriculum, but an integral part of the Educational process (Groenewald, 2008).

A further definition by Jones and Quick (2007, p. 30), states that WIL is considered an educational strategy where learning in the classroom alternates with learning in the workplace and allows for the competencies of students to be developed and nurtured by the mentors. Reeders (2000, p. 205), defines WIL as student learning for credit designed to occur either in the workplace or within a campus setting that emulates key aspects of the workplace. Groenewald (2004, p. 17) stated that in 2002, the National Commission for Co-operative Education offered a more inclusive definition of WIL as a structured strategy integrating classroom studies with learning through productive work experiences in a field related to a student's academic or career goals.

McGlothlin Jr. (2003, p. 41), agrees that the importance of WIL being a part of a curriculum in a field such as hospitality management cannot be over-emphasized. Students gain valuable experience by way of applying their practical learning in the workplace, develop their skills in interacting with fellow workers, customers and management and discover in which direction they would like to steer their careers.

The South African Qualifications Authority (SAQA), states that:

The National Diploma in Hospitality Management is compiled in accordance with the core learning areas which will assist in the development of potential managers with a sound operational background. Operational electives are offered in the second and the third year of study to provide for specialized areas within the field of hospitality (p.12).

According to the Department of Education (DoE) report 151 (2004, p. 190-192), the National Diploma Hospitality Management must hold a minimum of a half year experiential time. The Cape Town Hotel School (CTHS) offers two periods of six months each, totaling a years' worth of WIL for each student.

The researcher recognizes the importance of all the stakeholders in a WIL program, but for the purpose of this study, the role of the mentor was singled out, since preliminary investigation by the researcher showed that there was little or no form of dedicated mentorship for CTHS students by an industry mentor. This hypothesis formed the basis for this research.

The term 'mentor', is derived from Greek Mythology where 'Mentor' was the counselor and surrogate father to Telemachus while his father, Odysseus, was away. Mentor was the key to Telemachus's growth by guiding, educating, and protecting him, introducing him to influential leaders, and teaching him valuable leadership skills (Yahner & Goodstein, 2006).

More recent definitions have developed since ancient Greek times, as highlighted by Meyer and Fourie (2004, p. 88), who define a mentor as a seasoned senior person who is able to offer the wisdom of years of experience from which to counsel and guide younger or less experienced individuals as they move ahead in their careers. He/she does this by coaching, teaching, advising, prompting, discussion, admonition, and acting as a role model.

Examples of great historical mentors include, Socrates who mentored Plato, who mentored Aristotle, who mentored Alexander the Great. Socrates uses the analogy when describing himself, of being a mid-wife assisting the labour of the mind in bringing knowledge and wisdom to birth (Sapp, 2006). It is clear that great leaders would not have achieved their full potential without effective mentoring.

It is apparent from authors such as Turner (2004), Gibson (2002), Clutterbuck (2004, p. 12) and Goodyear (2006), that mentoring is a supportive relationship between a caring individual with specialized knowledge who shares experience and wisdom with another person, resulting in personal and career growth.

Nicolaides (2006, p. 7) states that it is ideal that students should be mentored on a one-to-one basis where a senior-level industry mentor assists a protégé, over and above the student's university mentor/lecturer. Business that intends to implement mentorship needs to take various aspects into consideration before implementation. These aspects include the formulation of clear objectives and expectations as well as timeframes for the completion of the assigned tasks, which should be realistically achievable.

A number of authors identify the various roles of mentors in different ways. The most suitable descriptions of these roles are offered by Coetzee and Stone (2004, p. 21), who define the role of a mentor as counselor, advisor, encourager, subject matter expert, friend, guardian, leader, motivator, role model and knowledge developer.

According to Drahosz (2010), mentorship, coaching and training must be supported by a mentoring plan which outlines the sequence of events necessary to implement the program. In addition, the mentoring plan should address how the organization will approach each step by making use of a set of design principles as listed in the table below.

TABLE 1

Training Connection (TTC) key design principles

Design Principle	Training Connection
Relevance	The program is designed specifically to meet the unique requirements of the organization and its employees.
Top management support	Senior leaders recognize the importance of the mentoring program, and visibly demonstrate their support through their words, actions and resources over the short and long term.
Systematic matching	Carefully constructed processes are used to select and match mentors and mentees.
Role clarity	Mentors' and mentees' roles and responsibilities are clearly defined and mutually agreed upon.
Variety	Mentees experience a wide range of learning activities and environments.
Technology	Mentors and mentees use the Internet to streamline and manage the administrative details of their mentoring partnerships.
Evaluation	Processes are implemented to continually evaluate and refine the program and its components

Source: Drahosz, n.d.

