

1-1-1972

A comparative study of attitudes toward undergraduate education for the hotel and restaurant industry.

Robert Francis Lukowski
University of Massachusetts Amherst

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations_1

Recommended Citation

Lukowski, Robert Francis, "A comparative study of attitudes toward undergraduate education for the hotel and restaurant industry." (1972). *Doctoral Dissertations 1896 - February 2014*. 2608.
https://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations_1/2608

This Open Access Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. It has been accepted for inclusion in Doctoral Dissertations 1896 - February 2014 by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. For more information, please contact scholarworks@library.umass.edu.



A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF ATTITUDES TOWARD UNDERGRADUATE
EDUCATION FOR THE HOTEL AND RESTAURANT INDUSTRY

A Dissertation Presented

By

ROBERT FRANCIS LUKOWSKI

Robert F. Lukowski

Submitted to the Graduate School of the
University of Massachusetts in
partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

January, 1972

Major Subject Educational Administration

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF ATTITUDES TOWARD UNDERGRADUATE
EDUCATION FOR THE HOTEL AND RESTAURANT INDUSTRY

A Dissertation

By

ROBERT FRANCIS LUKOWSKI

Approved as to style and content by:

Ray Budde
Chairman

John M. Hill
Department Chairman

R. V. F. Jones
Member

Norman Courmator
Member

Ernest M. Buck
Graduate School Representative

January, 1972

P R E F A C E

How do educators of major hotel and restaurant administration schools and industry leaders view the present state of undergraduate higher education for the hotel and restaurant industry? Is there a degree of consistency in the opinions held by educators? Are opinions of educators in general agreement with opinions of industry leaders regarding the importance of broad or liberal education for leadership in the hotel and restaurant industry? Are the opinions of chief executive officers and chief personnel officers in general agreement regarding undergraduate higher education for the hotel and restaurant industry? These questions prompted the study.

There has not been as much attention paid as one might expect to the views and opinions of industry leaders. Laurice T. Hall, Director and General Manager, Pinehurst Country Club, Denver, Colorado, speaking before a group of hotel and restaurant administration educators recently stated:

In closing I would touch only briefly--without attempting to open Pandora's Box--about the inter-relationship between hospitality education and the industry.

Sometimes people wait for others to change their poor attitudes before we change ours. Wouldn't it be nice for a change to put the shoe on the other foot and change our attitudes before they do? . . . Wouldn't

this help our students and also help to close the industry-education gap. The chasm, if you will, I've heard educators elude to. Maybe your attitude toward industry does affect their attitude toward you. But maybe there are two sides to the story.¹

The purpose of this study is to learn some of the viewpoints and opinions of educators, chief executive officers, and chief personnel officers toward undergraduate higher education for the hotel and restaurant industry. Is there a degree of consistency among the three groups? Is there a degree of consistency within each of the groups?

The educators selected to participate in this study occupy positions in six of the major hotel and restaurant administration schools.

The industry leaders selected to participate in the study occupy important positions in eighty hotel and restaurant firms.

I want to express my sincere appreciation to the members of my committee who aided in the preparation and execution of this study: Dr. Ray Budde, Dr. Norman G. Cournoyer, Dr. Robert C. Jones, and Dr. Ernest M. Buck. Also, to the New England Hotel-Motel and Restaurant Educational Foundation, Incorporated, for their financial assistance, my sincere thanks.

¹Laurice T. Hall, Relevancy--A Byword for Leadership in Our Time, Transcript of Major Addresses, C.H.R.I.E.'s 25th Annual Conference, Las Vegas, Nevada, December 27-30, 1970 (Washington, D.C.: Published by the Council, 1970), p. 58.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PREFACE	iii
LIST OF TABLES	viii
Chapter	
I. NATURE AND BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY	1
Industry's Point of View	
The Problem	
Need for the Study	
Purpose of the Study	
The Approach	
Hypotheses	
Summary and Review	
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	16
Education of Business Leaders	
Predictors of Success	
III. DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	32
Limitation of the Study	
Definition of Terms	
Population	
Sampling Procedures	
Instrument	
Validity of the SD Measurement	
Reliability of SD Measurements	
Equal Intervals	
Analysis and Treatment of Data	
IV. ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS	44
Percentage of Response to Instrument	
Analysis of Five General Study Areas, Four	
Specific Curriculum Areas, and Four	
Indicators Used as Predictors for Success	
Analysis of Mean Scores Among Educators,	
Chief Executive, and Chief Personnel	
Officers for Five General Study Areas	

Analysis of Mean Scores Among Educators, Chief Executive, and Chief Personnel Officers for Four Specific Curriculum Areas	
Analysis of Mean Scores Among Educators, Chief Executive and Chief Personnel Officers for Four Indicators for Success	
Analysis of Mean Scores Between Chief Executive Officers and Chief Personnel Officers	
Analysis of Mean Scores Between Chief Executive Officers and Chief Personnel Officers Within Same Type of Firm	
Analysis of Mean Scores of Chief Executive Officers Among the Eight Types of Firms	
Analysis of Mean Scores of Chief Personnel Officers Among the Eight Types of Firms	
Analysis of Mean Scores Among Eight Types of Firms for Five General Study Areas, Four Specific Curriculum Areas, and Four Indicators for Success	
Analysis of Mean Scores Among Educators for Six Schools for Five General Study Areas, Four Specific Curriculum Areas, and Four Indicators for Success	
Preferred Course Area Concentration	
Educational Level of Respondents	
Area of Educational Concentration of Respondents	
Evaluation of Objectives of Undergraduate Schools of Hotel and Restaurant Administration	
Relative Ranking of Essential Educational Objectives of Undergraduate Education	
Respondents' Comments Concerning the State of Higher Education for the Hotel and Restaurant Industry	

V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS 95

Conclusions	
Course Area of Concentration Preferred by Educators, Chief Executive, and Chief Personnel Officers	
Areas of Educational Concentration of Educators, Chief Executive, and Chief Personnel Officers	
Educational Backgrounds of Educators, Chief Executive Officers, and Chief Personnel Officers	

Specific Comments and Recommendations for Improvement of Higher Education for the Hotel and Restaurant Industry	
Evaluation of Representative Objectives of Undergraduate Education for the Hotel and Restaurant Industry	
Implication of the Results	
Recommendations	
Recommendations for Further Research	

Appendix

A. CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S COVERING LETTER . . .	113
B. CHIEF PERSONNEL OFFICER'S COVERING LETTER . . .	115
C. EDUCATOR'S COVERING LETTER	117
D. INSTRUMENT	119
E. REPRESENTATIVE COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF EDUCATORS, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICERS, AND CHIEF PERSONNEL OFFICERS	139
F. HOTELS AND RESTAURANT ORGANIZATIONS SELECTED FOR THE STUDY	151
BIBLIOGRAPHY	153

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Percentage of Industry Responding	46
2.	Percentage of Educators Responding	47
3.	Mean Scores, Standard Deviations for Educators, Chief Executive Officers, and Chief Personnel Officers	49
4.	Mean Scores, "F" Ratios of Educators, Chief Executive Officers, and Chief Personnel Officers for Five General Study Areas	52
5.	Mean Scores, "F" Ratios of Educators, Chief Executive Officers, and Chief Personnel Officers for Four Specific Curriculum Areas	54
6.	Mean Scores, "F" Ratios of Educators, Chief Executive Officers, and Chief Personnel Officers for Four Indicators for Success	55
7.	Mean Scores, "F" Ratios of Chief Executive Officers and Chief Personnel Officers for Five General Study Areas, Four Specific Curriculum Areas, and Four Indicators for Success	57
8.	"F" Ratios of Mean Scores Between Chief Executive Officers and Chief Personnel Officers within Same Type of Firm for Five General Study Areas	59
9.	"F" Ratios of Mean Scores Between Chief Executive Officers and Chief Personnel Officers within Same Type of Firm for Four Specific Curriculum Areas	61
10.	"F" Ratios of Mean Scores Between Chief Executive Officers and Chief Personnel Officers within Same Type of Firm for Four Indicators for Success	62

Table	Page
11. Mean Scores, Standard Deviations of Chief Executive Officers for Eight Types of Firms	64
12. Mean Scores, Standard Deviations of Chief Personnel Officers for Eight Types of Firms	65
13. "F" Ratios for Chief Executive Officers and Chief Personnel Officers Among Eight Types of Firms for Five General Study Areas, Four Specific Curriculum Areas, and Four Indicators for Success	67
14. "F" Ratios of Mean Scores Among Eight Types of Firms for Five General Study Areas, Four Specific Curriculum Areas, and Four Indicators for Success	68
15. Mean Scores, Standard Deviations for Eight Types of Firms for Five General Study Areas . .	69
16. Mean Scores, Standard Deviations for Eight Types of Firms for Four Specific Curriculum Areas	70
17. Mean Scores, Standard Deviations for Eight Types of Firms for Four Success Indicators	71
18. Mean Scores, Standard Deviations Among Educators for Six Schools	73
19. "F" Ratios of Mean Scores Among Educators of Six Schools for Five General Study Areas, Four Specific Curriculum Areas, and Four Indicators for Success	74
20. Course Area Concentration Preferred by Educators, Chief Executive and Chief Personnel Officers	76
21. Educational Level at Start of Teaching or Business Careers	79
22. Educational Level as of August 31, 1971	81

Table	Page
23. Area of Educational Concentration for Educators, Chief Executive Officers, and Chief Personnel Officers	82
24. Evaluation of Objectives of Undergraduate Schools of Hotel and Restaurant Administration	84
25. Ranking of Essential Educational Objectives of Schools of Hotel and Restaurant Administration	88

C H A P T E R I
NATURE AND BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Higher education for the hotel and restaurant industry is a relatively recent concept. In 1922, forty-one years after the first school of business was established at the University of Pennsylvania, Dr. Howard B. Meek started the first undergraduate program in hotel and restaurant administration at Cornell University. Six years later, Michigan State University launched a similar program. Since then, undergraduate programs in hotel and restaurant administration have grown in scope and numbers.

Today, about twenty-five four-year institutions of higher education grant baccalaureate degrees to graduates who have devoted four years of study to some phase of hotel, restaurant, or institutional administration.¹

Unlike higher education for business, higher education for the hotel and restaurant industry has not been characterized by self-study and curriculum revision over the years. Presently, among the many four-year institutions a wide variation is found between the course content and the

¹"Schooling the Food Service Executive of Tomorrow," Food Service, XXXII (September, 1970), 12.

curriculums of what is called the "same field of study."²

Higher education for the hotel and restaurant industry covers a wide range of programs. Some programs are business oriented and lean heavily on economics. Others are food production oriented, while some programs combine both areas.³ Emphasis in several programs is on vocational skills, others supervisory competence, and in still others middle or top level executive skills.

Well-defined procedures for curriculum and course content are lacking. In business administration, one finds well-established procedures and well-defined subject matter for teaching.

Holzinger in discussing curriculum development for the food service industry states:

The curricula are creatures of the faculties, often made to serve the needs and abilities of the faculty instead of those whom the faculty should serve. Too often, a course is taught or weight is assigned because of the influence of the person who teaches it.⁴

There is also a problem of what basic information

²Lendal H. Kotschevar, "Some Educational Needs in Our Industry." Xerox copy of article supplied by Dr. Chester G. Hall, Jr., Director of Education, National Restaurant Association, 1970. Publisher unknown.

³Ibid.

⁴Stephen K. Holzinger, "Developing a College Level Training Program for the Food Service Industry" (unpublished Master's thesis, New York City University, 1970), pp. ii-iii.

should be taught and at what level. Kotschevar states that "there are few precedents or well-defined standards for teaching in this area."⁵ Welch in discussing teaching methodology writes:

Overspecialization of the instructional personnel, operates in direct opposition to the student's needs and interest, in many cases. Whether the subject matter is liberal arts, professional or vocational, there is a tendency for all individuals to follow their own particular interest in their field. Many college instructors develop a degree of specialization which may be compared to "tunnel vision" in the pursuit of their individual interests. In presenting their parts of the curriculum to students, such instructors present their subject matter as they see it, which may be completely irrelevant to the student's interests or to his needs as he sees them.⁶

It could be said that the subject matter presented by these instructors might be completely irrelevant to the needs of the hotel and restaurant industry.

Hotel and restaurant administration schools and departments are the only academic bodies concerning themselves with the study of the hotel and restaurant industry. How well they are doing their job is open for debate. Their programs are criticized by students, educators, and the industry. The students cry for relevancy.⁷ The academic

⁵Kotschevar, loc. cit.

⁶John M. Welch, Junior College Programs for the Hospitality Industry, Council on Hotel, Restaurant, and Institutional Education (Ithaca, N.Y.: Published by the Council, 1962), p. 21.

⁷Lendal H. Kotschevar, Increasing the Productivity of

community criticizes the professional content of their programs. The curriculums are charged with excessive "vocationalism" or as Welch implies, the lack of "academic respectability."⁸

There is a trend to reduce vocational and specialized hotel and restaurant administration courses in favor of generalized or liberal education, a philosophy that finds much acceptance among some hotel and restaurant educators.⁹ Advocates of this philosophy are especially prone to cite its relevance to the development of general and intellectual skills of judgment, problem solving, and creativity.¹⁰

For example, the philosophy of one department of hotel and restaurant administration states:

Recognizing that the man trained for today is out of date tomorrow, teaching emphasis at the University of Massachusetts is on principles and analytical tools,

Our Educational Programs. Transcript of Major Addresses, Council on Hotel, Restaurant, Institutional Education's 25th Annual Conference, Las Vegas, Nevada, December 27-30, 1970 (Washington, D.C.: Published by the Council, 1970), p. 45.

⁸ Welch, op. cit., p. 32.

⁹ Council on Hotel, Restaurant, and Institutional Education, "Meeting of Senior Colleges," Chicago, 1965. (Mimeographed.)

¹⁰ Thomas Powers, The Live Case Method: A Systems Approach to Hotel and Restaurant Education. Transcript of Major Addresses, C.H.R.I.E.'s 25th Annual Conference, Las Vegas, Nevada, December 27-30, 1970 (Washington, D.C.: Published by the Council, 1970), p. 17.

processes and systems. These change relatively slowly.¹¹

Dukas in discussing the educational philosophy of the hotel and restaurant management program at Florida State University states:

Our program of professional education at F.S.U. concentrates upon developing the abilities and the wide range of knowledge that will be required of tomorrow's industry leaders.¹²

But, who knows what knowledge tomorrow's industry leaders will need? Others strongly defend a specialized curriculum in hotel and restaurant administration based on well-defined and accepted professional goals.¹³ Their argument is that a curriculum that gives students specialized instruction, even though it involves today's practices, gives the student something concrete to work with while he is learning his job.

They argue that most new innovations are a modification of existing practices. Therefore, if a student knows current practices he can understand and accept improvements on it better than if he knew none.

The center of controversy here is the question of the

¹¹A Philosophy of Hotel and Restaurant Education. Student Handbook, Department of Hotel and Restaurant Administration. (Amherst: University of Massachusetts, 1970), p. 4. (Mimeographed.)

¹²"Is Foodservice Education for Real," Fast Food, LXVI (May, 1967), 112.

¹³C.H.R.I.E., "Meeting of Senior Colleges."

relationship between academic training and professional or vocational competence. Wilson states:

The professional preparation for university students planning careers in the food service and lodging industry should include both non-professional knowledge and professional or technical knowledge. The combination of academic subject matter should provide a sound base of business administration, plus specialized technical industry information. In addition to the business and industry preparation, the curriculum should provide cultural experiences that will enhance the individual['s] ability to contribute to the community and enjoy leisure time pursuits.

The balance of these three areas of preparation should be realistically evaluated periodically to insure adequate professional preparation and social acceptance in a changing economic environment.¹⁴

What approach is "right" is still a matter of opinion. As Fuller states: "Yet debate about hotel course content and emphasis remains inconclusive because we [educators] are long in opinion and short on facts."¹⁵

Industry's Point of View

Recently, hotel and restaurant education has been criticized by industry personnel as not being attuned to industry's needs. Steven S. J. Hall, Vice President of Operations, Sheraton Corporation Motor Inns, states:

It is time that both Cornell and Michigan State

¹⁴Fast Foods, op. cit., p. 117.

¹⁵John Fuller, "Educating Future Managers for the Hotel and Food Service Industry," in Articulation, Newsletter of the C.H.R.I.E., XVII (February-March, 1971), 6-11. Reprinted from HCI Journal, September, 1971.

and the myriad of other schools who are attempting successfully in many cases to produce executives for the hospitality industry get together and do some real soul searching as to whether they are producing what the industry requires or what the industry is. There is a substantial difference.

In my opinion, it is critical that the various educational institutes set up strong lines of communication and evaluate together the needs of the industry if the industry is to survive not in today's environment but the environment we can expect to find in the 1980's.¹⁶

Wayne Oldham, past Executive Vice-President, the Downtowner Corporation, expresses his feelings on higher education for the hotel and restaurant industry in this manner:

Lastly, I think some very strong ties should be made between the various hotel and motel companies and the schools in which discussion can evolve about what is being taught is what is needed. . . . As in every business, there is a great deal of difference between school room theory and business practicality and the two need to be brought together so that one benefits the other.¹⁷

Martin Judge, Managing Editor, Hospitality magazine, writing about hotel schools states:

One view is that the hotel schools simply don't realize what the lodging industry needs in the way of managerial material. Another view is that the hotels are so inflexible they will not accept the bright new ideas that the bright new students bring to them. Both views are probably correct, to large extent, for many.¹⁸

¹⁶ Steven S. J. Hall, "Opinion," Hospitality, X (January, 1971), 142.

¹⁷ Wayne Oldham, "Opinion," Hospitality, X (January, 1971), 140.

¹⁸ Martin Judge, "Observation," Hospitality, X (January, 1971), 124.

Laurice T. Hall, Director and General Manager, Pinehurst Country Club, speaking before the Council of Hotel, Restaurant, and Institutional Education's 25th Annual Conference about the interrelationship between hospitality education and the industry urged educators to take the initiative to close this "chasm" between education and the industry. He states:

If there is a bad attitude on the part of some of the industry operators toward education, can we set [sit] back and wait for "their" attitude to change? I urge you, as educators, to continue your self-motivation toward building the bridge for the students, ourselves, and our industry.¹⁹

One might think that the lines of communication between the educational institutions and the hotel and restaurant industry on matters relating to the education of future industry leaders were open and strong. This does not seem to be the case.

The Problem

A primary source of recruitment for management personnel and executive trainees for the hotel and restaurant industry is the hotel and restaurant administration schools. The increasing demand for managerial and executive personnel emphasizes the need for effective and meaningful hotel and

¹⁹Laurice T. Hall, Relevancy--A Byword for Leadership in Our Time. Transcript of Major Addresses, C.H.R.I.E.'s 25th Annual Conference, Las Vegas, Nevada, December 27-30, 1970 (Washington, D.C.: Published by the Council, 1970), p. 58.

restaurant education. A clear understanding of the hotel and restaurant industry's educational requirements is essential if present and future hotel and restaurant administration schools are to meet the industry's personnel demands effectively. As Hall states:

If hospitality oriented schools are producing potential executives who are capable of integrating into the existing system, then the resultant inbreeding will in the not too distant future minimize the value of the educational institutes and cause a drastic and sudden change to the industry's traditional managerial philosophies.²⁰

The question under debate is not so much the immediate usefulness of higher education for the hotel and restaurant industry, but the appropriate kind of higher education for future hotel and restaurant executives. There is a need to determine what basic information should be taught and at what level. Kotschevar states:

We also have had a problem on what and how much we should teach our students and what we should leave for industry to do. Perhaps we are saying we in education will teach the basics and industry will do the remainder will be a good solution to this problem.²¹

He further states:

We also need to know something about the probable developments of our industry so they [educators] can properly prepare students to meet change, but this must be done with care because it is possible to overprepare students for the future. Should we teach our students to use

²⁰Hall, loc. cit.

²¹Kotschevar, Increasing the Productivity of Our Educational Programs, p. 47.

nothing but convenience food . . .? There are some college programs today in which heavy emphasis is given to the use of the computer and advanced management techniques such as linear programming, operations research, queuing theory, Monte Carlo techniques, the domino theory and so forth. Our industry as yet doesn't know what these terms are let alone use them. A student so overprepared has a difficult time making good because we have prepared him for something industry is not yet ready to use him in.²²

Need for the Study

There is an apparent need to determine what the objectives of higher education should be for the hotel and restaurant industry, to substantiate or disprove the charge that present hotel and restaurant administration programs are not attuned to the needs of the industry. If a substantial difference exists, then the educational institutions and the hotel and restaurant industry should be so informed in order that appropriate adjustments may be considered.

