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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research study is to identify and evaluate student expectations prior to enrollment in a quantity food production lab/simulated restaurant environment. Web-based questionnaires were distributed to students at three four-year universities in the United States, who were required to take a quantity food production lab in order to meet graduation requirements. The questionnaire covered topic areas including material supplements and topics covered, expectations of the teacher, sources of influence, and real world applicability.

Respondents had high expectations of technology and online components being used in the course. There was a higher expectation of learning back-of-house tasks such as knife skills and food portioning, compared to front-of-the house skills like customer service and staffing. When compared to previous literature, the traits respondents expected of their teachers were similar to those identified in prior studies; this included approachability, timeliness, organization, and subject area knowledge. Two-sample t-tests were performed on several responses to determine if any significant differences existed between males and females; no significance was found.
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

Hospitality programs within four-year universities are on the rise and growing rapidly, not only in the number of programs offered, but the student enrollment within the programs (Ruhanen, 2005). Unlike years past, a management career within the hospitality industry now requires a college degree, accounting for the dramatic rise in numbers (Craig-Smilt & Ruhanen, 2005). Not only is the theory behind the practice important to know in regards to attaining a job post graduation, but also employers are now looking for the level of practical skill gained while enrolled in the college program (Cooper & Shepherd, 1997). Employers have begun to put great emphasis on having the practical hands-on experience prior to employment.

To meet the needs of the industry, colleges are offering more hands-on courses such as simulated hospitality environments, to allow students to experience what it is like to work in the industry, while remaining in the comfort of a classroom. These simulated labs and courses are diverse; examples include hotel front desk simulations, internships, internet-based simulations such as ProSim-Restaurant, and quantity food production labs. Researchers argue that students who have the hands-on experience and ability to practice the tasks before they enter the workforce are more confident when they encounter these situations in the industry (Armstrong, 2003). Being an active learner and participating in role-play type scenarios can also lead to a greater retention of knowledge due to developing interest in the topic (Richardson & Kleiner, 1992).

In order to ensure that college programs are teaching up-to-date content and skills in these simulated environments, evaluation and feedback of the department and its courses are key. Student and faculty critique of the department curriculum assist in
promoting effective and relevant educational programs (Reddout, 1973). Not only do evaluations provide critique, but they also can offer a glimpse into student expectations of the course and the instructor. Sander, Stevenson, King, and Coates (2000) stated student expectations are a valuable source of information; knowing about student expectations can help lecturers better design their teaching curriculum.

**Research Objectives**

This research study examined student expectations prior to enrollment in a quantity food production lab/simulated restaurant environment. The primary objectives of the study are:

1. determine student expectations of material supplements and topics covered, prior to enrollment in the course;
2. explore what external influences students credit influencing their expectations;
3. examine students’ opinions on the applicability of the course to their future career; and
4. determine student expectations and desired qualities of their instructors.

**Significance of Study**

Within the hospitality industry, there is very little research on evaluating student expectations of a quantity food production lab. The existing research focuses primarily on post-course evaluations, seeking to obtain student feedback on the course, if it was effective in advancing their learning, and what changes students suggest for future semesters. While there are studies on both quantity food production labs in hospitality programs, and evaluating student expectations, there are very few studies that combine these specific areas of research.
This research is important to not only hospitality researchers, but hospitality students and professors as well. An in-depth exploration of student expectations prior to enrollment in a quantity food production lab can contribute substantially to hospitality programs and research in many ways. Because limited research exists, a study of this nature will open up the door for other studies, allowing researchers to use it as a building block to something larger.

Results of this research will be valuable for educators at various institutions with hospitality programs. Educators can take the results and utilize the students’ expectations to restructure their course, or add additional content. Knowing what or who shapes a students’ expectations of courses can give educators the ability to assist in shaping or adjusting them. A move towards combining what students expect to learn or want to learn about with the current course outline has the potential to increase the effectiveness of the course for the students.

**Definition of Terms**

**Back-of-House (BOH):** The back of a restaurant, including kitchen and storage where, primarily, chefs, cooks, food preps, and dishwashers work (Restaurant Lingo, Slang, & Terms, 2012).

