A baseline study of the gaps in work-integrated Tourism learning: student expectations and perceptions

Tish Taylor*
Tshwane University of Technology
Staatsartillerie Road, Pretoria West, South Africa
E-mail address: TaylorTF@tut.ac.za

and

Sue Geldenhuys
Department of Tourism Management
Tshwane University of Technology
Staatsartillerie Road, Pretoria West, South Africa
E-mail address: geldenhuyss@tut.ac.za

*Corresponding author

Abstract

Work-integrated learning (WIL) has been widely used as an educational component in Universities of Technology (UoTs). With a work-based module becoming compulsory in higher education in South Africa, there is limited research in the academic literature on the gaps between students' expectations and perceptions of tourism WIL placements. The purpose of this study was to determine the gaps between the expectations and perceptions of tourism students with regard to their WIL placements. Third year tourism students at Tshwane University of Technology (TUT) completed expectation surveys prior to obtaining placement and perception surveys after completing their WIL placements. The analysis will be used to reveal trends and patterns in responses through statistical analyses, which will be a useful baseline for further studies as well as initiating debate on the interpretation and use of the data to inform follow-up action. The study concludes that preparation for WIL placement needs to be improved in order to minimize the gaps. Although the study is based on research in South Africa, it is argued that suggestions and discussions of selected placement issues may be potentially applicable to tourism placements in other countries.

Keywords: work-Integrated learning (WIL), student expectations, student perceptions, GAPS

Introduction

Work integrated learning (WIL) is increasingly being adopted in higher education qualifications, providing undergraduate students with the opportunity to gain professional experience in the field, as part of their formal qualification (Council of Higher Education, 2010:17). In fact, WIL has been considered such an important part of undergraduate education that several scholars have suggested it be made a compulsory component in higher education curricula (Rothman & Sisman, 2016:1003). The promotion of WIL has been regarded as the key to providing quality education for students (Tran & Soejatminah, 2016:338). Business and Industry have increasingly called for HEIs to generate better-prepared and even work-ready graduates (Rayner & Papakonstantinou, 2015:13). Tourism employers rely heavily on HEIs to provide graduates that have both the theoretical knowledge of the field, as well as the practical skills and knowledge to think independently (Spowart, 2011; Hughes, Mylonas & Beckendorff, 2013). According to the CHE (2010:17), WIL is a compulsory form of experiential learning embedded in the curriculum at

1

Universities of Technology (UoTs). The Tshwane University of Technology (TUT, 2013:4) proposed a draft policy on WIL, which indicates that WIL is an integral part of every programme offered. According to the CHE (2004:18), higher education institutions (HEIs) are equipped to play a major role in generating the high- and medium-level capacities and skills required by the public sector. South African HEIs commitment to positive graduate outcomes, global citizenship and community engagement add extra dimensions to the importance of WIL in curriculum design and development (CHE, 2011:3), resulting in student satisfaction becoming progressively more important (Smith & Worsfold, 2014:1070). However, student experiences during WIL are not under the control of the higher education institution (HEI) nonetheless HEIs will ultimately be held responsible for the quality of student's placement experiences (Smith & Worsfold, 2014; Kundasami, 2007).

A review of WIL literature identifies the increasing importance of WIL to all involved stakeholders. Researchers have explored procedural issues of WIL, administrative perspectives, key components, relationships, associations and success factors (Zopiatis & Theocharous, 2013:33). However, a gap identified in the literature is that of the student voice (Taylor & Geldenhuys, 2016; Tran & Soejatminah, 2016) regarding their perspectives on WIL placement as well as the strengths and weaknesses of the WIL experience (Taylor & Govender, 2016:2). Students' voices and experience in relation to WIL appear to be less taken into account (Tran & Soejatminah, 2016:338) and this requires attention since students are considered the main customers of academic institutions, and can provide valuable feedback, based on their unique individual and also collective experiences.

In order to develop a well-organized quality WIL program it is important to understand what students expect prior to commencing their placement, as well as what students perceive after the internship. Understanding the overall placement satisfaction and the relationships between the gaps of expectations and perceptions will enable HEIs to develop policy, practice and support for WIL that is student-centred. To facilitate the development of student-centred WIL, it is essential to understand students' perceptions and expectations of WIL (Tran & Soejatminah, 2016:339). The purpose of this paper is to contribute to the theoretical understanding of WIL by seeking to identify any gaps that exist between the expectations and perceptions of tourism students relating to WIL.