How do the leaders of major hotel and restaurant organizations view the present state of undergraduate education for the hotel and restaurant industry? Is there a degree of consistency in the opinions held by industry leaders? Are the opinions of industry leaders in general agreement with the opinions of educators regarding the importance of higher education for the hotel and restaurant industry? Are the opinions of chief executive officers in

²²Ibid., p. 46.

general agreement with the opinions of chief personnel officers regarding higher education for the hotel and restaurant industry?

A knowledge of the educational opinions and recommendations of educators, chief executive officers, and chief personnel officers is important in establishing a sound and effective program in the professional education of future hotel and restaurant administration personnel.

Purpose of the Study

This study has as its main purpose the investigation of the opinions and attitudes held by educators, chief executives, and chief personnel officers toward higher education for the hotel and restaurant industry. At issue here is not the bipolar "accept-reject" attitudes of the three groups, but a searching look at the differences of attitudes held by the three groups toward higher education for this industry.

Information pertinent to the above statement and related questions could be of substantial value to both the academic and industry communities. The role of hotel and restaurant administration programs might be strengthened through knowledge and understanding of educational opinions of educators, chief executive officers, and chief personnel officers.

Kotschevar states: "There is an urgent need today for

industry and educators to join together to develop a discipline in our field, the outlines of which we now have."²³ A new partnership is needed to stimulate quality and meaningful education for future executives in the hotel and restaurant industry.

The Approach

In addressing the problem, a twofold approach was used:

1. To investigate the opinions and attitudes held by educators, chief executive officers, and chief personnel officers toward higher education for the hotel and restaurant industry, to determine the extent of the "within-group" and the "among groups" agreement in the following areas:
 - a. Relative importance of five general study areas usually required of hotel and restaurant administration majors on the undergraduate level, e.g., social sciences, humanities, physical sciences, general business subjects, and specific business subjects.
 - b. Relative importance of four specific curriculum areas usually required of hotel and restaurant administration majors on the undergraduate level, e.g., general hotel and restaurant subjects, quantitative hotel and restaurant subjects, specific hotel and restaurant subjects, and specific subjects in personnel management.
 - c. Relative importance of the four indicators frequently used to rate hotel and restaurant administration graduates for positions in the industry, e.g., college grade point average, extracurricular activities, personality

²³Kotschevar, "Some Educational Needs in Our Industry."

- factors, and the quality and prestige of the college or university attended.
- d. Relative importance of basic liberal arts or general education in undergraduate education for hotel and restaurant administration majors.
2. To investigate the educational backgrounds and opinions of respondents which include:
 - a. Educational level and educational concentration of respondents.
 - b. Evaluation of representative objectives of undergraduate education for the hotel and restaurant industry.
 - c. Specific comments and recommendations for improvement of higher education for the hotel and restaurant industry.

Hypotheses

Seven hypotheses were postulated and tested to determine if there were differences among educators, chief executive officers, and chief personnel officers in the attitudes they hold toward higher education for the hotel and restaurant industry.

1. The attitudes held by educators toward five general study areas, four specific curriculum areas, and four indicators used as predictors of success are no different than the attitudes held by chief executive officers and chief personnel officers.
2. The attitudes held by chief executive officers toward five general study areas, four specific curriculum areas, and four indicators used as predictors of success are no different than the attitudes held by chief personnel officers for the same areas.

3. The attitudes held by chief executive officers and chief personnel officers within the eight types of firms toward five general study areas, four specific curriculum areas, and four indicators used as predictors of success do not differ.
4. The attitudes held by chief executive officers among the eight types of firms toward five general study areas, four specific curriculum areas, and four indicators used as predictors of success do not differ.
5. The attitudes held by chief personnel officers among the eight types of firms toward five general study areas, four specific curriculum areas, and four indicators used as predictors of success do not differ.
6. The attitudes expressed by the eight types of firms toward five general study areas, four specific curriculum areas, and four indicators used as predictors of success do not differ.
7. The attitudes held by educators among the six schools toward five general study areas, four specific curriculum areas, and four indicators used as predictors of success do not differ.

Summary and Review

This study was designed to focus on the problems of intercommunication between educators and industry representatives concerning the importance of five general study areas, four specific curriculum areas, and four indicators used as predictors of success.

The study did not attempt to settle the time-worn arguments concerning the relative advantages and disadvantages of a specialized or liberal education as

preparation for hotel and restaurant business careers, but, more directly, to determine if there were differences in attitudes of educators, chief executive officers, and chief personnel officers toward these areas.

CHAPTER I I

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

An extensive review of the literature revealed no empirical research concerning the attitudes and opinions of educators, chief executive officers, and chief personnel officers toward higher education for the hotel and restaurant industry. There were, however, several studies related to the education and development of business leaders, factors associated with success in business, and several studies dealing with undergraduate education for business.

Education of Business Leaders

In 1952, the editors of Fortune published a study of the three highest paid men in each of the 200 largest industrial companies, twenty-five largest railroads, and twenty-five largest utilities. The study reported that the typical executive was a four-year college graduate. A larger portion of the older executives majored in engineering and science. The younger the executives, the study found, the more education they had, with emphasis on business and economics. Regardless of age, the data indicated that humanities and other liberal arts subjects did not attract

a majority of the students.¹

In 1955, Newcomer made a survey of individuals who had reached top executive positions in approximately 400 major business organizations. She investigated the factors that characterized the top executive during the period from early 1900 to 1950. It was found that while there was agreement that education, ability and merit were becoming the dominant factors in the final selection of executives, there was not complete agreement as to what the nature of educational preparation should be. The question under debate is not so much the immediate usefulness of higher education for business, but the appropriate kind of higher education for the future business executive.²

The Ford Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation each commissioned and financed a major study of higher education as preparation for business careers. Working under the sponsorship of the Ford Foundation, Robert A. Gordon and James E. Howell completed one study, Higher Education for Business. A similar study, The Education of American Businessmen, by Frank C. Pierson et al., sponsored by the Carnegie Corporation, was published the same year. These

¹"The Nine Hundred," Fortune, XLVI (November, 1952), 132.

²Mabel Newcomer, The Big Business Executive: Factors That Made Him 1900-1950 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1955), p. 66.

studies were the first important in-depth investigations of American collegiate schools of business.³

Both reports were sharp indictments of the general state of business education in the United States. They were highly critical of the various types of business education offered by most of the nation's collegiate business schools. In general, the two reports criticized the conventional subject offerings in the business curriculum, and especially the so-called "practical" and "descriptive" courses such as Hotel Front Office Procedures and Principles of Baking.⁴

The two reports did not attack the idea that higher education should not prepare students to do useful and remunerative work. On the contrary, they criticized business schools because of their narrow and misconceived interpretation of vocational education, for not preparing young people to do over the entire length of their careers the most useful or the most remunerative work of which they are capable. The authors suggested that many of the business schools were not meeting the long-term requirements of business firms for competent, imaginative, flexible, and creative managers, prepared to deal with problems of the future.

The writers suggested some definite changes in course

³Robert A. Gordon and James E. Howell, Higher Education for Business (New York: Columbia University Press, 1959); Frank G. Pierson et al., The Education of American Businessmen (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959).

⁴Pierson, op. cit., pp. 219-220.

offerings. Many of the traditional offerings they would either leave out or radically change. Also, they suggested some new offerings. Specifically they favored increased emphasis in the quantitative techniques as an aid to decision making. They stressed a wider application of the behavioral sciences to management problems. All in all, they recommended an approach to business training slanted toward the traditional liberal arts.

The two reports aroused a certain amount of criticism from the so-called practical-minded advocates of a professional type training for the businessman. Critics of the reports favored a form of business education designed to equip a student to do a job in business.

Tonne criticized the reports because the recommendations were not based on factual evidence.⁵ Instead, the critics said the recommendations were largely the opinions of the authors.⁶ Although opinions of others are used to back the conclusions, the critics said these opinions were carefully selected to support the viewpoints of the authors.

A substantial group of business educators look upon the two reports as lacking in the judicial attitude so vital to scientific research. The authors should have made objective use of statistical evidence in arriving at their

⁵Herbert A. Tonne, "Two Evaluations of the Collegiate Schools of Business," Journal of Business Education, XXXV (January, 1960), 158.

⁶John W. Wingate, "The Question of Business

conclusions. If they had, their recommendations would have been more acceptable. Kreiberg, writing in the Office Executive, expresses this criticism:

. . . our real need at this time is some scientifically collected data on what the desirable attributes for college business education are and how well we are meeting those attributes. What we have received thus far does not appear to be based on scientific evaluation.⁷

The critics contend that the reports are big-business oriented. The reports are concerned primarily with training only quality students for high-level roles in the large business corporations. The authors admitted that most of their supporting research was done in the big business area, but they contended that their recommendations applied equally well to business education at all levels. However, Pierson acknowledged a need for lower level business education at less prestigious institutions.

Since the issuance of these two reports in 1959, there have been several studies to reassess the status of higher education for business. In 1961, Lesikar completed a study of the educational needs of small businessmen in Louisiana.⁸ The primary objective of the study was to gather data that

Specialization in Colleges and Universities," Collegiate News and Views, VIII (May, 1960), 2.

⁷Irene D. Kreiberg, "The Current Agitation Against University-College Programs in Business Administration," Office Executive, XXXV (June, 1960), 30.

⁸Raymond V. Lesikar, Needs of Education for Small Business Based on a 1959 Survey of Louisiana Businessmen (Baton Rouge: College of Business Administration, Louisiana State University, 1961).

would provide guidance for curriculum planning for small businessmen. The sample used in the survey consisted of 161 of the leading executives in Louisiana's small businesses.

The study found "contrary to opinions expressed by selected leaders in big business, most of the small business executives interviewed favored a practical type of education."⁹ About half (48 percent) in the sample favored a curriculum "mostly practical, some liberal." The next largest group (28 percent) favored a curriculum with about equal emphasis on liberal and practical subjects.

According to the survey results, approximately 56 percent of the small business executives favored a curriculum ranging from "mostly practical, some liberal" to "entirely practical" as compared with 16 percent who favored a curriculum ranging from "mostly liberal, some practical" to "entirely liberal." Perhaps an even more significant grouping is the 84 percent who favored one-half or more of practical studies in the business curriculum.

The most cogent conclusion that could be drawn from the study by Lesikar is found in this quote:

Small business executives recognize the need for including liberal courses in the business curriculum. But courses subject to immediate practical application are more highly regarded than are courses (such as English literature) that lean toward the aesthetic. The same holds true for courses (such as science)

⁹Ibid., p. 27.

that have little relationship to the profit and service objectives of small business.¹⁰

However, the study found that the small business executives in performing their work were classified as generalists, performing an array of functions not easily placed into logical "practical" categories. Furthermore, it was found that there was a difference between what executives think should be taught in college and what they actually performed in their duties.

A survey of personnel managers in the Cincinnati area conducted by Hailstones, Roberts, and Steinbruegee to ascertain what they wanted in the way of college trained men revealed such subjects as foreign language, sociology, political science, history, psychology, and natural science were given very low ratings.¹¹

In 1963, the Institute of Higher Education at Columbia University published a critical analysis of the intervening discussions since 1959 in the hope of clarifying the issues in higher education for business. The study by the Institute found that there were still many unresolved problems in this area of concern, especially as to what constitutes an appropriate business education.¹²

¹⁰Ibid., p. 38.

¹¹T. J. Hailstones, E. Roberts, and John Steinbruegee, "Personnel Managers Evaluate a College Business Program," Collegiate News and Views, VIII (May, 1955), 7-11.

¹²Earl J. McGrath, J. D. McNulty, and W. D. Kephart, Liberal Education and Business (New York: Columbia University Press, 1963), p. 74.

The Committee for Economic Development (CED), in 1964, published a monograph entitled Educating Tomorrow's Managers. After thorough discussion, the committee concluded "that much remains to be done before most schools (of business) can claim that they have fully met the criticisms raised in the late 1950's."¹³ In addition, the committee reported that businessmen and educators should seek every opportunity to encourage students planning business careers to acquire the kind of education that will serve them throughout their lives.

Yet, the committee did not put the development of the ideal business curriculum on an "either-or basis" of liberal education.

We consider it a serious mistake, however, to put the problem in either-or terms--either students should be trained for first jobs or educated for lifelong careers (or for "living" or "citizenship"). In fact, we consider the task confronting general and business education today is to reconcile those different objectives to eliminate either-or thinking, and to prepare students both for the beginning of their careers and for the long pull.¹⁴

The committee left the decision up to administrators and faculty members of business colleges and universities to decide on how to deal with the manifold problems of business education.

¹³The Committee for Economic Development (CED), "Educating Tomorrow's Managers," The Business School and the Business Community (New York: By the Committee, 1964), p. 10.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 12.

Bond and Leabo in 1964 conducted a study of sixty-six business leaders who were trustees of the Committee for Economic Development (CED). They found that there was a trend to reduce specialized business courses in favor of general business courses and/or basic liberal arts courses. They concluded that further study and analysis of educating and developing business leaders were needed.¹⁵

Kilcourse, in 1967, conducted a study of the opinions of chief executive officers and chief personnel recruitment officers of major businesses in the United States concerning the present state of collegiate higher education for business.¹⁶

His analysis of 351 returns mailed to 375 major business firms had as his immediate objectives the following:

(1) to determine if there was agreement between chief executive officers and chief personnel recruitment officers as to the importance of a liberal or specialized education for business; and (2) to determine if there was agreement within organizations (banking, insurance, industrial, etc.) between the

¹⁵Floyd A. Bond, Dick A. Leabo, and A. W. Swinyard, Preparation for Business Leadership--Views of Top Executives (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan, 1964), p. 41.

¹⁶Robert S. Kilcourse, "Higher Education for Business: A Comparative Study of the Current Philosophies and Policies of Chief Executives of Major Business Organizations and the Practices of Their College Personnel Recruitment Officers" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Florida State University, 1967).

chief executive officers and the chief personnel recruitment officers as to the importance of a liberal or specialized education.

In general, the author concluded that the business executives who participated in the study were in agreement that undergraduate business education should be broad and not overspecialized. The chief executives and the chief recruitment officers agreed that basic liberal arts courses had a substantial role in higher education for business.

There was 91 percent agreement within organizations between chief executives and chief recruiters on the desirability of basic liberal arts courses directly related to business management. Ninety-five percent (95 percent) of chief executive officers and 94 percent of chief recruiters rated education in business-related liberal arts subjects either essential or desirable in higher education for business.¹⁷

Only 60 percent within-organization agreement was found on the desirability of basic liberal arts subjects not directly related to business management, e.g., art appreciation, history, music, and related subjects, in higher education for business. Seventy-three percent (73 percent) of chief executive officers and 69 percent of chief recruitment officers rated education in basic liberal arts

¹⁷Ibid., p. 94.

subjects not directly related to business management as a desirable objective of higher education for business.¹⁸

There was a 66 percent within-organization agreement on type of educational background preferred when employing recent college graduates. Seventy-two percent (72 percent) of chief executives and 64 percent of chief recruiters preferred approximately one-half basic liberal arts subjects and one-half general business subjects with a modest scattering of specialized business subjects.¹⁹

Kilcourse found that there was considerable lack of agreement between chief executives and chief personnel recruiters in approximately one-half of the business organizations reporting on the relative importance of college grade point average, extracurricular activities, personal appearance and other personality factors, and quality and prestige of college or university attended.²⁰

Predictors of Success

Business firms and personnel recruiters, in particular, have developed a number of basic assumptions about various aspects of college performance as being indicative of future success in occupational pursuits. Many of these assumptions are a priori. Where research has been done, the findings are not conclusive and in instances contradictory.

¹⁸Ibid., p. 88. ¹⁹Ibid., pp. 88-89. ²⁰Ibid., pp. 87-88.

Perhaps the most common single criterion for success in occupational pursuits is the college grade point average. More studies have dealt with the relationship between college grade point average than with any other aspect of college life.

Hoyt examined forty-six studies grouped into one of eight categories--business, teaching, engineering, medicine, scientific research, miscellaneous occupations, studies of eminence, and nonvocational accomplishments. Although the study devoted only a minor part of its consideration to college grades and success in business, the study concluded that "the weight of the evidence suggest no relationship between the two."²¹

Calhoon and Reddy in examining fifteen studies concerning grade point average and success in business found contradictory and confusing results. Of the fifteen studies analyzed, four showed a definite correlation between grades and business success, four showed some correlation, and seven showed no correlation. Although the findings are far from being conclusive, the authors contend that "there is a conceivable defense for some connection between grades and success."²²

²¹Donald P. Hoyt, The Relationship between College Grades and Adult Achievement. A Review of the Literature. Research Report No. 7, September, 1965 (Iowa City, Iowa: American College Testing Program, 1965), p. 12.

²²Richard P. Calhoon and A. C. Reddy, "The Frantic

Jennings has conducted research which shows that scholastic standing in undergraduate school is an unreliable guide to an individual's management potential. He states: "The routes to the top are apt to hold just as many or more men who graduated below the highest one third of their college class than above (on a per capita basis)."²³

Husband in defense of grade point average and success in business stated: "In many ways selecting men for employment is like betting on a horse race; if you bet on the favorite you will win most of the time, and if you bet on the long shot you will occasionally collect."²⁴ According to Husband, the "long shot" is the man who didn't do well in college but might be a "late bloomer."

However, it isn't all a matter of marks. Husband also found that the more extracurricular activities a man had, the higher his income. From the results of his study he concludes: "Together or singly, in sum, grades and extra curricular activities furnish an excellent predictor of

Search for Predictors of Success," Journal of College Placement, XXVIII (February-March, 1968), 55-58.

²³Eugene E. Jennings, The Mobile Manager (Ann Arbor: Bureau of Industrial Relations, University of Michigan, 1967), p. 21. (Graduate School of Business Administration.)

²⁴Richard W. Husband, "What do College Grades Predict?" Fortune, LV (June, 1957), 157-158.

later success."²⁵

The Husband study showed that those who held offices in colleges were more likely to be leaders. Those holding two or more offices earned significantly more than those with no activity; those holding one office earned slightly higher salaries.

Lattin in a fourteen-year follow-up study of Cornell hotel administration graduates found that success in hotel and restaurant administration was related to achievement in college, measured by grade point average and by election to honor societies.²⁶

Campus activities as indicative of leadership in business have supporters. Calhoon and Reddy analyzed eight studies dealing with the relationship between extra-curricular activities and success in business. Five studies showed some correlation between extracurricular activities and business success, but three showed none. According to the authors "direct proof is certainly lacking, but the weight of existing evidence indicates that extra-curricular activities should be a 'plus'. . . ." ²⁷

²⁵ Ibid., p. 158.

²⁶ Gerald W. Lattin, "Factors Associated with Success in Hotel Administration," Occupations, XXIX (October, 1950), 36-39.

²⁷ Calhoon and Reddy, op. cit., p. 62.

Participation in athletics as indicative of success in business also has strong supporters. The major assumption here is that athletes are energetic, competitive, and learn to develop leadership abilities earlier in life. Of the four studies analyzed by Calhoun and Reddy, one study showed some correlation between participation in athletics and success in business. The results of this study showed that those with "numerals" and "letters" all had higher average salaries than the "none" group. Lettermen had considerably higher earnings than the "numerals" group. The results of the other three studies testing athletics as a predictor of success in business were inconclusive.²⁸

Lack of correlation between grade point average and success in business may be surprising to those who place a premium on academic achievement. The results of the studies give little comfort to those business firms and individuals who value academic achievement as a measure of general worth. It may reflect more an individual's ability to cram, to memorize, or to second-guess examinations. Or, as Calhoun and Reddy state: "High grades can also indicate negative factors such as extreme introversion, compensation for social or athletic deficiencies, and intensesness."²⁹

Despite the inconclusiveness of the current research, two conclusions can be drawn: (1) grades, plus participation

²⁸Ibid.

²⁹Ibid., p. 58.

in extracurricular activities may be indicative of how a college graduate will perform in business; and (2) until a better method is developed to predict success, there is still a certain amount of value in using these criteria as clues to success in business.

The studies reviewed here have been relatively few in number and limited in scope and purpose. There has been no apparent attempt to relate and compare educators' opinions with the opinions held by chief executive officers and chief personnel officers. If major differences exist, there is a need to inform those concerned. This study is designed to determine, compare and relate these opinions.

C H A P T E R I I I

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The problem with which this study was concerned was to find out if differences exist in attitudes and opinions among educators, chief executive officers, and chief personnel officers regarding higher education for the hotel and restaurant industry.

The major areas of investigation were:

1. To determine if differences in attitudes exist among educators, chief executive officers, and chief personnel officers in the following areas:
 - a. The importance of five general study areas usually required of hotel and restaurant administration majors at the undergraduate level, e.g., social sciences, general business subjects, and specific business subjects.
 - b. The importance of four specific curriculum areas usually required of hotel and restaurant majors at the undergraduate level, e.g., general hotel and restaurant subjects, quantitative hotel and restaurant subjects, specific hotel and restaurant subjects, and specific subjects in personnel management.
 - c. The importance of four indicators of success frequently used to rate hotel and restaurant administration graduates for employment in the industry, e.g., college grade point average, extracurricular activities, personality factors, and quality and prestige of college or university attended.
 - d. The importance of basic liberal arts courses in higher education for the hotel and restaurant industry.