**Front-of-House (FOH):** The front of a restaurant, including the dining room and/or bar, where customers are served. Primary staff includes wait staff, bussers, dining room managers, and bartenders (Restaurant Lingo, Slang, & Terms, 2012).

**Quantity Food Production:** Preparing food in large quantities (Knight & Kotschevar, 2000).

**Word-of-Mouth (WOM):** Passing of information from person to person, via oral communication. (Word-of-Mouth Definition, 2015).
CHAPTER 2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Bridging the gap between what students are expecting to learn in a class and what hospitality programs are teaching is an ongoing issue that many college programs face (Ruhanen, 2005). The first section of the literature review will define experiential learning, and how it relates to education in the hospitality industry. Section two will define Iowa State University’s quantity food production lab, the Joan Bice Underwood Tearoom, as well as the John Purdue Room and Skyviews Restaurant. Section three includes the importance of evaluating student expectations; section four is dedicated to previous research in the industry.

Experiential Learning

In order to better prepare students for the hospitality industry, universities are integrating hands-on learning into the classroom; this type of learning is experiential learning. Specht and Sandlin (1991) define experiential learning as something that “focuses on ‘doing’ in addition to the ‘hearing’ and ‘seeing’ that occur in traditional lecture class.” This type of learning allows students to interact with their environment and influence the outcome, just as they might experience in the industry. Experiential learning transitions the student from an active learner, to an active participant (Brotherton, 1985).

The foundations of experiential learning date back to the 20th century, when scholars searched for a way to describe how humans learned and developed simultaneously (Kolb & Kolb, 2005). This process became experiential learning and many of the century’s theorist found experiential learning on six key concepts. Kolb (1984) outlined the concepts as follows:
1. *Learning is best conceived as a process, not in terms of outcomes.* To improve learning in higher education, the primary focus should be on engaging students in a process that best enhances their learning – a process that includes feedback on the effectiveness of their learning efforts.

2. *All learning is relearning.* Learning is best facilitated by a process that draws out the student’s beliefs and ideas about a topic so that they can be examined, tested, and integrated with new, more refined ideas.

3. *Learning requires the resolution of conflicts between dialectically opposed modes of adaptation to the world.* Conflict, differences, and disagreement are what drive the learning process. In the process of learning one is called upon to move back and forth between opposing modes of reflection and action and feeling and thinking.

4. *Learning is a holistic process of adaptation to the world.* Not just the result of cognition, learning involves the integrated functioning of the total person.

5. *Learning results from synergetic transactions between the person and the environment.* In Piaget’s terms, learning occurs through equilibration of the dialect processes of assimilating new experiences into existing concepts and accommodating existing concepts to new experience.

6. *Learning is the process of creating knowledge.* ELT proposes a constructivist theory of learning whereby social knowledge is created and recreated in the personal knowledge of the learner.

Skills such as problem solving and judgment are essential to learning and students develop these skills through immersing in an interactive environment (Feinstein, 2001).
Students gain this type of knowledge, also known as dynamic knowledge, in an experiential learning environment (Feinstein, 2001). A 2001 study on the effectiveness of simulation as instruction for foodservice concluded that experiential learning activities, such as simulated environments, allow the learner to have an increase in dynamic knowledge. The dynamic knowledge then helps the learner have a better understanding of the complexities of foodservice (Feinstein, 2001).

A study conducted by Kiser and Partlow (2013) interviewed forty schools across the United States that offered hospitality programs, and found that these schools offered a combined 235 courses with an experiential learning component within their departments. Nearly fifty percent of these courses were foodservice related; the remaining fifty percent were hotel courses, tourism courses, and other. Ninety-five percent of the programs also required at least one experiential learning course in order for the students to graduate. The authors concluded that experiential learning is a very important aspect of educating hospitality students as it provides a link between the discipline teachings, and what will be experienced in the industry. Pre-industry experience can been seen as a competitive advantage for students entering the workforce; students become more marketable, making experiential learning more valuable (Kiser & Partlow, 2013).