Hillman (2010) claims that the development of a mentoring plan can increase the sense of personal control that both members of the relationship have or may need. Such plans can be a systematic way by which to identify expectations (e.g., times for regular meetings) and the topics or issues to be covered.

According to Alderman and Milne (2005), the mentorship plan embodies the negotiated agreements between students and mentors. They also state that "The plans are based on the students' personal and professional goals. They are not formal contracts but developmental guides which can be modified, if necessary over the period of work experience" (p.7).

They also state that to enable the mentors to compile a plan, they should consider the outcomes of the student's WIL program which can be supplied by the academic institution. The educational institution should provide the industry placement venue with a mentorship plan which includes inter alia the needs of the student, learning goals, purpose of the WIL program, areas of activity, and methods of evaluation and feedback. These guidelines could form the basis of the mentor/mentee plan in order for effective learning to take place.

Mentorship and the relationship to the learning process of students

Research has shown that successful mentoring relationships can assist individuals in *learning the ropes* at an organization, suggests Goodyear (2006). In her article titled

“Mentoring: A learning Collaboration”, Goodyear highlights that career mentoring comprises three functions: career assistance, psychosocial support, and role modeling.

The idea of role modeling is based on the work of Bandura (1986), a psychologist who studied how people learn.

Researchers in higher education (Ramsden 1987; Ramsden & Entwistle 1983; Entwistle & Tait 1990; Trigwell & Prosser 1999) have generally agreed that a learning climate which involves respect for students, freedom to learn and enthusiasm on the part of the teacher [mentor] encourages a deep approach to learning. It is evident that effective mentorship closely relates to the success of learning, and correlates with students being guided towards career development.

Objectives of Work-integrated Learning

Hodges and Birchell (2003, p. 16) mention that work-integrated programs have the purpose of preparing students for the workplace by identifying and developing the important competencies employers believe employees need. Duignan (2002, p. 214) and Fallows and Steven, (2000, p. 75) note that an important objective of WIL programs is to increase the employability of students and not the academic performance of students.

The Cape Peninsula University of Technology (CPUT) Quality Assurance policy for Work Integrated Learning (2005, p. 2) lists the following goals:

- To promote WIL as a strategy for applied learning.
- To engage in partnership agreements with stakeholders in commerce, industry, statutory and parastatals in striving to meet the education and skills development needs for a developing economy.
- To implement and coordinate the formal integration of academic studies with structured and supervised productive work experience within participating organizations.
- To ensure that the quality of service delivery at the institution is assured by a management structure that recognizes and is responsive to legislation pertaining to educational and labor reform.
- To ensure cost effectiveness and accountability in the resourcing needs and reporting structures, without compromising the educational and training ideals of WIL.
- To ensure that the experiential learning component of each program is assessed in line with outcome based Education principles.

Mentoring and Work-Integrated Learning

For WIL to be successful, each stakeholder has a specific role to play. Nicolaides (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 hospitality sector, for example.

According to Gibson, Brodie, Sharpe, Wong, Deane and Fraser (2008, p. 5), the successful introduction and sustenance of a WIL program requires commitment by all stakeholders and a clear belief in the positive outcomes and relationships that can be achieved. Charles (1992, p. 13), from the University of the West Indies surveyed students studying towards Tourism and Hospitality studies. The data collected indicated that students were generally satisfied with their career choice, although their satisfaction appears to be decreasing with time, and they have been most influenced in their views by their internship experience.

In a similar study Barron and Maxwell (1993, p. 5), investigated the responses of Hospitality Management students before and after returning from a WIL program. They found that first year students held positive views of their future placement organizations, such as that the hospitality industry offers career opportunities, the prospect of training, financial rewards, and job satisfaction. However, the students returning from their Co-operative Education placements held generally negative views in all of these areas.

Successful mentoring systems rely on competent mentors who are capable of forming strong, supportive relationships with protégés (Sherman, Voight, Tibbetts, Dobbins, Evans & Weidler, 2000). They add that mentors, like all strong adult education instructors, should have a firm understanding of adult learning theory. The chart below defines skills and knowledge areas needed by competent mentors.