2. To determine if differences in attitudes exist between chief executive officers and chief personnel officers within each category of firms in the following areas:
 - a. The importance of the same five general study areas.
 - b. The importance of the same four specific curriculum areas.
 - c. The importance of four indicators of success frequently used to rate hotel and restaurant graduates for employment.
 - d. The importance of basic liberal arts courses in higher education for the hotel and restaurant industry.
3. To determine if differences in attitudes exist among chief executive officers among the eight categories of firms in the above-mentioned areas.
4. To determine if differences in attitudes exist among chief personnel officers among the eight categories of firms in the same areas.
5. To determine if differences in attitudes exist among educators of the six schools used in the study in the same areas.

Additional areas of investigation were:

1. Educational level of respondents at the start of their business or teaching career and currently.
2. Educational level and educational concentration of respondents who attended college.
3. Information concerning respondent's viewpoints of objectives of undergraduate education for the hotel and restaurant industry.
4. Additional comments concerning respondent's viewpoints of the state of undergraduate education for the hotel and restaurant industry.

Limitation of the Study

Any conclusions that can be drawn from the findings of this study are necessarily limited by the following:

1. Although studies have substantiated the reliability and validity of the Semantic Differential scale, the reliability and validity of SD scale used in this study was unknown.
2. Since only firms selected from Institutions' annual directory of 400 largest organizations were used, it was necessary to assume that these firms were typical of unlisted firms.

Definition of Terms

In this study the following definitions are used:

Educators. Individuals in charge of teaching hotel and restaurant subjects in higher education.

Chief executives. The president, executive vice-president, or executive director of a hotel or restaurant firm.

Chief personnel officers. The individual or officer in charge of personnel.

Hotel and restaurant firms. One of the randomly drawn commercial firms listed in Institutions' 1970 annual directory of the largest hotel and restaurant organizations in the United States.

Schools of hotel and restaurant administration. One of the major schools or departments listed by Fast Food journal offering a degree in hotel and restaurant administration.

Hotel and restaurant education. The undergraduate education of hotel and restaurant administration majors in a school or department of hotel and restaurant administration.

Higher education. Education beyond the high school level leading to the baccalaureate degree.

General study areas. Five study areas usually required of hotel and restaurant majors at the undergraduate level, e.g., social sciences, humanities, physical sciences, general business subjects, and specific business subjects.

Specific curriculum areas. Study areas in hotel and restaurant curriculum such as general hotel and restaurant subjects, quantitative hotel and restaurant subjects, specific hotel and restaurant subjects, and specific subjects in personnel management.

Indicators. Four criteria frequently used to rate hotel and restaurant students for employment, e.g., college grade point average, extracurricular activities, personality factors, and the quality and prestige of the college or university attended.

Instrument. A form consisting of a Semantic Differential scale and a questionnaire.

Population

The population for the study included educators, chief executive officers, and chief personnel officers. The educators were selected from the following schools of hotel and restaurant administration: Cornell University, University of Denver, Florida State University, University of Massachusetts, Michigan State University, and Pennsylvania State University. The choice of these schools was based on the fact that they were classified as "major senior colleges offering a degree" in hotel and restaurant administration by Fast Foods journal.¹ These schools graduate

¹Fast Foods, op. cit., p. 98.

the largest number of hotel and restaurant administration majors each year.

The chief executive and chief personnel officers were selected from the major commercial hotel and restaurant firms listed in Institutions' annual directory of the 400 largest hotel, restaurant, and institutional organizations in the United States for the year 1970.²

The hotel and restaurant firms selected represented every type of major commercial hotel and restaurant firms as categorized by the editors of Institutions. The categories included: "Hotel/Motel Food Service; Franchise, Snack and Take-out; Restaurants and Cafeterias; Diversified Food Service; Full Line and Service Management; General Retailing; and Transportation."³

Sampling Procedures

A list of sixty educators was obtained from the catalogues of the six schools used in the study. Names of the educators were verified by staff members of the hotel, restaurant, and travel administration department at the University of Massachusetts.

A total sample size of eighty hotel and restaurant firms was obtained by selecting at random ten companies

²"Institutions 400," Institutions, XLVII (July, 1970), 89-179.

³Ibid., p. 87.

from each category of hotel and restaurant firms as defined by Institutions' 1970 annual directory of the largest hotel and restaurant organizations in the United States. Names of the chief officers were taken from Institutions' "A confidential buyer's guide of the 400 key companies and their executives."

Identical instruments were sent to each of the 220 individuals. The mailing consisted of an initial send-out and two follow-ups spaced at approximately three weeks apart. Each follow-up contained all the original materials and a follow-up letter. Where needed, a fourth follow-up letter was sent requesting the individual to fill out the instrument and return it via air mail. Additional postage was included to cover the cost of air mail.

Instrument

The instrument was divided into two parts: a Semantic Differential scale (SD) and a questionnaire. The SD consisted of ten scales selected from the "evaluation" factors found in Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum⁴ and Snider and Osgood.⁵ Each scale consisted of a seven-point scale

⁴Charles E. Osgood, G. J. Suci, and P. H. Tannenbaum, The Measurement of Meaning (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1957).

⁵James G. Snider and Charles E. Osgood, eds., Semantic Differential Technique: A Sourcebook (Chicago: Aldine, 1969).

with contrasting adjectives at each end.

The SD measures people's reactions to stimulus words or concepts in terms of rating on the bipolar scales. The polarities of the scales were reversed randomly to minimize response sets. The final scale was reproduced for five general study areas, four specific curriculum areas, and four indicators of success frequently used to rate college graduates for positions in business.

Validity of the SD Measurement

The SD has been used as a measure of attitudes in a wide variety of studies. Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum report exploratory studies in which the SD was used to assess attitude change as a result of mass media programs and as a result of messages structured in different ways.⁶

The SD has been used by other investigators to study attitude formation in the marketing of beer,⁷ toward organizations,⁸ and toward jobs and occupations.⁹ The results

⁶Osgood et al., op. cit., pp. 305-311; 240-241.

⁷William A. Mindak, "Fitting the Semantic Differential to the Marketing Problem," in Semantic Differential Technique: A Sourcebook, ed. by James G. Snider and Charles E. Osgood (Chicago: Aldine, 1969), pp. 618-623.

⁸A. Barclay and Frederick J. Thumin, "A Modified Semantic Differential Approach to Attitudinal Assessment," Journal of Clinical Psychology, XIX (July, 1963), 376-378.

⁹R. D. Rodefeld, "The Generalized Attitude of Members Toward Their General Farm Organizations" (unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Wisconsin, 1967).

of these studies, and many others,¹⁰ support the validity of the SD as a technique for measuring attitudes.

The general validity of the SD for measuring attitudes is supported by studies which compare SD measurements with attitude measurement on traditional scales. Osgood et al., present evidence of the validity of evaluation factor scores as estimated by correlation with other scales. Correlations with the Thurston scale ranged from .74 to .82 for the concepts Negro, Church, and Capital Punishment. Evaluation factor scores for the concept, Crop Rotation, correlated highly with the scores on a Guttman scale.¹¹

A study by Nichols and Shaw supports the validity of SD ratings as measurements of attitudes; however, they suggest caution in accepting the SD as equivalent to traditional forms of attitude measurements. They found low correlation between SD scores and scores on the Thurston scale when the concepts were salient to the subjects.¹²

Reliability of SD Measurements

A study of the absolute deviations between ratings of a concept in test and retest was reported in Osgood et al.

¹⁰Snider and Osgood, loc. cit.

¹¹Osgood et al., op. cit., pp. 189-199.

¹²Shirley A. Nichols and Marvin E. Shaw, "Saliency and two Measures of Attitude," Psychological Reports, XIV (February, 1964), 273-274.

For evaluation scales it was found the average difference between ratings on the test and retest was a little more than one-half scale units.¹³

DiVesta and Dick studied the test-retest reliabilities of SD ratings made by grade school children. In their study, each subject rated a different concept on a series of scales. Reliabilities were determined by correlating the ratings made on a first test with ratings made on a second test one month later. The correlations for different scales ranged from .27 to .56. They found that reliabilities were somewhat higher in the upper grades, but evaluation scales tend to be somewhat more reliable at all grade levels.¹⁴

A reliability study by Norman found that certain scales are associated with greater stability; in particular, evaluation scales show fewer shifts in ratings.¹⁵

Equal Intervals

The metric characteristics of the SD were investigated by Messick.¹⁶ Messick applied the method of successive

¹³Osgood et al., op. cit., p. 127.

¹⁴Francis J. DiVesta and Walter Dick, "The Test-retest Reliabilities of Children's Ratings of the Semantic Differential," Educational and Psychological Measurements, XXVI (Autumn, 1966), 605-616.

¹⁵Warren T. Norman, "Stability Characteristics of the Semantic Differential," American Journal of Psychology, LXXII (December, 1959), 581-584.

¹⁶Samuel J. Messick, "Metric Properties of the Semantic

intervals to SD data to determine if the assumption of equal intervals was warranted. He found that category boundaries were similarly spaced on all of the nine scales he considered, but not exactly in the proper position for equal intervals. Messick indicates that despite the deviation from equal interval assumption, one does not go far wrong in making this assumption. The correlations between the assumed and scaled boundaries were greater than .98 for every scale he considered.

His scaling study revealed that the center point of SD scales is not true zero, but rather a point lying about .2 scale units away from true zero. The information available suggests that the basic metric assumptions for the SD are not quite accurate, but also that violation of these assumptions is not serious enough to interfere with many applications of the SD.

The SD has been applied to a variety of attitude research problems. It has been shown to be sufficiently reliable and valid for many research purposes. Furthermore, SD measurements have been found to correlate highly with measurements on traditional attitude scales. The results obtained by others indicate its usefulness as a technique in this study.

The questionnaire contained items to determine educational level of the respondents at the beginning of their

careers and currently, academic preparation, and number of years out of college. Also included in the questionnaire was a list of objectives of higher education for the hotel and restaurant industry, type of curriculum preferred, and an invitation to the respondents to report any incidents, favorable or unfavorable, that related to the respondents' experience with higher education for the hotel and restaurant industry.

Data Collection

The instrument, covering letters, and stamped self-addressed return envelopes were sent to each educator, chief executive officer, and chief personnel officer selected in the sample.

The instrument was designed in six parts to facilitate data collection and tabulation (see Appendix). The six parts were as follows:

- I. General Background Information
- II. General Curriculum Information
- III. Specific Curriculum Information
- IV. Success Criteria
- V. Objectives of Undergraduate Schools of Hotel and Restaurant Administration
- VI. Course Area of Concentration
- VII. A Section for Additional Information

Analysis and Treatment of Data

The results obtained from each returned instrument were coded. The biographical information along with raw scores were keypunched on data processing cards.

To test the hypotheses, raw scores obtained from the SD were treated by an analysis of variance. Various "F" ratios were computed as well as sums of scores, sums of squares, means, standard deviations, and standard errors. Computer programs were used to compile, summarize, and compute percentages for items in the questionnaire.

C H A P T E R I V
ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS

The first step in analyzing the data was to compute the mean scores of educators, chief executive officers, and chief personnel officers for the five general study areas, the four specific curriculum areas, and the four indicators used as predictors of success. The mean scores were then treated by an analysis of variance to determine if difference in attitudes toward these areas existed (1) among educators, chief executive officers, and chief personnel officers; (2) between chief executive officers and chief personnel officers; (3) between chief executive officers and chief personnel officers within the same type of firms; (4) among the chief executive officers for the eight types of firms; (5) among chief personnel officers for the eight types of firms; (6) among the eight types of firms; and (7) among educators of the six schools.

The responses to the questionnaire were summarized and analyzed to determine the (1) opinions of educators, chief executive officers, and chief personnel officers on (a) objectives of higher education for the hotel and restaurant industry, (b) type of curriculum preferred; (2) area of educational concentration for educators, chief executive officers, and chief personnel officers; (3) educational

level of respondents at the start of their business or teaching careers and currently; and (4) representative comments and comments and recommendations of educators, chief executive officers, and chief personnel officers.

Percentage of Response to Instrument

Table 1 indicates the percent of response by industry representatives to the instrument. Respondents were grouped into eight types of firms to aid in the analysis and comparison. Had the total group responded, the sample size would have been 160, ten chief executive officers and ten chief personnel officers in each of the eight types of firms. The actual return was 89 or 55.6 percent. Eight cases were incomplete and were deleted from the sample. Thus the total number of industry respondents was 81.

Transportation firms showed a total response of 85 percent. Responses from the Restaurant and Cafeteria firms were the lowest with 35 percent. There appeared to be widespread interest in the study. More than 97 percent of the chief personnel officers requested summary copies of the results. Eighty percent (80 percent) of the chief executive officers requested summary copies.

Table 2 indicates percentage of educator's response to the instrument. Respondents were grouped into six (6) schools of hotel and restaurant administration to aid in

TABLE 1
 PERCENTAGE OF INDUSTRY RESPONDING

Type of Firm	Com- panies	Chief Executive Officers	Chief Personnel Officers	Percent of Total
Diversified Food Service	10	5	6	55
Franchise, Snack, and Take-Out	10	3	5	40
Restaurant and Cafeterias	10	3	4	35
Full Line and Service Manage- ment	10	5	6	55
Transportation	10	10	7	85
Hotel and Motel Food Service	10	4	4	40
General Retailing	10	7	2	45
Diversified Food Service Lodging	10	4	6	50
TOTAL	80	41	40	51

TABLE 2
 PERCENTAGE OF EDUCATORS RESPONDING

Universities	Staff	Replies	Percent of Total
Cornell	28	19	68
Massachusetts	9	8	88
Michigan State	7	6	86
Denver	4	3	75
Pennsylvania State	8	8	100
Florida State	4	3	75
TOTAL	60	47	78

the analysis and comparison. Pennsylvania State University had a 100 percent response. Cornell University shows the lowest response with 68 percent. However, Cornell University had the largest number of respondents. Had the total group responded the sample size would have been 60. The actual return was 52 or 86.6 percent. Five cases were incomplete and deleted from the sample. Thus the total sample was 47 or 78.3 percent. More than 93 percent of the respondents requested summary copies of the results.

Analysis of Five General Study Areas, Four Specific
Curriculum Areas, and Four Indicators Used as
Predictors for Success

Mean scores and standard deviations for educators, chief executive officers, and chief personnel officers for Five General Study Areas, Four Specific Curriculum Areas, and Four Indicators used as predictors of success are listed in Table 3. Mean scores were computed from the ten SD scales for each category within the three areas.

The scores for the scales were simply the numbers ten through seventy assigned to each scale. Each scale had a maximum value of seventy and a minimum value of ten. An example of one of the SD scales used in this study is:

Good 70 : 60 : 50 : 40 : 30 : 20 : 10 Bad

The positions on the scale measure intensity of feelings (slight through extreme) and directionality (good versus bad). The position coded 40 represents "neutrality," positions 30 and 50 "slightly good or bad," the 20 and 60 positions represent "very or quite good or bad," and the 10 and 70 represents "extremely good or bad."

For example, in Table 3, the total mean score of educators for all ten scales measuring the importance of social sciences in the curriculum is 57.6. In this case the 57.6 mean score represents an attitude of a little more than "slight" importance of social sciences in the curriculum;

TABLE 3

MEAN SCORES, STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR EDUCATORS, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICERS,
AND CHIEF PERSONNEL OFFICERS^a

	Educators (N=47)		Chief Executive Officers (N=41)		Chief Personnel Officers (N=40)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
GENERAL STUDIES						
Social Sciences	57.6	8.3	48.6	12.2	48.8	12.4
Humanities	53.1	9.5	48.1	12.8	47.6	10.9
Physical Sciences	58.1	8.7	52.9	12.2	51.4	10.4
General Business	66.7	4.7	65.2	6.9	66.0	4.8
Specific Business	67.4	4.2	66.3	5.0	64.0	6.5
SPECIFIC CURRICULUM						
General Hotel and Restaurant	63.2	11.2	64.6	6.3	64.5	7.4
Quantitative Controls	67.2	4.2	65.7	6.3	66.0	6.7
Planning and Organizing	65.9	6.2	63.3	7.1	61.9	9.1
Human Relations	65.3	8.3	64.9	7.0	66.9	4.5
SUCCESS INDICATORS						
Grade Point Average	51.2	10.5	48.5	8.7	49.5	11.6
Extracurricular Activities	55.1	9.2	50.4	9.3	52.6	9.2
Personality Factors	60.8	10.4	60.8	8.3	61.0	7.7
Quality and Prestige of College	52.9	10.4	47.3	9.4	47.6	9.1

^aRounded to nearest whole number.

whereas if one looks at "specific business," the educator's mean score is 67.4. This shows that educators attach close to "extreme" importance of this study area in the curriculum.

From Table 3, it can be further said that educators look upon the General Study Areas of "social sciences, humanities, and physical sciences" as being more important in the curriculum than do the chief executive officers and the chief personnel officers. For the Four Specific Curriculum Areas, the mean scores for the three groups are quite close indicating similarity of agreement as to the importance of these areas in the curriculum.

The mean scores of educators, chief executive officers, and chief personnel officers for Four Indicators for Success indicate that the attitudes of the three groups are quite similar. The three groups believe that Success Indicators are only "slightly" important except for "personality factors." As measured on the SD scale, the three groups attach "very or quite" importance to this indicator.

However, to determine if significant differences in attitudes existed among the three groups toward the Five General Study Areas, Four Specific Curriculum Areas, and Four Indicators used as predictors of success, an analysis of variance of mean scores was made. To test the significance of difference, the null hypothesis was assumed.

Analysis of Mean Scores Among Educators, Chief Executive
and Chief Personnel Officers for Five
General Study Areas

When the mean scores of educators, chief executive officers and chief personnel officers for Five General Study Areas were analyzed by analysis of variance, the results show a significant difference among the mean scores for social sciences, humanities, physical sciences, and specific business areas. The "F" ratios in Table 4 are significant at the .05 level. The null hypothesis of no difference among the means for these areas is rejected. Evidently, educators attached more importance to these General Study Areas in the curriculum than do chief executive officers and chief personnel officers.

It should be noted that although there is disagreement among the three groups for "specific business," it is only a matter of intensity. The three groups rate "specific business" "very or quite" important as measured on the scale. The "F" ratio indicate a significant difference. Educators place more emphasis on this area. The three groups agree on the relative importance of "general business" area in the curriculum.

TABLE 4

MEAN SCORES, "F" RATIOS OF EDUCATORS, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICERS, AND CHIEF PERSONNEL OFFICERS FOR FIVE GENERAL STUDY AREAS

General Study Areas	Mean Scores			"F" Ratio
	Educators	Chief Executive Officers	Chief Personnel Officers	
Social Sciences	57.6	48.6	48.8	9.741 ^b
Humanities	53.1	48.1	47.6	3.340 ^a
Physical Sciences	58.1	52.9	51.4	5.032 ^b
General Business	66.7	65.2	66.0	0.841
Specific Business	67.4	66.3	64.0	4.541 ^a

^aAn "F" ratio of 3.07 is required for significance at the .05 level for 2 and 125 degrees of freedom.

^bAn "F" ratio of 4.78 is required for significance at the .01 level for 2 and 125 degrees of freedom.

Analysis of Mean Scores Among Educators, Chief
Executive and Chief Personnel Officers
For Four Specific Curriculum Areas

When the same analysis was applied to the mean scores for Four Specific Curriculum areas, the results were completely different in that there was agreement in all areas except "planning and organizing." In Table 5, the "F" ratio for "planning and organizing" is significant at the .05 level. The null hypothesis for this area is rejected. However, all three groups rate this area "very or quite" important in the curriculum as measured on the scale. The difference is that educators place more emphasis on this study area. It is surprising that educators believe that planning and organizing is more important. On an a priori basis it would seem that chief executive officers would have had a much higher mean score for this particular area.

Analysis of Mean Scores Among Educators, Chief
Executive and Chief Personnel Officers
For Four Indicators for Success

The mean scores in Table 6 reflect the "slight" importance attached to "college grade point," "extracurricular activities," and "quality and prestige of college" attended by educators, chief executive officers, and chief personnel officers. The "F" ratios for these indicators are not significant at the .05 level indicating unanimity of agreement as to the importance of these indicators as predictors for success.