**Joan Bice Underwood Tearoom**

The Quantity Food Production course at Iowa State University provides students with the experience of learning foodservice managerial skills, and applying them to a simulated restaurant environment; learning takes place in a traditional lecture hall, as well as a quantity food production lab. The Quantity Food Production course, also known as Tearoom, is a course required for those pursuing a degree in Hospitality, Dietetics, Food
Science, or Culinary Science (Tearoom, 2014). Students work through a rotation being many head positions such as chef or baker, table servers, front and back of the house managers, retail managers, and overall kitchen manager. The students prepare lunches Tuesday through Friday, with seating for approximately 100 in the dining room, as well as the availability of to-go meals (Tearoom, 2014).

The Joan Bice Underwood Tearoom originated in 1925 built to accommodate the large-quantity cooking classes that the College of Human Sciences had to offer (Access Iowa State, 2013). In 2001, Joan Bice Underwood made a large monetary donation to the Tearoom to help support the college with renovations and updates (Access Iowa State, 2013). Because of the donation, the university named the Tearoom after her, and renovated it to look like the facility did when she took the course in the 1950’s (Access Iowa State, 2013). The Tearoom not only functions as a learning lab for students, but also provides a place to host events such as selling cherry pies, departmental events, and a lab for the Fine Dining Management course (Tearoom, 2014).

**Skyviews Restaurant**

Skyviews Restaurant, situated on the campus of Texas Tech University, is operated by students enrolled in the University’s Restaurant, Hotel, and Institute Management (RHIM) department. Established in 1989, Skyviews Restaurant was the RHIM department’s way of giving students a simulated real-world experience, prior to entering the workforce (Skyviews – About Us, 2015).

The restaurant hosts two separate labs – the first lab being freshman, sophomore, and junior-level students, and the second lab being the senior-level students. Underclassmen prepare the restaurant for the daily lunch buffet, and leave shortly after
lunch, making way for the senior class to take over. Senior level students transform Skyviews into a “white table cloth” restaurant, hosting a four-course dinner that varies by week. Much like the Joan Bice Underwood Tearoom, the menu is on a rotation throughout the semester, as are the students and the positions they hold (Skyviews – About Us, 2015).

**John Purdue Room**

Purdue University's department of Hospitality and Tourism Management offers two quantity food production labs to its students, both of which are ran out of the John Purdue Room. Students enrolled in the courses get a variety of experiences ranging from food production and equipment usage, to front and back of house management (John Purdue Room, 2012).

The John Purdue Room is very similar to Skyviews restaurant, as the second year students operate the lab over the lunch hour, and the fourth year students transform the room into a fine dining establishment for dinner. Second year students take the course as a prerequisite, to familiarize them with the kitchen, production techniques, and equipment usage. Fourth year students get more exposure to front and back of the house management including marketing, menu development, menu execution, and evaluation (John Purdue Room, 2012).

**How Are Student Expectations Formed?**

In order to evaluate and understand student expectations, it is important to first understand how they were formed. This can be a difficult subject area to study as expectations are continuously changing (Boulding, Kalra, Staelin, & Zeithaml, 1993). Andrew and Hauser (2011) state that there is very little research that evaluates how
students actually form their educational expectations, despite how useful it may be to the research community.

At the high school level, research suggests that high school students create expectations of their future education by adapting what they already know to new information (Andrew & Hauser, 2011). Within higher education, research has shown that student expectations are dependent upon numerous factors such as culture and gender (Sander et al., 2000). Redish, Saul, and Steinberg (1998) state that students bring into the classroom their own set of attitudes, beliefs, and assumptions that guide their expectations of the course.

**Importance of Evaluating Student Expectations**

Feedback plays an important role in evaluating a course and determining any changes needed for future semesters. Evaluation of expectations prior to course enrollment can be a key feature in providing more effective course objectives and curriculums for hospitality programs across the nation. Research has demonstrated that not only is post-course feedback important, but pre-course feedback on expectations is relevant as well (Sander et al., 2000).