TABLE 2
Skills and knowledge needed by mentors

Skill, Knowledge Area	Mentors
Interpersonal	are amiable, patient, compassionate, empathic, and honest, self-confident, are open and friendly.
Communication	can pick up on protégés' verbal and nonverbal cues, recognize and understand different communication styles, and are skilled in conflict resolution.
Listening	are active listeners, listen for what is not said, as well as what is said.
Content Area	are experts in the areas in which their protégés require assistance, have a broad knowledge base in their field. Keep up with current trends and latest research.
Awareness of Diversity	are sensitive to protégés' individual learning styles, are comfortable with people of diverse backgrounds. Can accept different points of view.
Reflective Supervision Skills	engage in self-reflection. Have strong skills in observing and giving feedback. Build on past experience to advise and assist protégés with their current dilemmas.

Source: Sherman, Voight, Tibbetts, Dobbins, Evans and Wiedler, 2000, p. 19

Selecting a mentor

Mentors can have a significant effect upon the professional development of aspiring young or mid-career adults. Whether a mentor's impact is positive or negative depends in large part upon how well informed and skilled the mentor is, and upon the mentor's commitment and availability (Hillman, 2010).

Sherman et al., (2000, p. 20) state that the process for selecting mentors may be formal or informal. A formal process may include letters of recommendation from program coordinators or supervisors and possibly peers; a résumé; and a written statement describing why they wish to become a mentor and the strengths and expertise they bring to the mentoring situation. More often than not, however, the selection process is informal and mentors are selected either because they volunteer or are recommended by their supervisors.

Whether formal or informal choosing of mentors take place, the following criteria, as listed by Meyer and Fourie (2004), should be considered by industry when choosing a mentor for students:

A mentor has a keen interest in the needs and development of subordinates, and has displayed a good track record with the development of persons within her/his ambit; has a sound understanding of the organization, its strategic intent and its functioning; is willing to share her/his expertise without being threatened by the mentees' potential; has patience, good interpersonal skills, and sufficient time to devote to the relationship; is committed to the mentorship program and is prepared to invest the necessary time and expertise in it; is held in high regard among her /his superiors and colleagues (p.190).

Barriers to effective mentoring

Michael (2008), states that:

most barriers to effective mentoring and coaching stem from issues of organizational culture where the prevailing culture is not sympathetic to mentoring and coaching, or does not fully understand it. Another originates due to personality issues between those involved in mentoring and coaching programs. Barriers include poor matching of mentors or coaches to their protégés; lack of managerial support at higher levels; resentment from those not chosen to participate in mentoring and coaching programs, perhaps due to a perception of favoritism; the creation of unrealistic expectations as to what mentoring and coaching can achieve and the blurring of role boundaries, for example, between the role of manager and mentor (p.15)

Nicolaides (2006, p. 1) argued that although WIL has barriers in its implementation, it is highly conducive to a quality education, provided that efficient student mentorship is undertaken and industry is serious about it.

METHOD

The researcher directed a survey towards students of the CTHS who had completed at least one WIL program, and could give insight into their experiences in relation to mentorship while they were placed at selected venues. A survey was also done with the placement

venues at which these students were placed. The research participants were an integral part of the design. Qualitative methods were used in order to gain understanding of the experiences of the research participants.

The respondents to the survey questionnaires were second and third year Hospitality Management students at the CTHS, who were enrolled for the subject Experiential Learning (EL) during the year 2010 as well as the industry venues at which they were placed. The total population for student respondents (N=158) thus refers to all CTHS students who completed at least one WIL period in industry as part of their diploma studies during the year 2010. Table 3 shows the group subdivisions.

TABLE 3
Cape Town Hotel School Student Sample

	Course	Population	Respondents
(AC2)	Accommodation Management 2	59	39
(AC3)	Accommodation Management 3	28	27
(FB2)	Food & Beverage Management 2	30	25
(FB3)	Food & Beverage Management 3	12	12
(PC2)	Professional Cookery 2	24	23
(PC3)	Professional Cookery 3	5	5

Goddard and Melville (2009, p.35) state that “samples must be representative of the population being studied.” The questionnaire was administered in a classroom environment for each of the above sub-groups, with a total of n=131 respondents.

Shillingford (2006, p. 29) states that a common instrument for observing data beyond the physical reach of the observer is the questionnaire. A questionnaire was sent to 34 companies at which CTHS students were placed for WIL programs in the year 2010. The researcher decided to make use of a survey method to obtain information rather than one-on-one interviews with the respondents. Survey research is the most frequently used mode of observation in the social sciences (Shillingford, 2006, p.28). In this way more venues could be reached so that the total population of industry respondents was N = 34. Although all properties were approached, only 22 of the venues agreed to participate in the survey by completing the questionnaires forwarded to them. A response of 65 percent is indicated. In this research, the author selected questionnaires as survey type and data collection instrument, since most of the respondents were accessible as groups which easily facilitated self-administered responses.