Literature

WIL encompasses a range of activities and experiences that draw together theoretical work with workplace learning in a purposeful way (Brown, 2010; Smith, 2012). Industry professionals support the notion that WIL placements develop students' leadership, problem solving and customer relations competencies (Zopiatis & Constanti, 2007:393). Students view the WIL placement experience as an opportunity to enhance their personal skills and gain a better understanding of the field and industry (Lam & Ching, 2007). However, the satisfaction and success of a placement will depend on aspects such as the type of placement, the level of work experience and the quality of workplace supervision (Zopiatis & Constanti, 2007:393). Stakeholders need to understand which aspects of the WIL placement program contribute to the effectiveness of the program as well as those aspects, which limit program effectiveness. Placement programs are created with the aims of developing educated and skilled graduates that are satisfied with the programs (Smith & Worsfold, 2014:1070). Students are the main customers of higher education and their views towards the educational services offered can be considered a quality index of the HEI (Asefi, Delaram & Deris, 2017:2). Satisfaction may influence a student's desire to continue with or defect from a HEI (Ham & Haydak, 2003:223). HEI quality assurance systems emphasize the student experience as one of the assessment criteria (Vajda, Farkas & Málovics, 2015:79), and although WIL placement is conducted off-site, it is still a compulsory credit-bearing component of the academic program and therefore influences the quality assurance system.

The WIL placement experience can either confirm or disconfirm students' expectations regarding employment in the industry in terms of job interests, workplace and employer expectations and personal fit within the profession (Rothman & Sisman, 2016:1004). If stakeholders are not consulted during the planning of placement programmes, students often have poor experiences (Singh & Dutta, 2010:86). Students are placed at workplace sites and left under the supervision of a mentor (Kundasami, 2007:4), who is not always fully aware of the placement objectives (Lam & Ching, 2007:340) or use students for entry-level jobs (Singh & Dutta, 2010; Lam & Ching, 2007). In a study conducted by Taylor and Geldenhuys (2016a: 7) on the post-placement opinions of tourism students' it was found that students did not have enough work to keep them busy and therefore felt that they were not learning, they worked long hours and also overtime, with no payment and were tasked with menial jobs, such as, cleaning and restocking brochure shelves and making tea and coffee for staff. This has raised concern among all parties involved as they have a direct affect on future demands (Singh & Dutta, 2010:86). The issue of how students expect, perceive and evaluate their placement has become a necessary research issue (Lam & Ching, 2007:340), and identifying and assessing gaps is a popular methodological tool in service quality management (Jackson, Helms & Ahmadi., 2011:396).

Research examining the gaps between students' pre-placement expectations and post-placement perceptions of WIL is limited. Lam and Ching (2007) conducted an exploratory study of an internship program for Hospitality students in Hong Kong. The study found that students' expectations were unmet (2007:348). Out of a total of 27 variables, there were 17 internship variables that produced gaps between the students' pre-placement expectations and post-placement perceptions. For all 17 variables, students' expectations were greater than the actual perceptions. In a similar study conducted by Singh and Dutta (2010) Hospitality internship placements were anaysed for the United Kingdom (UK) and India. The study found significant differences between students' expectations and perceptions, as well as differences between the Indian and UK internship experience (Zopiatis & Theocharus, 2013:38). Zopiatis and Constanti (2007) investigated the hospitality industry-education relationship in Cyprus.

The study identified five relationships between internship stakeholders in an attempt to investigate the mismatch between educational experience and practical experience. Results found that just over half of respondents agreed that the actual internship experience had met their expectations (2007:400). However, the study also found that almost half of the respondents stated that they were reconsidering pursuing a career in the hospitality industry (2007:400). These studies indicate that definite gaps exist between students' expectations and perceptions with WIL placement, however they do not focus on tourism students neither do they provide a South African context.

This study will identify the gaps between expectations and perceptions of tourism students' WIL placements. Third year tourism students' completed the expectations of WIL survey prior to the six-month compulsory placement period. After completing the six-month placement, the students then completed the perceptions of WIL survey including their overall satisfaction with WIL. By determining what students expect and perceive, valuable information can be made available to planners to promote the quality of educational services (Asefi *et al.,* 2017:2). While Industry standards agree on core aspects of the concepts of quality, there is ongoing debate on what constitutes quality in education (Jackson *et al.*, 2011:392). User's experience has emerged as the most important factor impacting the way in which expectations and perceptions of the service are formed (Lilley & Usherwood, 2000:16).

