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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

This study is an education-based study with a focus on hospitality management, which provides a process for evaluation of the Bachelor of Science in hospitality management capstone course at the University of North Texas (UNT). The purpose of the study was to develop a test blueprint to measure programmatic student learning outcomes (SLOs).

For years, hospitality educators have questioned whether hospitality management programs are adequately preparing students for the hospitality industry (Kay & Russette, 2000). Assessment is a process by which educators are able to determine if students are learning the intended information and to what extent. Assessment, when completed correctly, can enhance an educational experience to ensure efficiency and accuracy, as well as determine the attainment of specific learning outcomes for this educational experience. Assessment begins with clearly defined objectives for a course or program; as deciding what a student is supposed to learn provides an excellent starting point in determining whether the information is being obtained. Student learning outcomes are clear, measurable, and obtainable goals established for an educational experience, which illuminates a specific path for students and educators to follow (Kay & Russette, 2000).

The Hospitality Management Program at UNT has established four programmatic student learning outcomes (SLOs). These SLOs state that upon graduating with a bachelor of science degree in hospitality management, students will be able to:

SLO 1. Demonstrate basic knowledge of theoretical constructs pertaining to the hospitality industry.

SLO 2. Apply the basic principles of critical thinking and problem solving when examining hospitality management issues.
SLO 3. Apply technical aspects of the hospitality industry.

SLO 4. Demonstrate professional demeanor, attitude, and leadership needed for managerial positions in the hospitality industry.

The UNT hospitality management faculty assesses the attainment of these four SLOs in a number of ways. Students’ achievement in the program not only stems from the curriculum, but also through students’ abilities to interact in social networking events, industry internships, and other educational experiences that take place outside of the classroom.

The curricula for any educational experience should be based on the desired outcome. In this case, graduates are expected to be able to demonstrate theoretical constructs, apply critical thinking, and be able to perform the technical aspects while demonstrating professionalism, attitude, and leadership within the hospitality industry. These skills and abilities are considered amongst the most desirable qualities for hospitality graduates by industry professionals. These specific skills and abilities, often known as competencies, are the building blocks for curriculum development. Students must be adequately equipped with the knowledge and skills, or competencies, required for success in the industry. Assessment can provide the type of feedback educators desire to determine the students’ attainment of these competencies. One way of assessing curricula is by establishing a capstone course.

Development of Capstone Course

In the hospitality management program at UNT, a capstone course was developed in 2005. First, the UNT faculty asked the question “What do hospitality management students need to know when they graduate?” In order to answer this question, they gathered information from students, the industry, alumni, and the faculty to develop program competencies. Once this
information was gathered, Dr. Richard Tas and Dr. Lea Dopson of the UNT faculty utilized the information gathered to develop specific curricular competencies based on previous industry studies pertaining to students, faculty, and a review of literature. These competencies were then grouped into categories by Tas and Dopson for easier review. From this information, 211 final competencies were identified for the UNT hospitality curriculum and were reviewed by industry professionals, students, alumni, and faculty. The hospitality management faculty compared these 211 competencies to the entire hospitality management curriculum and assigned each competency a level of Bloom’s taxonomy (Dopson & Tas, 2004). Bloom’s taxonomy delineates six stages of cognitive development ranging from simple to complex: knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation. A crosswalk analysis was then created by Dopson using these individual competencies and the faculty’s desired level of Bloom’s taxonomy for each (Dopson & Tas, 2004).

Next, the UNT curriculum was compared with the top 25 hospitality programs in the country. Specific content areas were developed based on the competencies identified and were discussed with the entire hospitality management faculty for debate of major structural curriculum components such as individual courses, internships, and specific concentrations. Based on both of the prior comparisons, the faculty added, deleted, and changed curriculum content to result in the final content areas (Dopson & Tas, 2004).

When reviewing the original crosswalk of the entire hospitality management curriculum, one particular course was accentuated. This course covered a representative breadth of content areas and a significant depth of learning outcomes, utilizing Bloom’s taxonomy Levels 4-6 (analysis, synthesis, and evaluation). Using the original crosswalk analysis for the entire program’s competencies, the specific competencies related to this course were extracted. This
course was then identified and modified to be a capstone course for the curriculum, with the intent of being a culminating experience for the hospitality management program (L. Dopson, personal communication, September 9, 2009).

The course experienced a variety of changes over the four years that followed. These changes were typically dependent on the faculty member selected to teach the course and their specific area of interest. Dr. Daniel Spears was hired to teach upper level management in addition to this newly designed capstone course. Spears completed a crosswalk analysis of the capstone competencies compared to the learning objectives of the capstone course using the revised Bloom’s taxonomy. This crosswalk identified the levels of Bloom’s currently being taught in the class, which may or may not match the faculty’s expectations of the Bloom’s levels that should be taught in the course. Spears identified the gaps between the faculty’s established competency levels and the levels being taught in the class. Spears made the necessary changes to the course to obtain the desired competency levels based on the results of the gap analysis (D. Spears, personal communication, February 2, 2010).

Capstone Course as an Assessment Tool

All theoretical courses in the hospitality management curriculum are required prerequisites or co-requisites to the capstone course. As a result of the required prerequisites, students are expected to come into the capstone course with preexisting knowledge of the following content areas: accounting, finance, and cost controls; human resources; information technology; basic and strategic management; marketing; leadership; sustainability; globalization; and legal issues.

As a culminating experience, the faculty desired to assess two out of the four
programmatic student learning outcomes within the context of the capstone course. The faculty
determined that SLO 2 (Apply the basic principles of critical thinking and problem solving when
examining hospitality management issues) would assess critical thinking skills through case
study analysis as well as in the group project. SLO 3 is largely assessed in the laboratory courses
in the program and SLO 4 is assessed in the pre-internship and internship courses. However, the
hospitality management program at UNT did not have an adequate tool to assess SLO 1
(Demonstrate basic knowledge of theoretical constructs pertaining to the hospitality industry.)
The faculty concluded that an objective question testing format with multiple choice questions
should be used to assess achievement of these competencies in the capstone course (L. Dopson,
personal communication, September 9, 2009).

Assessment in Higher Education

Assessment is a critical component in higher education (Daigle, Hayes, & Hughes, 2007;
Jervis & Hartley, 2005; Murray, Perez, & Guimaraes, 2008; Peach, Mukherjee, & Hornyak,
2007). Educational institutions strive to provide students with an effective, efficient, and positive
learning experience; therefore, assessment is of utmost importance for higher education.
Assessment can evaluate the effectiveness of teaching with its primary purpose to continually
improve upon the students’ educational experience. Ensuring students are successfully prepared
and equipped with the tools they need for a successful career can be a meticulous task, but
nonetheless should be each educator’s top priority (Daigle et al., 2007).

Assessment is important for several reasons; the most important of which is to measure
learning achievement against specific learning goals and to provide feedback for individual
students (Daigle et al., 2007). Assessment also assists educational institutions and faculty
members in enhancing, evolving, and improving their students’ learning experiences.

Assessment is essential in order to receive accreditation (Daigle et al., 2007).

The US Department of Education sets specific standards that educational institutions must abide by in order to qualify for accreditation. The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, also known as SACS, is the regional accrediting body for UNT. SACS requires each school to engage in ongoing self-assessment and to document their results of continuous improvement efforts (AdvancED, 2008). Educational institutions are required to regularly complete multiple detailed documents which demonstrate their ability to adhere to the standards set forth by SACS. In addition, the hospitality management program at UNT is accredited by the Accreditation Commission for Programs in Hospitality Administration, (ACPHA); therefore the program must assess specific standards to maintain accreditation (ACPHA, 2010). For this reason, assessment of curriculum becomes a constant undertaking (Peach et al., 2007).

Statement of the Problem

Assessment is an essential component for accreditation. SACS and ACPHA require the assessment of programmatic student learning outcomes and necessary documentation in order for an educational institution to qualify for accreditation. The hospitality management program at UNT did not have an adequate assessment tool to measure SLO 1 (demonstrate basic knowledge of theoretical constructs pertaining to the hospitality industry.) A multiple choice assessment was administered in the capstone course that was designed to assess competencies with curriculum content areas or categories, however, the tool’s content area emphases, number of questions, and depth of Bloom’s taxonomy varied according to each instructor’s judgment causing fluctuation of content in each semester.
Need for the Study

Previous research suggests the importance of assessment in higher education (Daigle et al., 2007; Jervis & Hartley, 2005; Murray et al., 2008; Peach et al., 2007). The dynamic hospitality industry requires that students are adequately prepared for the fast-paced environment they will enter upon graduation. To ensure that the UNT hospitality management program is properly educating and preparing their graduates, an accurate, effective, and consistent assessment process is needed. Developing an adequate assessment tool is an effective way to measure any deficiencies between student achievement and industry expectations (Stivers & Phillips, 2009).

Developing a test-blueprint for UNT’s hospitality management program capstone course provides the standardization of assessment regardless of the instructor’s judgment or preference. It also assesses the achievement of SLO 1 (demonstrate basic knowledge of theoretical constructs pertaining to the hospitality industry) as realized through the capstone course. This requires the capstone course to be a culminating experience. Specifically, the faculty wants to be able to generalize the results of the capstone multiple choice assessments to the attainment of the theoretical constructs delivered throughout the entire curriculum.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to develop a test blueprint for a hospitality management capstone course to measure programmatic student learning outcomes. The participants of this study were the UNT hospitality management faculty and the industry professionals who sit on the board of governors for this program. The data were collected through a focus group session.
which took place at a hotel in Fort Worth, Texas. A post-focus group survey was emailed to the sample as a follow up to the focus group discussion sessions.

Research Questions

In order to create a test blueprint that measures the achievement of SLO 1 as realized in the hospitality management capstone course at the UNT, the following research questions must be addressed:

1. What content domains must be included in the capstone course test blueprint?
2. What curricular competencies must be measured within each content domain of the test blueprint?
3. What is the optimal proportion for each of the test blueprint domains?

Definitions

*Capstone course* can be defined as a culminating experience that incorporates a body of previous knowledge learned throughout an educational program and aids in the transition from student to industry professional (Henscheid, 2000; Moore, 2009).

*Crosswalk* refers to an analytic procedure used to match a specific listing of items with another as a cross reference to determine common categories (Blank, 1993).

*Culminating experience* refers to a final educational experience for a student that builds upon preexisting knowledge to enable the student to develop new ideas or solutions to problems (Henscheid, 2000; Moore, 2009).

*Curricular competencies or competencies* refer to specific skills or abilities that are essential for a professional in the hospitality industry. Students must be capable of demonstrating
the specific competency in order to be adequately prepared for a successful career in the industry (Dopson & Tas, 2004; Gorsline, 1996; Perdue, Woods, & Ninemeier, 2001; Rychen & Salganik, 2003; Ven & Chuang, 2005).

Domains in this study describe the categories by which curricular competencies are grouped. Domains may also be thought of as content areas that hospitality educators must cover in their courses (Cizek, 1997; Tas et al., 1996). An example of a domain in this study is “marketing” and it would include the competency “Develop a marking plan for a hospitality property.” The nine domains in this study refer to accounting, finance, and cost controls; marketing; human resources; legal issues; leadership; strategic and basic management; globalization; sustainability; and information technology.

Focus groups can be defined as groups of 8-12 people who are asked to answer and discuss a series of questions relating to a specific topic. The purpose of the focus group in this study is to draw out more detailed responses to the survey questions and to clarify any confusing issues (Ehrmann & Zuniga, 1997).

Focus group protocol enables a facilitator to follow a set of guidelines while asking questions in a way that is clear and easy to understand and that encourages feedback from the group. Focus group protocol includes the way the questions should be asked and the responses administrators should utilize to keep the conversation neutral (Ehrmann & Zuniga, 1997).

Probing question refers to the question a focus group administrator asks as a follow up to a comment made by the focus group to draw out additional details or to clarify a confusing issue. An example of a probing question may be, “Could you explain that comment more specifically?” (Ehrmann & Zuniga, 1997).
*Student learning outcomes (SLOs)* are measurable, observable, and obtainable objectives established by educational institution departments to clearly define goals for students to obtain over the course of the program (Murray et al., 2008; University of Rhode Island, 2009, Outcomes Assessment).