Structured self-administered questionnaires were submitted to second and third year students in the Hospitality Management program. The questionnaires were distributed in a class room setting, and students completed and submitted these without much delay. Goddard and Melville (2009), maintain that a questionnaire is the only practical approach when dealing with many respondents.

They further state that “respondents are also able to answer when it is convenient for them and may not be as inhibited in answering sensitive questions” (p.49). The researcher obtained a high number of questionnaire returns as a result of distributing the questionnaires directly to students whilst in class at the CTHS.

The structure of the questions was mainly closed-ended, in the form of multiple choice options, where the respondent was asked to select the best possible answer out of the choices from a list. Some ‘yes or no’ questions were also included in the questionnaire. The researcher made use of one contingency question, thus excluding the subjects not related to that particular question. This question was followed by questions on a rating scale to determine to what extent respondents agreed with a set of statements.

According to Garland (1991, p. 66), the purpose of a rating scale is to allow respondents to express both the direction and strength of their opinion about a topic. Garland examined the desirability of a mid-point on a rating scale, and concluded that the explicit offer of a mid-point is largely one of individual researcher preference. By adding a mid-way point, the researcher may run the risk of respondents staying neutral as a result of being uncertain. Matell and Jacoby (1972, p. 508), state that the decision to make use of the mid-way option in the Likert scale would depend on the level of ‘uncertain’ responses one is willing to tolerate.

Having taken into consideration what researchers have said regarding the desirability of using a mid-point on a rating scale, the author decided to omit the mid-point from the rating scale in the survey presented to students in order to force an either positive or negative opinion.

RESULTS

The survey results will be interpreted and discussed in two separate sections: the students’ survey and the industry’s survey.

Student views

The information obtained through a survey conducted with students shows that the majority of students from the CTHS were placed in hotels with more than 80 rooms. In most cases a venue only accommodated a single student. Two students, indicated that their placement accepted up to 25 students. Of the student respondents, 44.3 percent experienced their WIL program in the Food and Beverage sector of the industry; 33.5 percent completed their WIL program in the Rooms Division section and the balance of 22.2 percent in the kitchen environment.

An overwhelming figure of 96.2 percent of students felt that an industry mentor is necessary, and 85.4 percent indicated that the lack of mentorship could lead to a student withdrawing from the course. This clearly indicates the need for mentorship by students. Only 69.6 percent of the respondents were in fact assigned a dedicated industry mentor. Most of the assigned mentors held the position of Head of Department (24.7%). Although

this indicates a level of seniority, it is alarming to note that only 10.1 percent of the industry mentors were Training Managers who are usually associated with the training needs of working individuals.

Of the students who were fortunate enough to be assigned an industry mentor, 40.5 percent felt that their mentor did not assist them in time of difficulty, and 43.2 percent thought that the mentor did not fully understand the role they had to perform in the development of the student. It was however noted that a total of 63 percent of the students agreed to varying extents that the mentor offered wise advice when required. The role of the mentor and that of the supervisor is often expected to be the same by the student. It is, however, quite different, since the supervisor is an operational figure whose relationship to the students would be that of tasks and operations, where a mentor forges a strong supportive relationship.

A relatively high number (31.5%) of students did not think that their mentors were caring, and a further 45.9 percent of the students did not feel that they received encouragement throughout their WIL program. The majority of students (54.9%) were not provided with a training plan or schedule indicating the learning areas and proposed outcomes for the contracted six-month WIL placement period. The importance of such a plan is emphasized by Alderman & Milne (2005, p. 7), who states that the mentorship plan is one of the critical success factors of the whole program.

The researcher deduced that even though mentors were assigned to students in some cases, more than half (51.3%) of the students considered terminating their WIL program before the completion date. The reason for this could be contributed to the lack of trained mentorship available, and the absence of training plans.

Industry Views

The largest portion of industry respondents were from hotels (81.8%) with the same percentage indicating that their venues exceeded 80 rooms or seats. The industry respondents accepted a range from one to ten students amongst them, with most of them taking between two and six students per semester. The majority of those who responded to the industry survey indicated that they mostly accepted trainees in the Rooms Division (40.9%) section. Since this contradicted the result from the same question asked in the student survey, it can be deduced, that the industry surveys were mostly answered by those venues accepting room's division students.