The quality of service, in this case WIL placement, has different meanings for different stakeholders, namely; industry, the HEI and the students. However, students still remain a viable and important consideration in the quality of service (Jackson *et al.,* 2011:392).

According to Parasuruman, Zeithaml and Berry (1985) there are four possible reasons for any gap between expectations and perceptions. Gaps can be caused by failing to understand customer expectations, failing to convert perceptions of customer expectations into service specification, failing to observe the specification and failing to appropriately manage customer expectations (Jackson *et al.,* 2011:397).

In customer service, if actual experiences differ from the perceived experiences, gaps are said to exist (Jackson *et al.,* 2011:396). In any service organisation it is vital to understand these gaps in order to remedy the situation, and higher education is no exception. In the interest of improving the customer experience of students, it is therefore important to understand the gaps between the pre-WIL expectations and post-WIL perceptions.

Methodology

Pre- and post-WIL structured questionnaires were developed and pilot tested with a sample of students at Tshwane University of Technology and minor changes were made for clarity and understanding. The sampling method used was non-probability convenience sampling and consisted of all third-year tourism students in the Department of Tourism Management at Tshwane University of Technology. The pre-WIL questionnaire was administered to third-year tourism students in May 2016. Participants took part in the study with their knowledge and consent and were free withdraw at any time. The purpose of the study was explained to the participants prior to their participation. Participants were all over the age of 18 years and participation in the study was entirely voluntary. They were assured of confidentiality and the fact that the results would be used for academic purposes only. No personal details of the participants were collected or used as part of the study. The Departmental Committee on Postgraduate Studies (DCPS), Faculty of Management Sciences at Tshwane University of Technology approved the ethical aspects of the questionnaire and the study proposal in November 2015. The questionnaire consisted of 43 statements rated on a five-point Likert scale, ranging from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (5). The first section asked students to rate their expectations of the WIL placement program and consisted of five dimensions, namely, skills, outcomes, work environment, personal and type of work.

The second section asked students to rate their expectations of the work place and consisted of three dimensions, namely, organisation, environment and supervisor. The third and final section asked students to rate their expectation of the higher education institution and consisted of two dimensions, namely, support and contact.

The post-WIL questionnaire consisted of the same 43 statements rated on a five-point Likert scale ranging from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (5). Students' were asked to rate their level of agreement with each perception statement, which consisted of the same three sections and dimensions as the pre-WIL questionnaire. Students that have completed their six-month WIL placement, return to the HEI to submit their WIL report. The post-WIL questionnaire was then given to the same students' that completed the pre-WIL questionnaire, when they returned to submit their WIL reports. Post-WIL questionnaires were collected between December 2016 and June 2017.

Scale reliability analysis was used to measure the internal consistency of the pre-WIL expectation and post-WIL perception constructs. Both the pre- and post-WIL scales have a high level of internal consistency, as determined by a Cronbach's alpha of 0.915. A total of 51 students completed both the pre- and post-WIL questionnaires. This study classifies the Likert-scale data as ordinal and conducts non-parametric analysis. Descriptive analyses were conducted to provide a demographic profile of respondents. Scores reflecting the gap between expectations and perceptions were derived by means of a Wilcoxon signed Rank test for each of the dimensions.

Results

A total of 51 tourism students completed both the pre- and post-WIL questionnaires. While the questionnaires provided detailed results, the intention of this article is to focus on the data generated on the gaps between students' expectations and perceptions. This approach is intended to give substance to the students' view of WIL that will be a useful catalyst for debate and will encourage further critical scrutiny of the WIL placement program. To contextualize the gaps between expectations and perceptions, Table 1 below presents an overview of the profile of the tourism students' that participated in the survey.

Table 1: Profile of 51 reports

		Percentage (%)
Gender	Female	70,6%
	Male	29,4%
Age	> 20	9,8%
	21-23	62,7%
	24 <	25,5%
National Diploma (ND)	ND Ecotourism Management	7,8%
	ND Event Management	17,6%
	ND Adventure Tourism Management	15,7%
	ND Tourism Management	58,8%

Table 1 shows that of the 51 students who undertook WIL placement between June 2016 and June 2017, two-thirds were female (70,6%). Such a finding is commensurate with the general phenomenon that almost all of the tourism qualifications offered in South Africa have more female students than male students. More than half the students were aged between 21 and 23 (62,7%) with just less than one-third of respondents' aged 24 and over (25,5%).