TABLE 5

MEAN SCORES, "F" RATIOS OF EDUCATORS, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICERS, AND CHIEF PERSONNEL OFFICERS FOR FOUR SPECIFIC CURRICULUM AREAS

Specific Curriculum Areas	Mean Scores			"F" Ratio
	Educators	Chief Executive Officers	Chief Personnel Officers	
General Hotel and Restaurant	63.2	64.6	64.5	0.333
Quantitative Controls	67.2	65.7	66.0	0.785
Planning and Organizing	65.9	63.3	61.9	3.156 ^a
Human Relations	65.3	64.9	66.9	0.960

^aSignificant at .05 level for 2 and 125 degrees of freedom.

TABLE 6

MEAN SCORES, "F" RATIOS OF EDUCATORS, CHIEF
EXECUTIVE OFFICERS, AND CHIEF PERSONNEL
OFFICERS FOR FOUR INDICATORS FOR
SUCCESS

Success Indicators	Mean Scores			"F" Ratio
	Educators	Chief Executive Officers	Chief Personnel Officers	
College Grade Point	51.2	48.5	49.5	.773
Extracurricular Activities	55.1	50.4	52.6	2.825
Personality Factors	60.8	60.8	61.0	0.006
Quality and Prestige of College	52.9	47.3	47.6	4.745 ^a

^aSignificant at .05 level for 2 and 125 degrees of freedom.

The three groups rate personality factors "very or quite" important. On an a priori basis one would expect personality factors to be "very" important in a "people oriented" business. The "F" ratio is not significant indicating agreement among the three groups.

Educators, chief executive officers, and chief personnel officers do not agree on the relative importance of quality and prestige of college. The "F" ratio is significant at the .05 level. The null hypothesis of no differences among the means is rejected. Educators attach more importance to quality and prestige of college attended. However, it should be noted that educators rate this indicator "slightly" important while chief executive officers and chief personnel officers rate it "little or no" importance.

Analysis of Mean Scores Between Chief Executive Officers and Chief Personnel Officers

Table 7 shows no significant "F" ratios between chief executive officers and chief personnel officers for the Four General Study Areas, the Four Specific Curriculum Areas, and Four Indicators for Success. The null hypothesis of no difference between the means is accepted. There is no difference in the attitudes held by chief executive officers and chief personnel officers toward these areas of concern. They are in agreement as to their relative

TABLE 7

MEAN SCORES, "F" RATIOS OF CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICERS AND CHIEF PERSONNEL OFFICERS FOR FIVE GENERAL STUDY AREAS, FOUR SPECIFIC CURRICULUM AREAS, AND FOUR INDICATORS FOR SUCCESS

Areas	Mean Scores		"F" Ratios ^a
	Chief Executive (N=41)	Chief Personnel (N=40)	
GENERAL STUDIES			
Social Sciences	48.6	48.8	0.006
Humanities	48.1	47.6	0.043
Physical Sciences	52.9	51.4	0.366
General Business	65.2	66.0	0.329
Specific Business	66.3	64.0	3.071
SPECIFIC CURRICULUM			
General Hotel and Restaurant	64.6	64.5	0.003
Quantitative Controls	65.7	66.0	0.048
Planning and Organizing	63.3	61.9	0.548
Human Relations	64.9	66.9	2.289
SUCCESS INDICATORS			
Grade Point Average	48.5	49.5	0.179
Extracurricular Activities	50.4	52.6	1.162
Personality Factors	60.8	61.0	0.012
Quality and Prestige of College	47.3	47.6	0.019

^aAn "F" ratio of 3.960 is required for significance at the .05 level for 1 and 79 degrees of freedom.

importance in the curriculum.

For example, they view social sciences and humanities as being of "little or no" importance in the curriculum. The average mean score for social sciences and humanities for the two groups is 48.6 and 47.8, whereas the mean scores for general and specific business areas between the two groups are 62.6 and 65.1.

Further inspection of the table reveals that the chief executive officers and chief personnel officers rate the Four Specific Curriculum Areas "very or quite" important. This clearly indicates their position as to the relative importance of social sciences, humanities, and physical sciences in the curriculum.

Analysis of Mean Scores Between Chief Executive
Officers and Chief Personnel Officers
Within Same Type of Firm

Industry personnel represented in this study included chief executive officers and chief personnel officers among eight types of firms. To determine if differences in attitudes existed between the officers within each type of firm toward the areas under study, an analysis of variance was made of their mean scores and standard deviations.

Table 8 shows no difference in the attitudes between chief executive officers and chief personnel officers among the eight types of firms for the Five General Study Areas. No "F" ratios are significant at the .05 level. The null hypothesis is accepted.

TABLE 8

"F" RATIOS OF MEAN SCORES BETWEEN CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICERS AND CHIEF PERSONNEL OFFICERS
WITHIN SAME TYPE OF FIRM FOR FIVE GENERAL STUDY AREAS

General Study Areas	Firms ^a							
	Diversified Food Service (1)	Franchise, Snack and Take-Out (2)	Restaurants and Cafeterias (3)	Full Line Services Management (4)	Trans- Hotel and portation Service (5)	General Retail- ing and Lodging (6)	Diversified Food Service and Lodging (8)	
Social Sciences	1.907	0.804	2.804	0.022	1.143	0.031	0.257	3.436
Humanities	0.056	0.852	0.304	0.042	2.940	0.057	0.095	0.631
Physical Sciences	0.126	0.113	0.330	0.369	0.118	2.362	0.018	0.268
General Business	0.010	0.097	0.634	0.006	0.716	2.576	0.030	0.053
Specific Business	0.016	0.762	0.626	0.090	1.075	2.477	1.450	0.000

^aAn "F" ratio of 3.99 is required for significance at the .05 level for 1 and 65 degrees of freedom.

^bC.E.O.

^cC.P.O.

N=5 N=3 N=3 N=5 N=10 N=4 N=7 N=4 N=4 N=6 N=2 N=7 N=4 N=4 N=6 N=6

In Table 9, chief executive officers and chief personnel officers for two firms disagree as to the importance of "human relations" in the curriculum. The "F" ratios of 6.599 and 4.632 are significant. However, it should be noted that the average mean score for "human relations" is 65.3. In this case, for firm six, Hotel and Motel Food Service, the chief executive officer's mean score is 57.0 and the chief personnel officer's mean score is 67.0 (see Tables 11 and 12). The chief personnel officers believe this curriculum area is "very or quite" important while chief executive officers believe it "slightly" important.

On the other hand, for firm seven, General Retailing, the chief executive officer's mean score is 68.0. The chief personnel officer's mean score is 58.5. Chief executive officers for firm seven feel more strongly toward this area. The null hypothesis of no difference in attitudes between officers of the two firms is rejected.

Two firms in Table 10 indicate a lack of agreement between the chief executive officers and the chief personnel officers for the Success Indicator "extracurricular activities" and "quality and prestige of college." The "F" ratios of 4.043 and 5.390 are significant. Chief personnel officers in firm eight, Diversified Food Service and Lodging, rate "extracurricular activities" "slightly" important. Their mean score is 57.7. The mean score for chief personnel officers is 43.8 indicating that they believe "extracurricular

TABLE 9

"F" RATIOS OF MEAN SCORES BETWEEN CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICERS AND CHIEF PERSONNEL OFFICERS WITHIN SAME TYPE OF FIRM FOR FOUR SPECIFIC CURRICULUM AREAS

Specific Curriculum Areas	Firms ^a							
	Diversified Food Service (1)	Franchise, Snack and Take-Out (2)	Restaurants and Cafeterias (3)	Full Line Services Management (4)	Trans-portation (5)	Hotel and Motel Food Service (6)	General Retailing (7)	Diversified Food Service and Lodging (8)
General Hotel and Restaurant	2.209	0.900	0.020	0.737	0.040	0.000	2.150	0.089
Quantitative Controls	0.599	1.021	0.153	0.525	0.152	1.233	3.188	0.627
Planning and Organizing	0.082	0.196	0.027	0.058	0.682	0.281	1.186	0.449
Human Relations	0.176	1.588	0.377	3.132	0.641	6.599 ^a	4.632 ^a	2.183

^aSignificant at .05 level for 1 and 65 degrees of freedom.

^bC.E.O. N=5 N=3 N=3 N=5 N=10 N=4 N=7 N=4

^cC.P.O. N=6 N=5 N=4 N=6 N=7 N=4 N=2 N=6

TABLE 10

"F" RATIOS OF MEAN SCORES BETWEEN CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICERS AND CHIEF PERSONNEL OFFICERS WITHIN SAME TYPE OF FIRM FOR FOUR INDICATORS FOR SUCCESS

Success Indicators ^a	Firms ^a							
	Diversified Food Service (1)	Franchise, Snack and Take-Out (2)	Restaurants and Cafeterias (3)	Full Line Services Management (4)	Transportation (5)	Hotel and Motel Food Service (6)	General Retailing (7)	Diversified Food Service and Lodging (8)
College Grade Point	1.310	0.116	0.061	0.143	1.809	2.544	0.009	0.975
Extracurricular Activities	0.877	0.132	0.997	0.922	0.075	0.052	3.645	5.390 ^b
Personality Factors	0.019	0.665	1.356	0.054	0.598	0.156	0.842	0.160
Quality and Prestige of College	2.527	4.043 ^a	0.738	0.060	0.684	0.197	0.037	0.365

^aSignificant at .05 level for 1 and 65 degrees of freedom.

^bC.E.O. N=5

N=3

N=3

N=5

N=10

N=4

N=7

N=4

^cC.P.O. N=6

N=5

N=4

N=6

N=7

N=4

N=2

N=6

activities" is of "little or no" importance.

Chief executive officers in firm two, Franchise, Snack and Take-Out, rate "quality and prestige of college" "slightly" important (55.7). Chief personnel officers rate it "little or no" importance (42.8). The null hypothesis of no difference in attitude toward these study areas between chief executive officers and chief personnel officers is rejected.

Tables 11 and 12 list the mean scores and standard deviations of chief executive officers and chief personnel officers.

Analysis of Mean Scores of Chief Executive Officers Among the Eight Types of Firms

Table 13 indicates no significant difference among mean scores of chief executive officers for the eight types of firms. The null hypothesis of no difference in attitudes among the chief executive officers is accepted. Evidently the chief executive officers are in agreement as to the relative importance of the Five General Study Areas, the Four Specific Curriculum Areas, and the Four Indicators for Success (see Table 11).

Analysis of Mean Scores of Chief Personnel Officers Among the Eight Types of Firms

An analysis of mean scores of chief personnel officers among the eight types of firms indicates that they are in

TABLE 11

MEAN SCORES, STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICERS FOR EIGHT TYPES OF FIRMS^a

	Firms								Means (SD)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	
	Diversified Food Service	Franchise, Snack and Take-Out	Restaurants and Cafeterias	Full Line Services Management	Transportation	Hotel and Motel Food Service	General Retailing	Diversified Food Service and Lodging	
GENERAL STUDIES									
Social Sciences	54.8	36.7	37.0	49.6	54.1	48.0	48.4	44.5	46.6 (12.2)
Humanities	50.2	39.0	41.0	54.2	53.6	51.8	44.4	39.3	46.8 (12.8)
Physical Sciences	52.6	51.7	57.4	53.6	54.5	51.7	51.7	49.0	52.7 (12.2)
General Business	64.8	63.0	62.0	67.2	68.0	63.0	63.1	66.3	64.7 (6.9)
Specific Business	65.2	68.7	66.7	65.4	67.1	68.8	65.9	62.8	66.3 (5.0)
SPECIFIC CURRICULUM									
General Hotel & Restaurant	61.6	68.0	67.0	64.4	64.4	63.8	68.1	59.0	64.5 (6.3)
Quantitative Controls	63.2	68.3	70.0	63.4	66.0	62.5	69.6	62.3	65.7 (6.3)
Planning & Organizing	61.0	64.0	66.3	63.4	64.1	62.0	65.6	58.3	63.1 (7.1)
Human Relations	69.4	63.3	64.7	63.6	65.6	57.0	68.0	63.3	64.4 (7.0)
SUCCESS INDICATORS									
Grade Point Average	52.4	50.3	48.3	53.0	44.1	47.8	49.3	47.5	49.1 (10.2)
Extracurricular Activities	55.6	53.7	48.7	54.4	48.6	54.3	47.3	43.8	50.8 (9.2)
Personality Factors	63.0	57.0	68.7	64.2	59.5	60.0	59.6	56.8	61.1 (7.9)
Quality & Prestige of College	47.4	55.7	34.0	49.2	50.0	47.0	46.9	42.8	46.6 (9.4)

^aRounded to nearest whole number.

TABLE 12

MEAN SCORES, STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF CHIEF PERSONNEL OFFICERS FOR EIGHT TYPES OF FIRMS^a

	Firms								Means (SD)
	(1) Diversified Food Service	(2) Franchise, Snack and Take-out	(3) Restaurants and Cafeterias	(4) Full Line Services Management	(5) Transportation	(6) Hotel and Motel Food Service	(7) General Retailing	(8) Diversified Food Service and Lodging	
GENERAL STUDIES									(9)
Social Sciences	44.7	44.6	52.5	48.5	47.7	46.5	43.5	59.0	48.4 (12.4)
Humanities	48.5	47.0	46.0	55.7	43.6	49.8	41.5	45.3	47.2 (10.9)
Physical Sciences	55.2	54.6	45.8	53.0	51.6	41.5	53.0	53.0	50.9 (10.4)
General Business	65.2	64.4	65.8	67.5	65.4	70.0	64.0	65.3	65.9 (4.8)
Specific Business	65.7	64.8	63.0	66.5	64.0	62.0	60.0	62.7	63.6 (6.5)
SPECIFIC CURRICULUM									
General Hotel & Restaurant	67.8	63.2	66.3	68.0	63.0	63.8	60.0	60.3	64.1 (7.4)
Quantitative Controls	66.3	63.4	68.0	66.3	67.3	67.8	60.0	65.7	65.6 (6.7)
Planning & Organizing	62.5	61.2	65.3	64.7	60.6	58.8	58.0	62.0	61.6 (9.1)
Human Relations	68.0	68.4	67.3	69.5	63.4	67.0	58.5	68.5	66.3 (4.5)
SUCCESS INDICATORS									
Grade Point Average	45.3	47.8	50.3	55.3	50.9	52.3	48.5	41.0	49.8 (11.6)
Extracurricular Activities	50.3	51.2	55.8	49.0	49.9	52.8	61.5	57.7	53.5 (9.2)
Personality Factors	63.7	61.8	61.5	65.3	56.4	57.8	65.5	58.8	61.4 (7.7)
Quality & Prestige of College	55.8	42.8	39.8	50.5	46.4	49.8	45.5	46.2	47.1 (9.1)

^a Rounded to nearest whole number.

agreement as to the relative importance of all areas except for the Specific Curriculum Area of "human relations." The "F" ratio for "human relations" is significant at the .05 level. Chief personnel officers are not in complete agreement as to the importance of this subject matter (see Table 13). Inspection of Table 12 shows that the average mean score for "human relations" is 66.3. Chief personnel officers for firm seven, General Retailing, rate this curriculum area "slightly" important (58.5), while the other personnel officers rate this curriculum area "very or quite" important. Their mean scores range from 63.4 to 69.5. The null hypothesis of no difference in attitudes among chief personnel officers for this area is rejected.

Analysis of Mean Scores Among Eight Types of Firms for
Five General Study Areas, Four Specific Curriculum
Areas, and Four Indicators for Success

An analysis of the mean scores for the eight types of firms (Tables 15, 16 and 17), indicates that they are in general agreement for all areas of study except for "quality and prestige of college." In Table 14, the "F" ratio (2.150) is just significant at the .05 level. The null hypothesis of no difference in attitudes among firms is rejected for this area. Once again, the difference is the importance each firm attaches to this indicator. The mean scores for "quality and prestige of college" range from 39.9 ("slightly" unimportant) to 51.6 ("slightly" important). (See Table 17.)

TABLE 13

"F" RATIOS FOR CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICERS AND CHIEF PERSONNEL OFFICERS AMONG EIGHT TYPES OF FIRMS FOR FIVE GENERAL STUDY AREAS, FOUR SPECIFIC CURRICULUM AREAS, AND FOUR INDICATORS FOR SUCCESS

Areas	Chief Executive Officers	Chief Personnel Officers
GENERAL STUDIES		
Social Sciences	1.45	0.875
Humanities	1.24	0.745
Physical Sciences	0.16	0.887
General Business	0.55	0.631
Specific Business	0.58	0.364
SPECIFIC CURRICULUM		
General Hotel and Restaurant	1.14	0.781
Quantitative Controls	1.21	0.416
Planning and Organizing	0.54	0.264
Human Relations	1.43	2.843 ^a
SUCCESS INDICATORS		
Grade Point Average	0.70	1.286
Extracurricular Activities	0.98	0.867
Personality Factors	0.82	1.010
Quality and Prestige of College	1.64	1.689

^aAn "F" ratio of 2.32 is required for significance at the .05 level for Chief Personnel Officers for 7 and 32 degrees of freedom.

TABLE 14

"F" RATIOS OF MEAN SCORES AMONG EIGHT TYPES OF FIRMS FOR FIVE GENERAL STUDY AREAS, FOUR SPECIFIC CURRICULUM AREAS, AND FOUR INDICATORS FOR SUCCESS

Areas	Eight Firms ^a
GENERAL STUDY	
Social Sciences	0.802
Humanities	1.413
Physical Sciences	0.392
General Business	0.518
Specific Business	0.457
SPECIFIC CURRICULUM	
General Hotel and Restaurant	0.895
Quantitative Controls	0.457
Planning and Organizing	0.375
Human Relations	1.287
SUCCESS INDICATORS	
Grade Point Average	0.965
Extracurricular Activities	0.338
Personality Factors	1.427
Quality and Prestige of College	2.150 ^a

^aAn "F" ratio of 2.15 is required for significance at the .05 level for 7 and 65 degrees of freedom.

TABLE 15

MEAN SCORES, STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR EIGHT TYPES OF FIRMS FOR FIVE GENERAL STUDY AREAS^a

Firms	Study				
	Social Sciences	Humanities	Physical Sciences	General Business	Specific Business
1. Diversified Food Service	49.7	49.4	53.9	65.0	65.4
2. Franchise, Snack and Take-Out	40.6	43.0	53.1	63.7	66.7
3. Restaurants and Cafeterias	44.8	43.5	48.4	63.9	64.8
4. Full Line and Food Services Management	49.1	54.9	55.2	67.4	66.0
5. Transportation (Airlines)	50.9	48.6	52.6	66.7	65.6
6. Hotel and Motel Food Service	47.3	50.8	48.0	66.5	65.4
7. General Retailing	46.0	43.0	52.4	63.6	62.9
8. Diversified Food Service and Lodging	51.8	42.3	51.0	65.8	62.7
Mean	47.5	46.9	51.8	65.3	64.9
SD	(12.2)	(11.8)	(11.3)	(5.9)	(5.8)

^aRounded to nearest whole number.

TABLE 16

MEAN SCORES, STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR EIGHT TYPES OF FIRMS FOR FOUR SPECIFIC CURRICULUM AREAS^a

Firms	General Hotel Restaurant	Quantitative Controls	Planning and Organizing	Human Relations
1. Diversified Food Service	64.7	64.4	61.8	68.7
2. Franchise, Snack and Take-Out	65.6	65.9	62.6	65.9
3. Restaurants and Cafeterias	66.6	69.0	65.8	66.0
4. Full Line Food Services Management	66.2	64.9	64.0	66.6
5. Transportation (Airlines)	64.1	66.6	62.3	64.5
6. Hotel and Motel Food Service	63.8	65.1	60.4	62.0
7. General Retailing	64.1	64.8	61.8	63.3
8. Diversified Food Service and Lodging	59.7	64.0	60.1	57.8
Mean	64.3	65.6	62.3	65.3
SD	(6.8)	(6.5)	(8.1)	(5.9)

^aRounded to nearest whole number.

TABLE 17

MEAN SCORES, STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR EIGHT TYPES OF FIRMS FOR FOUR SUCCESS INDICATORS^a

Firms	Grade Point Average	Extra-Curricular Activities	Personality Factors	Quality and Prestige of College
1. Diversified Food Service	48.9	52.7	63.3	51.6
2. Franchise, Snack and Take-Out	49.1	52.4	59.4	49.2
3. Restaurants and Cafeterias	49.3	52.2	65.2	36.9
4. Full Line Food Services Management	54.2	51.7	64.8	49.9
5. Transportation (Airlines)	47.5	49.2	58.0	48.2
6. Hotel and Motel Food Service	53.5	53.5	58.9	48.4
7. General Retailing	48.9	54.4	62.5	46.2
8. Diversified Food Service and Lodging	44.3	50.7	57.8	44.5
Mean	49.4	52.1	61.2	46.9
SD	(10.2)	(9.2)	(7.9)	(9.2)

^aRounded to nearest whole number.

The average mean scores again point out that "social sciences, humanities, and physical sciences" are considered least important in the curriculum by the eight firms; whereas "general and specific business areas" and the Four Specific Curriculum Areas are considered "very" important.