*Test blueprint* is a chart used to guide educators in developing tests for students. This chart shows the number of questions on a multiple choice exam each content area (or content domain) should contain (Spray & Huang, 2000).

Limitations

The study is limited to the following factor. Only one hospitality management program in one city was used for this study. It is difficult to make generalizations from these findings due to the small sample size utilized for this study. For future studies, it will be necessary to obtain a more diverse and representative sample.

Delimitations

A delimitation of this study is that all of the competencies do not necessarily need to be taught in the capstone course. Out of the 77 competencies relative to the capstone course, some competencies were not considered for assessment in the capstone course; it is assumed that students will have learned and assessed these competencies through other courses in the program prior to enrolling in the capstone course.
Protection of Human Subjects

The University of North Texas’s institutional review board approved the protection of rights of the human subjects utilized in this study. Ethical principles and the welfare of the human subjects were in compliance with the standards set forth by the Institutional Review Board.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter describes in detail a comprehensive review of literature of the following areas: competencies, domains, curriculum development, capstone course, student learning outcomes, and assessment. The following conceptual model has been utilized to organize this portion of the study. The graphic representation of the process to develop the test blueprint is depicted in Figure 2.1.

![Conceptual model diagram]

Figure 2.1. Conceptual model.

Figure 2.1 provides a roadmap for this study. Each component of the conceptual model was a step in the process of the development of a test blueprint for the capstone course. Bloom’s
taxonomy (Bloom, 1956) is the framework utilized throughout the entire study; furthermore, it has served as the building block for each of the components in this study.

Bloom’s Taxonomy

In 1956, Benjamin Bloom and a team of educational psychologists developed a taxonomy that established levels of intellectual phases required for learning. He believed this taxonomy could serve as a common language for educators, and provide the opportunity for educational outcomes to be measured by the extent of knowledge as well as the intensity of the knowledge (Krathwohl, 2002). According to O’Halloran and O’Halloran (1999), Bloom’s taxonomy can serve as a “guideline for instructors to ensure that higher levels of learning, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation are emphasized” (pg. 1). It is very helpful in the development of curriculum and enables educators to evaluate students’ progress toward established goals and objectives (O’Halloran & O’Halloran, 1999).

The six stages of Bloom’s taxonomy (1956) are in categories ranging from simple to complex: knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation. The following list is derived from Ven and Chuang, (2005) and provides an example of the verbs classified in each category; however this list is not comprehensive:

1. **Knowledge**- know, label, list, memorize, name, recall, remember

2. **Comprehension**- clarify, comprehend, define, discuss, observe, paraphrase, understand

3. **Application**- answer, complete, consolidate, demonstrate, locate, maintain, utilize

4. **Analysis**- analyze, breakdown, classify, distinguish, examine, identify, separate

5. **Synthesis**- arrange, build, configure, establish, recognize, specify

In 2001, the Bloom’s taxonomy model was revised by several of the original researchers. The most significant change from Bloom’s taxonomy to the revised Bloom’s taxonomy is the exchange of the final two levels. Instead of synthesis being followed by evaluation, the revised version of Bloom’s places evaluating before synthesis and renames synthesis as “creating.” Bloom’s taxonomy’s most frequent use has been to categorize curricular goals to demonstrate the extent at which these objectives were being learned or not (Krathwohl, 2002).

The revised Bloom’s taxonomy was modified by changing the name of each level from a noun to a verb. The revised version also brought about a two-dimensional approach to the taxonomy, where as Bloom’s taxonomy took a one-dimensional approach. The revised Bloom’s taxonomy incorporates the noun and verb, and each provides a separate dimension, “the noun providing the basis for the Knowledge dimension and the verb forming the basis for the Cognitive Process dimension” (Krathwohl, 2002, p. 2).

Crosswalk Analysis and Test Blueprint

A crosswalk analysis refers to a grid used to compare, contrast, or assess a specific listing of items with another as a cross reference to determine commonalities. A crosswalk analysis used for competency evaluation normally contains specific competencies across the y axis, and the x axis typically lists specific categories into which the competencies will be classified. The intersection of the competency with the corresponding or associated category may contain a number which is representative of a level of Bloom’s taxonomy. This number represents the level at which that competency is delivered within a specific category. As was demonstrated by Blank (1993), crosswalk analyses are useful as a starting point in evaluating or cross referencing numerous items to identify commonalities.
A test blueprint is an outline of topics to be tested and provides a weighted value or importance level associated with each area of knowledge. The weighted value determines the relative importance of the topics to one another and enables an educator to distinguish which portions of an examination are accentuated with more or less than the other portions. The test blueprint represents a relationship between the topics or content domains and their importance for a professional in the industry. The examination created from a test blueprint would presumably determine whether an individual who took the exam would be prepared or unprepared for a career in the industry (Spray & Huang, 2000).

The test blueprint also shows the breadth and depth of the questions that are asked. The test blueprint depicts each competency and the associated levels of the revised Bloom’s taxonomy by which each competency should contain. There are numerous designs and templates for test blueprints, and the weighted values can be collected in multiple ways. Interviews, focus groups, frequency scales, consequence scales, and the Rasch Rating Scale Model are commonly used methods of collecting weighted importance for content domains (Spray & Huang, 2000).

Competencies and Domains

The term competency has several meanings. According to Rychen and Salganik (2003), competencies are knowledge, skills, and attitudes that are observable and measurable. Competencies may also refer to attributes needed to complete a task or characteristics necessary for success (Dopson & Tas, 2004; Gorsline, 1996). Perdue, Woods, and Ninemeier (2001, p. 19) define the term competency as the “knowledge, skills, and performance abilities required to perform a job effectively.” Possessing knowledge and skills provides the aptitude to complete a task, while the desire to perform the task is directly related to a person’s attitude. Competencies
may be divided into two categories: generic competencies and professional competencies (Kerns, 2001). Generic competencies are general competencies such as reading, writing, and listening; generic competencies are needed in every work environment. Professional competencies are more specific based on knowledge and skills (Ven & Chuang, 2005).

Competencies are determined for the rationale of pinpointing specific skills or knowledge a person must possess in order to assess their abilities; this process is typically related directly to learning. Competency statements are created for establishing competency requirements, basic academic skills, teaching objectives, assessment criteria, and learning outcomes. They also play a major role in job recruitment and personnel profiles (Ruhland & Brewer, 2001). Competency statements describe the outcome of an activity in terms of performance. This is accomplished by using an action verb to describe the behavior and then articulating to whom or to what the action verb is being directed. Each level of competence is determined according to the action verb being used (Ven & Chuang, 2005).

The revised Bloom’s taxonomy table enables educators to rate learning concepts based on a consistent scale to determine the degree of knowledge required for each competency. Typically, hundreds of competencies are required for any one job. Competencies can be grouped into categories making it easier for educators to discuss competency categories rather than specific individual competencies. These categories are also known as content domains. Each content domain represents a grouping of competencies relevant to one another enabling educators to teach managerial competencies more effectively (Tas et al., 1996). Content domains are used as a way to organize competencies to enable educators and students to discuss specific skills and knowledge required but in more general terms. Content domains are sometimes referred to as fields of study and provide a sense of structure to curricula (Cizek, 1997).
Hospitality management curricula must include content domains that have been identified as essential components for professionals in the hospitality industry. Within these content domains, or categories, are specific competencies which identify specific skills or tasks required for proficiency in a hospitality management position. Enabling students and educators to classify key competencies into content domains creates a common language and a broader spectrum of content that provides an effective and efficient hospitality management curriculum (Okeiyi, Finley, & Postel, 1994).

The term domain has many different meanings. Benjamin Bloom (1956) discusses specific categories of learning domains. Learning domains should not be confused with content domains as they are very different. Bloom identifies three areas of learning domains: Cognitive (knowledge), Affective (attitude), and Psychomotor (skills) (Krathwohl, 2002). These learning domains are sometimes referred to as learning outcomes and may be used as key components when developing educational lessons (Vinson, 2009). The learning domains established by Bloom make it possible for educators to determine the specific anticipated outcome of a lesson plan. By identifying these three learning domains, it enables educators to determine how they may represent content, create activities, and assess the mastery of the information presented to the students (Vinson, 2009).

In curriculum development, domains are often defined as “accepted knowledge” required for the profession (Ornstein & Hunkins, 1988). However, researchers typically come to a consensus on these content areas, but rarely agree on the components of curriculum in these areas. According to Ornstein and Hunkins (1988), many researchers believe the problem is that knowledge is diffused in many sources that are often undefined as curriculum sources. Therefore, this information remains unread because there is so much to read. Curriculum
specialists seem to utilize their own personal beliefs of curriculum development to establish definitions. This lack of consensus suggests that a framework must be established for conceptualizing the domains of curriculum. This framework enables curriculum developers to organize thoughts and processes, and understand the necessary components of the field of study.

Specific competencies must be grouped into content domains in order to grasp a manageable body of content that can be assessed. Competencies and content domains provide a common language and allow for key ingredients in the hospitality management pie to be identified and addressed. Incorporating hospitality management competencies into hospitality management curriculum enables higher educators to provide students with industry specific knowledge and skills essential for success in the industry. This provides hospitality management students with the preparation and education needed in the industry (Okeiyi et al., 1994).

According to Dopson and Tas (2004), hospitality educators need to focus on key competencies essential for success in the hospitality industry and incorporate these elements into curricula to ensure students are adequately prepared for their career. By incorporating these competencies, the “gap” between student and industry professional will be reduced.

Curriculum Development

Hospitality curricula should be developed by integrating the essential competencies and domains required for the profession. Educators must ensure students are equipped with the knowledge, skills, and attitudes essential for success in the hospitality industry (Dopson & Tas, 2004). Using Bloom’s taxonomy to develop curricula enables educators to measure the degree to which students master a subject. By using the revised Bloom’s taxonomy two-dimensional approach, students are able to learn a topic more completely and to a higher comprehension
level. The revised Bloom’s taxonomy is sequential, which means that a student must learn one level entirely before significant advancement is achievable (Robinson, 2009). This enables educators to recognize a progression of learning outcomes as a result of mastering the content.

When developing a lesson, utilization of the revised Bloom’s taxonomy can assist in developing a chain of experiences aimed to produce the desired level of learning and can provide evidence of expertise at each level (Robinson, 2009). For educators, this means several forms of teaching are required to ensure students fully master the content by proving verification of the level of the student’s comprehension. Utilizing only one form of instruction, such as lectures or textbook instruction may not be adequate to develop the skills and knowledge desired. Hands-on learning through the use of case studies or projects to enhance critical thinking skills may be more effective to develop the skills and knowledge sought (Robinson, 2009).

Competencies are key components in curriculum development. Educating students on essential industry competencies is critical in ensuring students are well prepared for their careers in hospitality management. Curriculum development should be thought of as an ongoing process, as it is important for hospitality educators to continuously update curricula to keep up with the changing needs of the hospitality industry (Dopson and Nelson, 2003).

**Consensus Building**

Developing curriculum is an intricate process and requires research, industry input, and the contribution all faculty members (Dopson and Tas, 2004). However, establishing a consensus among all of these elements is challenging. Consensus building may be defined as collaboration or problem solving, and typically requires a neutral mediator to facilitate the meeting. Consensus building is an essential element in the curriculum development process. During curriculum
development discussion sessions, it is important that each participant be allowed to voice their opinion and group members listen openly. Reaching a mutually acceptable solution is, after all, the main purpose of a discussion meeting. Establishing consensus among the group can be difficult depending on the topic at hand; however, it is important the facilitator act as a manager to ensure that the discussion continuously works toward the decision process (Consensus Building Handbook, 2009).

Developing a feel for consensus building is beneficial for any educator as it is a skill that can be utilized in a classroom, in a faculty meeting, during curriculum development, or in a focus group setting. Including all faculty in curriculum development is important and establishing a consensus is equally important to continuously improve the curriculum (Consensus Building Handbook, 2009).