The majority of students were registered for the Tourism Management Diploma (58,8%), with the fewest number of students' registered for the Ecotourism Management diploma (7,8%). This finding is aligned with previous research conducted by Taylor and Geldenhuys (2016), where Tourism Management students made up the majority of respondents.

Table 2, below, provides the results of the students' expectations in terms of the industry sector they expected to work in and the actual industry sector where students' completed their WIL placement.

Table 2: Industry WIL placement

Industry	Expectation Percentage (%)	Perception Percentage (%)
Retail/Wholesale	43,8%	13,7%
Government	6,4%	9,8%
Transport	11,7%	3,9%
Hospitality	11,7%	47,1%
Adventure	14,2%	11,8%
Event	12,2%	13,7%

The majority of students (43,8%) expected to find WIL placement within the retail or wholesale sector, which corresponds with the number of students registered for the Tourism Management diploma. These students are provided with retail and wholesale industry specific training, such as Galileo and Tour Plan, and are therefore best suited to work in this sector. It is interesting to note that only 13,7% of students found WIL placement in the retail and wholesale sector. Only 11,7% of students expected to work in

the Hospitality sector. However, 47,1% of students found WIL placement in the Hospitality sector.

This result is commensurate with previous research conducted by Taylor and Geldenhuys (2016) indicating that majority of tourism students' find WIL placement within the Hospitality sector.

Table 3, below, provides information pertaining to the WIL placement of tourism students during June 2016 and June 2017.

Table 3: Tourism students undertaking WIL between June 2016 and June 2017

		Percentage (%)
Payment for WIL	Yes	72,5%
	No	27,5%
Offered permanent position	Yes	27,5%
	No	72,5%
Were you given a contract?	Yes	56,9%
	No	43,1%
Were you given a job description?	Yes	45,1%
	No	54,9%
Did you change departments during WIL?	Yes	76,5%
	No	23,5%
Did you change organisations during WIL?	Yes	15,7%
	No	84,3%
Were you satisfied with your WIL placement?	Yes	86,3%
	No	13,7%

Most of the students' received payment for their WIL placement (72,5%) with only 27,5% of these students' offered a permanent position with their WIL organisation. Just over half of the students' were given a contract by their WIL organisation (56,9%) while only 45,1% was given a job description. Majority of students' changed departments during their WIL placement (76,5%), which provided them with a range of experiences. There was 15,7% of students' that changed their WIL placement organisation during the six-month placement period. No previous research has been conducted to determine the affect of changing organisations during WIL placement on the outcomes of WIL or on the success rate of WIL at a HEI. At TUT students may change their organisation during their six-month placement period, however no assessments or reports are required from previous organisations, only from those where the student has completed the WIL placement. As a result, vital information is being lost. Most students' were satisfied with their WIL placement (86,3%) while only 13,7% were dissatisfied.

The mean scores for both the expectation and perception variables are provided in Table 4 below. The differences between expectation and perception mean scores is calculated by subtracting expectations from perceptions (P-E=difference).

Table 4: Gap scores of variables

Variables	E Mean	E Std. Deviation	P Mean	P Std. Deviation	P-E
Section 1: WIL					
Skills dimension					
Provide technical skills	4.59	±.606	4.39	±.532	-0.2
Provide communication skills	4.71	±.460	4.63	±.488	-0.08
Provide HR skills	4.73	±.451	4.53	±.674	-0.2
Provide managerial experience	4.73	±.446	4.20	±.960	-0.53
Outcomes dimension					
Increase knowledge	4.63	±.631	4.53	±.578	-0.1
Gain experience	4.82	±.385	4.49	±.644	-0.33
Improve career options	4.65	±.594	4.53	±.504	-0.12
Close gap between theory and practice	4.55	±.610	4.31	±.812	-0.24
Clarify career goals	4.78	±.415	4.39	±.723	-0.39