Analysis of Mean Scores Among Educators for Six Schools for
Five General Study Areas, Four Specific Curriculum Areas,
and Four Indicators for Success

Mean scores for educators of the six schools in the study are listed in Table 18. The "F" ratios in Table 19 are not significant at the .05 level. The null hypothesis of no difference among the means is accepted. Overall, educators are in general agreement as to the relative importance of the Five General Study Areas, the Four Specific Curriculum Areas, and the Four Indicators for Success.

However, inspection of Table 18 reveals differences in the intensity of importance of the areas under study among the educators. For example, the educators representing Denver University do not believe "social sciences, humanities, and physical sciences" are as important in the curriculum as do the educators from Florida State University. Florida State rates these areas "very" important while Denver rates them "slightly" important.

It is interesting to note that "college grade point" is rated lowest by the educator among the Four Indicators

TABLE 18
 MEAN SCORES, STANDARD DEVIATIONS AMONG EDUCATORS FOR SIX SCHOOLS^a

Areas	Cornell (N=19)	Univ. of Massa- chusetts (N=8)	Michigan State Univ. (N=6)	Denver Univ. (N=3)	Pennsyl- vania State Univ. (N=8)	Florida State Univ. (N=3)	Means (SD)
GENERAL STUDIES							
Social Sciences	55.4	59.8	61.7	51.0	59.3	60.0	57.8 (8.3)
Humanities	51.5	50.4	53.5	51.3	56.1	63.3	54.4 (9.5)
Physical Sciences	58.2	60.4	57.3	57.3	54.8	63.0	58.5 (8.7)
General Business	67.4	65.6	67.5	67.3	65.7	66.7	66.7 (4.7)
Specific Business	68.1	66.0	68.7	68.7	64.6	70.0	67.7 (4.2)
SPECIFIC CURRICULUM							
General Hotel & Restaurant	63.6	63.3	63.0	65.7	61.4	63.3	63.4 (11.2)
Quantitative Controls	68.5	65.3	66.5	68.0	65.0	70.0	67.2 (4.2)
Planning & Organizing	66.2	64.4	69.3	64.3	64.1	67.0	65.9 (6.2)
Human Relations	63.7	65.8	67.2	64.7	65.5	70.0	66.1 (8.3)
SUCCESS INDICATORS							
Grade Point Average	50.5	52.6	54.5	47.7	49.1	55.0	51.6 (10.5)
Extracurricular Activities	54.3	55.6	52.5	54.0	57.1	59.3	55.5 (9.2)
Personality Factors	62.5	61.5	51.0	63.7	59.5	68.3	61.1 (10.4)
Quality & Prestige of College	55.1	52.9	51.0	55.0	44.4	63.7	53.7 (10.4)

^a Rounded to nearest whole number.

TABLE 19

"F" RATIOS OF MEAN SCORES AMONG EDUCATORS OF SIX SCHOOLS FOR FIVE GENERAL STUDY AREAS, FOUR SPECIFIC CURRICULUM AREAS, AND FOUR INDICATORS FOR SUCCESS

Areas	Educators of Six Schools ^a
GENERAL STUDIES	
Social Sciences	1.194
Humanities	1.132
Physical Sciences	0.522
General Business	0.267
Specific Business	1.461
SPECIFIC CURRICULUM	
General Hotel and Restaurant	0.069
Quantitative Controls	1.552
Planning and Organizing	0.647
Human Relations	0.370
SUCCESS INDICATORS	
Grade Point Average	0.348
Extracurricular Activities	0.318
Personality Factors	1.679
Quality and Prestige of College	2.223

^aAn "F" ratio of 2.43 is required for significance at the .05 level for 5 and 41 degrees of freedom.

for Success. On an a priori basis, it would seem that educators would consider "college grade point" more important than "extracurricular activities" or "quality and prestige of college" attended. The results indicate that educators believe "personality factors" is the most important indicator for success.

Preferred Course Area Concentration

Educators, chief executive officers, and chief personnel officers were asked to select one of the six course area concentration which they believed would best prepare a student for an executive level position in the hotel and restaurant industry.

Table 20 indicates the percentage of response among educators, chief executive officers and chief personnel officers regarding the best course area concentration. Sixty-six percent (66 percent) of educators, 54 percent of chief executive officers, and 75 percent of chief personnel officers prefer an educational background that consists of approximately one-half hotel and restaurant administration subjects and one-half general business subjects with a modest scattering of liberal arts subjects.

The next most preferred area of concentration is approximately one-half basic liberal arts and one-half general business subjects with a modest scattering of hotel and restaurant administration subjects. Twenty-three percent

TABLE 20

COURSE AREA CONCENTRATION PREFERRED BY EDUCATORS, CHIEF
EXECUTIVE AND CHIEF PERSONNEL OFFICERS

Course Area Concentration Preferred for Students Ex- pecting to Reach Executive Level in the Industry	Percentage of Respondents ^a		
	Educa- tors	Chief Executive Officers	Chief Personnel Officers
Exclusive liberal arts background e.g., English, philosophy, sci- ence, mathematics, modern lan- guage and related subjects.	2	5	0
Exclusive general business subject background, e.g., principles and theories of organization, man- agement, economics, and related subjects.	0	5	2
Approximately one-half basic lib- eral arts and one-half general business subjects with a modest scattering of hotel and restau- rant administration subjects.	23	24	15
Substantial hotel and restaurant administration specialization in one or two areas at the expense of basic liberal arts courses.	6	8	2
Substantial hotel and restaurant administration specialization in one or two areas at the expense of general business courses.	2	0	2
Approximately one-half hotel and restaurant administration sub- jects and one-half general busi- ness subjects with a modest scattering of liberal arts sub- jects.	66	54	75
Others	0	2	5

^aRounded to nearest whole number.

(23 percent) of educators, 24 percent of chief executive officers, and 15 percent of chief personnel officers prefer this area.

There appears to be a controversy between the chief executive and chief personnel officers regarding the best area of concentration. A much larger percentage of chief personnel officers (74 percent) prefer the course area concentration of one-half hotel and restaurant administration subjects and one-half general business subjects with a modest scattering of liberal arts subjects. Only 54 percent of chief executive officers prefer this area. The results tend to support Whyte's observation that American business leaders keep crying out for well rounded liberally trained college graduates--generalists rather than specialists--while their personnel recruiters keep demanding and hiring more specialists.¹

Further inspection of Table 20 reveals that the three groups do not believe that an exclusive liberal arts or general business background, or substantial specialization in hotel and restaurant administration is of much value to a student aspiring to executive positions in the hotel and restaurant industry.

Their opinions on course area of concentration can be

¹William H. Whyte, Jr., The Organization Man (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Co., 1956), p. 101.

attributed to the educational backgrounds of the respondents (see Table 21). The dominant areas of educational concentration for the three groups reporting is hotel, restaurant, and business administration.

Educational Level of Respondents

A comparison was made of the educational level of respondents at the start of their teaching or business careers with education completed as of August 31, 1971.

Table 21 shows the level of education for educators, chief executive officers, and chief personnel officers at the start of teaching or business careers. Eighty-one percent (81 percent) of all educators responding had a bachelor's or higher degree at the start of their teaching careers. Sixty percent (60 percent) of all chief executive officers responding had a bachelor's or higher degree, while 66 percent of chief personnel officers had a bachelor's or higher degree at the start of their business careers.

Educators report the highest percentage having master's degrees (19 percent) and earned doctorates (15 percent). Five percent (5 percent) of chief executive officers and 3 percent of chief personnel officers report having a doctorate.

As of August 31, 1971, 99 percent of educators had a bachelor's or higher degree. Thirty percent (30 percent)

TABLE 21
 EDUCATIONAL LEVEL AT START OF TEACHING OR
 BUSINESS CAREERS

Educational Level	Percentage of Respondents ^a		
	Educators	Chief Executive Officers	Chief Personnel Officers
Had not attended college	15	20	5
Attended college but had received no degree	4	20	25
Earned an associate's degree	0	0	5
Earned a bachelor's degree	38	50	45
Began work toward an advanced degree	9	5	13
Earned a master's degree	19	0	5
Earned a doctor's degree	15	5	3

^aRounded to nearest whole number.

report having a master's degree and 43 percent report having a doctorate. Chief executive officers and chief personnel officers show no increase in advanced degrees. However, 81 percent of chief executive officers and 71 percent of chief personnel officers report having a bachelor's degree (see Table 22).

Educators show the highest increase (60 percent) in educational level after the start of their teaching careers. Thirty-two percent (32 percent) of all chief executive officers reporting indicate an increase in their educational level while 18 percent of chief personnel officers responding show an increase in educational level after the start of their business careers.

The high increase in educational level for educators can be attributed to the demands placed on them for advanced degrees in higher education. The increase in educational level for chief executive officers may be an indication of the importance placed on continuous higher education in executive development.

Areas of Educational Concentration of Respondents

Table 23 indicates the areas of educational concentration of educators, chief executive officers, and chief personnel officers. Hotel, restaurant, and business administration are the dominant areas of educational concentration for all three groups reporting.

TABLE 2?
 EDUCATIONAL LEVEL AS OF AUGUST 31, 1971

Educational Level	Percentage of Respondents ^a		
	Educators	Chief Executive Officers	Chief Personnel Officers
Had not attended college	0	8	0
Attended college but had received no degree	2	13	23
Earned an associate's degree	0	0	8
Earned a bachelor's degree	9	53	35
Began work toward an advanced degree	17	23	28
Earned a master's degree	30	0	5
Earned a doctor's degree	43	5	3

^aRounded to nearest whole number.

TABLE 23

AREA OF EDUCATIONAL CONCENTRATION FOR EDUCATORS, CHIEF
EXECUTIVE OFFICERS, AND CHIEF PERSONNEL OFFICERS

Educational Concentration	Percentage of Respondents ^a		
	Educators	Chief Executive Officers	Chief Personnel Officers
Hotel and Restaurant Administration	25	29	18
Business	11	24	42
Liberal Arts	4	15	20
Combination	40	15	18
Others	20	7	2

^aRounded to nearest whole number.

Thirty-five percent (35 percent) of educators indicate concentrating their studies in hotel, restaurant, and business. Forty percent (40 percent) report concentrating their studies in two or more areas.

Fifty-three percent (53 percent) of the chief executive officers report educational concentration in hotel, restaurant, and business areas. The chief executive officers are about evenly divided between hotel and restaurant administration (29 percent) and business areas (24 percent).

Chief personnel officers, on the other hand, show the highest percentage (42 percent) of educational concentration in the business areas. Only 18 percent report concentrating their studies in hotel and restaurant administration. Twenty

percent (20 percent) indicate concentration in the liberal arts. Yet, chief personnel officers represent the largest of the three groups agreeing that curriculum content consist of approximately one-half hotel and restaurant administration, one-half general business subjects, and a modest scattering of liberal arts subjects (see Table 22).

Evaluation of Objectives of Undergraduate Schools of Hotel and Restaurant Administration

Table 24 shows the percentage evaluation of objectives of undergraduate schools of hotel and restaurant administration by educators, chief executive officers, and chief personnel officers. However, the trend of acceptance given as either "essential or desirable" is somewhat similar.

The development of effective communication skills is ranked first by 87 percent of the educators and 78 percent of the chief personnel officers reporting. It is ranked third by 83 percent of the chief executive officers. Eighty-eight percent (88 percent) of the chief executive officers rank first the development of qualities such as creative thinking, inspiration, and initiative. It is ranked fourth by 75 percent of the educators and ninth by 63 percent of the chief personnel officers.

Eighty-one percent (81 percent) of educators rank second the development of analytical and problem-solving abilities as an essential objective of undergraduate

TABLE 24

EVALUATION OF OBJECTIVES OF UNDERGRADUATE SCHOOLS OF HOTEL AND RESTAURANT ADMINISTRATION

Educational Objective	Percentage of Respondents									
	Educators			Chief Executive Officers			Chief Personnel Officers			N ^a
	E	D	N	E	D	N	E	D	N	
Provide professional or vocational competence for initial employment in the hotel and restaurant industry	51	40	9	27	63	10	50	43	7	
Development of analytical and problem solving abilities	81	19	-	71	27	2	63	30	7	
Development of personal, moral and ethical values	68	21	11	76	17	7	68	30	2	
Development of competence in both verbal and written communication	87	13	-	83	15	2	78	22	-	
Development of a sound and comprehensive knowledge of general hotel and restaurant administration principles and theory	70	26	4	46	52	2	63	35	2	
Development of a sound and comprehensive knowledge of general business principles and theory	68	32	-	61	37	2	65	33	2	
Educating students for industry positions of vice-president and above	13	45	42	5	29	66	5	15	80	8
Development of understanding concerning human behavior	72	26	2	78	22	-	78	22	-	

TABLE 2.4-- Continued

Educational Objective	Percentage of Respondents											
	Educators			Chief Executive Officers			Chief Personnel Officers			N ^a		
	E	D	N	E	D	N	E	D	N	E	D	N
Instruction and training in current hotel and restaurant administration practices	57	32	11	41	49	10	58	42	-			
Provide a minimal exposure to the skills and knowledge of the hotel and restaurant industry	54	21	25	51	39	10	68	17	15			
Development and understanding concerning human behavior	77	23	-	78	20	2	68	32	-			
Educating students for industry positions of junior executives	49	36	15	29	52	19	28	40	32			
Development of the ability to cope with human emotions in order to get results	72	21	7	83	17	-	75	18	7			
Instill knowledge, cultivate intellectual skills, and cultivate traits of personality and character	55	26	19	54	36	10	53	33	14			
Development of advanced management techniques such as linear programming, operations research, queuing theory, Monte Carlo techniques, and the Domino theory	13	64	23	10	29	61	5	32	63			
Development of qualities such as loyalty, maturity, enthusiasm and persistence	55	23	22	61	34	5	63	17	20			
Development of qualities such as creative thinking, inspiration and initiative	72	15	13	88	12	-	63	20	17			

^a(E) Essential, (D) Desirable but not necessary, (N) Uncertain and No opinion.

education. It is ranked sixth by 71 percent of the chief executive officers and eighth by 63 percent of the chief personnel officers reporting.

The development of the ability to cope with human emotions in order to get results is ranked fifth by 72 percent of educators, second by 83 percent of chief executive officers, and third by 75 percent of chief personnel officers.

The development of personal, moral and ethical values is ranked eighth by educators (68 percent) and fifth by chief executive officers (76 percent) and chief personnel officers (68 percent).

The development of a sound and comprehensive knowledge of general hotel and restaurant administration principles and theory is ranked sixth by 70 percent of educators, eleventh by 46 percent of chief executive officers, and seventh by 63 percent of chief personnel officers. The development of a sound and comprehensive knowledge of general business principles is ranked seventh by educators (68 percent), seventh by chief executive officers (61 percent), and sixth by chief personnel officers (68 percent).

Instruction and training in current hotel and restaurant administration practices is ranked ninth by 57 percent of educators, twelfth by 41 percent of chief executive officers, and eleventh by 58 percent of chief personnel officers. To provide professional or vocational competence

for initial employment in the hotel and restaurant industry is ranked thirteenth by educators (51 percent) and chief personnel officers (50 percent). It is ranked thirteenth by chief executive officers (50 percent).

Educating students for industry positions of junior executives is ranked fourteenth by 49 percent of educators and 28 percent of chief personnel officers. It is ranked thirteenth by 29 percent of chief executive officers.

The development of advanced management techniques is ranked sixteenth by 13 percent of educators and 5 percent of chief personnel officers. It is ranked fifteenth by 10 percent of chief executive officers.

Relative Ranking of Essential Educational Objectives of Undergraduate Education

Table 25 indicates the relative ranking of educational objectives of undergraduate schools of hotel and restaurant administration that are deemed essential by educators, chief executive officers, and chief personnel officers. The first number after the objective refers to the educators, the second number to the chief executive officers, and the third number to the chief personnel officers.

The development of effective communication skills is ranked first by educators and chief personnel officers. It is ranked third by chief executive officers. The development of qualities such as creative thinking, inspiration, and

TABLE 25

RANKING OF ESSENTIAL EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES OF SCHOOLS OF
HOTEL AND RESTAURANT ADMINISTRATION

Educational Objectives	Order of Ranking		
	Educators	Chief Executive Officers	Chief Personnel Officers
1. The development of competence in both verbal and written communication	1	3	1
2. The development of analytical and problem solving abilities	2	6	8
3. The development and understanding concerning human behavior	3	4	3
4. The development of qualities such as creative thinking, inspiration, and initiative	4	1	9
5. The development of the ability to cope with human emotions in order to get results	5	2	3
6. The development of a sound and comprehensive knowledge of general hotel and restaurant administration principles and theory	6	7	6
7. The development of a sound and comprehensive knowledge of general business principles and theory	7	11	6
8. The development of personal moral and ethical values	8	5	2

TABLE 25--Continued

Educational Objectives	Order of Ranking		
	Educators	Chief Executive Officers	Chief Personnel Officers
9. Instruction and training in current hotel and restaurant administration practices	9	12	11
10. The development of qualities such as loyalty, maturity, enthusiasm and persistence	10	8	10
11. To instill knowledge, cultivate intellectual skills, and cultivate traits of personality and character	11	9	12
12. Provide a minimal exposure to the skills and knowledge of the hotel and restaurant industry	12	10	4
13. Provide professional or vocational competence for initial employment in the hotel and restaurant industry	13	14	13
14. Educating students for industry positions of junior executives	14	13	14
15. Educating students for industry positions of vice-president and above	15	16	15
16. The development of advanced management techniques	16	15	16

initiative is ranked first by chief executive officers. It is ranked fourth by educators and tenth by chief personnel officers.

The development of analytical and problem solving abilities is ranked second by educators, sixth by chief executive officers, and ninth by chief personnel officers. The development and understanding concerning human behavior is ranked third by educators, fourth by chief executive officers, and second by chief personnel officers.

The development of the ability to cope with human emotions in order to get results is ranked fifth by educators, second by chief executive officers, and third by chief personnel officers.

The development of a sound and comprehensive knowledge of general hotel and restaurant administration principles and theory is ranked sixth by educators, eleventh by chief executive officers, and seventh by chief personnel officers. The development of a sound and comprehensive knowledge of general business principles is ranked seventh by educators, seventh by chief executive officers, and sixth by chief personnel officers.

Instruction and training in current hotel and restaurant administration practices is ranked ninth by educators, twelfth by chief executive officers, and eleventh by chief personnel officers. To provide professional or vocational competence for initial employment in the hotel and restaurant

industry is ranked thirteenth by educators and chief personnel officers. It is ranked fourteenth by chief executive officers.

Educating students for industry positions of junior executives is ranked fourteenth by educators and chief personnel officers. It is ranked thirteenth by chief executive officers.

The development of advanced management techniques is sixteenth by educators and chief personnel officers. It is ranked fifteenth by chief executive officers.

Respondents' Comments Concerning the State of Higher Education for the Hotel and Restaurant Industry

The respondents were offered an open end question to add any information, favorable or unfavorable, they considered pertinent to the subject of higher education for the hotel and restaurant industry. While reactions and comments of educators, chief executive officers, and chief personnel officers do not provide an exact evaluation of the state of higher education for the hotel and restaurant industry, they do provide a good indication of what might be wrong.

The comments of educators, chief executive officers, and chief personnel officers regarding the state of higher education are incorporated in the appendix. (See Appendix E.) A brief summary of the comments follows.

There appears to be some agreement among educators

that formal training in hotel and restaurant administration is helpful in preparing students for entry into the hotel and restaurant industry. However, some felt that formal hotel and restaurant administration courses were not the essential ingredient for success. They stated that attitude, motivation, and the desire to work were perhaps more important. A few educators expressed their beliefs that liberal arts subjects were necessary to round out the student's education.

In the opinion of one educator, a person with drive and high intelligence would be successful in the hotel and restaurant industry regardless of his major. Another educator expressed his opinion that the industry does not need an individual of the high "S.A.T." type. According to this educator, what is needed is a person who wants to work and lead people in the industry.

There was some concern among a few educators toward the highly specialized courses offered in hotel and restaurant administration schools. Some educators expressed their opinion in regard to the type of curriculum needed today. They suggested the blending of hotel, liberal arts, and business courses that would encourage the student to develop "creative thinking."

From the opinions expressed by the educators, success in the industry can come from a number of ways. Although practical experience was mentioned by some educators, it

seems that the success of a student graduating from a hotel and restaurant administration school is based on the assumptions that he needs to have an understanding of what the industry is about, know some vocational skills, and understand concepts so that he can advance in his job when the opportunity arises.