Curriculum development is a continuous process and requires constant attention from educators. Curriculum development is critical to the success of any educational institution as the success and preparation of graduates from the institution reflect the legitimacy of the establishment. Utilizing key competencies and essential content domains as a foundation for curriculum development equips students with the knowledge and skills required for a successful career (Jervis & Harley, 2005).

Capstone Courses

A capstone course should be a positive and successful learning experience for every student (Jervis & Hartley, 2005). It should provide a way for students to utilize their skills and abilities to create solutions to problems through critical thinking. The professor should act as a mentor or guide to lead students into problem analysis and resourceful solutions. The capstone
course should be “an in-depth opportunity for the student to demonstrate accomplishment of the full spectrum of that learning” (Moore, 2009, pg. 2). Therefore, it is essential that the capstone course include a wide and balanced variety of expectations. The student should be given the opportunity to utilize existing knowledge to develop a solution to new analytical problems established in the course (Moore, 2009). Revised Bloom’s taxonomy is a common method used to ensure all levels of intellectual activity are being utilized. By incorporating Levels 4-6, analyzing, evaluating, and creating, the course focuses more on the “why” of learning and “how” to reach a solution, than just the “what.” Capstone courses are intended to integrate critical thinking throughout the course rather than only technical skills (Moore, 2009).

One of the main purposes of a capstone course is to prepare students for the professional world in which they are about to enter. For this reason, educational institutions usually ensure this course is mandatory in order for students to graduate. Typically, capstone courses are taken by students in the final semester of their educational experience; this course acts as a transition class from under-graduate to professional in the industry. According to Henscheid (2000), an important goal for capstone courses is to provide students with career preparation and pre-professional development. Career preparation is especially important with the increased competition in today’s workforce, and the rapid technological advancements that occur on a constant basis. Graduates are expected to be hospitality managers upon completion of their degree. Often, students do not feel ready for this type of intense position immediately following graduation. Capstone courses are intended to help to bridge the gap between students and the industry (Moore, 2009).

The capstone course serves as a collaboration of all previous skills and knowledge that students have obtained with the proficiency and critical thinking abilities required by
professionals in the industry. According to Moore (2009), students are expected to display a mastery of learning and demonstrate the ability to apply it to new and integrated information. The capstone course serves as a summative evaluation of the students’ experience at an educational institution and provides an opportunity to utilize pre-existing knowledge to develop relationships between individual courses in preparation for their career (Moore, 2009).

Universities have struggled to provide an opportunity for students to connect all of the knowledge learned in individual courses prior to entering the workforce (Jervis & Hartley, 2005). Today, educational institutions are attempting to tie all of students’ educational experiences together through capstone courses; they are recognizing that universities should be accountable for clearly stating and explaining their expected standards for student learning, as well as assessing these objectives to determine the level at which they have been met (Moore, 2009).

_Culminating Experience_

A capstone course is typically designed to be a culminating experience for the student. It serves as a collaboration of knowledge and skills and also a bridge between college student and industry professional. The course provides learning from a comprehensive perspective. New information is not presented in this course, rather, the building upon pre-existing knowledge is demonstrated (Moore, 2009).

A capstone course is usually one of the concluding courses taken by a student and is intended to provide a “practice run” for students to utilize their knowledge and experience in a non-threatening environment. This kind of course provides an opportunity for students to combine everything learned throughout the program and utilize this to formulate solutions to
problems. Capstone courses provide an opportunity to determine whether students have acquired the knowledge and skills anticipated from a set of expected outcomes. The capstone course serves as an opportunity for students to demonstrate that the goals for learning developed by their educational institution and major department have been met (Moore, 2009).

A capstone course should be created to evaluate cognitive, affective, and psychomotor learning in a student-centered environment. According to Moore, (2009) this requires students to demonstrate the ability to analyze and synthesize both knowledge and skills. The course acts as an instrument for evaluation that requires the application of the previous knowledge acquired through the program. A “capstone course is usually the culminating academic experience that ties together all previous courses in an academic discipline and facilitates transition to a chosen career” (Henscheid, 2000, p. 2).

Educational institutions often struggle to appropriately design capstone courses so they can be accurately and adequately assessed. Capstone courses are often identified, but they may or may not be designed to be culminating experiences. They may be designed for students to use knowledge acquired through the program, but rarely are capstone courses designed to build off of this knowledge to develop solutions to complex problems or situations using critical thinking skills. The “tying in” of individual competencies and content domains regarding their relationships to one another is the critical component often left out of capstone course design. Whether this feature exists determines whether the course can be defined as a true culminating experience. Adequately designed culminating capstone courses may be used to assess the entire curricula. Henscheid (2000) found that almost half of the regionally accredited higher educational institutions use capstone courses as part of their assessment program.
Colleges and universities across the country are using capstone courses to evaluate students’ mastery of their programs. According to Henscheid (2000), many educational institutions require that students enrolled in the capstone course present their papers/projects to the departmental faculty to demonstrate achievement of the department’s learning goals. Many methods of assessment are currently being used to evaluate capstone courses and their associated curricula.

Challenges with Capstone Courses

It has been established throughout this section of the review of literature that capstone courses serve as a fundamental stepping stone for students preparing to launch into their profession. Why then, haven’t all universities designed capstone courses for their programs? The reason for this is that capstone courses are challenging to design and implement correctly; consequently, all universities and their individual departments have not yet established and implemented adequate capstone courses (Henscheid, 2000).

As discussed earlier, capstone courses combine the skills and knowledge students have previously obtained and create critical thinking opportunities for students. The challenge for department faculties and professors is developing scenarios through which critical thinking may be utilized. These scenarios may include case studies, projects, and/or discussions using students’ prior knowledge as a foundation and encouraging the discovery of a solution through critical thinking. According to Moore (2009), capstone courses may be thought of as a summative evaluation of the entire curriculum; this presents the challenge of incorporating all of the skills and knowledge demonstrated in each course of the program into a holistic learning experience in the capstone course. This is time consuming and requires the involvement of the
entire faculty to incorporate the fundamental aspects of the individual courses taught by each faculty member (Dopson & Tas, 2004).

Another challenge to designing a capstone course is the identification of weaknesses associated with the program. If students are unable to use critical thinking skills related to a particular topic because of a deficiency in a specific area of the curricula, this may hinder the experience of the capstone course for students. By creating a capstone course used as an evaluation tool for the curriculum, it may present other issues that must first be addressed before the capstone course can reach its full potential (Murray et al., 2008).

Teaching this type of course is extremely time consuming and calls for an educator who is a master of many areas within a specific department. Instructors not only need to be comfortable with all of the different content areas, but they must be extremely fluent incorporating all of the necessary areas and applying critical thinking at Levels 4-6 of the revised Bloom’s taxonomy. The instructor of a capstone course must also have the ability to utilize different methods of instruction throughout the course (Jervis & Hartley, 2005).

Instructors should use different types of instructional methods when teaching a capstone course. Typically the most common methods used are oral presentations, group projects, and individual projects (Henscheid, 2000). Instructors usually dictate their utilization of instructional methods off of past experiences and the positive or negative outcome it produced. In the hospitality industry especially, there is requirement for strong interpersonal skills and the ability to work with others. For this reason, group projects or team presentations are increasingly popular methods of instruction. Open discussion and case study analysis are commonly used practices for instructors as well (Jervis & Hartley, 2005).
These methods of instruction require an immense number of hours of preparation and grading time (Jervis & Hartley, 2005). Instructors must identify topics, determine readings, and select cases to use in the course. It has been found that each case takes approximately eight to ten hours of preparation time and readings require two to three hours. Projects, case studies, exams, and written assignments may take anywhere from four to sixteen hours per week to prepare depending on class size. One project for one individual may take one hour to read and evaluate, depending on the requirements and complexity of the assignment. This adds an intense amount of responsibility and commitment for the instructors of capstone courses (Jervis & Hartley, 2005).

Jervis & Hartley (2005) recommend professors use a “team effort” to teach capstone courses. The benefits of several professors teaching this one course would be the diversification of content experts, meaning each faculty typically has expertise or experience in a different area. This would also reduce preparation time for one professor since the responsibility would be spread amongst two or three instructors. Professors may rotate content areas or rotate a small number of weeks at a time enabling the workload to be reduced dramatically. This team-taught option would, however, require numerous meetings of professors to ensure content was equally and adequately divided and covered in conjunction with the learning outcomes determined for the capstone course (Jervis & Hartley, 2005).

Another difficult aspect of an effective capstone course is determining an appropriate class size. Large classes increase the workload for professors through the additional assignments, papers, or projects that must be graded. Instructors must be able to prepare instructional methods that are manageable based on class size. In large courses, discussion may be limited. As a result, fewer in-class activities may be assigned and more lecture-based teaching methods may be
utilized by the professor. In larger classes, instructors may also give fewer assignments, projects, or case studies to keep the workload manageable. Smaller classes allow for more open discussion and the ability for most students to contribute to the conversation. However, smaller classes may mean more sections of the capstone course must be offered to accommodate the number of students required to take the course. The ideal number of students for a capstone course, according to Jervis & Hartley (2005), is no less than 20 and no more than 30 students in each course. This encourages class discussion, promotes the manageability of the course for the instructor, and ensures the workload for the professor is not overly excessive.

It is essential to have the entire faculty’s “buy-in” when developing a capstone course (Dopson & Tas, 2004; Peach et al., 2007). The support and ownership of the department’s faculty is critical in the success of the capstone course. All courses leading up to the capstone experience should be thought of as building blocks to enhance the student’s learning experience. All faculty must be involved in the design, development, and the implementation of the capstone course in order for the course to act as an assessment of the entire curriculum (Stivers & Phillips, 2009).

A capstone course provides the opportunity to enhance a student’s learning experience. This potential culminating experience is a single opportunity for all knowledge and skills to be assembled collectively. The capstone course “transcends the debate over professional and non-professional issues” (Moore, 2009, p. 13). It ties together both knowledge and experience and provides a unique application of the entire collegiate experience to result in the successful completion of educational requirements. Encompassed in these courses are university core classes and departmental expectations of proficiency; allowing students the ability to demonstrate mastery of their profession. The capstone course draws together the expected
outcomes of higher education, the university, and the individual department to create an assessment tool that seize the opportunity to evaluate and enhance the students’ learning experience (Moore, 2009). This course is intended to be a final preparation course that is valuable, beneficial, and provides a unique method of assessment for the institution. Across the country, colleges and universities use capstone courses as a form of assessment to determine how completely programmatic student learning outcomes are being achieved in their institution (Henscheid, 2000).

Student Learning Outcomes

Student learning outcomes (SLOs) have several meanings. SLOs may refer to specific objectives set for students to reach pertaining to an individual course, or SLOs may describe expected outcomes established by a specific educational department within a university for a particular program. Therefore, outcomes will be referred to throughout this section as pertaining to the entire program, and objectives will be utilized in relation to individual courses within the program. Regardless of the use, these expectations must be clearly defined, measurable, obtainable, and observable goals established to guide educational experiences for students (Murray et al., 2008). SLOs explain what students will learn, demonstrate, or understand within a specified amount of time. According to the University of Rhode Island, SLOs are defined as statements that identify the “skills, knowledge, attitudes, or values that students will be able to know, do, or demonstrate by the time they have completed a program, course, or project” (University of Rhode Island, 2009, Outcomes Assessment). By developing specific outcomes for students, educators are able to structure learning and guide the learning experience throughout the course or program.
According to Betts (2008), every course designed should contain specific objectives that are cohesive with the overall program’s expectations. If these objectives do not effectively address the material covered in the program, they should be adjusted or changed accordingly. Objectives should be established prior to the start of a course. This is an essential component for success; establishing expectations before beginning keeps students and teachers on a direct path and avoids aimlessly covering material to fill class periods (Betts, 2008). Objectives, as well as SLOs should be defined from an operational perspective and often begin with the phrase, “the student will be able to.” Learning outcomes describe specific skills, knowledge, or abilities that students will possess and be able to demonstrate upon completion of an educational program (Murray et al., 2008).