Work environment dimension					
Work in a knowledge centred environment	4.57	±.608	4.12	±.621	-0.45
Network with other industry professionals	4.75	±.483	4.35	±.716	-0.4
Work in an interesting and challenging environment	4.63	±.488	4.35	±.716	-0.28
Work in an enjoyable environment	4.82	±.385	4.39	±.723	-0.43
Personal dimension					
Improve self-confidence	4.63	±.662	4.67	±.589	0.04
Advance my career	4.76	±.513	4.49	±.703	-0.27
I will be satisfied with my WIL	4.75	±.595	4.29	±.807	-0.46
I will take responsibility	4.76	±.428	4.59	±.497	-0.17
I will make decisions	4.69	±.583	4.20	±1.000	-0.49
Type of work dimension					
Will work in a managerial position	4.14	±1.096	1.69	±.860	-2.45
Will do administrative tasks	4.06	±.858	4.20	±1.059	0.14
Section 2: Organisation					
Organisation dimension					
Organisation will pay me	4.31	±.787	3.12	±1.558	-1.19
Organisation will offer me a full time position	4.29	±.923	2.35	±1.647	-1.94
Organisation will provide additional training	4.51	±.703	3.69	±1.334	-0.82
Will work in various departments in the organisation	4.61	±.666	4.08	±1.309	-0.53
Will be treated as part of the staff	4.69	±.616	4.29	±1.045	-0.4
Will have enough work	4.41	±.638	4.37	±.631	-0.04
Will observe and learn	4.61	±.568	4.41	±.638	-0.2
Will work 40 hours a week	4.14	±.775	3.92	±1.369	-0.22
Will work over weekends	3.22	±1.064	3.80	±1.569	0.6
Environment dimension					
Co-worker support	4.63	±.631	4.35	±.744	-0.28
Will work independently	4.20	±.917	4.04	±.937	-0.16
Supervisor dimension					
Suervisor will assist with relationships	4.51	±.674	4.02	±1.049	-0.49
Supervisor will provide support	4.76	±.428	4.18	±.910	-0.58
Supervisor will show an interest in me	4.71	±.460	4.31	±.836	-0.4
Supervisor will be responsive	4.78	±.415	4.24	±.971	-0.54
Supervisor will correct me	4.80	±.401	4.57	±.500	-0.23
Section 3: Higher education institution					
Support dimension					
HEI will provide emotional support	4.06	.988	3.16	1.302	-0.9
HEI will provide academic support	4.44	.577	3.55	1.254	-0.89
HEI will provide technical support	4.42	.538	3.27	1.387	-1.15
Contact dimension					
HEI will co-ordinate between all stakeholders	4.55	.577	3.88	1.125	-0.67
HEI will contact me regularly	4.45	.642	3.16	1.286	-1.29
HEI will visit the work place	4.31	.616	1.98	1.157	-2.33
HEI will regularly contact my supervisor	4.45	.642	2.76	1.320	-1.69
P=perception; E=expectation					

There were only two variables that yielded a positive difference between expectations and perceptions. The difference between expectation and perception for "improve self-confidence" increased by 0.04. This indicates that the perception of self-confidence was higher than the expectation. For the variables "will do administrative tasks" and "will work weekends" the perception means were higher by 0.14 and 0.6 respectively. The largest gaps were "will work in a managerial position" (-2.45) and "HEI will visit the work place" (-2.33).

The Wilcoxon matched-pair signed rank test was employed to analyze the gap between expectations and perceptions of the 10 WIL placement dimensions. Table 5 below,

provides the results of the analysis.

Table 5: Wilcoxon Signed rank of differences between expectations and perceptions

Section	Dimension	Mean	Standard deviation	Z-Value	Asymp. Sig.	Effect size (*r*)
Section 1: WIL	Perception Skills	2.14	±1.44	-5,865	.000	0.6
	Expectation Skills	4.78	±0.42			
	Perception Outcomes	4.65	±0.59	-1.000	.317	0.1
	Expected Outcomes	4.76	±0.43			
	Perception Work Environment	4.27	±0.75	-3,777	.000	0.4
	Expectation Work Environment	4.78	±0.42			
	Perception Personal	4.61	±0.57	-2,502	.012	0.2
	Expectation Personal	4.86	±0.35			
	Perception Type of Work	1.61	±0.94	-5,839	.000	0.6
	Expectation Type of Work	3.90	±1.06			
Section 2: Work place organization	Perception Organization	4.00	±0.72	-3,794	.000	0.4
	Expectation Organization	4.61	±0.53			
	Perception Environment	3.39	±1.28	-3,124	.002	0.3
	Expectation Environment	4.14	±0.85			
	Percetion Supervisor	4.37	±0.82	-4.096	.000	0.4
	Expectation Supervisor	4.87	±0.34			
Section 3: Higher Education Institution	Perception Support	3.14	±1.31	-4,463	.000	0.4
	Expectation Support	4.35	±0.70			
	Perception Contact	2.75	±1.11	-5,600	.000	0.6
	Expectation Contact	4.51	±0.58			

The gap between expectations and perceptions of outcomes was the only dimension that did not provide a statistically significant gap. Despite slight differences in the mean scores, students' felt that their expectations towards 'outcomes' were satisfied. The remaining 9 dimensions all yielded statistically significant differences between expectations and perceptions.