Voss, Gruber, and Szmigin (2007) state, “student expectations are a valuable source of information.” New students may have unrealistic expectations of their experience at college, and if higher education organizations have a better understanding of student expectations, they should be able to ensure they are realistic. The research study evaluated student expectations of instructor qualities, and concluded that students expect their instructors to be approachable, enthusiastic, and knowledgeable. Findings also showed that students want their instructors to pay more attention to the vocational aspects of the
course, and introduce topics that will help students prepare for their profession. The authors conclude that the findings of this study demonstrate how student expectations can help create a framework for a course, to meet student wants and needs (Voss, Gruber, & Szmigin, 2007).

Gilmore and Robson (1990), authors of a study on student perception, expressed that their decision to evaluate the course structure came from findings stating that, “evaluating course structure is an integral part of an educational program, and provides basic information for a variety of educational decisions” (Gronlund, 1985), and that “the need for program evaluation has been emphasized by many educators and practitioners” (Scherile, Roach, & Hoyt, 1987). The authors state that curriculum critique and evaluation by students can help promote positive changes to a program, thus making it more effective to student learning (Gilmore & Robson, 1990). A study produced by Guevara and Stewart (2011) evaluated how well student perceptions matched alumni expectations, and yielded findings stating that student evaluations are of great importance, as they can measure student perception of how useful knowledge is and what they are actually learning. Evaluation of a course can also provide feedback for instructors to measure the effectiveness of their instruction (Nargundkar & Shirkhande, 2012).

**Evaluating Student Expectations**

Gilmore and Robson (1990) conducted a study with a purpose of evaluating students’ perceptions of specific experiences they had while enrolled in Iowa State University’s quantity food production lab, also known as the Joan Bice Underwood Tearoom. The researcher used course outlines, objectives, and evaluation forms to establish main points for the Likert-scale style questionnaire. Findings showed that
students found most of the experiences in Tearoom to be “quite important” to their career goals; previous work experience and their major were two large influences on questionnaire responses.

While it aligns with the majority of research on post-course feedback, the study is crucial to supporting research in the areas of quantity food production labs. Gilmore and Robson (1990) emphasize that they conducted an extensive and in-depth literature review on the area of interest and turned up few results by stating, “no studies were found in the literature that reported on the effectiveness of laboratory course or practicums in hotel and restaurant management.” Gilmore and Robson counter their research with explaining that further exploration yielded results in the area of dietetics. A study produced by Fruin and Lawler (1987) found that work experience and knowledge application in practical settings, such as labs similar to Tearoom, increased skill levels of students (Fruin & Lawler, 1987).

**Conclusion**

After a cursory review of literature, a clear gap exists. Although there is research on student expectations and how they are formed, as well as the importance of student evaluations, there is very limited research on these areas in relation to quantity food production labs/simulated restaurant environments. An in-depth exploration of student expectations can provide valuable feedback for hospitality programs, helping the departments shape their program and bridge the gap between students’ expectations of what they think they will learn, and what instructors are teaching.
CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY

This research study design assists in determining student expectations prior to taking a quantity food production lab. A heavy focus was placed on identifying external factors that have influenced the students’ expectations, as well as what was expected of specific aspects of the course. Each student received the same questionnaire.

Introduction

This study was quantitative in order to identify students’ expectations of a quantity food production lab prior to enrollment in the course. Students’ responses to a questionnaire were collected and analyzed to determine what students’ expectations are of the course syllabus, their instructor(s), topics covered, material supplements, applicability to their future career, and what specifically has influenced their expectations of the course.

Use of Human Subjects

An Application for Approval of Research Involving Humans was submitted to the Institutional Review Board at Iowa State University. After clarification on several responses, the research was deemed exempt by the review board. The researcher received approval for student participation by Texas Tech University and Purdue University after submitting copies of the survey to each university’s hospitality department director. The exemption letter is in Appendix A.

