



Journal of Hospitality, Leisure,  
Sport and Tourism Education

Vol. 4, No. 2.

ISSN: 1473-8376

[www.hlst.heacademy.ac.uk/johlste](http://www.hlst.heacademy.ac.uk/johlste)

## Editorial

John Tribe ([j.tribe@surrey.ac.uk](mailto:j.tribe@surrey.ac.uk))

Chair of the Editorial Board.

DOI:10.3794/johlste.42.ed

© Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport and Tourism Education

There are three academic papers, two practice papers, one research note and one review of educational resources in this edition of JoHLSTE. Before these are discussed I would like to draw attention to the geographic spread of authorship of the papers in this edition and express my delight that the journal is attracting contributions from around the world and addressing important cultural issues in and for education.

Indeed the Caribbean is the setting of the first of the academic papers where Acolle Lewis presents *Rationalising a Tourism Curriculum for Sustainable Tourism Development in Small Island States: A Stakeholder Perspective*. There has been much talk of the MacDonaldising and globalising effects on the curriculum and a worry that we are moving towards a standardised curriculum to be taken up, irrespective of the local context and conditions. Against this trend, Lewis addresses the question as to what is an appropriate tourism curriculum for small island states in the Caribbean. Her threefold approach is to analyse the local context within which the tourism curriculum is to be developed, examine the role of stakeholders in curriculum decision-making; and present and discuss the findings from a stakeholder enquiry conducted in the Caribbean.

The results of her enquiry are that an appropriate tourism curriculum for the Caribbean should satisfy three criteria. First it should deliver better tourism services as well as contribute to the creation of a better tourism society. Second it should respond to the key issues for tourism development in the islands. Third, it should be informed by the viewpoints of a wide cross-section of stakeholders in the local society. Providing more detail on the last of these, Lewis reports that the purpose of a tourism degree should be to develop broadly educated students who can be knowledgeable about and responsible in tourism development, as well as occupationally functional in tourism. What is equally interesting about Lewis's study is that she reports a shift in her own outlook on the role of tertiary tourism education in an island context. She concludes that in the Caribbean, educators must be aware of the fact that what is appropriate for the tourism curriculum is directly linked to what is important for tourism development in the islands. Therefore, Lewis states that stakeholder involvement in curriculum decision-making has to be a central part of the whole curriculum development process if tourism education is to contribute to the sustainable development of the tourism industry in small island states.

Turning to the field of Leisure, Mary Parr and Brett Lashua analyse *Students' Perceptions of Leisure, Leisure Professionals and the Professional Body of Knowledge*. Whilst there have been several studies by academics on the nature of Leisure, the purpose of Parr and Lashua's study was to give a voice to students, to discover their perceptions and views about leisure, leisure professionals, and the

body of knowledge. Their findings are that traditional, objective definitions of leisure persist among students. They suggest that these attachments to traditional, objective definitions of leisure may be coming from mixed and/or limited messages from faculty and textbooks, from the broader culture and common usage of the term leisure, or a combination of both. Their conclusions are that if professionals continue to perpetuate the notion of leisure as fun, relaxing, free-time, activities through their professional and personal actions, then that is what leisure will be. Against this Parr and Lashua suggest that faculty present leisure as developmental action, complementing service learning experiences and facilitating the development of critical thinking skills through comparison of alternative meanings of leisure. By this means they argue that the purview of practice can be expanded and can act as a catalyst in the development of the principles of a 'good society' – through teaching, learning, and personal and professional practice.

Jammie Price, Kimberly Lukhard and Rose Postel's paper is titled *Quantity Food Production Management: Interactive CD-ROM vs. Lecture Methods of Instruction* and the purpose of their study was to determine if there was a difference in learning among students taught the same subject matter material using two different instructional methods. These were a traditional lecture and a CD-ROM. The study found that a large majority of students preferred lecture instruction to CD-ROM instruction. However despite the students' preferences, the exam scores in the study were not consistently higher with traditional lecture instruction than with CD-ROM instruction. According to the authors, the findings seem to suggest that some subject materials may be more appropriate for CD-ROM than others. Additionally they state that to satisfy the diverse learning needs of students and enhance computer skills it would be beneficial to offer courses that combine traditional lecture methods of instruction with computer assisted self-study.

In the practice section of the journal Rong Huang also investigates the area of student learning preferences in a paper titled *Chinese International Students' Perceptions of the Problem-Based Learning Experience*. Huang's starting point is that problem-based learning (PBL) has been proved to be effective in building the necessary skills and personal qualities that employers are looking for. Her paper reports on an exploratory study of Chinese international students' perceptions of their PBL experience in tourism-related courses at universities in the UK. Huang's findings suggest that the students found the PBL more interactive than their previous learning style, and that it allowed them to learn on their own. However she notes that some negative perceptions were also expressed. In particular she points to the fact that the students had a large psychological obstacle when it came to debating subjects with their lecturers. Huang's findings provide useful information to improve PBL sessions and, more generally, course design in the UK for international students.

Soo K. Kang, Chi-Mei Emily Wu and Rebecca Gould note that hospitality education programmes have worked to reduce gaps in the practical side of the subject by recruiting industry-trained professionals. They provide an interesting insight into this issue (which has previously received little academic attention) in their paper titled *An Exploratory Study: Students' Perceptions of Academic Faculty and Industry Practitioner Instructions*. The purpose of their study was to identify students' perceptions of teaching by academic faculty members versus industry practitioners.

Their study indicated that while industry professionals possess many exceptional qualities and skills, weaknesses of industry-trained instructors were a lack of: classroom skills, including instructional expertise (i.e. using instructional visual aids, coordinating group activities, encouraging student discussion); understanding of students' needs; the ability to motivate students, and flexible office hours. The authors therefore suggest that hospitality programmes that hire industry practitioners should be aware of these challenges so that they can assist new faculty members in their professional development and maximise teaching effectiveness. Kang, Wu and Gould also note that academic faculty members can address their weakness in terms of lack of practical experience and knowledge by participating in faculty internship programmes, networking with industry practitioners, and inviting industry professionals as guest speakers and to seminars. The authors conclude that a well-blended composition of both academics and industry practitioners can enable hospitality programmes to be more competitive and better serve their stakeholders. In support of this a team- or cooperative-

teaching approach between an experienced faculty member and an industry practitioner with little teaching experience can improve the quality of teaching and learning.

Richard Godfrey's research note is titled *The Provision of Postgraduate Taught Lectures and Seminars in Support of PhD Education at Brunel University: Student Perception and Alignment with Official Academic Guidelines*. This is a timely and useful contribution since whilst the so-called "black box" of mainstream education has come under increasing scrutiny and accountability, what goes on in a typical UK PhD programme of studies has remained largely hidden from view. Godfrey notes that the lack of more explicit guidelines in the Roberts Review (2002) and QAA Code of Practice (2004) increases the risk of some universities providing inadequate education to their students and warns that some institutions may not provide their PhD graduates with all of the skills required for professional research and by employers.

This edition of the journal concludes with the Educational Resources Review section where John Harris reviews two texts that cover the ground for 'Sport and Society'. These are Cashmore, E. (2005) *Making Sense of Sports* (4th edn). London: Routledge and Coakley, J. (2004) *Sports in Society: Issues and Controversies* (8<sup>th</sup> edn). Boston: McGraw Hill. Harris commends both texts. He finds that both authors write in a clear and accessible style and that each text includes a number of thought-provoking questions and useful exercises to develop thinking around subjects. Moreover, he notes that for those committed to the promise of the sociological imagination, both texts show that there are numerous ways to look at the place of sport in society.