Discussion

Fifty-one tourism students were surveyed to identify potential gaps between expectations and perceptions of the WIL placement programme. Descriptive statistics provided a profile of the students' that took part in the study. Majority (43,8%) of students expected to work in the retail and wholesale sector. This is aligned with the number of students registered for the Tourism Management qualification (58,8%). However, only 13,7% of students completed their WIL placement in this sector and almost half of the students completed their placement in the Hospitality sector (47,1%). Students' registered for Tourism qualifications at TUT have received industry specific training and as a result are underutilizing their qualification specific training when completing their placement in the Hospitality industry. This could result in dissatisfaction with WIL placement or even potential career uncertainty as well as the perception held by industry that graduates do not have the required industry skills.

Table 3 provides information related to tourism students WIL placement and although most of the students were paid for their WIL placement (72,5%) only 27,5% of the WIL students were offered a permanent position. Taylor and Geldenhuys (2016b:9) conducted research into the final evaluations of WIL students by their supervisors and found that unpaid students had better job understanding and were better at completing tasks than paid students. This could account for the results for unpaid students and the findings for students offered permanent jobs are the same, however further research should be conducted into the association of payment for WIL and permanent positions. Table 4 indicated the mean scores for each of the 43 variables in terms of expectations and perceptions, as well as the differences between these scores.

Out of 43 variables, only three variables indicated an increase in the gap mean score. Students' expectation scores for 'will do administrative tasks' and 'will work weekends' were lower than the perception scores. This indicates that, although the gap is positive, more students' conducted administrative tasks and worked weekends than what was expected. Students' perceptions scores for the remaining variables were lower than expectation scores, which indicate a WIL placement shortfall. The Wilcoxon matched-pairs sign test with continuity correction of the ten WIL placement dimensions showed that nine of the dimensions were significantly different ($p<0.05$).

The three dimensions with the largest effect size were skills (Z= -5,865, r = 0.6), type of work (Z = -5,839, r = 0.6) and contact (Z = -5,600, r=0.6). The possible reasons for such findings could be attributed to disparity with the industry sector where students found WIL placement, unrealistic expectations by students in terms of the type of work undertaken during WIL and the level of contact by the HEI. It is however important to understand the origin of student expectations for WIL placement in order to apply corrective measures. The findings may suggest that tourism students did not gain the full WIL placement experience and could create uncertainty for a future career in the industry. These findings are similar to those of Lam and Ching (2007), which indicate lower perception means for 19 of the 27 variables used in the study.

Conclusion

The study attempted to identify gaps between the expectations and perceptions of tourism students' WIL placements. The findings of the study have shown that overall students' expectations were not met.   Based on the findings of this study a number of implications can be derived. It is important for HEI's to understand the basis for tourism students' expectations towards WIL placement and to provide comprehensive pre-WIL training. All stakeholders must be invited to participate in the planning of a WIL training programme. It is important to identify potential industry placement opportunities and to match these with the most appropriate qualification. More tourism students tend to complete WIL placement in the Hospitality industry than any other industry sector, which could potentially lead to dissatisfaction with WIL and unclear career direction. HEIs should provide clear guidelines for both industry supervisors indicating what is expected during the WIL placement program, and students in order to minimize the gap between expectations and perceptions. HEIs should consider enhancing WIL programs but providing full-time specialist staff whose sole purpose is to administer WIL placements within the Department. This will allow for more efficient contact between the stakeholders as well as allowing for site visits during WIL placement.

There were limitations in this study including the sample size. As a result, findings may not be generalized to other samples. Further studies should include a larger sample size and other HEIs offering tourism qualifications.

References

Asefi, F., Delaram, M. & Deris, F. (2017). Gap between the Expectations and Perceptions of students regarding the Educational Service Offered in a School of Nursing and Midwifery. *Journal of Clinical and Diagnostic Research*, 11(4): JC01-JC04.