Although a high percentage of those venues who returned the questionnaire showed that they provided mentors to students, it is still a concern that 22.7 percent knowingly did not provide the students with mentors. One could speculate that those who did not return the questionnaires would give even less support to students. Most of the mentors allocated to students held the position of Department Head (35.3%), which correlates with the result from the student survey. This is an important outcome as it endorses one of the study's objectives, which was to ascertain whether industry provides trained mentors to students on WIL programs.

In addition, industry identified that only 47.1 percent of their mentors were actually trained in this role and 50 percent of them felt that they did not understand the CTHS's mentorship expectations. It is important for the CTHS to take note of this result for future improvement of the WIL program.

Although it is apparent that a lack of trained mentors exists within the hospitality venues used by the CTHS for WIL programs, it is pleasing to note that 81.8 percent of these respondents would like to participate in a mentorship course, if presented, at the CTHS and are, therefore, serious about improving the situation.

It is evident that students feel that mentorship is a very important aspect of the WIL program if success is to be achieved in their training, but that they do not always get the support needed. Industry identified that their mentorship ability was limited as the mentors were not trained in this role, and would like to receive assistance to reduce the shortcomings associated with the lack of mentorship. If such a course were to be presented at the CTHS, they would certainly be interested in attending.

CONCLUSION

The purpose of the study was to shed light on problem areas experienced by students of the CTHS on WIL programmes with specific reference to mentorship or the lack thereof. Information obtained from surveys led to an emphasis on problem statements relating to the lack of mentorship which could result in students leaving the course or changing career direction.

Literature reviewed has revealed the importance of guidance through mentorship which facilitates learning in the workplace. Through the surveys conducted it was evident that over 40 percent of those students who were allocated mentors believed that the guidance was deficient in some form. Most of them were not provided with a training schedule to show in which areas they were expected to train during the six-month WIL period. They indicated a large percentage of caring mentors who, however, were not sufficiently trained in the role.

Responses from industry show that many of them did not allocate mentors to students on the CTHS's WIL program. The lack of awareness of CTHS's mentorship expectations by industry is a concern that needs to be addressed. Industry also specifies a need for mentorship training since most of their allocated mentors have no training in this role.

As a result of the findings, it is proposed that students of the CTHS on WIL programs be provided with a dedicated mentor who is suitably trained and holds a position within the organisational structure of the venue which allows them to be available for the student. Individuals who are selected as mentors of students must be trained in this role. The CTHS should develop a training course or workshop specifically aimed towards the training of mentors from industry who are allocated to WIL students. This would present an opportunity for the CTHS to, not only provide all industry participants with mentorship training, but also offer them a clear understanding of the school's expectations in this regard. A mentorship evaluation form should be developed and provided to students who complete a WIL program in order to assess the level of mentorship they experienced at the industry venue.

This would provide ongoing assurance that students are being guided correctly. Through the recommendations above, the researcher hopes that forthcoming WIL programs will be better managed through industry mentorship, and that future graduates from the CTHS will benefit from this experience, thus ploughing back into industry the expertise and values they have gained.