Among the chief executives, some agreed that a general or liberal education is important for hotel and restaurant administration students. One chief executive expressed the opinion that the specific skills related to the hotel and restaurant industry can be learned on the job in three to six months. However, many of the chief executives stressed the importance of teaching hotel and restaurant administration majors that all management does not exist at the executive or administrative level. Hotel and restaurant administration students should understand that few, if any, will start their careers in the upper levels of management. The possession of a hotel and restaurant administration degree does not provide immediate access to executive positions. The hotel and restaurant graduate must work long hours in the lower levels of management. Promotions are earned through application of one's abilities and potential.

Many chief executives indicated the need for students to improve their ability to communicate both orally and in writing. The chief executives also stressed the importance

of developing human relation skills in students to the extent that these skills can be developed in college.

Some personnel officers agreed on the importance of a broad or general education for hotel and restaurant administration students. However, there was substantial agreement among the personnel officers of the importance of practical experience. They indicated that hotel and restaurant administration graduates lack the practical experience to do the job successfully.

They say in effect that practical learning situations and basic understanding of the functional jobs in industry are important if the student is to do the job successfully.

Personnel officers expressed some concern that hotel and restaurant administration graduates come out of college looking for a position with a large salary and a title without realizing that they must start from the bottom up. They say the possession of an academic degree is important. However, it is not an inviolable guarantee of promotion. Initiative, motivation, ambition, common sense, and the ability to thrive under pressure seem to be the major attributes a student must have to get ahead in the industry.

Personnel officers stressed the importance of developing human relation skills. A good understanding of human relations and the ability to handle the human aspect of management are key factors for determining success in hotel and restaurant management.

C H A P T E R V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

How do educators and industry representatives view the present state of higher education for the hotel and restaurant industry? Are the attitudes and opinions regarding the relative importance of Five General Study Areas, Four Specific Curriculum Areas, and Four Indicators used as predictors for success consistent and compatible among educators, chief executive officers, and chief personnel officers? How do the three groups view the importance of basic liberal arts courses in undergraduate education for the hotel and restaurant industry? What recommendations do educators, chief executive officers, and chief personnel officers suggest for improvement of higher education for the hotel and restaurant industry? These were the questions which prompted this study.

The twofold purpose of this study was to make an:

1. Investigation of the opinions and attitudes held by educators, chief executive officers, and chief personnel officers toward higher education for the hotel and restaurant industry, to determine the extent of the "within-group" and the "among groups" agreement in the following areas:
 - a. Relative importance of five general study areas usually required of hotel and restaurant administration majors on the undergraduate level, e.g., social sciences, humanities, physical sciences, general business subjects, and specific business subjects.

- b. Relative importance of four specific curriculum areas usually required of hotel and restaurant administration majors on the undergraduate level, e.g., general hotel and restaurant subjects, quantitative hotel and restaurant subjects, specific hotel and restaurant subjects, and specific subjects in personnel management.
 - c. Relative importance of four indicators frequently used to rate hotel and restaurant administration graduates for positions in the industry, e.g., college grade point average, extracurricular activities, personality factors, and quality and prestige of college attended.
 - d. Relative importance of basic liberal arts or general education in undergraduate education for the hotel and restaurant industry.
2. Investigation of educational backgrounds and opinions of respondents which include:
- a. Educational level and educational concentration of respondents.
 - b. Evaluation of representative objectives of undergraduate education for the hotel and restaurant industry.
 - c. Specific comments and recommendations for improvement of higher education for the hotel and restaurant industry.

The population for the study included forty-seven educators, forty-one chief executive officers, and forty chief personnel officers. The educators were selected from the six major senior colleges offering a degree in hotel and restaurant administration listed by Fast Foods Journal.¹

The chief executive and chief personnel officers were

¹Fast Foods, op. cit., p. 98.

selected from the major commercial hotel and restaurant firms listed in Institutions' annual directory of the 400 largest hotel, restaurant, and institutional organizations in the United States for the year 1970.²

The three groups were in general agreement as to the relative importance of "specific business" in the curriculum; however, educators attach more importance to this study area. There was a difference in attitudes among the three groups; therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Educators, chief executive officers, and chief personnel officers were in agreement as to the relative importance of "general business" studies. The "F" ratio was not significant. This part of the null hypothesis was accepted.

The null hypothesis for the Specific Curriculum Areas, "general hotel and restaurant," "quantitative controls," and "human relations" was accepted. No "F" ratios were significant. Evidently, the attitudes of educators, chief executive officers, and chief personnel officers toward these curriculum areas are similar. The "F" ratio for "planning and organizing" was significant at the .05 level. Although the three groups believe "planning and organizing" subjects were important, once again, educators believe this curriculum area was more important than either the chief

²"Institutions 400," op. cit., p. 87.

executive officers or personnel officers believe it to be. The null hypothesis was rejected.

"F" ratios for "college grade point," "extracurricular activities," and "personality factors" were not significant, indicating no difference in attitudes among the three groups toward these Success Indicators. However, the "F" ratio for "quality and prestige of college" was significant beyond the .05 level, indicating considerable disagreement among educators, chief executive officers, and chief personnel officers. The null hypothesis of no difference in attitudes among the three groups toward "quality and prestige of college" was rejected.

Conclusions

Seven hypotheses were postulated and tested to determine if differences in attitudes existed among educators, chief executive officers, and chief personnel officers regarding higher education for the hotel and restaurant industry. To test the hypotheses, mean scores obtained from the SD scale were treated by an analysis of variance.

1. The attitudes held by educators toward five general study areas, four specific curriculum areas, and four indicators used as predictors of success are no different than the attitudes held by chief executive officers, and chief personnel officers.

Hypothesis number one was rejected and accepted in part. Under General Study Areas, "F" ratios were significant

at the .01 level for "social sciences and physical sciences," indicating a significant difference in attitudes among educators, chief executive officers, and chief personnel officers concerning the relevancy of these study areas in the curriculum.

The "F" ratio for "humanities" was significant at the .05 level. Educators believed "humanities" to be more important in the curriculum than do either the chief executive officers or the chief personnel officers. The "F" ratio for "specific business" was significant at the .05 level.

2. The attitudes held by chief executive officers toward five general study areas, four specific curriculum areas, and four indicators used as predictors for success are no different than those held by chief personnel officers for the same areas.

The null hypothesis of no difference in attitudes between chief executive officers and chief personnel officers toward the Five General Study Areas, Four Specific Curriculum Areas, and Four Indicators used as Predictors of Success was accepted. No "F" ratios were significant at the .05 level. Chief executive officers and chief personnel officers were in agreement as to the relative importance of the areas under study.

3. The attitudes held by chief executive officers and chief personnel officers within the eight types of firms toward five general study areas, four specific curriculum areas, and four indicators used as predictors of success do not differ.

The "F" ratios for the Five General Study Areas were

not significant at the .05 level. The null hypothesis of no difference in attitudes between chief executive officers and chief personnel officers within the eight types of firms toward Five General Study Areas was accepted.

The null hypothesis of no difference in attitudes between chief executive officers and chief personnel officers within the same type of firms toward Four Specific Curriculum Areas was accepted with the exception of firms six and seven, Hotel and Motel Food Service and General Retailing. The "F" ratios were significant at the .05 level, indicating disagreement between the chief executive officers and chief personnel officers of the two firms as to the relative importance of "human relations" in the curriculum.

Two "F" ratios were significant for two types of firms for the Success Indicators "extracurricular activities" and "quality and prestige of college." The null hypothesis of no difference in attitudes between chief executive officers and chief personnel officers within firm eight, Diversified Food Service and Lodging, toward "extracurricular activities" was rejected.

The null hypothesis for firm two, Franchise, Snack and Take-Out, was rejected. There was disagreement between chief executive officers and chief personnel officers as to the relevancy of "quality and prestige of college" as an indicator of success in management.

4. The attitudes held by chief executive officers among the eight types of firms toward five general study areas, four specific curriculum areas, and four indicators used as predictors of success do not differ.

Hypothesis number four was accepted in full. No "F" ratios were significant. Chief executives among the eight types of firms were in complete agreement as to the relative importance of the Five General Study Areas, the Four Curriculum Areas, and the Four Indicators used as Predictors of Success.

5. The attitudes held by chief personnel officers among the eight types of firms toward five general study areas, four specific curriculum areas, and four indicators used as predictors of success do not differ.

Hypothesis number five was rejected in part. The "F" ratio for "human relations" was significant at the .05 level. The null hypothesis of no difference in attitudes of chief personnel officers among the eight types of firms toward the curriculum area "human relations" was rejected. The null hypothesis was accepted for the Five General Study Areas and the Four Indicators of Success.

6. The attitudes expressed by the eight types of firms toward five general study areas, four specific curriculum areas, and four indicators used as predictors of success do not differ.

Hypothesis six was rejected in part. No "F" ratios were significant for the Five General Study Areas and the Four Specific Curriculum Areas. The firms disagreed on the relative importance of the Success Indicator "quality and

prestige of college." The "F" ratio was significant; therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. The null hypothesis was accepted for "grade point average," "extracurricular activities," and "personality" factors.

7. The attitudes held by educators among the six schools toward five general study areas, four specific curriculum areas, and four indicators used as predictors of success do not differ.

Hypothesis seven was accepted in full. No "F" ratios were significant at the .05 level. Educators were in agreement as to the relative importance of the Five General Study Areas, the Four Specific Curriculum Areas, and the Four Indicators of Success.

Course Area of Concentration Preferred by Educators,
Chief Executive, and Chief Personnel Officers

Sixty-six percent (66 percent) of educators, 54 percent of chief executive officers, and 75 percent of chief personnel officers indicated the desirability of course area concentration for students aspiring to executive positions to consist of approximately one-half hotel and restaurant administration subjects and one-half general business subjects with a modest scattering of liberal arts subjects.

Only 23 percent of educators, 24 percent of chief executive officers, and 15 percent of chief personnel officers preferred a course area concentration of approximately one-half basic liberal arts subjects and one-half general business subjects with a modest scattering of hotel

and restaurant administration subjects.

In effect, the majority of educators, chief executive officers and chief personnel officers do not believe instruction in the liberal arts is important in the development of the potential executive for the hotel and restaurant industry.

Areas of Educational Concentration of Educators, Chief Executive, and Chief Personnel Officers

Approximately 40 percent of educators indicated that they had concentrated their studies in more than one area. Twenty-five percent (25 percent) of educators concentrated their studies in hotel and restaurant administration. Eleven percent (11 percent) concentrated their studies in business.

Twenty-nine percent (29 percent) of chief executive officers reported hotel and restaurant administration as their educational area of concentration. Business education was second with 24 percent of chief executives reporting.

Hotel and restaurant and business were the dominant areas of educational concentration of the three groups.

Educational Backgrounds of Educators, Chief Executive Officers, and Chief Personnel Officers

A comparison of educational levels of educators, chief executive officers, and chief personnel officers at the start of their careers and as of August, 1971, revealed that

educators had a 60 percent increase in educational level since entering teaching. Chief executive officers reported a 32 percent increase in educational level and chief personnel officers reported an 18 percent increase in educational level.

Specific Comments and Recommendations for Improvement of Higher Education for the Hotel and Restaurant Industry

Educators, chief executives, and chief personnel officers named several areas for improvement of higher education for the hotel and restaurant industry. The most frequently noted were:

1. Educators
 - a. Reduce the number of specialized courses especially those in which there is no real body of knowledge.
 - b. Design curriculums so that the student will receive a well-rounded education.
2. Chief Executive Officers
 - a. Place more emphasis on developing the skills of human relation to the extent that these skills can be developed in college.
 - b. Offer more realism in courses on the undergraduate level.
 - c. Stress improvement in communication skills.
3. Chief Personnel Officers
 - a. Place more emphasis on developing the skills of human relations.
 - b. Offer students more practical experience before graduation. Summer placement programs should be improved.

Chief executive and chief personnel officers say in effect that the hotel and restaurant industry is a "people business." The ability to communicate effectively and the ability to work with people are perhaps the two most important ingredients for success in the hotel and restaurant industry.

Chief executives and chief personnel officers believe that higher education for the hotel and restaurant industry has been remiss in not informing students that it takes hard work and long hours to succeed in the hotel and restaurant industry. Few, if any, will start their careers in the upper levels of management. Promotions are earned through long and diligent applications of one's abilities.

Evaluation of Representative Objectives of Undergraduate Education for the Hotel and Restaurant Industry

Educators, chief executive officers, and chief personnel officers ranked the following as essential objectives of undergraduate education for the hotel and restaurant industry.

1. The development of competence in both verbal and written communications.
2. The development of the ability to cope with human emotions in order to get results.
3. The development and understanding concerning human behavior.
4. The development of qualities such as creative thinking, inspiration, and initiative.

5. The development of personal moral and ethical values.
6. The development of analytical and problem solving abilities.
7. The development of a sound and comprehensive knowledge of general business principles and theory.
8. The development of a sound and comprehensive knowledge of general hotel and restaurant administration principles and theory.

Educating students for industry positions of junior executives or higher and the development of advanced management techniques were ranked lowest by the three groups.

Implication of the Results

Although causation cannot be inferred from analysis of variance studies such as this, several implications can be drawn.

Educators, chief executive officers, and chief personnel officers who participated in this study were in general agreement as to the relative importance of the Four Specific Curriculum Areas in undergraduate education for the hotel and restaurant industry.

Educators, chief executive officers, and chief personnel officers were not in general agreement as to the relative importance of the general study areas of "social sciences," "humanities," and "physical sciences." Educators were more positive in their attitudes toward these study

areas as indicated by their mean scores. However, educators did not rate these study areas as important as "general and specific business," the Four Specific Curriculum Areas, or the Success Indicator "personality factors."

In effect, educators say that while these study areas are "slightly" important in the curriculum, more important are the general study areas of "general and specific business" and the Four Specific Curriculum Areas. To say that "social sciences," "humanities," and "physical sciences" are not "slightly" important would be tantamount to disagreeing with the educational philosophy of developing a well-rounded individual.

Chief executive officers rated the general study areas of "social sciences and humanities" to be of "little or no" importance in the curriculum. A plausible explanation is that they see little relationship of these study areas to the most important indicator of success--the profit and loss statement.

The results give little comfort to those educators, chief executive officers, and chief personnel officers who value academic achievement as a measure of future success. The three groups do not view "college grade point" as a measure of how well a student will perform in the business world.

As a result, one should not encourage hotel and restaurant administration students to excel academically

as the first step toward achieving success in the hotel and restaurant industry. Rather, it would appear that they should be encouraged to develop communication, human relations, analytical and problem solving skills and, in addition, the intrinsic traits of creativity, inspiration and motivation. Whether these can be developed in the classroom is a moot point.

This study did not attempt to settle the time-worn arguments concerning the relative advantages and disadvantages of hotel, restaurant and liberal arts programs as preparation for employment opportunities. But the results suggested that liberal arts subjects were not considered very important in the curriculum by the three groups. More important was a high degree of specialization in hotel, restaurant, and general business administration.

Nor does this study settle the question of what type of education is needed for the 1980's. It appears that if higher education concentrates on developing students' competencies in verbal and written communications, human relations, and analytical skills, higher education will provide the education necessary for success in the hotel and restaurant industry. How the student applies these skills is another question.

For those who say "higher education is not attuned to the needs of the hotel and restaurant industry," the study neither substantiates nor disproves this allegation. The

results indicate that those educators, chief executive officers, and chief personnel officers who participated in the study were in general agreement with the curriculum areas related to hotel and restaurant administration.

Perhaps there are shortcomings in the curriculum areas as far as some industry people were concerned, but they must realize that a student cannot learn in just four short years everything they think he should know. The student is introduced to a wide range of knowledge. Therefore, it is the responsibility of industry to provide jobs for graduates in which they can apply this knowledge and grow as they gain experience.

Recommendations

On the basis of this investigation, the following recommendations are made:

1. That hotel and restaurant school administrators be advised that hotel and restaurant students need improvement in:
 - a. Effective communication skills.
 - b. Knowledge of human behavior and human relation skills.
 - c. More meaningful and practical experiences before entering the hotel and restaurant business. The transition from academic studies to industrial application is much smoother if a student has had meaningful and practical experience in actual work situation in the hotel and restaurant industry during his attendance at school.

- d. True concepts of the hotel and restaurant business world.
2. That executives and personnel officers in the hotel and restaurant industry be informed that:
 - a. The time allotted in four years of undergraduate hotel and restaurant administration is limited for the acquisition of essential knowledge and/or skills. Therefore, the objective of higher education is to educate its undergraduates in a wide range of knowledge and disciplines.
 - b. Therefore, it is industry's responsibility to provide jobs for hotel and restaurant administration graduates in which they may be trained in the application of that knowledge until they become proficient or skilled in its application.
 3. That the hotel and restaurant industry be informed of the lack of agreement among educators, chief executive officers, and chief personnel officers on matters relating to the relative importance of general study areas of social sciences, humanities, and physical sciences.
 4. That educators, chief executive officers, and chief personnel officers be informed that there is a difference in opinions among them on matters relating to the essential objectives of higher education for the hotel and restaurant industry.
 5. That chief executives be informed that a larger percentage of chief personnel officers (75 percent) prefer course area concentration of approximately one-half hotel and restaurant administration and one-half general business subjects with a modest scattering of liberal arts subjects as compared to 54 percent of chief executive officers preferring this area of concentration.
 6. That hotel and restaurant schools make students aware of discrepancies between viewpoints of educators and industry representatives, and between chief executive officers and chief personnel officers.
 7. That critics of hotel and restaurant administration schools be informed that educators, chief

executive officers, and chief personnel officers are in general agreement as to the relative importance of business and hotel and restaurant administration subject matter areas.

Recommendations for Further Research

As a result of this investigation, the following recommendations for further research are submitted:

1. A study concerning the establishment of a national advisory board or council with joint academic and industry membership to review and evaluate all course offerings and programs in higher education for the hotel and restaurant industry. This study could determine what organizations should initiate establishment of the board or council.
2. A study concerning the establishment of a hotel and restaurant administration internship program for undergraduate hotel and restaurant majors. This investigation could examine the feasibility and desirability of such an internship program.
3. A study concerning the establishment of a faculty-hotel and restaurant business leader exchange program. This study could determine how to get the hotel and restaurant administration professor out of the classroom and into the practical business situation, and the hotel and restaurant executive out of the business situation into the classroom.
4. A feasibility study of summer, or other work programs which will enable hotel and restaurant administration students (and possibly even professors) to gain meaningful and practical experience in hotel and restaurant work.
5. A feasibility study concerning the establishment of workshop programs for educators and hotel and restaurant leaders to develop a better understanding of one another's problems.
6. A study involving investigation of the reasons for the lack of agreement between chief executive officers and chief personnel officers concerning

areas of course concentration.

7. A study involving investigation of the reasons for lack of agreement among educators, chief executive officers, and chief personnel officers on matters related to the relative importance of social sciences, humanities, and physical sciences subjects in higher education for the hotel and restaurant industry.

A P P E N D I X A

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S COVERING LETTER



The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
University of Massachusetts
Amherst 01002

DEPARTMENT OF
HOTEL AND RESTAURANT
ADMINISTRATION

Chenoweth Laboratory
Tel. 413 545-2651

In order to obtain a better understanding of the current opinions of hotel and restaurant management leaders concerning higher education (college) for the hotel and restaurant industry, a study is being conducted at the University of Massachusetts with joint participation by the Center for Leadership in Educational Administration of the School of Education and the Department of Hotel and Restaurant Administration.

As a successful leader in the industry, you are in a strategic position to assess many of the problems encountered by young hotel and restaurant administration graduates entering the hotel and restaurant industry and to evaluate the qualities essential for leadership development. By completing and returning the enclosed form you will provide information which can substantially aid those persons who are responsible for the formulation and execution of educational policies relating to higher education for the hotel and restaurant industry.

Your answers will be held in strict confidence. No person other than those actively engaged in the study will have any clue as to the identification of any individual return. This study is in the interest of educational research for the benefit of the hotel and restaurant industry.

Completion of the form will require a short period of your valuable time but it is very important that we know your reactions. A summary of the results of the study will be made available upon completion to those persons who request it.

This study cannot achieve its objectives without a high degree of response from all of the hotel and restaurant management executives selected to participate. I respectfully solicit your

-2-

cooperation and I thank you for your thoughtful participation.

Sincerely yours,

Robert F. Lukowski
Research Assistant

Research being conducted under the direction of Dr. Ray Budde,
School of Education, and Dr. Norman G. Cournoyer, Department of
Hotel and Restaurant Administration.

A P P E N D I X B

CHIEF PERSONNEL OFFICER'S COVERING LETTER



DEPARTMENT OF
HOTEL AND RESTAURANT
ADMINISTRATION

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
University of Massachusetts
Amherst 01002

Chenoweth Laboratory
Tel. 413 545-2061

In order to obtain a better understanding of the current opinions of chief personnel officers concerning higher education (college) for the hotel and restaurant industry, a study is being conducted at the University of Massachusetts with joint participation by the Center for Leadership in Educational Administration of the School of Education and the Department of Hotel and Restaurant Administration.