SLOs may also be thought of as expectations for learning. Setting expectations is an essential component in education; it enables students to understand the specific knowledge and the level at which they are expected to know that information. SLOs are essential for high quality programs. By clearly identifying the levels of learning, educators are able to assess whether these levels are being taught in the classroom and whether students are mastering the content to the expected levels (Betts, 2008).

SLOs serve several purposes, most importantly by providing departments with feedback and enabling departments to understand how to better facilitate learning. They also provide students with the ability to explain what they know how to do. SLOs enable students to understand the skills they are learning and present them with a roadmap of where learning opportunities exist within their department. (University of Rhode Island, 2009, Outcomes Assessment). Typically, a program of study will contain five to ten general outcomes with more clearly defined objectives designated for each individual course. Outcomes and objectives should
address the knowledge, skills, or abilities that are expected to be obtained, and they should be stated in a way that can be measured or assessed (Murray et al., 2008).

SLOs provide consistency for programs and are critical elements in the assessment process. SLOs should be clearly defined, well-established, and adequately communicated to students and educators. One key purpose of SLOs is to create a path for learning, providing a communicated and defined guide to educational experiences. By clearly stating what students should be able to know or do, SLOs provide a starting point for the assessment process (Murray et al., 2008).

Assessment

Student achievement is the true purpose of any institution of higher education. Assessment is the vehicle through which a program is able to determine the level of attainment of established SLOs and how to improve student achievement of these expectations. Assessment of an educational program begins with clearly defined SLOs and evaluates the depth of student learning. The results of assessment should be utilized to enhance the learning experience by ensuring both teaching and learning are effective and efficient (Murray et al., 2008).

Several years ago, course evaluation was only for extremely advanced educational institutions. Shortcuts were often created by universities so they could go through the motions of assessing their curriculum without actually having to do so, thus, resulting in a significant gap between education and industry expectations (Daigle et al., 2007; Stivers & Philips, 2009). All too often education is criticized for not adequately preparing students for their industry; assessment is an effective way to aid in closing this gap. In today’s culture of accreditation,
assessment is an essential component to the success of a department, and educational institutions have no choice in whether to participate (Peach et al., 2007).

Assessment can be defined as a process by which curricula is evaluated to determine if the anticipated student learning outcomes are being satisfied (Murray et al., 2008). The purpose of assessment is to improve and enhance curriculum, making the learning experience more effective and efficient for students. According to Daigle et al. (2007), course assessment should be viewed as a basic building block for evaluating SLOs at the department level.

*Elements in Assessment*

Assessment can be complex, as the elements incorporated within assessment may have many variations. Outcomes assessment and classroom assessment are significantly different. Harwood and Cohen (1999) define outcomes assessment as intermittently conducted by administrators to make adjustments to benefit future students in future classes. They define classroom assessment as constant and immediate changes to the course program by faculty to benefit current students. In essence, it is an instructor’s responsibility to maintain classroom assessment to ensure the learning process is effective and efficient. This approach is direct and is more student-based; it can be referred to as a “bottom-up” approach to assessment (Daigle et al., 2007, p. 3).

The “top-down” approach stems from the US Department of Education, which sets regulations requiring educational institutions to complete assessment in order to qualify for accreditation (Apostolou, 1999). The “top-down” assessment approach is an attempt to promote accountability among educational institutions to encourage the utilization of the bottom-up approach (Daigle et al., 2007, p. 3). According to Daigle et al. (2007), accreditation should be
the third most important reason to complete assessment. The most important reason should be to ensure SLOs are being achieved at the expected levels and to provide guidance and feedback to the individual students in the program. The second most important reason to assess courses is to help educational institutions and faculty improve programs and future students’ learning experiences.

Forms of Assessment

There are two basic forms of assessment: indirect and direct. Indirect assessments include focus groups, surveys, interviews, etc. According to Price and Randall (2008), knowledge surveys are frequently used for indirect assessment. These surveys ask students to rate their skills and knowledge covering a range of content areas associated with program. Students base responses on their level of confidence in identifying and solving problems in these specific areas. Results of this type of indirect assessment are immediate; however, the surveys are time-consuming and intense for students to complete (Price & Randall, 2008).

Direct assessment, “requires that students demonstrate mastery of topics or skills” by evaluating the students’ actual work (Price & Randall, 2008, p. 2). Direct assessment can be achieved through papers, presentations, case studies, or pre-tests and post-tests. The most commonly used form of direct assessment is pre-testing and post-testing because it easily identifies the difference in student learning over the course of the semester. The results of this form are immediate as well, but time constraints limit the amount of information that can be tested. This form of direct assessment allows educators to incorporate SLOs established for the curriculum (Price & Randall, 2008).
By utilizing direct assessment methods, educators can determine the achievements of students by using course-embedded assessment. Course-embedded assessment, an advanced and structured assessment, requires that students’ work be evaluated by using the specific objectives established for the course (Price & Randall, 2008). It is organized, informal, and allows for everyday classroom activities to provide feedback for faculty on ways the course can be enhanced or improved. This efficient and effective method ensures consistency among several sections of the same course (Gerretson & Golson, 2005; Price & Randall, 2008).

Assessment encourages education to be focused on student-based learning rather than on teaching-based education. It enables educators to ensure that courses or programs are meaningful and useful. Assessment is a continuous process and must be thought of in this way (Peach et al., 2007).

Assessing a Capstone Course

According to Jervis & Hartley (2005), assessing a capstone course brings about two basic issues. The first is that the instructor and/or faculty must assess whether the students’ performance meets the course objectives. The second issue is whether the capstone course should be utilized as an assessment for the entire program. This relates back to determining if the capstone course in its entirety is effective and efficient. Faculty should determine solutions for these issues and identify the main purpose of the capstone course for their department. According to Stivers and Phillips (2009), faculty should keep in mind these recommended guidelines for assessment:

1. The main purpose of assessment is to enhance and improve departmental curriculum
2. Assessment of student learning involves faculty, staff, and students
3. Assessment is guided by the institution’s mission

4. Assessment should not be used for faculty or staff evaluations

5. Assessment is an ongoing and continuous process

6. The assessment process is evaluated regularly (p. 3)

Assessment is an integral part of program improvement (Murray et al., 2008). It should be a process that adequately evaluates students’ achievement of SLOs and objectives for a program or course. Capstone course assessment will illuminate the program’s strengths and weaknesses. This provides the opportunity for improvement and the enhancement of the student learning experience (Murray et al., 2008). It is an evaluation that requires “constant reevaluation, revision, and improvement of procedures” (Peach et al., 2007, p. 4). This endless process often challenges educational institutions due to the amount of effort and time required. Assessment must be thought of as a journey, rather than a task. Assessment should bridge the gap between perception and reality by providing students with the preparation they warrant for a successful career in the industry (Stivers & Phillips, 2009).
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the methodology involved in conducting this study. This study was designed to develop a test blueprint for a hospitality management capstone course to measure programmatic student learning outcomes. This chapter includes the research questions formulated for this study, description of the sample, data collection, and data analysis that were used to conduct this study.

In addition, the revised Bloom’s taxonomy will be used throughout this study. The decision to use the two-dimensional approach was made to keep the study current. Some portions of this study had been created using Bloom’s taxonomy; those pieces were reevaluated and converted to the revised Bloom’s to keep the study cohesive and accurate (Krathwohl, 2002). The revised Bloom’s taxonomy was utilized in nearly every aspect of this study.

Research Questions

In order to create a test blueprint that measures the achievement of SLO 1 as realized in the hospitality management capstone course at the University of North Texas, the following research questions were addressed.

1. What content domains must be included in the capstone course test blueprint?
2. What curricular competencies must be measured within each content domain of the test blueprint?
3. What is the optimal proportion for each of the test blueprint domains?
Sample

The population for this study consisted of the UNT hospitality management full-time faculty and the industry professionals on the advisory board for the program. The sample for the focus groups used in this study were a convenience sampling utilizing the same full-time hospitality management faculty and industry professionals/board of advisors who attended the October 2, 2009 board meeting held at a hotel in Fort Worth, Texas. There were 15 UNT hospitality management faculty members and 29 members of the board of governors in the population.

Data Collection

Two hundred eleven competencies were developed by the hospitality management faculty at UNT. The 77 competencies pertaining to the capstone course were extracted and grouped into categories by the researcher. These categories were compared to the faculty’s list of domains for the entire program and the final list of content domains was established by the researcher and the hospitality management chair.

The focus groups were presented with informed consent forms and all attendees of the fall hospitality management board meeting chose to participate in the focus group discussions. The focus groups were given the task of assigning each of the nine content domains with an associated weighted percentage. The total of the nine domains had to equal 100%. The researcher divided the attendees into two focus groups so there were equal numbers of industry professionals and equal numbers of faculty members in each group. Each focus group contained 14 participants and the groups were asked to sit on opposite sides of the hotel ballroom from one another for the focus group discussions. A specific agenda was communicated and a precise time
was allotted for the discussion of each domain. Two administrators led the focus group discussions. One administrator was the researcher, and the other was a trained research assistant who was also a graduate student at the University of North Texas. The research assistant was trained according to focus group protocol established by the researcher, as listed below.

A. Primary questions were asked to spark and encourage discussion for each domain as follows:

1. Regarding the _____ domain, what is the percentage of time hospitality students should spend learning this content area?

2. Regarding this same domain, what percentage do you feel is appropriate to weight the importance of this content area for hospitality students?

3. How do you feel about the associated percentage we have just assigned to this domain?

4. Based on the list of percentages we have developed for each of the nine domains, which percentages would you change keeping in mind the total of all 9 domains must equal 100%?

B. During the focus group discussion, probing questions were used to extract additional information from the participants or to clarify any confusing discussion amongst the group. Examples of probing questions that were used are, “Could you explain what you mean in more detail?” or “How do you feel about that?”

C. Each of the nine domains were discussed for approximately two minutes.

D. Twelve minutes were allowed for the focus groups to determine the exact weighted percentage of each domain through consensus.
E. Each focus group’s discussion was recorded to document the conversation. (see Appendix D).

The method of decision making was consensus building based on the theories described in The Consensus Building Handbook (2009). The administrators of the focus groups acted as neutral mediators of the discussion and allowed participants to generally agree on each content domain’s weight. Once the domains had a weighting associated, the administrators allowed participants to revise the weights after looking at the entire listing. Each participant was allowed to voice their opinion and a mutually acceptable weighting was determined. Upon the completion of the 30 minute focus group discussions, each group had reached a consensus.

Approximately one week after completion of the focus group, a survey was e-mailed to all UNT full-time faculty members, as well as the entire hospitality management advisory board. The survey was created using the Survey Monkey software program and asked respondents to select one of the scenarios established by the focus groups. Respondents were asked to select the scenario based on the weighted percentages they felt were most accurate. Respondents were also given the option to create their own scenario, if they felt the two scenarios were not representative of their opinion. The link to the survey was emailed to the sample with an informed consent document explaining that the responses will be kept confidential and that there are no foreseeable risks in participating in the survey. Survey responses were kept confidential as responses were not associated with names or email addresses. Responses and contact information for the population were kept on a locked computer within a locked office on campus.

The researcher established a specific procedure that would take place if any ties existed upon completion of the survey. The researcher asked the chair of the hospitality management program to lead the faculty through the following process during a faculty meeting. The
department’s faculty, as a whole, were asked to break the tie. After they looked at the results of
the survey, the faculty had to make a decision whether to select one option as it is, select one
option and modify it, or create a completely new option using the data provided. Ultimately, it is
the faculty’s responsibility to determine the curriculum, which is why they were selected to
break the tie.

The researcher also collected demographic information from the participants including
age, gender, education, title of their current position, and the number of years they have worked
in their respected industry. This information is displayed in Table 4.3. and Table 4.4. The survey
was a post-focus group instrument that resulted from the focus groups discussions.

In summation, the researcher used the results of the focus groups to determine the
optimal weighted percentages for each of the nine content domains. From these percentages a
test blueprint was developed to establish a consistent measurement tool that is used to measure
programmatic student learning outcomes in a hospitality management capstone course. The test
blueprint determines the number of multiple choice questions per content domain to be included
on examinations in the capstone course.