Brown, N. (2010). WIL[ling] to share: an institutional conversation to guide policy and practice in work-integrated learning. *Higher Education Research & Development,* 29(5), 507-518.

Council on Higher Education (CHE). (2004). South African Higher Education in the first decade of democracy, ComPress, Gauteng, 1-40.

Council on Higher Education (CHE). (2010). Universities of Technology – Deepening the debate. Council of Higher Education, Pretoria.

Council on Higher Education (CHE). (2011). Work-Integrated Learning: Good Practice Guide.http://www.che.ac.za/sites/default/files/publications/Higher_Education_Monitor_12 .pdf Date of access: 10 September 2015.

Griesel, H. & Parker, B. (2009). *Graduate Attributes A baseline study on South African graduates from the perspective of employers*, Higher Education South Africa, Pretoria.

Ham, L. & Hayduk, S. (2003). Gaining Competitive Advantages in Higher Education: Analyzing the Gap between Expectations and Perceptions of Service quality. *International Journal of Value-Based Management,* 16, 223-242.

Hughes, K., Mylonas, A. & Beckendorff, P. (2013). Students' reflections on industry placement: comparing four undergraduate work integrated learning streams. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Cooperative Education* 14(4): 265-279.

Jackson, M.J., Helms, M.M. & Amadi, M. (2011). Quality as a gap analysis of college students expectations. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 19(4), 392-412.

Kundasami, V. (2007). *The assessment of work-integrated learning (WIL) at a University of Technology*, thesis, University of Pretoria.

Lam, T. & Ching, L. (2007). An exploratory study of an internship program: The case of Hong Kong students. *Hospitality Management*, 26, 336-351.

Lilley, E. & Usher wood, B. (2000). Wanting it all: The relationship between expectations and the public's perceptions of public library services. *Library Management,* 21(1), 13-24.

Parasuruman, A., Zeithaml, V.A. & Berry, L.L. (1985). A conceptual model of service quality and its implications for future research, *Journal of Marketing,* 49(4), 41-50.

Rayner, G. & Papakonstantinou, T. (2015). Student perceptions of their workplace preparedness: Making work-integrated learning more effective. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Cooperative Education*,16(1) 13-24.

Rothman, M. & Sisman, R. (2016). Internship impact on career consideration among business students. *Education + Training,* 58(9), 1003-1013.

Singh, A. & Dutta, K. (2010). Hospitality Internship placements: Analysis for United Kingdom and India. *Journal of Services Research,* 10(1), 85-99.

Smith, C. (2012). Evaluating the quality of work-integrated learning curricula: a comprehensive framework. *Higher Education Research & Development,* 31(2), 247-262.

Smith, C. & Worsfold, K. (2014). WIL curriculum and student learning: a structural model of their effects on student satisfaction. *Studies in Higher Education,* 39(6), 1070-1084.

Spowart, J. (2011). Hospitality students' competencies: Are they work ready? *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality and Tourism*, 10, 169-181.

Taylor, T.F. & Geldenhuys, S. (2016a). Tourism students' post-placement opinions of work integrated learning (WIL). *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure*, 5(1),

1-11.

Taylor, T. & Geldenhuys, S. (2016b). Tourism students' evaluation of work-integrated learning: A post-placement analysis. *African Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure,* 5(3) 1-13.

Taylor, S. & Govender, C.M. (2016). Increasing employability by implementing a Work-Integrated Learning partnership model in South Africa – A student perspective. *Africa Education Review,* 14(1) 105-119.

Tran, L.T. & Soejatminah, S. (2016). 'Get Foot in the Door': International Students' Perceptions of Work Integrated Learning. *British Journal of Educational Studies,* 64(3), 337-355.

Tshwane University of Technology. (2013). *Draft Policy on Work-integrated learning.* Pretoria, RSA.

Vajda, B.K., Farkas, G. & Málovics. (2015). Student evaluation of training and lecture courses: development of the COURSEQUAL method. *Springer-Verlag.*

Zopiatis, A. & Constanti, P. (2007). "And never the twain shall meet" investigating the hospitality industry-education relationship in Cyprus. *Education + Training,* 49(5), 391-407.

Zopiatis, A. & Theocharous, A.I. (2013). Revisiting hospitality internship practices: A holistic investigation. *Journal of hospitality, leisure, sport & tourism education*, 13, 33-46