As an individual in charge of personnel recruitment, you are in an excellent position to assess many of the problems encountered in the recruitment of hotel and restaurant administration and to evaluate objectives of higher education for the hotel and restaurant industry. By completing and returning the enclosed form you will provide information which can substantially aid those persons who are responsible for the formulation and execution of educational policies relating to higher education for the hotel and restaurant industry.

Your answers will be held in strict confidence. No person other than those actively engaged in the study will have any clue as to the identification of any individual return. This study is in the interest of educational research for the benefit of the hotel and restaurant industry.

Completion of the form will require a short period of your valuable time but it is very important that we know your reactions. A summary of the results of the study will be made available upon completion to those persons who request it.

This study cannot achieve its objectives without a high degree of responses from all of chief personnel officers selected to

-2-

participate. I respectfully solicit your cooperation and I thank you very much for your thoughtful participation.

Sincerely yours,

Robert F. Lukowski
Research Assistant

Research being conducted under the direction of Dr. Ray Budde, School of Education, and Dr. Norman G. Cournoyer, Department of Hotel and Restaurant Administration.

A P P E N D I X C

EDUCATOR'S COVERING LETTER



DEPARTMENT OF
HOTEL AND RESTAURANT
ADMINISTRATION

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
University of Massachusetts
Amherst 01002

Chenoweth Laboratory
Tel. 413 545-2061

In order to obtain a better understanding of the current opinions of hotel and restaurant administration educators concerning higher education (college) for the hotel and restaurant industry, a study is being conducted at the University of Massachusetts with joint participation by the Center for Leadership in Educational Administration, School of Education, and the Department of Hotel and Restaurant Administration.

As an individual in charge of teaching hotel and restaurant administration courses, you are in an excellent position to assess many of the problems encountered in curriculum development and to evaluate objectives of higher education for the hotel and restaurant industry. By completing and returning the enclosed form you will aid this study to determine those educational factors that are important in preparing students for leadership positions in the hotel and restaurant industry.

Your answers will be held in strict confidence. No person other than those actively engaged in the study will have any clue as to the identification of any individual return. This study is in the interest of educational research and is purely scientific in nature.

Completion of the form will require a short period of your valuable time but it is very important that we know your reactions. A summary of the results of the study will be made available upon completion to those persons who request it.

This study cannot achieve its objectives without a high degree of response of all the hotel and restaurant administration educators selected to participate. I respectfully solicit your cooperation and I thank you very much for your thoughtful participation.

-2-

Sincerely yours,

Robert F. Lukowski
Research Assistant

Research conducted under the direction of Dr. Ray Budde, School of Education, and Dr. Norman G. Cournoyer, Department of Hotel and Restaurant Administration.

A P P E N D I X D

INSTRUMENT

HIGHER EDUCATION FOR THE HOTEL AND
RESTAURANT INDUSTRY QUESTIONNAIREDIRECTIONS:

Please complete and return this questionnaire at your earliest convenience.

You are urged to include any additional information that you believe would be beneficial to this study.

PLEASE RETURN THIS DOCUMENT TO:

Higher Education for the Hotel/Restaurant
Industry Study
P. O. Box 196
Amherst, Massachusetts 01002 Att: Robert F. Lukowski

I. GENERAL BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Name of your institution/organization: _____

2. Present position: _____

3. What level of education had you attained at the time you began hotel or restaurant management career? What level of education have you attained as of today? (Please check the appropriate phrase in each column.)

EDUCATION AT START
OF CAREEREDUCATION COMPLETED
AS OF TODAY

() Had not attended college.

() Had not attended college.

() Attended college but received no degree.

() Attended college but received no degree.

() Earned an associate's degree.

() Earned an associate's degree.

() Earned a bachelor's degree.

() Earned a bachelor's degree.

() Begun work toward an advanced degree.

() Begun work toward an advanced degree.

() Earned a master's degree.

() Earned a master's degree.

() Earned a doctor's degree.

() Earned a doctor's degree.

4. If you attended college, what was your area of concentration?

() Hotel and Restaurant Management () Business () Liberal

Arts () Other (Please Specify.) _____

-2-

5. How long have you been out of college? _____ years.
6. Do you wish a summary of the findings of this study?
 () Yes () No If yes, where should summary be sent?

Name: _____

Address: _____ Zip _____

DIRECTIONS

On the following pages you will find a set of scales. At the top of each page of the form you will find a concept word, words, or statement related to higher education for hotel and restaurant management students. Below it are ten scales. The scales are defined by two polar-opposite adjectives.

We ask you to judge the concept at the top of the page on each of the ten scales. Each judgment consist of deciding whether a concept or statement is best described by the adjective toward the left end of a scale or the one toward the right end.

For example, here is how you are to use these scales:

Statement

An educational objective of higher education for the hotel and restaurant management field should be the development of personal moral and ethical values of the student.

If you feel that the statement at the top of the page is very closely related to one end of the scale, you should place your check-mark (X) as follows:

Essential X : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Nonessential

or

Essential ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : X : ___ Nonessential

If you feel that the statement is quite closely related to one or the other end of the scale (but not extremely), you should place your check-mark () as follows:

Relevant ___ : X : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Irrelevant

or

Relevant ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : X : ___ Irrelevant

-3-

If the statement or concept seems only slightly related to one side as opposed to the other side (but is not really neutral), then you should place your check-mark as follows:

Negative ___:___: **X** :___:___:___:___ Positive
or

Negative ___:___:___:___: **X** :___:___ Positive

The direction toward which end of the scale you check depends upon how strongly you feel about your judgment.

If you consider the statement or concept to be neutral on the scale, both sides of the scale equally associated with the statement, or if the scale is completely irrelevant, unrelated to the statement, then you should place your check-mark in the middle space:

Strong ___:___:___: **X** :___:___:___ Weak

Important: Place your check-marks in the middle of spaces, not on the boundaries.

___: **X** :___:___: **X** :___:___
This Not This

Be sure you check every scale for every statement,
DO NOT OMIT ANY.

Never put more than one check-mark on a single scale.

Make each scale a separate and independent judgment. Work at fairly high speed through the scales. Do not worry or puzzle over individual scale items. It is your first impressions, the immediate "feelings" about the items that we want. On the other hand, please do not be careless, because we want your true impressions.

We ask you not to look back and forth through the statements. Do not try to remember how you checked similar statements earlier.

Thank you.

-4-

II. GENERAL CURRICULUM INFORMATION

This section is concerned with five general course areas available to a hotel and restaurant management student in college or university undergraduate education. Please judge each course area on the basis of the relative importance each course area is for success in hotel and restaurant management leadership. DO NOT OMIT ANY SCALE OR SCALE ITEM

Course Area Number 1

SOCIAL SCIENCES

(e.g., Anthropology, Government, Sociology, and related subjects.)

Useful _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Useless

Unneeded _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Needed

Bad _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Good

Valuable _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Worthless

Timely _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Untimely

Unhelpful _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Helpful

Meaningful _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Meaningless

Important _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Unimportant

Undesirable _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Desirable

Definite _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Uncertain

-5-

Course Area Number 2

HUMANITIES

(e.g., Art, Literature, Modern Language, Music, Philosophy, and related subjects)

Useful ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Useless

Unneeded ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Needed

Bad ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Good

Valuable ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Worthless

Timely ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Untimely

Unhelpful ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Helpful

Meaningful ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Meaningless

Important ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Unimportant

Undesirable ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Desirable

Definite ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Uncertain

-6-

Course Area Number 3

PHYSICAL SCIENCES

(e.g., Biology, Chemistry, Geology, Mathematics, Physics, and related subjects)

Useful ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Useless

Unneeded ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Needed

Bad ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Good

Valuable ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Worthless

Timely ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Untimely

Unhelpful ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Helpful

Meaningful ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Meaningless

Important ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Unimportant

Undesirable ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Desirable

Definite ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Uncertain

-7-

Course Area Number 4

GENERAL BUSINESS SUBJECTS

(e.g., Theories and Principles of Administration, Economics,
Leadership Theory, Organizational Theory and related subjects)

Useful ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Useless

Unneeded ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Needed

Bad ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Good

Valuable ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Worthless

Timely ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Untimely

Unhelpful ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Helpful

Meaningful ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Meaningless

Important ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Unimportant

Undesirable ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Desirable

Definite ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Uncertain

-8-

Course Area Number 5

SPECIFIC BUSINESS SUBJECTS

(e.g., Accounting, Public Relations, Computer Programming,
Management, Finance, Marketing, and related subjects)

Useful ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Useless

Unneeded ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Needed

Bad ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Good

Valuable ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Worthless

Timely ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Untimely

Unhelpful ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Helpful

Meaningful ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Meaningless

Important ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Unimportant

Undesirable ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Desirable

Definite ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Uncertain

-9-

III. SPECIFIC CURRICULUM INFORMATION

This section is concerned with four course areas available to a hotel and restaurant administration student in college or university undergraduate education. Please judge each course area on the basis of the relative importance each course area is for success in hotel and restaurant administration leadership. DO NOT OMIT ANY SCALE OR SCALE ITEM.

Course Area Number 1

GENERAL HOTEL AND RESTAURANT SUBJECTS

(e.g., Introduction to Hotel and Restaurant Administration, General Theory of Food Purchasing, Preparation, and Service, Development of the Industry, Current Trends, and related subjects.)

Useful _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Useless

Unneeded _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Needed

Bad _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Good

Valuable _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Worthless

Timely _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Untimely

Unhelpful _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Helpful

Meaningful _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Meaningless

Important _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Unimportant

Undesirable _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Desirable

Definite _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ Uncertain

-10-

Course Area Number 2

QUANTITATIVE CONTROLS

(e.g., Specialized Hotel and Restaurant Accounting, Food and Beverage Cost Controls, Use and Interpretation of Financial Statements, Budgeting, and related subjects.)

Useful ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ Useless

Unneeded ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ Needed

Bad ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ Good

Valuable ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ Worthless

Timely ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ Untimely

Unhelpful ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ Helpful

Meaningful ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ Meaningless

Important ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ Unimportant

Undesirable ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ Desirable

Definite ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ Uncertain

-11-

Course Area Number 3

PLANNING AND ORGANIZING THE OPERATION

(e.g., Marketing of Services, Scheduling Production, Business Strategy of the Operation, Hotel and Restaurant Systems and Operations, Hotel and Restaurant Design and Equipment Layout, and related subjects.)

Useful ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Useless

Unneeded ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Needed

Bad ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Good

Valuable ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Worthless

Timely ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Untimely

Unhelpful ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Helpful

Meaningful ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Meaningless

Important ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Unimportant

Undesirable ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Desirable

Definite ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Uncertain

-12-

Course Area Number 4

EFFECTIVE HUMAN RELATIONS

(e.g., Personnel Systems, Employee Recruitment, Selection and Evaluation, Organizations and People, Training and related subjects.)

Useful ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ Useless

Unneeded ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ Needed

Bad ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ Good

Valuable ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ Worthless

Timely ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ Untimely

Unhelpful ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ Helpful

Meaningful ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ Meaningless

Important ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ Unimportant

Undesirable ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ Desirable

Definite ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ Uncertain

-13-

IV. SUCCESS CRITERIA

This section is concerned with four criteria frequently used to rate college graduates for positions in the hotel and restaurant industry. Please judge each criterion on the basis of the relative importance each criterion is for success in the hotel and restaurant industry. DO NOT OMIT ANY SCALE OR SCALE ITEM.

Criterion Number 1

COLLEGE GRADE POINT AVERAGE

Useful ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ Useless

Unneeded ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ Needed

Bad ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ Good

Valuable ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ Worthless

Timely ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ Untimely

Unhelpful ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ Helpful

Meaningful ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ Meaningless

Important ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ Unimportant

Undesirable ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ Desirable

Definite ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ Uncertain

-14-

Criterion Number 2

SUBSTANTIAL ACHIEVEMENT IN EXTRA CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES

(e.g., Sports, Fraternal Organizations, Professional Clubs, and related organizations.)

Useful ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ Useless

Unneeded ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ Needed

Bad ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ Good

Valuable ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ Worthless

Timely ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ Untimely

Unhelpful ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ Helpful

Meaningful ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ Meaningless

Important ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ Unimportant

Undesirable ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ Desirable

Definite ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ : ____ Uncertain

-15-

Criterion Number 3

PERSONAL APPEARANCE AND OTHER PERSONALITY FACTORS

Useful ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ Useless

Unneeded ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ Needed

Bad ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ Good

Valuable ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ Worthless

Timely ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ Untimely

Unhelpful ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ Helpful

Meaningful ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ Meaningless

Important ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ Unimportant

Undesirable ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ Desirable

Definite ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ Uncertain

-16-

Criterion Number 4

QUALITY AND PRESTIGE OF COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY ATTENDED

Useful ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Useless

Unneeded ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Needed

Bad ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Good

Valuable ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Worthless

Timely ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Untimely

Unhelpful ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Helpful

Meaningful ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Meaningless

Important ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Unimportant

Undesirable ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Desirable

Definite ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Uncertain

-17-

V. OBJECTIVES OF UNDERGRADUATE SCHOOLS OF HOTEL AND RESTAURANT

ADMINISTRATION

Please evaluate the following educational objectives by placing in the space provided a numeral from 1 to 5 that most nearly corresponds to your opinion. Please use the following code to indicate your opinion.

- | | |
|---------------------------------|----------------|
| (1) ESSENTIAL | (4) UNCERTAIN |
| (2) DESIRABLE BUT NOT ESSENTIAL | (5) NO OPINION |
| (3) UNNECESSARY | |

- () To provide professional or vocational competence for initial employment in the hotel and restaurant industry, e.g., immediate usable hotel or restaurant management skills.
- () The development of analytical and problem solving abilities.
- () The development of personal moral and ethical values.
- () The development of competence in both verbal and written communication.
- () The development of a sound and comprehensive knowledge of general hotel and restaurant administration principles and theory.
- () The development of a sound and comprehensive knowledge of general business principles and theory.
- () Educating students for industry positions of vice-president and above.
- () The development of understanding concerning human behavior.
- () Instruction and training in current hotel and restaurant administration practices.
- () Provide a minimal exposure to the skills and knowledge of the hotel and restaurant industry.
- () The development and understanding concerning human behavior.
- () Educating students for industry positions of junior executives, e.g., corporate unit managers, district managers, and above.
- () The development of the ability to cope with human emotions in order to get results.

-18-

- () To instill knowledge, cultivate intellectual skills, and to cultivate traits of personality and character.
- () The development of advanced management techniques such as linear programming, operations research, queuing theory, Monte Carlo techniques, and the domino theory.
- () The development of qualities such as loyalty, maturity, enthusiasm and persistence.
- () The development of qualities such as creative thinking, inspiration, and initiative.

-19-

In your opinion, a hotel and restaurant administration student planning to reach the executive level in the hotel and restaurant industry should concentrate his studies in one of the following areas. (Please check one response.)

- () Exclusive liberal arts background, e.g., English, philosophy, science, mathematics, modern language, and related subjects.
- () Exclusive general business subject background, e.g., principles and theories of organization, management, economics, and related subjects.
- () Approximately one-half basic liberal arts and one-half general business subjects with a modest scattering of hotel and restaurant administration subjects.
- () Substantial hotel and restaurant administration specialization in one or two areas at the expense of basic liberal arts courses.
- () Substantial hotel and restaurant administration specialization in one or two areas at the expense of general business courses.
- () Approximately one-half hotel and restaurant administration subjects and one-half general business subjects with a modest scattering of liberal arts subjects.

-20-

The purpose of this section is to afford you the opportunity to add any information (favorable or unfavorable) that you consider pertinent to the subject of higher education for the hotel and restaurant industry. You are encouraged to use this section to make known your thinking. REMEMBER, YOUR ANSWERS WILL BE HELD IN STRICT CONFIDENCE.

A P P E N D I X E

REPRESENTATIVE COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF EDUCATORS,
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICERS, AND CHIEF PERSONNEL OFFICERS

EDUCATORS:

1. I feel higher education has two goals. One, to train the student for entry into management after four years of college; and two, to help develop the student so that he is not obsolete in ten years. For this reason, I am against the number of specialized courses we now teach our students-- they are a waste. We would do better to develop the student's ability to think through a liberal education with some rudimentary business courses. This would help develop the student's mind and he would be able to communicate with people of varied backgrounds. Having been exposed to a broad cross-section of knowledge, he should be able to specialize as needed during his career in HRI. With a liberal arts background, he should also be able to bring more insight to bear on problems he is required to solve and to see problems outside the narrow confines of his own bailiwick.
2. As I work with students as a teacher and major advisor, two areas seem to be particularly critical. One, the area you are tapping in regard to orientation and secondly, the sophistication of our students in a career choice in the industry and their experience of it.

In relation to course work, it is, I am sure, time for a change. I feel certain we all agreed it was wise to move away from a straight operational level. Now, the pendulum may be moving too far in another direction. As the holder of an M.B.A., I wonder whether we have become too fond of our techniques and neglected to tell our students that they are simply a bag of tools. The next step, and, I feel strongly enough about this to be working toward my doctorate in the field, must be the development of a viable sociology of hospitality. Our operations, as a service industry, are particularly

sensitive to a growing public concern for the social responsibility of business. It is in this setting that our students will increasingly be required to function and for which we must continue to prepare them.

The second area has to do with the opportunities available to our students to gain experiential knowledge about our industry. The only radical part of the proposal is in the timing. I would like to see this done as early as possible; the second year following a first year on campus might not be too early. Not the least among the benefits of such a sequence would be the increased maturity of students following a period in the working world, which many may not have entered with any degree of seriousness up to this time. Additional benefit would accrue too, from the higher level at which courses could be taught since the experience of the returning student would become a given. The industry would benefit from a predicted lower turn-over rate based on a presumed greater degree of astuteness in initial job selection. Lastly, it would serve to break the pattern of intensive educational concentration which is presently mandatory.

3. The basic legitimizing agent for our field is the student's interest. While our subject matter is important, we are not the custodians of any special "discipline." Rather, we are engaged in the application of disciplines to our problem area.
4. The only rationale for our existence is the offering of these courses (General hotel and restaurant subjects). Otherwise the students could take general business.
5. The purpose of a college education is to develop an individual through enough basic "in depth" education in his chosen field, the ability to think, to adjust, to evaluate and to progress; and to do this he must have developed self-discipline as well as work disciplines.

Management and business must be incorporated, but we are fast approaching the mess that education found itself--teachers knew all the principles of education but no subject matter to teach.

6. General education is desirable up to a point, but the sometimes proposed theory that a broad liberal arts program is the ideal background for a business executive leaves me cold.

At the same time, many, if not all, of our specialized hotel schools offer too highly specialized courses in which there is no real body of knowledge or any genuine discipline.

The pendulum surely swings--first we were too much on the vocational side and now every school thinks it should be providing the type of course normally found at the graduate level. In my opinion, we are getting too much highly theoretical mumbo jumbo and too little realism in our advanced management and finance courses. Our product has a great body of knowledge, but, too often, has no idea of how or when to apply it.

7. There must be an up-to-dateness in the program, which would be a blend of hotel, liberal arts, "business." Encourage individual creative thinking, knowledgeable ability with respect to sources of information.
8. Graduates of the Seventies will need to have more basic hotel skills to get their first jobs than has been true for a generation. The hotel-motel industry was reorganized during the Fifties and the food service industry during the Sixties. Successful operation of the basic unit is today's goal. Promotion will be slower for that reason.
9. No matter what you do in the curriculum--success depends on the product, e.g., the student, the selection process. The greatest curriculum in the world will not overcome the weak product.

We know grades aren't important as indicators of success in management. What is? Attitude! We don't need the high SAT types, we need individuals who want to work, want to lead and have a particular and substantial interest in the industry.

10. I believe it's possible to accomplish all of the objectives I have indicated essential within the four-year curriculum, but only with a much more intensive effort from faculty and students than most of either are willing to provide.

We do the student a disservice if we provide him with only a technical education applicable only to the hospitality field.

The majority of students do not use their elective choices wisely.

Interspersion of work experience with academics is most important in a technical school.

11. More stress in the areas of: (1) problem solving, (2) modern business tools and practices, and (3) communication.
12. There should be opportunities for students to have options at least in junior and senior years, so they can get more courses in areas in which they want to specialize.

Necessary are some business courses, some liberal arts, humanities, social sciences, etc. to supplement the hotel and restaurant courses so that graduates have a well-rounded education.

The industry is so diverse, it is not possible to give the student great expertise. But he does need to have an understanding of what is involved, know some skills, and understand concepts so he can make best advantage of opportunities and the training he gets on the job.