REFERENCES

- Abeyssekera, I. (2006). Issues relating to designing a work-integrated learning programme in an undergraduate accounting degree programme and its implications for the curriculum school of business. *Asian Pacific Journal of Co-operative Education*, 7(1),7-15.
- Alderman, B., & Milne, P. (2005). A model for work-based learning. *University of Canberra for students in the Bachelor of Communications course 2005 Conference Proceedings* (p.1). Lanham, Maryland.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Barron, P., & Maxwell, G. (1993). Hospitality management students' image of the hospitality industry. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*. 5(5), 5-8.
- Beard, C., & Wilson, J.P. (2002). *The power of experiential learning: A handbook for trainers and educators*. London, UK: Kogan Page.
- Cape Peninsula University of Technology (CPUT). (2005). *Quality assurance policy for work integrated learning*. [Unpublished internal document] South Africa: Author.
- Cates, C., & Jones, P. (1999). *Learning outcomes: The educational value of cooperative education*. Maryland, USA: Co-operative Education Association.
- Charles, M.A. (1992). Career influences, expectations, and perceptions of Caribbean hospitality and tourism students: A third world perspective. *Hospitality and Tourism Education*, 4(3), 9-11.
- Clutterbuck, D. (2004). *Everyone needs a mentor* (4th ed.). London, UK: CIPD.
- Coetzee, M., & Stone, K. (2004). *Learner support: Toward learning and development*. Randburg, SA: Knowers Publishing.
- Crebert, G., Bates, M., Bell, B., Patrick, C.J., & Cragnolini, V. (2004). Ivory tower to concrete jungle revisited. *Journal of Education and Work*, 17(1), 47-70.
- Department of Education [DoE]. (2004). *Formal Technikon Instructional programmes in the RSA*. Retrieved May 3, 2010, from <http://www.education.gov.za/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=0yb8XScTak4%3D&tabid=452&mid=1037>
- Drahosz, K.W. (n.d.). *Seven steps to mentoring success*. Retrieved June 16, 2010, from <http://www.thetrainingconnection.com/7steps>
- Duignan, J. (2002). Undergraduate work placement and academic performance: Failing by doing. In A. Goody, J. Herrington & M. Northcote (Eds), *Proceedings of the Annual Higher Education Research & Development Society Conference* (pp. 214-221). HERDSA.
- Entwistle, N., & Tait, H. (1990). Approaches to learning, evaluation of teaching and preferences for contrasting academic environments. *Higher Education*, 19, 169-194.
- Fallows, S., & Steven, C. (2000). Building employability skills into the higher education curriculum: A university-wide initiative. *Education and Training*, 42(2), 75-82.
- Finn, K.L. (1997). The spaces between: Toward a new paradigm for co-operative education. *Journal of Co-operative Education*, 32(2), 36-45.
- Fleming, J., & Eames, C. (2005). Student learning in relation to the structure of the co-operative experience. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Co-operative Education*, 6(2), 26-31.
- Garland, R. (1991). The mid-point of a rating scale: Is it desirable? *Marketing Bulletin. Massey University Magazine*. Retrieved July 12, 2010, from http://marketing-bulletin.massey.ac.nz/V2/MB_V2_N3_Garland.pdf
- Gibson, E., Brodie, S., Sharpe, S., Wong, D.K.Y., Deane, E., & Fraser, S. (2008). *Towards the development of a work-integrated learning unit*. Sydney: Macquarie University. Retrieved June 16, 2010 from <http://www.cfl.mq.edu.au/celebrate/pdf/papers/gibson1.pdf>
- Gibson, A. (2002). *Mentoring definitions*. Retrieved June 7, 2010, from <http://www.coachingnetwork.org.uk/ResourceCentre/Articles>
- Goddard, W., & Melville, S. (2009). *Research methodology: An introduction*. Lansdowne, South Africa: Juta & Co, Ltd.
- Goodyear, M. (2006). Mentoring: A learning collaboration. *Educause Quarterly Magazine*, 29(4). Retrieved June 18, 2010 from