Reliability and Validity of Instruments

Qualitative research is the study of real-world situations which are meant to provide a
knowledge, explanation, or understanding behind similar situations (Golafshani, 2003).
Quantitative research, on the other hand, is based on theoretical considerations and measures
relationships through statistical analysis. These two types of research are very different, and are
often thought to compete with one another; when the reality is, qualitative and quantitative
research should complement one another. Qualitative research intends to provide knowledge or
understanding and quantitative research is intended to explain (Golafshani, 2003; Labuschagne, 2003).

Qualitative analysis indicates an emphasis on processes but does not measure variables through quantity, amounts, or frequencies (Labuschagne, 2003). Rather, qualitative analysis utilizes knowledge in conjunction with numbers to produce descriptive data. Therefore, reliability and validity are typically viewed in union during qualitative analysis (Golafshani, 2003).

Reliability in qualitative research can be misleading. According to Stenbacka (2001), if a qualitative study contains reliability, the study may be of poor quality (Golafshani, 2003; Stenbacka, 2001). For example, conducting interviews that all heed the same results produces undesirable results. Instead of reliability and validity, terms such as dependability, consistency, transferability, and trustworthiness should be used in qualitative research as the criterion for quality (Golafshani, 2003; Labuschagne, 2003; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Stenbacka, 2001). According to Stenbacka 2001, reliability is irrelevant when determining quality in qualitative research.

Validity has been argued by several researchers to be insignificant without reliability (Golafshani, 2003). However, some form of quality check is still needed. Consequently, many researchers have developed their own measures for validity and reliability in their qualitative research, seeking out verification such as dependability and trustworthiness (Golafshani, 2003; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Stenbacka, 2001).

In this study, the nine content domains were identified and agreed upon by four hospitality management professors at UNT. This approval of the nine content domains was used to measure dependability and consistency in this qualitative study.
Data Analysis Procedures

The data collected in this study was utilized to formulate a test blueprint which enabled the instructor of a hospitality management capstone course to determine the number of multiple choice questions per content domain that to be included on examinations for the course.

Procedure 1

The researcher took the original groupings faculty created for 211 competencies for the entire curriculum. The researcher then took the 12 domains and reduced them to 9 domains that were relevant to the capstone course. This procedure was used to analyze the following:

Research Question 1: What content domains must be included in the capstone course test blueprint?

Procedure 2

The researcher summarized and reduced the competencies to a quantity appropriate for a test blueprint. This procedure was used to analyze the following:

Research Question 2: What curricular competencies must be measured within each content domain of the test blueprint?

Procedure 3

The researcher used focus groups and the post-focus group survey to determine relative weights of domains for the test blueprint. This procedure was used to analyze the following:

Research Question 3: What is the optimal proportion for each of the test blueprint domains?
CHAPTER 4
RESULTS

This chapter presents the analysis of the data collected for this study. The focus group discussions are summarized and a depiction of each groups’ recommended weighted percentages for each of the nine content domains is found in this chapter. The results of the post-focus group survey followed by a detailed description of the demographic information collected in this study are included. Finally, this chapter contains the discussion of the research questions.

As described in Chapter 3, the following three research questions were examined in alignment with the research objectives of this study.

Research Question 1: What content domains must be included in the capstone course test blueprint?

In an earlier curriculum review, the UNT hospitality management faculty analyzed 211 competencies and assigned appropriate levels of Bloom’s taxonomy for the entire curriculum. To categorize these competencies, the faculty had identified 12 content domains: accounting, cost controls, marketing, human resources, information technology, basic and service management, personal attributes and leadership, going green, global issues, strategic management, legal issues and hospitality law, and tourism.

The researcher, along with the hospitality management chair, analyzed 77 competencies assigned by the faculty to the capstone course and grouped them into the 12 content domains. Although these content domains had been identified based on the competencies, overlapping material within the content domains remained. The researcher and hospitality management department chair revised the content domains to eliminate redundancy.
Accounting and cost controls were combined into one category, which assumed all accounting concepts, called *accounting, finance, and cost controls*. Basic and service management were assumed into one category and titled *strategic management*. Personal attributes and leadership were narrowed to simply *leadership*, and global issues and tourism were combined into *globalization*. Going green was changed into *sustainability*. Legal issues and hospitality law was reduced to *legal issues*, and human resources, marketing, and information technology stayed the same, thus resulting in the final nine content domains.

In order to establish dependability of the domains, the researcher polled four UNT hospitality management full-time faculty for their expert judgment. These faculty agreed that the nine content domains were accurate and representative of the information being covered in the capstone course. One of the four professors recommended that in the future it may be necessary to add a *tourism* domain to cover a rapidly growing and important segment of the hospitality industry within the course, but it was not recommended for this study. All four professors approved the list and requested the study continue.

Research Question 2: What curricular competencies must be measured within each content domain for the test blueprint?

The researcher translated the faculty’s recommended Bloom’s taxonomy levels to revised Bloom’s taxonomy levels and developed a crosswalk analysis which displayed the 77 competencies associated with the capstone course and the learning objectives for this course.

The researcher, along with the hospitality management chair, went through the 77 competencies to find commonalities. The 77 competencies were analyzed to reduce to the smallest number of competencies as possible without reducing content. This resulted in 49
competencies. The researcher and hospitality management chair evaluated the list of competencies and concluded that numerous competencies lacked descriptive verbs and the appropriate levels of the revised Bloom’s taxonomy. The competencies were further revised to be more accurately descriptive. The current instructor of the capstone course, Dr. Daniel Spears, was then asked by the researcher to assign each of the 49 revised competencies with the appropriate level of the revised Bloom’s taxonomy based on the faculty’s recommended level of Bloom’s and the current instruction of the course (see Appendix G). The current instructor, the chair of the department, and the researcher determined that competencies that fell under Bloom’s Levels 1-3, would be taught and measured in pre-requisite and co-requisite courses. An example of a competency rated at Levels 1-3 would be “understand and use spreadsheets.” Competencies such as this example would be purposefully left out of the final list of competencies from the capstone course as a result of students’ pre-existing knowledge from other courses in the curriculum. For this reason, time would not be spent teaching students in the capstone course how to understand and use spreadsheets, but rather, they would be expected to develop and analyze spreadsheets during the capstone course. Once the competencies were condensed further to omit Bloom’s Levels 1-3, the final list containing 38 competencies were categorized into nine different content domains established in Research Question 1.
Research Question 3: What is the optimal proportion for each of the test blueprint domains?

Focus Group Discussion

During the focus group discussion, there was much debate over the specific definitions and the subcategories of each of the nine content domains (see Appendix E). Industry professionals participating in the focus group discussion questioned what the desired position in the hospitality industry was by the students taking the course. For example, one participant asked, “What position is the goal here? Are most [students preparing to be] general managers or department heads? If we narrow the focus to the general manager-type position, with the goal of being a big-time boss, then I think every single category is important.” Industry professionals argued their point of view by identifying key subject matter or skills under each domain and why that point was important to them in their current job. One participant stated, “You would place more emphasis on marketing than human resources? I think knowing more about the people that you are going to be around is more important than the product you are serving. My biggest challenge is maintaining people in my world.”

Participants agreed that all nine content domains were important; however, the sustainability and globalization domains had significantly less weight than the rest of the content domains. The reason for this was the “newness” of the subjects. A participant said, “If you are going to emphasize one [domain], let it be human resources, information technology, or accounting. Sustainability, nobody even knew what that was two years ago. Globalization is the same thing.” Each domain was evaluated and defended by focus group members. One participant felt that managers in the hospitality industry typically have employees who work for them that specialize in certain areas and therefore they should not be as heavily weighted as
some of the others, “Most places have legal counsel so it isn’t important for these students to know a ton about legal issues. Same goes for human resources, they should have someone that works for them deal with it.” In the end, the domains discussed to have the most value were marketing, basic and strategic management, and accounting, finance, and cost controls.

The nine domains were discussed in detail for most of the 30 minutes allotted and final weightings were determined by consensus. One group finished in 20 minutes and the other group finished in 28 minutes. Upon completion of the focus group discussion, several participants bantered with participants from the other focus group to discuss why their group’s scenario was more accurate. Focus group participants were concerned with the limited information they were given about each content domain. Only the titles of the nine content areas were given; no detailed description or list of competencies was provided to the focus group participants. One participant stated, “Where does service fall into?” Another participant commented, “Should we put sales under marketing?” Focus group results indicated that each group developed their own “definition” for the content domains. A participant commented, “Where does management fall? There is a big difference between management and strategic management, but both are extremely important. I think that [basic management] should be in here. Where does that go?”

As a result of the focus group discussion, basic management was added to the strategic management content domain. The participants commented that it was important for basic management to be categorized under one of the domains. It was recommended to add this term and therefore it was included under the strategic management content area. The focus group results are illustrated in Table 4.1.
Table 4.1

*Scenarios Developed by Focus Group Discussions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>Group 1 Recommendation</th>
<th>Group 2 Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounting, Finance &amp; Cost Controls</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Issues</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Management</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globalization</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Post-Focus Group Survey Results

The post-focus group survey was developed based on the results of the focus groups’ discussions. The survey asked respondents to choose the most accurate representation of the content domains and the associated percentages. Respondents were also given the opportunity to create their own proportions by weighting the domains themselves if they felt the two choices were misrepresentative of their opinion. Of the 39 respondents, 18 selected Group 1’s recommendation, and 18 selected Group 2’s. Two respondents selected to develop their own recommendation and one respondent did not complete the survey. The scenarios developed by the two respondents who elected to create their own weighting and the weights by the focus groups for the content domains are demonstrated in Table 4.2.
Table 4.2

Results of Post-Focus Group Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>Group 1 Recommendation</th>
<th>Group 2 Recommendation</th>
<th>Independent 1 Recommendation</th>
<th>Independent 2 Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounting, Finance &amp; Cost Controls</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Issues</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic &amp; Basic Management</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globalization</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Respondents</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is prudent to note that the participants that selected to develop their own weighted proportions for the nine domains encountered a different terminology for one of the content domains. The term “Legal Issues” had been utilized during the focus group discussion and the term “Hospitality Law” was used in the open-ended question on the post-focus group survey. This was a result of a mistake in survey development. Therefore, the participants that developed their own scenario may have interpreted the meaning of this domain differently. However, the mistake was deemed insignificant to the results of the study, since neither independent recommendation was chosen for final weighting of domains (discussed later in this chapter).
Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

The respondents of the post-focus group survey consisted of 60.5% males and 39.5% females. Of the respondents, 44.7% had a bachelor’s degree, 13.2% had a master’s degree, and 36.8% had a doctorate. Of the industry professionals who completed the survey, the following positions were held: chief operating officer, vice president of human resources, area general manager, senior vice president of sales and marketing, vice president of operations, vice president of leadership development, vice president of sales and marketing, senior vice president of development, chief executive officer, general manager, partner, chairman and chief executive officer, president, director of art and editorial/publisher, vice president of restaurant, senior vice president global partner marketing, regional vice president, and president of hospitality division. Faculty answering this survey question ranged from lecturer to associate dean. The results are demonstrated in Table 4.3.
Table 4.3

Current Titles of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Title</th>
<th>Number of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vice President Human Resources</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Vice President of Sales &amp; Marketing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President of Operations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President of Leadership Development</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area/Multi-Site General Manager</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President of Sales &amp; Marketing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Vice President of Development</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman/CEO/COO</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Art &amp; Editorial/Publisher</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President of a Restaurant Company</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Vice President Global Marketing Company</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Vice President</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair of Hospitality Management</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Dean</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Out of the 38 completed surveys, only 2.6% of respondents were less than 30 years of age and 57.9% of the respondents were over the age of 41 as demonstrated in Table 4.4. Of the respondents who were educators, 31.3% have worked in higher education for 20-23 years, and 12.6% have worked in higher education for 24 years or more as shown in Table 4.4. Of the industry professionals participating in the post-focus group survey, 25% have worked in the industry longer than 32 years, while 62.5% have worked longer than 20 years in the industry. The results are shown in Table 4.4.
### Table 4.4

**Demographic Information of Post-Focus Group Survey Respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive Demographics</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>60.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 70</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Degree</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>44.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degree</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph. D.</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher than Ph. D.</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-11</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-15</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-19</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-23</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-27</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-31</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 32 Years</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years as an Educator</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-11</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-15</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-19</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-23</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-27</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-31</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 32 Years</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years in Hospitality Industry</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-19</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-23</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-27</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-31</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 32 Years</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The survey results displayed in Table 4.2. indicate an exact tie in the number of responses to each option. As stated in Chapter 3, should a tie exist, the UNT hospitality management faculty would be asked to break the tie. Since it is important for the entire faculty to be involved in the development of curriculum (Dopson & Tas, 2004), the faculty used a consensus with compromise decision-making process to reconcile the survey results (L. Dopson, personal communication, January 22, 2010). The faculty made a rational decision about the resulting weights utilizing the information from the post-focus group survey results, which included industry input.