Participants

This study explores the views of college students who attend one of three four-year universities in the United States, who have not yet taken the quantity food production course offered by their college. The researcher invited students from Iowa State University, Texas Tech University, and Purdue University to participate in this study. Iowa State
University was a convenience sample, and chosen because of its student-run restaurant, the Joan Bice Underwood Tearoom. Texas Tech and Purdue participated due to the similarity of their hospitality programs to Iowa State University’s, as well as their offerings of student-run restaurants, the John Purdue Room and Skyviews Restaurant. There is a large variance in the types of student-run restaurants offered by hospitality programs; these two were the most similar to Iowa State University in terms of how the course was structured and the subject areas taught.

**Survey Instrument**

The researcher formulated survey questions using previous research on student expectations. General topic areas were adapted from Redish et al. (1998) 34-question MPEX survey evaluating student expectations of an introductory physics class, as well as Sander et al. (2000) questionnaire evaluating student expectations of teaching. Although neither of these studies were conducted with hospitality students, they provided a strong foundation for formulating questions for this survey instrument by suggesting basic subject areas to expand upon, such as teacher expectations, applicability, amount of effort put into the class, and prior knowledge needed. A copy of the survey can be found in Appendix D.

The instrument was then pilot tested to ensure validity of the questions; pilot study participants included faculty of the Iowa State University’s hospitality program, hospitality industry professionals, and several current students in the College of Human Sciences at Iowa State University. After receiving feedback, several items were removed, added, and altered to ensure clarity and correctness of each question being asked. This included revising the age groups to include smaller ranges and adjusting the wording of the rating scales.
The questionnaire consists of three main parts; demographic information, student expectations of lab, and “other.” The first section of the questionnaire included demographic questions for the survey respondents. Included were questions on age, gender, student status (i.e. freshman, sophomore, junior, etc.), if they have had any previous restaurant experience, and if yes, in what areas.

Section two of the questionnaire used Likert-scale questions to evaluate the students’ expectations of certain aspects of the course. Questions in section two directly related to identifying expectations students had on areas such as instructor qualities, material supplements, the syllabus, topics covered during the course, and the applicability of the course to their career. The scale for questions in section two ranged from high to low expectation.

Section three, the last section of the survey, included questions that were more open-ended in nature, allowing students to choose one or more answers that apply to the question or rating items in order from highest to lowest. The first question asked students to rate their expectation of learning a variety of topics, from topic not covered to topic thoroughly covered. Students then ranked the importance of instructor qualities, from not important to very important. Lastly, students identified what has influenced their overall expectations of the course. This question included an “other” option, where the student was able to type in any other answer that may apply.
Data Collection

Faculty, advisors, and department heads ensured that the surveys reached the appropriate student populations. For Iowa State University, these were undergraduate students in dietetics, hospitality, food science, and culinary science. Professors disturbed surveys at Texas Tech to students enrolled in any food and beverage class. Survey recipients at Purdue were those who were going to be enrolled in their version of a quantity food production lab in Spring 2015. The study population is limited to students, aged 18 years and older, who have not yet taken a quantity food production lab at their university. In order to ensure only qualified individuals took the survey, the researcher included the qualifications at the time of distribution as well as in two separate qualifying questions at the beginning of the survey.

Sample members received the survey via email. The email contained an introduction of the researcher and a brief explanation of the purpose of the survey; this script can be found in Appendix C. A direct link to the survey, hosted on Qualtrics, was included in the email body. The initial survey page contained an informed consent statement, followed by options that would either continue on or exit the survey. Page two included two qualifying questions, asking students to verify their age, and if they had completed a quantity food production lab. The third page was the collection of demographic information; pages four and five were dedicated to student expectations of the course, and what has influenced those expectations. The total collection period was 7 weeks long.
Data Analysis

Survey responses were collected using Qualtrics, an online questionnaire software. Once all the responses were collected, data was imported into Jmp Pro 11. Prior to analysis, several responses were removed due to incomplete sections and answers on the survey. Descriptive statistics were analyzed using Jmp Pro 11. Excel was used to perform t-tests and two-sample t-tests with equal and unequal variances. Before beginning analysis in Excel, questionnaire responses were given numeric values.