13. Formal hotel and restaurant administration is most helpful in job-landing and equipping the individual to develop well. However, it is not essential. The essential thing is that the individual be sufficiently motivated and be able to take a "long view" of things that comes only with attention to the broader things of life such as interest and knowledge of liberal arts subjects bring about.
14. One of the reasons many students major in this field is because it is practical and they can tie their enthusiasms and energies into something they think they can see in tangible form. They also believe that learning useful skills will bring immediate rewards. In the past this has been largely true.

In my opinion the person with drive and high intelligence is going to be successful in this field regardless of what he majors in in college. He will be successful that much quicker if he

knows the fundamentals and the skills of the field having learned them more rapidly and in more organized fashion in the college curriculum.

The hotel and restaurant field is patently a field which draws upon several more basic disciplines for answers to best house, entertain, and feed people while away from home.

15. Hotel and restaurant students are generally exposed to beliefs of instructors not generally speaking on empirical data. That represents a better approach to indoctrinating students to the business. Good theory is good practice, the former is what we should be teaching and the practice should come in the summers and at work. Most theory will have to be modified but at least they have a point of departure to which they should strive to reach.
16. Actually you could achieve success by a number of different ways. It is not possible to clearly state that there is only one way. A lot depends upon a student's outside interests and also his industry background and experience.

I favor the idea that different schools should follow different approaches. We really don't know enough about it to dictate one type of program for everybody. In fact, many industry leaders have had no hotel training or education prior to their rise to the top. On the other hand, others have had considerable college education in the field. My feelings, however, tend to be contrary to the Cornell philosophy--which to my thinking is top heavy in vocational subject matter.
17. University based education can at best lay a foundation and provide investigative tools. Job specific programs must be handled "in house" and through the Educational Institute of AHMA.
18. I believe that the industry should support an educational program that begins at age 14 and continues through the Ph.D. level or whatever degree of higher education the individual may be able to achieve. In addition to the regular high school academic courses a background in foods should be given that includes table setting, personal grooming, selection--preparation--and

serving of foods in correct menu combinations. At age 18--if legally permissible--training in beverages (beers, ales, wines and spirits) should commence. Grass roots knowledge and experience are essential. On-the-job training should be part of the program too.

19. We should prepare students with competence to readily enter the H.R.I. field with usable skills. However, we should expect him to rise rapidly to positions of responsibility and authority once he becomes oriented into the procedures of his firm. Advanced business management techniques are essential and he should be exposed to these as an undergraduate.

CHIEF EXECUTIVES :

1. No one university program can solve all the needs of the industry. Of greater importance, no single university program can possibly hope to graduate individuals all cast in the same mold.

It might be hoped that many young high school graduates can be attracted to matriculate in any of several broadly based H.R.I. undergraduate schools. Hopefully, a large majority might elect to continue past a single or two year indoctrination into higher education and H.R.I. specialties. From that point on the curriculum should be bold enough to encourage each individual to become better prepared for any number of career choices.

Obviously, a superior chef can also hold a bachelor's degree and be useful and happy if he can concentrate on personal skills. The same reasoning can be applied to the man who seeks the highest corporate level, the small-town innkeeper or restaurateur, the designer, or the computer expert.

2. I believe young people entering the restaurant industry out of college would be better prepared with a liberal arts and business preparation. I feel the specific information etc. related to the restaurant business can be learned in three to six months of intensive effort. However, it seems a shame to me to waste the college experience (four years) in highly specialized areas. I was an engineer and now regret I did not have a liberal education.

3. The industry as a whole needs more qualified management at all levels--this it is agreed. However, the stress at the educational level is being put on executive and administrative management which is causing a great imbalance in many operations today. True the industry is now talking systems, approaches, theories by the dozen but I ask where, when, and how are the customers going to be taken care of? More operational management is needed--men and women who know how and what it takes to please our customers and make a profit for the company. We have had no success with fresh from college graduates because of a lack of realism that this industry is work and lots of it. Every member of our management team who is a college graduate comes to us after previous work experience where there has been defeats, failures, rejections, etc. (i.e., reality is relevant and maturity is significant). Common sense as an attribute does not appear in your questionnaire and in no college degree programs--yet most successful businesses need this most of all.
4. Any individual with average intelligence and education along the lines of the items I've checked and one who has originality and initiative built into his personality would be a strong candidate for success in my book and is readily available in the personnel pool at any time. However, the one area I would emphasize most strongly would be in the area of development of qualities such as loyalty, maturity, enthusiasm and persistence. Loyalty cannot be stressed too strongly. In my book it is the ingredient most needed to assure proper attitude and total success in adjusting to one's responsibilities.
5. I have approached this questionnaire with a view toward education for top management and an important role in the community and self-enlightenment. Ideally, a liberal arts college course with graduate work in business and restaurant and/or hotel management specialization would be the "thing."
6. It disturbs me that current teachings do not provide the student a way of thinking. In other words, lots of written material but hardly any thinking.

7. Actual on-the-job training timewise is more valuable than classroom study--also from a personal standpoint actual work in the kitchen such as assisting the cook, dishwashing, and laying out work patterns is very valuable since it involves analyzing each employee's capabilities.
8. Too many graduates come into the business wanting to be a vice-president right away without any real background or knowledge. Schools are at fault in making the kids think they are capable for a top executive job without really knowing what goes on.
9. A good broad general education is important. You learn the specifics on the job. Too much specialization gives tunnel vision and inhibits progress.
10. Courses should be conducted as much as possible to simulate real business situations particularly in personnel and human relations both upwards and downwards. More emphasis should be given to written communications cycle.

Students must understand that in any organization you start at the bottom, learn basic management skills, prove your ability, and move as rapidly as possible upwards. Time is entirely dependent upon the individual.

11. I feel that one's success can be measured in how well you can apply in general practice your book knowledge.
12. I have had no formal training in restaurant management, thus the value of a specific curriculum in hotel and restaurant management is somewhat obscure to me. My experience tells me our industry is sadly lacking in competent business administrators. There is a void of professionalism that must be filled if this industry is to advance.

Until the above takes place then your best bet is to train your students to listen to and listen with his people. Finally teach your man to communicate.

13. Many educational facilities are at fault for placing too much emphasis on the vocational aspect of the industry and not enough emphasis on the skills of human relations, to the extent that these skills can be developed in college.

14. Most common short comings observed in hotel and restaurant graduates are:
 - a. Unwillingness to get their hands dirty and a mistaken impression that their sheepskin provides immediate entry to executive management.
 - b. Inability to express themselves accurately and lucidly in simple English.
 - c. Reluctance to face long hours and weekend work.
15. Students graduating from a school of hotel and restaurant management without a significant amount of menial work having been put in the field are a complete waste. Not so much from the point of view of acquiring skills, but from knowing what the industry is all about before they take a management or pre-management position in the industry.

It's still a people business and seemingly there are no short cuts to learning human behavior-- Eyeball confrontations.

Give 'em a good business background, lots of human relations, minimum food basics, and for the public restaurant inclined, send them to some art courses. Teach them some creativity.

CHIEF PERSONNEL OFFICERS:

1. In recent years--1965 to 1971--hotel and restaurant management majors have come out of college expecting miracles. This industry is infamous for putting most strength in experience. I can agree with this after seeing what is presently graduating from college.
2. The time for a H.R.I. graduate to have been exposed to the unglamorous but essential jobs in the hotel and restaurant industry should be in early stages of education for two obvious reasons:
 - a. To avoid graduating a specialist in H.R.I. who will not work in the industry which he has been trained for.

- b. The time to learn how to make a room up, wait on tables, cook, wash dishes, etc., is before graduation so that when graduated and given first management responsibility the graduate can relate to the employee who has to perform the work and can train and motivate these employees.

This has been attempted by most of H.R. & I. schools by means of summer placement for work credit. Usually these jobs on the whole have no organization or plan to them and tend to become a long party.

A fresh look should be taken to what may be considered the vocational training aspect in relationship to all of the theoretical training.

- 3. I feel that the one area of concern which most students fail to anticipate is their lack of practical experience. They come out of college looking for a position with a large salary and a title, when in actual practice they must start out by learning the business from the ground up. The restaurant business is one which consists of a lot of hard work and long hours, not an 8-5 five day week.

Initiative, motivation and ambition are necessary parts of any man's makeup and he must be willing to sacrifice a lot of his personal life to become an integral part of it (industry?). Common sense, self-starting and the ability to thrive under pressure all go into becoming successful in the restaurant industry today. It takes years of hard work plus an education, not just a college degree.

- 4. While I doubt that any college can mold personality traits, I would prefer an individual who is highly motivated over one who is highly trained.
- 5. I have noticed two basic weaknesses in food management personnel.
 - a. Inability to handle the human aspect of management.
 - b. Inability to apply general theory to specific business problems.

I suspect that too much emphasis has been placed on the technical aspects of food preparation and service to the detriment of general business planning.

6. Most of the successful food and beverage executives I know in the airline industry have had heavy exposure to food knowledge since menu planning and quality control are vital parts of airline catering. Maybe Home Ec or some Lausanne type cooking lessons should be included in the curriculum.
7. We look for individuals that are capable of "doing a job" when we employ them. They must also be capable of advancement (Not all will advance however). It is our opinion of the above two qualities in an individual that will lead us to employ that individual.
8. If the hotel and restaurant student expects to reach top executive positions in the industry they should concentrate on the technical skills of accounting, finance, and operations research.
9. A general knowledge of hotel & restaurant administration and general business subjects is important, however, the development of analytical and problem solving abilities together with a good understanding of human relations seems to be the key factors determining success in hotel-restaurant management.
10. The student should be prepared to initially assume a position requiring some basic understanding of personnel leadership, restaurant operation, equipment, menu planning, food storage, maintenance, hygiene, etc. In terms of curriculum development, however, the higher the manager rises in the organization's hierarchy, the less valuable such "how-to" subjects become. Some form of continuing education (such as evening MBA programs) appear well suited for assisting in the transition from first line supervisor to high-level corporate executive.
11. A broad based, well-rounded individual functions better in executive developmental programs than a specialized individual.

Emphasis should be on awareness and broad educational

experiences with a portion of the curriculum being devoted to specifics in the hotel and restaurant area which differentiates from other avenues of business. So much of the person's development actually takes place after graduation that cannot be learned out of a textbook or teaching or learning institution that the individual must be prepared by a well-rounded education to learn to handle "life's" everyday problems.

12. H & R course, general business are very important, but to round out the individual there is a definite need for behavior science courses and the arts and humanities in general. To get all of this into a four year program, is it possible to cut down on some of the duplicity in the H & R and general business courses?
13. Cut out the "theory" courses and substitute practical learning situations as can be taught by restaurant and hotel operators--past and present.

The development of creative thinking, inspiration, and initiative qualities are essential for hotel and restaurant graduates. Also, lets instill the idea that they are going to wash dishes, broil, and get their hands dirty before they become district managers.

Consider a coop-type program for students. Book work can never be a substitute for practical experience. Make it a requirement for graduation.

14. It is essential for a foodman to know everything possible about basic food handling such as preparation, recipes, cooking times, temperature, taste, etc. Also have thorough on-the-job training in dealing with employees, cleaning procedures and the like.
15. While they have the academic background, they missed a lot about understanding people. The schools should give more instruction in supervisory techniques to better prepare the student for working with people.

A P P E N D I X F

HOTELS AND RESTAURANT ORGANIZATIONS SELECTED FOR THE STUDY

Alsonnett Hotels*	Inter-Continental Hotels*
American Motor Inns*	International Leisure
American Snacks	Interstate United*
ARA Services	
Associated Hosts	J. J. Newberry*
Autoviable Services*	John R. Thompson*
Blaikie, Miller and Hines*	Kenny Kings
Braniff Airways*	Kentucky Fried Chicken*
Brigham's*	
Burger King*	Linton Foods*
	Iowe's Hotels*
Carl Karcher Enterprises*	Lum's*
Carvel Corporation	
Chicken Unlimited*	Macke Company*
Childs Restaurants	Mannings*
Chock Full O' Nuts*	Marriott Corporation*
Commissary Corporation	McDonald's
Continental Airlines*	Mister Donut of America*
Cooky's Pubs*	Mister Steak*
Danner Foods*	Nathan's Famous*
Del Webb*	National Airlines*
Downtowner Corporation	Northwest Airlines*
Drug Fair*	
Dunfey Family Corporation	Original Pancake Houses
Dutch Inns of America	
	Pan American World Airways*
Eastern Airlines*	
El Chico Corporation*	Realty Hotels*
Federated Department Stores*	Sears, Roebuck*
Food Service Management*	Service Systems*
Friendly Ice Cream*	ServAmerica*
Frostop Corporation	Servomation
Furr's Cafeterias	Sheraton Corporation*
	Sky Chefs*
G. C. Murphy	Specialty Restaurants*
General Host	Sportservice Corporation
	S. S. Kresge*
Holly Grills*	Stewarts Root Beer
Host International*	
Howard Johnson*	

Topsy's International*
Trans World Airlines*

United Air Lines*
USA/AF Exchange*
United States Lines
Universal Services*

Valle's Steak House*

Walgreen Company*
- Wetson's Corporation*
White Tower Management*
W. T. Grant

Zuider Zee

*Organizations which participated.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

Books

- Argyris, Chris. Integrating the Individual and the Organization. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1964.
- _____. Personality and Organization. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957.
- Barnard, Chester I. The Functions of the Executive. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1938.
- Bond, Floyd A.; Leabo, Dick A.; and Swinyard, A. W. Preparation for Business Leadership--Views of Top Executives. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1964.
- The Committee for Economic Development (CED). Educating Tomorrow's Managers. The Business Schools and the Business Community. New York: Published by the Committee, 1964.
- Gordon, Robert A., and Howell, James E. Higher Education for Business. New York: Columbia University Press, 1959.
- Jennings, Eugene E. The Mobile Manager. Ann Arbor: University Press, 1967.
- Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1964.
- Lesikar, Raymond V. Needs of Education for Small Business Based on a 1959 Survey of Louisiana Businessmen. Baton Rouge: College of Business Administration, Louisiana State University, 1961.
- Lundberg, Donald E. The Hotel and Restaurant Business. Amherst, Mass.: University of Massachusetts, 1969.
- McGrath, Earl J. Liberal Education in the Professions. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1959.

- _____; McNulty, J. D.; and Kephart, W. D. Liberal Education and Business. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1963.
- Newcomer, Mabel. The Big Business Executive: Factors that Made Him 1900-1950. New York: Columbia University Press, 1955.
- Odiorne, George S. Executive Skills: Their Diagnosis and Development. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1964..
- Osgood, Charles E.; Suci, George J.; and Tannebaum, P. H. The Measurement of Meaning. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1957.
- Pierson, Frank C. et al. The Education of American Businessmen. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959.
- Russell, Wiley Hayden. A Guide to Research in Education. St. Louis: Educational Publishers, Inc., 1959.
- Silk, Leonard S. The Education of Businessmen. Committee for Economic Development (CED) Supplementary Paper Number 11. New York: Published by the Committee, 1960.
- Snider, James G., and Osgood, Charles E., eds. Semantic Differential Technique: A Sourcebook. Chicago: Aldine, 1969.
- Urwick, L. F. Management Education in American Business. New York: American Management Association, 1951.
- Wert, James E.; Neidt, Charles O.; and Ahmann, J. Stanley. Statistical Methods in Educational and Psychological Research. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1954.
- White, William H., Jr. The Organization Man. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Company, 1956.

Reports

- Council on Hotel, Restaurant, and Institutional Education. Transcript of Major Addresses--25th Annual Conference. Las Vegas, Nevada, 1970.

- Hoyt, Donald P. The Relationship between College Grades and Adult Achievement. A Review of the Literature. Research Report No. 7, September, 1965. Iowa City, Iowa: American College Testing Program, 1965.
- Meek, Howard B. Education for the Restaurant Industry of the United States. Report to the National Restaurant Foundation, Chicago, Ill., April 15, 1964. Chicago, Ill.: National Restaurant Association, 1964.
- Welch, John M. Junior College Programs for the Hospitality Industry. Council of Hotel, Restaurant, and Institutional Education. Ithaca, N.Y.: Published by the Council, 1962.

Periodicals

- Barclay, A., and Thumin, Frederick J. "A Modified Semantic Differential Approach to Attitudinal Assessment." Journal of Clinical Psychology, XIX (July, 1963), 376-378.
- Calhoun, Richard P., and Reddy, A. C. "The Frantic Search for Predictors of Success." Journal of College Placement, XXVIII (February-March, 1968), 55-68.
- Calkins, Robert D. "Objectives of Business Education." Harvard Business Review, XXV (Autumn, 1946), 46-57.
- Chapman, Gilbert W. "Needed: Thinkers in Business." Dunn's Review and Modern Industry, LXXIX (February, 1962), 44-46.
- Cyert, R. M., and Dill, W. R. "Future of Business Education." Journal of Business, XXXVII (July, 1964), 221-237.
- DiVesta, Francis J., and Dick, Walter. "The Test-retest Reliabilities of Children's Ratings of the Semantic Differential." Educational and Psychological Measurements, XXVI (Autumn, 1966), 605-616.
- Fuller, John. "Educating Future Managers for the Hotel and Food Service Industry." Articulation, XVII (February-March, 1971), 6-11.
- Hallstones, T. J.; Roberts, E.; and Steinbruegee, John. "Personnel Managers Evaluate a College Business Program." Collegiate News and Views, VIII (May, 1955), 7-11.

- Hall, Chester G. "Education and the Industry's Future." Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly, X (November, 1969), 21-23.
- Heise, David R. "Some Methodological Issues in Semantic Differential Research." Psychological Bulletin, LXXII (1969), 406-422.
- Husband, Richard W. "What do College Grades Predict?" Fortune, LV (June, 1957), 157-158.
- "Institutions 40C." Institutions, XL (July, 1970), 89-179.
- "Is Foodservice Education for Real?" Fast Food, LXVI (May, 1971), 121-124.
- Judge, Martin. "Observation." Hospitality, X (January, 1971), 121-124.
- Kreiberg, Irene D. "The Current Agitation against University-College Programs in Business Administration." Office Executive, XXXV (June, 1960), 30-35.
- Lattin, Gerald W. "Factors Associated With Success in Hotel Administration." Occupations, XXIX (October, 1950), 157-165.
- Law, Alexander I. "A Semantic Differential Study of Meaning Held by Public School Personnel Toward Data Processing." California Journal of Educational Research, XIX (September, 1968), 157-165.
- Livingston, J. Sterling. "Myth of the Well-Educated Manager." Harvard Business Review, XLIX (January-February, 1971), 79-89.
- Nichols, Shirley A., and Shaw, Marvin E. "Saliency and two Measures of Attitude." Psychological Reports, XIV (February, 1964), 273-274.
- "The Nine Hundred." Fortune, XLVI (November, 1962), 132-136.
- Nixon, John E. "The Mechanics of Questionnaire Investigation." Journal of Educational Research, XLVII (March, 1954), 481-487.
- Norman, Warren T. "Stability Characteristics of the Semantic Differential." American Journal of Psychology, LXXII (December, 1959), 581-584.
- "Opinion." Hospitality, X (January, 1971), 135-144.

- Pallet, James E., and Hoyt, Donald P. "College Curriculum and Success in General Business." Journal of College Personnel, IX (July, 1968), 238-245.
- "Schooling the Food Service Executive of Tomorrow." Food Service, XXXII (September, 1970), 12-18.
- Shannon, J. R. "Percentages of Returns of Questionnaires in Reputable Educational Research." Journal of Educational Research, XLII (October, 1948), 138-141.
- Spivey, C. T. "Our Challenge: Better Managers." Financial Executive, XXXII (July, 1964), 13-15.
- Tonne, Herbert A. "Two Evaluations of the Collegiate Schools of Business." Journal of Business Education, XXXV (January, 1960), 158-160.
- Wingate, John W. "The Question of Business Specialization in Colleges and Universities." Collegiate News and Views, VIII (May, 1960), 2-6.

Unpublished Materials

- Council of Hotel, Restaurant, and Institutional Education. "Meeting of Senior Colleges." Chicago, Ill." March, 1965. (Mimeographed.)
- Holzinger, Stephen K. "Developing a College Level Training Program for the Food Service Industry." Unpublished Master's thesis, New York City University, 1970.
- Kilcourse, Robert S. "Higher Education for Business: A Comparative Study of the Current Philosophies and Policies of Chief Executives of Major Business Organizations and the Practices of Their College Personnel Recruitment Officers." Unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, Florida State University, 1967.
- Lunney, Gerald H. "The Construction of Questionnaires for Surveys in Education." Unpublished paper, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Rodefeld, R. D. "The Generalized Attitude of Members Toward Their General Farm Organization." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Wisconsin, 1967.

"The Passkey." Student Handbook, Department of Hotel and Restaurant Administration, Amherst: University of Massachusetts, 1970. (Mimeographed.)

Welch, John M. "Undergraduate Course in Commercial Food Service and Public Lodging Management." Department of Food Science and Nutrition, University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri. (Mimeographed.)