The department chair acted as the facilitator and neutral mediator of the discussion. Upon distribution of the survey results shown in Table 4.2., the faculty determined that Independent 1 and Independent 2’s recommendations would be removed. A straw vote was then cast to indicate each faculty member’s selection of Group 1’s recommendation or Group 2’s recommendation. The consensus among the faculty was to select Group 2’s recommendation and modify it. It was difficult to reach a consensus among the faculty regarding modifications due to the topics being discussed; each participant in this discussion taught at least one of the content domains which were being associated with weightings of importance. Ultimately the chair encouraged participants to work towards a compromise. Group 2’s recommendation was modified in the following ways: marketing was reduced from 20 to 15 %, leadership was lowered from 15 to 10 %, and legal issues were increased from 2 to 10 %. The compromise was based on faculty expertise and the final vote was unanimous. The professor who teaches the capstone course recused himself as to avoid conflict of interest. The faculty recommendation for each content domain with associated weighted values is depicted in Table 4.5. From this recommendation, a test blueprint was formulated for the capstone course.
Table 4.5

*Final Weighting Recommended by Faculty Tie-Break*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domains</th>
<th>Faculty Recommendation (Percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounting, Finance &amp; Cost Controls</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Issues</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic &amp; Basic Management</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globalization</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 5

INTERPRETATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to develop a test blue-print for the hospitality management capstone course at the University of North Texas. This chapter is intended to provide a general interpretation of the results of this study and to suggest practical recommendations for further research. The findings of the study and the Review of Literature were used as the basis of discussion.

Interpretation of Findings

The following interpretations were based on the results of the data analysis procedures discussed in Chapter 4. Interpretations of the findings address the research questions posed in the study.

1. What content domains must be included in the capstone course test blueprint?

The nine content domains incorporated in this study are representative of the UNT hospitality management program as a whole. In looking at the curriculum, all theoretical constructs in the current program are represented within these nine domains.

Based on the findings, although tourism, as recommended by one faculty member to be included in the future, is an important aspect of the hospitality industry there is only one tourism course out of 26 in the hospitality management curriculum at UNT (see Appendix A). This is a content area that might be incorporated as a content domain in the capstone course in the future; it is not, however, a major domain at this point in the time.
2. What curricular competencies must be measured within each content domain of the test blueprint?

The 77 competencies specifically covered in the capstone course are representative of the entire curriculum (see Appendix F). These specific competencies provide a firm knowledge base from which students are able to build, grow, and develop after graduation. The competencies used in this study are representative of skills, knowledge, and abilities required for a successful career in the hospitality industry.

After completing research question 3 and reviewing the weights of each domain, the researcher determined that there was not an adequate coverage under the legal issues domain. The researcher went back to the original 211 competencies listed for the curriculum and extracted competencies related to laws in the workplace, that were not included in the list of 77 extracted competencies for the capstone course. Sixteen legal issues competencies were extracted. From these 16 competencies, two competencies were identified as applicable to all segments of the hospitality industry and represent legal issues that all firms must address. Competency 53: Understand EEO regulations (sexual harassment, discrimination, ADA, etc) and Competency 65: Understand personal safety issues and regulations in the hospitality industry (worker’s compensation, OSHA, FMLA, HazComm, etc.) were the two competencies selected to be added to the legal issues domain.

3. What is the optimal proportion for each of the test blueprint domains?

During the focus group sessions, the researcher observed that many of the faculty members stepped back to allow the industry professionals to contribute their ideas. The industry professionals argued through the topics and faculty members quietly agreed or disagreed. Several
faculty assisted in explanations of the current curriculum and repeated the purpose of the focus groups to the industry professionals. This may have been due to the faculty’s awareness of the importance of industry input in this study, or perhaps, this particular faculty did not feel it was their place to control conversation or argue with board members directly. Very little contribution came from faculty during the focus group discussions. Faculty tended to gently guide conversation rather than become deeply engaged in it.

Many of the focus group participants struggled with the lack of definitions given for the content domains and, therefore, developed or assumed their own definitions. Each group discussed the domains before assigning specific weights and each group developed their own definitions for each of the content domains. Some group members made assumptions about where certain aspects of the industry fell within these nine domains. For example, sales was included under marketing in one focus group, but sales was not discussed in the other focus group. How each group defined the terms may have been a contributing factor to the significant differences between the two focus groups’ scenarios.

Focus group participants agreed that all nine categories were important; however, specific content domains were determined to have significantly less weight than others. Sustainability and globalization were given the least amount of weight in both groups. Focus group participants felt these concepts were too new to hold a significant portion of the weight. Participants agreed they were important, but not as important as other content areas.

In addition, industry professionals struggled with identifying the type of position a graduate of the program would mostly likely obtain. Several focus group participants expressed frustration in determining specifically which segment of the industry graduates would enter. Many commented that weighting was dependent on the segment of the hospitality industry
students chose. Focus group participants were also concerned with the level of management for which graduates were to be prepared, whether it was entry level management or general manager/chief executive officer. Participants commented that at a higher level of management graduates may have specialists in some of the domain areas within their supervision, such as Human Resources. Therefore, they would require a more general understanding of the topic rather than a detailed knowledge, which would impact the weight given to that content domain.

Leadership was a controversial subject in the focus group discussions. Some industry professionals questioned how leadership could be taught in a college course. Some participants felt management should be more heavily weighted than leadership and others felt leadership should be the most important area and, consequently, should have the most weight. A common thread found in most of the leadership discussion was determining how important leadership skills were in the “lower levels” of management. Since some participants viewed leadership as not as easily or as clearly defined as some of the other content domains (accounting, for example), participants formed their own definition of leadership and argued their point of view depending on their personal opinion.

One of the reasons the industry participants may have struggled with this entire exercise is that they may have been too far removed from entry level management positions to easily determine the weighting of significance for each domain. The industry professionals participating in this study all held positions such as chief executive officer, general manager, director, vice president, or partner. Table 4.3. contains a complete list of the specific industry participants’ titles. Therefore, many of the industry participants had not worked in entry level management positions in several years. This may have played a considerable role in how the content domains were weighted and interpreted by industry participants. Perhaps industry
participants weighted the content domains according to their current positions, or perhaps participants estimated how much weight these domains should have according to entry level positions within their individual organizations.

Numerous researchers have discussed their opinions about hospitality management education with regards to its longevity and purpose (Boyer, 1986; Evans, 1988; Henry, 1956; Horn, 1956; Lewis, 1982; Olsen & Reid, 1983; Palmer, 1985; Pizam, 1985; Riegel, 1991; Themal, 1985; Umbreit, 1992; Waskey, 1985; Wisch, 1991; Zabel, 1992). The dispute stems from the variance in beliefs of hospitality management education, competencies required for hospitality management, and general education (Dopson & Nelson, 2003). As demonstrated in the focus group discussions for this study, the dispute continues today.

According to Pizam (1985), education for a specific career is extremely different than training for a specific career. He states that if educational programs actually train students for the hospitality industry, the program should not exist within a university setting. Pizam questions whether hospitality educators should prepare students for a career in the industry by ensuring the attainment of managerial knowledge or by training students on specific skills needed to work in the industry (Pizam, 1985). Palmer (1985) stated that there should be no division between education and training, but rather that both should be incorporated cohesively with no definite beginning and end. Riegel (1991), however, argues that career education does not necessarily provide the specific technical skills needed for the industry. He stated that career education serves the purpose of producing “educated and knowledgeable workers who are capable of growing and maturing both in their chosen fields as well as individuals” (Reigel, 1991, p. 5).
Recommendations

Based on the results of this study, the researcher developed a test blue-print for the capstone course of the hospitality management program at UNT. This test blueprint should be used as an assessment tool to measure SLO 1 in the hospitality management curriculum at the revised Bloom’s taxonomy Levels 4 through 6.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Domains and Competencies</th>
<th>Weighted Percentage</th>
<th>Analyzing (Bloom’s Level 4)</th>
<th>Evaluating (Bloom’s Level 5)</th>
<th>Creating (Bloom’s Level 6)</th>
<th>Number of Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Domain 1: Accounting, Finance, and Cost Controls</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. A. Analyze financial statements (income statement, balance sheet, and statement of cash flows).</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. B. Manage revenues in hospitality businesses.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. C. Control costs in hospitality businesses.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. D. Analyze factors that influence profit in the hospitality industry.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. E. Analyze debt and equity financing of hospitality companies.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. F. Analyze financial ratios for the hospitality industry.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. G. Develop a capital budget using project valuation criteria</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Domain 2: Basic &amp; Strategic Management</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A. Create solutions for problems in the workplace.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. B. Examine the principles of quality management.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. C. Examine the principles of management. (Planning, organizing, influencing, implementation, delegation, etc.).</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. D. Develop a business plan for a hospitality organization.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. E. Examine strategic planning and management applications in the workplace.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. F. Examine crisis management from the operational and strategic perspectives.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Domain 3: Marketing:</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A. Analyze strategies that create consumer experiences as opportunities to expand customer bases and increase profits.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. B. Develop a marketing plan for a hospitality property.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. C. Examine the “branding concept” in the hospitality industry.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. D. Utilize the principles of internal marketing (employees) in the workplace.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Domain 4: Human Resources:</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Examine the strategic human resources business planning process, including:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Standards for labor productivity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Retention analysis of employees</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Employee recruiting plan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Employee orientation/education plan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Performance management plan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Employee relations plan.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table 5.1 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Domains and Competencies</th>
<th>Weighted Percentage</th>
<th>Analyzing (Bloom’s Level 4)</th>
<th>Evaluating (Bloom’s Level 5)</th>
<th>Creating (Bloom’s Level 6)</th>
<th>Number of Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Domain 5: Information Technology:</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. A. Examine the strategic roles of management information systems in current hospitality/tourism organizations.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. B. Utilize current information technologies in the hospitality industry.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. C. Analyze IT-enabled marketing, promotion and distribution practices in the hospitality industry.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Domain 6: Leadership:</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. A. Examine effective leadership characteristics.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. B. Demonstrate the affective characteristics of hospitality. Spirit of hospitality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. C. Examine the principles of change management.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. D. Maintain professional and ethical standards in the work environment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Domain 7: Legal Issues:</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. A. Analyze legal issues impacting the hospitality industry.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. B. Understand EEO regulations (sexual harassment, discrimination, ADA, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. C. Understand personal safety issues and regulations in the hospitality industry (worker’s compensation, OSHA, FMLA, HazComm, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Domain 8: Globalization:</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. A. Examine the issues of managing an international hospitality/tourism business from an operations perspective.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. B. Examine the issues of managing an international hospitality/tourism business from a policy perspective.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. C. Examine trends in global tourism.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Domain 9: Sustainability:</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. A. Examine sustainability in the workplace including effects on civic responsibility and stewardship.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. B. Determine implications of green technology on profitability in the hospitality industry.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. C. Manage the economic, social, and environmental impacts of tourism to sustain resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This test blueprint was developed using the weightings demonstrated in Table 4.5. Each content domain contains key competencies that the researcher recommends for the capstone course for the program, based on the results of the study. The test blueprint was designed to provide educators with a consistent measurement tool to assess each competency and content area based on a taxonomic level. The researcher recommends that three test questions be developed to measure each competency. This test blueprint was designed for an exam containing 100 questions. The researcher recommends that faculty develop three different but equivalent versions of the test, resulting in a test bank containing 300 questions. This enables the faculty to change the exam each semester or to develop several forms of the exam for each semester.