Research Objective One

Due to small sample size and few questions, only descriptive statistics were analyzed for expectations of material supplements, as well as topics learned. Results were then organized into a graph.

Research Objective Two

Sources of influence on students’ expectations were analyzed for descriptive statistics and organized in a graph based on student status. Graduate student and unidentified student status responses were excluded as they only made up 2.4% of the responses.

Research Objective Three

To determine if any significant differences existed between males and females and their perception of course applicability to the industry and their future career, a two-sample t-test was performed on each question in the section.

Research Objective Four

Two-sample t-tests were used to determine if there were any significant differences between the sex of the respondents and the importance they place on instructor qualities.
The qualities included approachability, timeliness, knowledge, enthusiasm, organization, and accommodation.
CHAPTER 4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Of the students invited to participate in the study, 102 completed the questionnaire. 82 responses were in usable format for this study. The amount of students reached by the survey was unknown; the researcher was not able to calculate a response rate. An issue with online surveys is the tendency for lower response rates; studies have shown that online surveys are more likely to yield lower response rates than surveys distributed in paper and pencil format (Sax, Gilmartin, & Bryand, 2003; Rolfson, Salomonsson, Dahlberg, & Garellick, 2011).

Despite tending to have lower response rates, online distribution of the survey was, and still seems to be, the most appropriate form of delivering this type of survey. Online distribution is convenient for both the researcher and the respondent, and is more appealing due to the interactive component (Sax et al., 2003). Web-based survey distribution is also time and cost-effective when compared to the more traditional paper and pencil surveys, including the distribution of the survey, as well as already having the results in electronic format upon completion (Kaplowitz, Hadlock, & Levine, 2004).

Demographics of Respondents

The initial portion of the survey collected demographic information from the respondents. Demographic information is in Table 1. The most prevalent age groups of the respondents included those that were age 18-20 (57.3 %) and 21-22 (32.9 %). Female respondents made up the largest portion of the sample at 86.4%, while males accounted for 13.6%. Student status was more evenly distributed: 10 freshman (12.3%), 19 sophomores (23.4%), 28 juniors (34.5%), 23 seniors (28.4%), and 1 graduate student (1.23%).
Prior Industry Experience

Students indicated what, if any, industry-related experience they have had, prior to enrolling in the course. 70 respondents (85.3%) reported having previous industry experience, while 12 respondents (14.6%) had no experience. Areas of experience that students were able to select from included host/hostess, waiter/waitress, cashier, cook, dishwasher, busser, managerial positions, bartender, or other. In the “other” section, respondents were allowed to type in an answer. Results are in Table 2. Waiter/waitress (42.7%), dishwasher (41.5%), cashier (41.5%), and host/hostess (39.2%) were the areas that the respondents had the most experience in. This was somewhat expected as the sample was drawn from college students, and these types of positions tend to have fewer
job qualifications and/or less previous experience necessary to fulfill the job duties

(Summary Report For Dishwashers, 2014; Summary Report For Waiters & Waitresses, 2014; Summary Report for Host & Hostesses, 2014). Responses from the “other” category included catering, dietary aid, barista, pastry chef, culinary program, grocery store worker, and line prep.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Experience</th>
<th>n (82)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waiter/Waitress</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cashier</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dishwasher</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host/Hostess</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busser</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartender</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Objective One

The focus of research objective one was to determine what students were expecting of material supplements provided to them, and what topics instructors would cover throughout the duration of the course. Both are key areas to explore in student expectations as they provide researchers with the very basic expectations of the course. Identifying students’ expectations on topics covered can be viewed as especially important, as the results could shed light on gaps between what the students are thinking they will learn and what is being taught.
Expectations of material supplements (n=81)

Students’ rated expectations of the material supplements provided during the course were rated on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from “very high expectation” to “low expectation”. Students were first asked if they expected that technology would be used to advance their learning in the course. The largest percentage of respondents (48.1%) answered with average expectation; this was also the largest response when asked about the usage of online components to further the students’ learning. When asked about the expectation that equipment manuals would be provided to the students for them to reference, 35.8% of respondents had a very high expectation. The remainder of the respondents were split between an above average expectation (29.6%), and an average expectation (28.4%).