- <http://www.educause.edu/EDUCAUSE+Quarterly/EDUCAUSEQuarterlyMagazineVolum/MentoringALearningCollaboratio/157429>
- Groenewald, T. (2004). Towards a definition for co-operative education. In R.K. Coll, & C. Eames, (Eds). *International handbook for co-operative education: An international perspective of the theory, research and practice of work-integrated learning* (pp. 17-25). Boston, MA: World Association for Co-operative Education.
- Groenewald, T. (2008). *Learning in vivo: A co-operative education paradigm*. Retrieved June 21, 2010 from http://psychsoma.co.za/learning_in_vivo/page/6/
- Haddara, M., & Skanes, H. (2007). A reflection on co-operative education: From experience to experiential learning. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Co-operative Education*, 8(1), 67-76.
- Hillman, M. (2010). *Strategic mentoring for profitable relationships*. Retrieved June 14, 2010 from <http://www.drmarkhillman.com/blustratart.html>
- Hodges, D., & Birchell, N. (2003). Business graduate competencies: Employers' views on importance and performance. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Co-operative Education*, 4(2), 16-22.
- Jones, J., & Quick, D. (2007). Co-operative education: An educational strategy with links to experiential and connected learning. *Journal of Co-operative Education and Internships*, 41(2), 30-36.
- Matell, M.S., & Jacoby, J. (1972). Is there an optimal number of alternatives for Likert scale items? Effects of testing time and scale properties. *Educational and Psychological Measurements*, 31, 657-674.
- McGlothlin Jr., C.W. (2003, June). Occupational safety & health (OSH) internships: What graduates are saying about their experience. *Professional Safety*, 41-50.
- Meyer, M., & Fourie, L. (2004). *Mentoring and coaching*. Randburg, SA: Knowres .
- Michael, A. (2008). *Mentoring and coaching*. Retrieved June 22, 2010 from [http://www.cimaglobal.com/Documents/Thought_leadership_docs/MigratedDocsMarch2010/Resources%20\(pdf\)/Topic%20gateways/Mentoring%20and%20coaching.pdf](http://www.cimaglobal.com/Documents/Thought_leadership_docs/MigratedDocsMarch2010/Resources%20(pdf)/Topic%20gateways/Mentoring%20and%20coaching.pdf)
- Moody, K. (1997). *Workers in a lean world*. London, UK: Verso.
- Nicolaides, A. (2006, April). The role of universities in South Africa and their educational quality and the efficacy of their work integrated learning programmes. Paper presented at the *South African Society for Co-operative Education 2006 conference, Johannesburg, South Africa*.
- Pratt, P.M. (1996). *Earn and learn through co-operative education*. Retrieved August 19, 2010 from <http://www.environs.com/talbot/learn1.html>
- Ramsden, P. (1987). Learning process and learning skills. In J.T.E. Richardson, *Student learning : Research in education and cognitive psychology*. Milton Keynes, UK: SRHE – Open University.
- Ramsden, P., & Entwistle, N. (1983). *Understanding student learning*. London, UK: Croom Helm.
- Reeders, E. (2000). Scholarly practice in work-based learning: Fitting the glass slipper. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 19(2), 205-220.
- Rittichainuwat, B.N., Worth, J., Hanson, R., & Rattanapinanchai, S. (2010, February). Enhancing student learning with work integrated learning: A case study in Thailand. Paper presented at the *International Conference on Work Integrated Learning: University-Industry Collaboration for real life Education, Hong Kong, China*.
- Sapp, K. (2006). *Famous mentors: Socrates*. Retrieved June 6, 2009 from http://www.creativeyouthideas.com/blog/mentoring_youth/famous_mentors_socrates.html
- Sherman, R., Voight, J., Tibbetts, J., Dobbins, D., Evans, A., & Weidler, D. (2000). *Adult educators guide to designing instructor mentoring*. Retrieved June 16, 2010 from <http://www.calpro-online.org/pubs/mentoring%20Guide.pdf>
- Shillingford, A. (2006). *Data collection protocols & participatory research techniques*. Retrieved March 12, 2010 from [http://www.caribank.org/titanweb/cdb/webcms.nsf/AllDoc/87A7DDD868B160EE04257482005C184B/\\$File/ParticipatoryResearch.pdf](http://www.caribank.org/titanweb/cdb/webcms.nsf/AllDoc/87A7DDD868B160EE04257482005C184B/$File/ParticipatoryResearch.pdf)
- South African Qualifications Authority (SAQA). (2004). *Criteria for the generation and evaluation of qualifications and standards within the National Qualifications Framework*. Pretoria, SA: Government Printer.
- Sovilla, E.S., & Varty, J.W. (2004). Co-operative education in the USA past and present: Some lessons learned. In R.K. Coll, & C. Eames, (Eds.). *International handbook for co-operative education: An*

- international perspective of the theory, research and practice of work-integrated learning* (pp. 3-16). Boston, MA: World Association for Co-operative Education.
- 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*.
- Trigwell, K., & Prosser, M. (1999). *Understanding learning and teaching: The experience in higher education*. Buckingham, UK: SRHE - Open University Press.
- Tull, D.S., & Hawkins, D. (1987). *Marketing research: Measurement and method*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Wagner, R., Childs, M., & Houlbrook, M. (2001). Workbased learning as critical social pedagogy. *Australian Journal of Adult Learning, 41*(3), 314-334.
- Yahner, R., & Goodstein, L. (2006). *Graduate student mentoring: Be more than an advisor*. Retrieved March 10, 2008, from <http://www.gradsch.psu.edu/facstaff/practices/mentoring.html>



Asia-Pacific Journal of Cooperative Education

ISSN 1175-2882

About the Journal

The Asia-Pacific Journal of Cooperative Education publishes peer-reviewed original research, topical issues, and best practice articles from throughout the world dealing with Cooperative Education (Co-op) and Work Integrated Learning/Education (WIL).

In this Journal, Co-op/WIL is defined as an educational approach that uses relevant work-based projects that form an integrated and assessed part of an academic program of study (e.g., work placements, internships, practicum). These programs should have clear linkages with, or add to, the knowledge and skill base of the academic program. These programs can be described by a variety of names, such as work-based learning, workplace learning, professional training, industry-based learning, engaged industry learning, career and technical education, internships, experiential education, experiential learning, vocational education and training, fieldwork education, and service learning.

The Journal's main aim is to allow specialists working in these areas to disseminate their findings and share their knowledge for the benefit of institutions, co-op/WIL practitioners, and researchers. It is hoped that the Journal will encourage quality research and explorative critical discussion that will lead to effective practices, advancement in the understanding of co-op/WIL, and promote further research.