Each domain’s weighted percentage was calculated out of 100 total questions for this test blueprint. For example, accounting, finance, and cost controls was weighted at 20%; therefore, 20 of the 100 questions on the exam would assess the accounting, finance, and cost controls domain. This remained consistent for all of the content domains. Within the 20 questions assigned to the accounting, finance, and cost controls domain, each competency was given an equal number of questions. There were 7 competencies under the accounting, finance, and cost controls domain, thus, the 20 questions could not be divided evenly. Each competency was then analyzed to determine which competencies were more complex and would require more questions to determine the students’ mastery of the content. The more complex competencies were given the remaining questions until the total number of questions under the accounting, finance, and cost controls domain equaled 20. The other domains were handled in a similar manner.

Some of the 77 competencies on the original crosswalk analysis for the capstone course were rated at levels ranging from 1-6 of the revised Bloom’s taxonomy. The chair of the
hospitality management program, the current instructor of the capstone course, and the researcher determined that only taxonomic Levels 4-6 would be assessed with this tool (the test blueprint). If the instructor would like to assess Levels 1-3, he may do so outside of this instrument.

Since most of the 77 original competencies were combined, adjusted, or revised, very few of the original competencies remained. The researcher utilized the original competencies, as well as the competency verbs based on the levels of the revised Bloom’s taxonomy, as a guide to determine the taxonomic level at which each competency should be tested. Once an example test blueprint was developed, the current instructor of the capstone course reviewed each revised competency and the associated level by which it will be assessed to identify any gaps or inconsistencies. Minor adjustments were made and the instructor and chair of the department approved the test blueprint.

The researcher recommends that the chair and instructor share the test blueprint with the faculty to determine if changes should be made, since this course will be used to assess SLO 1 and the effective attainment of theoretical constructs in the undergraduate hospitality management curriculum.

The researcher also recommends that the faculty change the capstone course to include the additional competencies identified in the legal areas because they were not included in the original 77 competencies.

Recommendations for Further Research

The following recommendations in the form of generalizations are suggested by the researcher based upon the findings of this study.
(1) Future studies desiring to determine the importance of specific content domains and an associated level of the revised Bloom’s taxonomy as they pertain to the hospitality industry, should obtain a wider sample size. This recommendation is suggested due to the small sample size used for this study.

(2) It is recommended that future focus groups asked to determine the optimal proportion of content domains be provided detailed definitions for each content domain which specifically explain the individual competencies and the components that are categorized under each content domain. Only the titles of the nine content domains were provided for this study and no further descriptions or components of each domain were given.

(3) Future studies seeking to obtain an accurate representation of the importance of individual content domains should utilize a more representative sample of focus group participant job titles. Participants with varying levels of responsibilities (titles) within the hospitality industry may provide significant insight in future studies. Specifically recent graduates or individuals working in entry level positions should be included to provide a different perspective of current needs, desires, and demands of the hospitality industry. Recent graduates may provide additional insight for this discussion because they may more easily relate to the transition between student and industry professional they recently experienced.

This study provided the UNT hospitality management program with an effective and consistent measurement tool which enables the assessment of the entire curricula. This study also defined a process by which other educational institutions may follow to develop an assessment tool for their individual programs.
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HOSPITALITY MANAGEMENT

Bachelor of Science Degree Requirement Sheet
Hospitality Management (HMGT)
2009-2010 Catalog

English (6 hours)
ENGL 1310 or 1313 Grammar and Composition 1
ENGL 1320 or 2700 Grammar and Composition 2
Or Technical Writing

Mathematics (3 hours)
MATH 1100 College Algebra or equivalent

Natural Sciences (6 hours)
Select from approved list

US History (6 hours)
HIST 2610-2620 US History

Political Science (6 hours)
PSCI 1040-1050 American Government

Visual and Performing Arts (3 hours)
Select from approved list

Humanities (3 hours)
Select from approved list

Social and Behavioral Sciences (3 hours)
ECON 1110 Principles of Macroeconomics

Electives (9 hours)
Your choice of any 9 hours credit

Required Business Course (3 hours)
MGMT 3720 Organizational Behavior

SMHM Core (15 hours)
SMHM 1450 Principles of Nutrition
(Satisfies Human Experience)
SMHM 3950 Creating the Consumer Experience
SMHM 3790 Pre-Internship Seminar
(SMHM 1500 or take concurrently)
SMHM 4750 Managing a Diverse Workforce
(Satisfies Human Experience)
(Senior standing)
SMHM 4790 Internship in Hospitality (see catalog)

Area of Specialization (42 hours)
SMHM 1420 (1) Food Sanitation
SMHM 1470 Principles of Food Preparation (1420 or take concurrently)
SMHM 1500 (2) Orientation to the Hospitality Industry
SMHM 2250 Restaurant Operations 1 (1420 or take concurrently)
SMHM 2800 Foundations of International Travel and Tourism
SMHM 3280 Resort and Club Management (Junior standing)
SMHM 3600 Management of Human Resources in the Hospitality Industry (Junior standing)
SMHM 3700 Hotel Operations (1500)
SMHM 4210 Hospitality Cost Controls (2280, 2480, Junior standing)
SMHM 4250 Restaurant Operations 2 (1420, 1470, 2280, 2480, 2550, 4210, Junior standing)
SMHM 4730 Hotel and Restaurant Management Systems (2280, 2480, 3700, 4210)
SMHM 4820 Facilities Planning, Equipment, Layout and Design (4250 or take concurrently)
SMHM 4860 Hospitality Business Strategies (see Catalog)

Plus 6 hours from:
SMHM 3240 Special Event Management
SMHM 3920 Recent Developments in the Hospitality Industry (Junior standing)
SMHM 4300 Survey of Beverages (21 years old)

Hospitality Industry Business (15 hours)
SMHM 2280 Hospitality Industry Financial Accounting
SMHM 2480 Hospitality Industry Managerial Accounting (SMHM 2280)
SMHM 3200 Hospitality Industry Law (Junior standing)
SMHM 3300 Hospitality Industry Marketing Sales (Junior standing)
SMHM 4480 Hospitality Industry Finance (2280, 2480, Junior standing)

TOTAL CREDIT HOURS REQUIRED FOR MAJOR: 120
42 HOURS MUST BE ADVANCED

All SMHM classes must have a grade of "C" or better starting the Fall 92
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APPENDIX B

INFORMED CONSENT FORM FOR FOCUS GROUPS
The purpose of this study is to evaluate and redesign the Hospitality Management Capstone Course to assess Programmatic Student Learning Outcomes. The purpose of this portion of the study is to conduct a focus group with University of North Texas Hospitality Management Faculty and their Board of Governors to determine the weighted percentage of specific content domains in the Capstone Course. A post-focus group survey will then be created using the scenarios developed by the focus groups. The results of the survey will be used to develop a test blueprint for the hospitality management capstone course to measure programmatic student learning outcomes.

You are being asked to participate in a Focus Group that will take approximately 30 minutes. There are no foreseeable risks involved in participating in this Focus Group. Participation is voluntary and you may stop at any time without penalty. After reading this form, please sign the bottom to give your consent to participate in this focus group. By signing this form you are confirming that you are at least 18 years old. Your identity and remarks during the focus group will remain confidential/anonymous to everyone outside of the focus group meeting. All conversations held during the Focus Group Meeting will be kept confidential to everyone outside of the Focus Group Meeting. All results from the Focus Group meeting will be kept in a secure environment. The confidentiality of your individual information will be maintained in any publications or presentations regarding this study. Results of the survey will be reported only on a group basis.

This research study has been reviewed and approved by the UNT Institutional Review Board (IRB). The UNT IRB can be contacted at (940) 565-3940 with any questions regarding the rights of research subjects.
Thank you for your time. If you have any questions regarding this study, please contact:

Jackie Stevenson

OR

Dr. Lea Dopson

Associate Professor, Chair of Hospitality Management

Thesis Chair

Principal Investigator Printed Name _________________________________________

Signature of Principal Investigator___________________________________________

Date________________

Focus Group Participant Printed Name ______________________________________

Signature of Focus Group Participant ________________________________________

Date ________________
APPENDIX C

INFORMED CONSENT FORM FOR ONLINE SURVEY
The purpose of this study is to develop a test blueprint for the Hospitality Management Capstone Course to measure Programmatic Student Learning Outcomes. The purpose of this portion of the study is to conduct a survey of University of North Texas Hospitality Management Faculty and their Board of Governors to determine the weighting of the specific content domains in the Capstone Course. Focus group discussions were conducted to develop these scenarios and the purpose of the survey is to determine the most accurate scenario. From the results of the survey, a test blueprint will be created.

The following survey will take you approximately 5 minutes to complete. Answering the questions in the survey involves no foreseeable risks. Participation is voluntary and you may stop at any time without penalty. By completing the survey you are giving consent to participate and confirming that you are at least 18 years old. Your answers will remain confidential/anonymous and will be protected by ensuring all survey results are kept in a secure environment. The confidentiality of your individual information will be maintained in any publications or presentations regarding this study. Results of the survey will be reported only on a group basis.

This research study has been reviewed and approved by the UNT Institutional Review Board (IRB). The UNT IRB can be contacted at (940) 565-3940 with any questions regarding the rights of research subjects. You may print this Notice for your records.

Thank you for your time. If you have any questions regarding this study, please contact:

Jackie Stevenson

OR

Dr. Lea Dopson, Associate Professor, Chair of Hospitality Management
APPENDIX D

LIST OF COMPETENCIES AND DOMAINS FOR UNT HOSPITALITY MANAGEMENT

CAPSTONE COURSE (SMHM 4860)
Domains and Competencies for SMHM 4860

Domain 1: Accounting, Finance, and Cost Controls:

1. A. Analyze financial statements (income statement, balance sheet, and statement of cash flows).
1. B. Manage revenues in hospitality businesses.
1. C. Control costs in hospitality businesses.
1. D. Analyze factors that influence profit in the hospitality industry.
1. E. Analyze debt and equity financing of hospitality companies.
1. F. Analyze financial ratios for the hospitality industry.
1. G. Develop a capital budget using project valuation criteria.

Domain 2: Human Resources:

2. Examine the strategic human resources business planning process, including:
   a. Standards for labor productivity
   b. Retention analysis of employees
   c. Employee recruiting plan
   d. Employee orientation/education plan
   e. Performance management plan
   f. Employee relations plan.
Domain 3: Information Technology:

3. A. Examine the strategic roles of management information systems in current hospitality/tourism organizations.
3. B. Utilize current information technologies in the hospitality industry.
3. C. Analyze IT-enabled marketing, promotion and distribution practices in the hospitality industry.

Domain 4: Basic and Strategic Management

4. B. Examine the principles of quality management.
4. C. Examine the principles of management. (Planning, organizing, influencing, implementation, delegation, etc.).
4. D. Develop a business plan for a hospitality organization.
4. E. Examine strategic planning and management applications in the workplace.
4. F. Examine crisis management from the operational and strategic perspectives.

Domain 5: Marketing:

5. A. Analyze strategies that create consumer experiences as opportunities to expand customer bases and increase profits.
5. B. Develop a marketing plan for a hospitality property.
5. C. Examine the "branding concept" in the hospitality industry.
5. D. Utilize the principles of internal marketing (employees) in the workplace.
Domain 6: Leadership:

6. A. Examine effective leadership characteristics.
6. B. Demonstrate the affective characteristics of hospitality. Spirit of hospitality.
6. C. Examine the principles of change management.
6. D. Maintain professional and ethical standards in the work environment.

Domain 7: Sustainability:

7. A. Examine sustainability in the workplace including effects on civic responsibility and stewardship.
7. B. Determine implications of green technology on profitability in the hospitality industry.
7. C. Manage the economic, social, and environmental impacts of tourism to sustain resources.

Domain 8: Globalization:

8. A. Examine the issues of managing an international hospitality/tourism business from an operations perspective.
8. B. Examine the issues of managing an international hospitality/tourism business from a policy perspective.
8. C. Examine trends in global tourism.

Domain 9: Legal Issues:

9. A. Analyze legal issues impacting the hospitality industry.
9. B. Understand EEO regulations (sexual harassment, discrimination, ADA, etc).
9. C. Understand personal safety issues and regulations in the hospitality industry (worker’s compensation, OSHA, FMLA, HazComm, etc).
APPENDIX E

COMBINED LIST OF FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION COMMENTS
• What teacher is actually going to teach a child leadership? How do you teach leadership?
  I’d have to unfortunately say it’s a general business concept.
• This is harder than you’d think. How do we know what way these kids are going? I mean, catering? Special events? Clubs? Hotels? Restaurants? Each one is different. I don’t know how we do this without pinpointing this.
• Is the program supposed to prepare them for CEO or entry level? If so how do they do that, I mean you don’t expect them to go get another degree to become a CEO do you?
• Finance. I think that’s the business part of it. You could figure that out pretty quick. I am thinking right out of school, not a seasoned 32 year old. As long as they come in understanding the 5p’s.
• Where does sales go?
• Lump it into marketing.
• Legal is a little more important at their age. They have to catch their tongue. I want them to know not to say something crazy to a server.
• Some of the stuff that you’re going to teach them they’re not going to use for their first five years. Legal, if you have the foundation, then that’s all it takes to get to a certain level.
• I would argue that IT is lower. The challenges can’t be taught in class. The work experience is how they get that.
• Cost control is probably most important.
• Global- that’s important but not at this level.
• There’s a lot of people charged with the marketing, but can’t get it done with the people, where the business is going, and how to make money. If you understand where profit is, you’re going to be successful. And most people don’t know that. I think that in the past
that’s been the problem whether you’re a marketing person or not.

- They should know more about legal issues. Legal issues more so than global.
- They already have a full class so it’s already being emphasized at the capstone level.

Acquired cost control and acquired, we have full classes. We don’t have a class on leadership. We have a class on legal issues. The global issues, sustain, leadership- we don’t have classes on them. This is a strategic management class. This is the first time they have been exposed to SM. We have full classes in certain issues and others where they get minimal exposure.

- You can teach people skills. The HR department isn’t the people skills- it’s the how do we hire. It doesn’t have anything to do with showing up on time or hiring people.
- Leadership and sustainability are not courses. Every student will come in with a course or so in that domain- they’re coming in with all that information. Leadership, sustain, global- that’s just how they integrate.
- You go two and half times marketing over human recourses? I’m fighting the war every day. I think knowing a lot more about the people that are going to be serving the product than the market is key. My biggest challenge is maintaining people in my world.
- I was just going to say the global, sustain, and leadership- those are contents within courses the students would have taken. I would say 5, 5, and 5 for those issues. And legal issues- I think we’re looking at legal and HR. 5 and maybe 10 for HR. A lot of the human relations is inherent in the individual.
- It’s kind of hard to teach some of that. That aspect of development is something we can guide them into, but not necessarily teach from a manual.
- I’d rather see more than legal. What I look at as legal- I look at managing either hotels or
restaurants that really have to do with legal and that’s where HR issues.

- From my perspective, leadership needs more than legal and HR. Biggest factor in hiring new young employees is HR. If you hire someone that is great with numbers but terrible with the people, they’re not going to succeed. My recommendation except I would take 5 percent out of marketing and put it in HR.

- Most places have legal counsel so it isn’t important for these students to know a ton about legal issues. Same goes for human resources, they should have someone that works for them deal with it.

- I think they’re pretty situational. What positions is the goal here? Are most general managers? Department heads? Narrow the focus to general manager-type position. Their ultimate goal of being big-time boss. In this case, I think every single category is important.

- The top 5 categories- those are all almost department specific, so if you’re going emphasize one, let it be IT or HR or accounting. Sustainability- nobody even knew what that was 2 years ago.

- Globalization- the same thing. I think leadership is more important as well. My goal was to be a general manager. I was trained how to do everything except general manager and that’s what my goal was. I disagree with the legal too. Things can hurt you and cost you money that aren’t money issues. Like something that you do with your vendors. TABC or something in that regard. I would put legal at more.

- The percentage of questions has no relationship to the number of classes they’ve taken on the issue.

- Clearly marketing is most important – joke. If a person only gets a Bachelor of Science, their whole career, at some point they’re going to need to know a lot of this- strategic
management, all of these things.

- I think accounting and finance are really important because I think that’s what they come back and tell me was the most useful class. That’s also why they go out of business. It’s because they can’t handle the money and they close down.

- If you’re a young manager, you’re going to have a lawyer help you out with the legal issues. I feel like you learn more about that area as you go.

- When I think of marketing, I think of marketing/sales. But does sales fall under marketing in this case?

- I think leadership at this level is minuscule. They won’t grasp it until they experience and are basically thrown into a leadership position. In my opinion that’s the only way to really teach leadership anyway. And these guys are coming out at a bachelor degree level; they’re not going to be GM’s or presidents of companies yet. They have plenty of time to develop their leadership skills in the correct environment. So we agree that leadership should be 5%.

- Well, personally I would lump leadership and management in the same category but that’s not how it’s done here. Management is definitely more important than leadership. Where does management go in all this? Why isn’t that in here?

- I don’t want entry level managers to lead, I want them to do what they are told. I want them to be able to manage my staff.

- But leadership is leading a department. Eventually being a manager. Getting your team to follow you, do what you want. That’s pretty important, especially if you’re starting at the bottom when you graduate as a lower level manager.

- I think that leadership is important in any job, but that’s just my opinion.

- Where does management fall? There is a big difference between management and strategic
management, but both are extremely important. I think that should be in here. Where does that go? I mean, basic management, every person in this industry needs it right? What do you think?

- It should be in there somewhere Bob, you’re right. Management skills are just as important as strategic if not more.
- I agree guys, they’ve got to know what they are doing. If they can’t manage, I don’t want them.
- Strategic management is important but at this level? Will they be able to grasp this idea right out of school? I wouldn’t expect my entry level managers to. That’s more my job than theirs.
- HR is way different issues- personnel, firing people, what you say and can’t say.
- Every one of these issues would talk about ethics. Every one of these would also cover technology.
APPENDIX F

POST-FOCUS GROUP SURVEY
Weighting the Hospitality Management Domains:

After the focus group session at the October 2nd Board Meeting, 2 scenarios were created for the appropriate percentages for the nine hospitality management content domains.

The purpose of this survey is to determine the weight of each of the nine domains according to their importance to Hospitality Management curriculum. This weighting will be used to develop a test blueprint to be used for assessment of the Hospitality Management Capstone Course at the University of North Texas.

Below are two suggestions for weighting which were made by the focus groups. Please review these suggested domain weightings, as you will be asked to give your input into how you would like the domains to be weighted.

The Suggestions for the associated weights for each domain are:

**Suggestion 1:**
25---Accounting, Finance, & Cost Controls
25---Marketing
15---Human Resources
10---Leadership
10---Legal Issues
5---Strategic Management
5---Information Technology
2.5---Sustainability
2.5---Globalization

**Suggestion 2:**
20---Strategic Management
20---Accounting, Finance, & Cost Controls
20---Marketing
15---Leadership
10---Information Technology
10---Human Resources
2---Legal Issues
2---Globalization
1---Sustainability
1. Please select one of the following suggestions:

- Scenario 1: 25---Accounting, Finance, & Cost Controls; 25---Marketing; 15---Human Resources; 10---Leadership; 10---Legal Issues; 5---Information Technology; 5---Strategic Management; 2.5---Sustainability
- Scenario 2: 20---Accounting, Finance, & Cost Controls; 20---Strategic Management; 20---Marketing; 15---Leadership; 10---Human Resources; 10---Information Technology; 2---Globalization; 2---Legal Issues; 1---Sustainability
- None of the Above. I would like to suggest my own weighting.

2. Please weigh each of the following domains based on what you believe their importance/prominence should be in the Hospitality Management Curriculum. The total weighting of the domains must equal 100.

Select the appropriate weight for each domain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounting, Finance, Cost Controls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality Law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic &amp; Basic Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3. What is your current title in your current job?

4. If you are an educator, how many years have you worked in higher education?
   - 1-3 years
   - 4-7 years
   - 8-11 years
   - 12-15 years
   - 16-19 years
   - 20-23 years
   - 24-27 years
   - 28-31 years
   - More than 32 years

5. If you are currently an industry professional, how many years have you worked in the Hospitality Industry?
   - 1-3 years
   - 4-7 years
   - 8-11 years
   - 12-15 years
   - 16-19 years
   - 20-23 years
   - 24-27 years
   - 28-31 years
   - More than 32 years
6. What is your age?
- 18-25
- 26-30
- 31-40
- 41-50
- 51-60
- 61-70
- Over 70

7. What is your level of education?
- High School Degree
- Bachelor's Degree
- Master's Degree
- Ph.D.
- Higher than Ph. D.

8. What is your Gender?
- Male
- Female

9. Your Comments are Invited Here:

[Text input field]

[Prev] [Done]
APPENDIX G

CROSSWALK ANALYSIS FOR DEVELOPMENT OF TEST BLUEPRINT USING REVISED BLOOM’S TAXONOMY
To allow graduates to succeed both short-term and long-term as corporate executives/entrepreneurs in the hospitality industry, this course will offer students the opportunity to learn to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Dr. Spears Recommendation</th>
<th>Test Blueprint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Domain 1: Accounting, Finance, and Cost Controls</td>
<td>Analyze financial statements (income statement, balance sheet, and statement of cash flows)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Manage revenues in hospitality businesses.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Control costs in hospitality businesses.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Analyze factors that influence profit in the hospitality industry.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Analyze debt and equity financing of hospitality companies.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Analyze financial ratios for the hospitality industry.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Develop a capital budget using project valuation criteria.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Domain 2: Human Resources</td>
<td>Examine the strategic human resources business planning process, including:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>a. Standards for labor productivity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>b. Retention analysis of employees</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>c. Employee recruiting plan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>d. Employee orientation/education plan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>e. Performance management plan</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>f. Employee relations plan.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Domain 3: Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technology:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Examine the strategic roles of management information systems in current hospitality/tourism organizations.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Utilize current information technologies in the hospitality industry.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Analyze IT-enabled marketing, promotion and distribution practices in the hospitality industry.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td><strong>Domain 4: Basic &amp; Strategic Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Create solutions for problems in the workplace.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Examine the principles of quality management.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Examine the principles of management. (Planning, organizing, influencing, implementation, delegation, etc.).</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Develop a business plan for a hospitality organization.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Examine strategic planning and management applications in the workplace.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Examine crisis management from the operational and strategic perspectives.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td><strong>Domain 5: Marketing:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Analyze strategies that create consumer experiences as opportunities to expand customer bases and increase profits.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Develop a marketing plan for a hospitality property.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Examine the &quot;branding concept&quot; in the hospitality industry.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Utilize the principles of internal marketing (employees) in the workplace.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td><strong>Domain 6: Leadership:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task Description</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Examine effective leadership characteristics.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Demonstrate the affective characteristics of hospitality. Spirit of hospitality.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Examine the principles of change management.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Maintain professional and ethical standards in the work environment.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td><strong>Domain 7: Sustainability:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Examine sustainability in the workplace including effects on civic responsibility and stewardship.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Determine implications of green technology on profitability in the hospitality industry.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Manage the economic, social, and environmental impacts of tourism to sustain resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td><strong>Domain 8: Globalization:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Examine the issues of managing an international hospitality/tourism business from an operations perspective.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Examine the issues of managing an international hospitality/tourism business from a policy perspective.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Examine trends in global tourism.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td><strong>Domain 9: Legal Issues:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Analyze legal issues impacting the hospitality industry.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td><strong>Domain 8: Globalization:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Examine the issues of managing an international hospitality/tourism business from an operations perspective.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Examine the issues of managing an international hospitality/tourism business from a policy perspective.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Examine trends in global tourism.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Domain 9: Legal Issues:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>52</strong></td>
<td>Analyze legal issues impacting the hospitality industry.</td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Revised Bloom’s Taxonomy Levels 4-6.*
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