Submitting Manuscripts

Before submitting a manuscript, please ensure that the 'instructions for authors' has been followed (www.apjce.org/instructions-for-authors). All manuscripts are to be submitted for blind review directly to the Editor-in-Chief (editor@apjce.org) by way of email attachment. All submissions of manuscripts must be in MS Word format, with manuscript word counts between 3,000 and 5,000 words (excluding references).

All manuscripts, if deemed relevant to the Journal's audience, will be double blind reviewed by two reviewers or more. Manuscripts submitted to the Journal with authors names included will have the authors' names removed by the Editor-in-Chief before being reviewed to ensure anonymity.

Typically, authors receive the reviewers' comments about a month after the submission of the manuscript. The Journal uses a constructive process for review and preparation of the manuscript, and encourages its reviewers to give supportive and extensive feedback on the requirements for improving the manuscript as well as guidance on how to make the amendments.

If the manuscript is deemed acceptable for publication, and reviewers' comments have been satisfactorily addressed, the manuscript is prepared for publication by the Copy Editor. The Copy Editor may correspond with the authors to check details, if required. Final publication is by discretion of the Editor-in-Chief. Final published form of the manuscript is via the Journal webpage (www.apjce.org), authors will be notified and sent a PDF copy of the final manuscript. There is no charge for publishing in APJCE and the Journal allows free open access for its readers.

Types of Manuscripts Sought by the Journal

Types of manuscripts the Journal accepts are primarily of two forms; *research reports* describing research into aspects of Cooperative Education and Work Integrated Learning/Education, and *topical discussion* articles that review relevant literature and give critical explorative discussion around a topical issue.

The Journal does also accept *best practice* papers but only if it present a unique or innovative practice of a Co-op/WIL program that is likely to be of interest to the broader Co-op/WIL community. The Journal also accepts a limited number of *Book Reviews* of relevant and recently published books.

Research reports should contain; an introduction that describes relevant literature and sets the context of the inquiry, a description and justification for the methodology employed, a description of the research findings-tabulated as appropriate, a discussion of the importance of the findings including their significance for practitioners, and a conclusion preferably incorporating suggestions for further research.

Topical discussion articles should contain a clear statement of the topic or issue under discussion, reference to relevant literature, critical discussion of the importance of the issues, and implications for other researchers and practitioners.

Asia-Pacific Journal of Cooperative Education.

www.apjce.org



EDITORIAL BOARD

Editor-in-Chief

Dr. Karsten Zegwaard

University of Waikato, New Zealand

Copy Editor

Jennifer Buckle

Asia-Pacific Journal of Cooperative Education

Editorial Board Members

Ms. Diana Ayling

Unitec, New Zealand

Mr. Matthew Campbell

Australian Catholic University, Australia

Dr. Sarojni Choy

Griffith University, Australia

Prof. Richard K. Coll

University of Waikato, New Zealand

Prof. Rick Cummings

Murdoch University, Australia

Prof. Leigh Deves

Charles Darwin University, Australia

Dr. Maureen Drysdale

University of Waterloo, Canada

Dr. Chris Eames

University of Waikato, New Zealand

Ms. Jenny Fleming

Auckland University of Technology, New Zealand

Dr. Thomas Groenewald

University of South Africa, South Africa

Ms. Kathryn Hays

Massey University, New Zealand

Ms. Katharine Hoskyn

Auckland University of Technology, New Zealand

Dr. Sharleen Howison

Otago Polytechnic, New Zealand

Dr. Nancy Johnston

Simon Fraser University, Canada

Prof. Stephen F. Johnston

University of Technology, Australia

Dr. David Jorgensen

Central Queensland University, Australia

Dr. Mark Lay

University of Waikato, New Zealand

Assoc. Prof. Andy Martin

Massey University, New Zealand

Ms. Susan McCurdy

University of Waikato, New Zealand

Ms. Norah McRae

University of Victoria, Canada

Assoc. Prof. Janice Orrell

Flinders University, Australia

Ms. Levinia Paku

University of Waikato, New Zealand

Ms. Sally Rae

Auckland University of Technology, New Zealand

Dr. David Skelton

Eastern Institute of Technology, New Zealand

Assoc. Prof. Neil Taylor

University of New England, Australia

Ms. Susanne Taylor

University of Johannesburg, South Africa

Dr. Franziska Trede

Charles Sturt University, Australia

Ms. Genevieve Watson

University of Western Sydney

Prof. Neil I. Ward

University of Surrey, UK

Mr. Nick Wempe

Whitireia Community Polytechnic, New Zealand

Dr. Marius L. Wessels

Tshwane University of Technology, South Africa