Expectations of topics learned (n=68)

In order to determine what students expected to learn while enrolled in the quantity food production lab, a question allowed them to rate their expectation of common subject areas. The subject areas included planning and organizing, scheduling and staffing, peer evaluation, table service, cash handling, kitchen equipment operation, knife skills, recipe conversion, portioning, customer interaction, front and back-of-house management, food portioning, menu planning, and nutritional analysis.

The topic least expected to learn about was cash handling, with 11.8% of respondents suggesting the topic would not be covered at all; nutritional analysis had the second highest response rate for a topic not covered. Menu planning was the topic expected to be the most thoroughly covered (53.0%). All questions had at least one respondent suggest that the topic would not be covered at all; these responses averaged out at 5.2%.
All of the topics had the highest response rate of either topic thoroughly covered, or topic adequately covered, with the exception of peer evaluation. For expectation of learning about peer evaluation, topic adequately covered and topic briefly covered had the same response rate, with 38.2% each. Subject areas that had the highest response of topic thoroughly covered included kitchen equipment operation, knife skills, recipe conversion, portioning, front and back-of-house management, food portioning, and menu planning. Planning and organizing, scheduling and staffing, peer evaluation, table service, cash handling, and customer interaction skills were all rated as topic adequately covered.

![Figure 1. Respondents’ expectations of topics covered](image)

When reviewing the responses, a pattern emerged, dividing the subjects into their respective areas – front-of-house and back-of-house operations. The back-of-house refers to the kitchen and food preparation areas, whereas the front-of-house refers to areas where customers are allowed, and the actual service occurs (Washington State Department
of Labor & Industries – Back of the House, 2014; Washington State Department of Labor & Industries – Front of the House, 2014). The majority of subject areas that students believe were to be thoroughly covered were those that you would typically engage in in back-of-the-house operations. Areas that students expected to be adequately covered, and rated slightly lower than thoroughly covered, all related to tasks that are typically part of the front-of-house operations.

One explanation for this lies within the name of the course itself: quantity food production. Upon reading the name of the course, one can assume that the structure of the course will revolve around the preparation of food. From there, one can start to associate the subject areas given to those that the student assumes are activities related to food preparation, thus, what the expect to learn the most about in the course.

**Research Objective Two**

In order to better understand student expectations prior to taking a quantity food production lab, it was necessary to explore what or who was influencing these expectations. Research objective two focused on external influences on student expectations. Students were prompted to “identify what has influenced your expectations for the course”, and allowed to select all applicable answers. Options included students who have previously taken the course, students who have not yet taken the course, other classes they have had with the instructor, or other, where they could write in an answer.

Out of the sample, 57 students (69.5%) responded that students who have previously taken the course influenced their expectations. 10 (12.2%) students selected the “students who have not yet taken the course” option; other courses taken with the instructor influenced the expectations of 10 (12.2%) students. Other areas of influence, as
determined by the other category, included the students’ advisors, other courses within the program, how the students thought the class should be ran, and several “no expectations.” Results are in Figure 2.

![Bar chart showing sources of influence on expectations](chart)

**Figure 2. Sources of influence on expectations**

In order to make connections between the answers to this question and the literature that is out there, it was necessary to go beyond the realm of student expectations in quantity food production labs. Because there is little research done on this specific area of academia, a new comparison was with the influences of word-of-mouth communication. Word-of-mouth (WOM) is defined as “informal, person-to-person communication between a perceived noncommercial communicator and a receiver regarding a brand, product, organization, or service” (Harrison-Walker, 2001). Word of mouth communication is one of the major influences of people’s attitudes and behaviors (Harrison-Walker, 2001).

Edwards and Edwards (2013) state that current college students rely heavily on computer-mediated word of mouth, using Internet sites to find information about the
professors they will have, make decisions about what courses to take, and to form their expectations. Online websites such as RateMyProfessor have gained great popularity for their offering of anonymous instructor ratings (Edwards & Edwards, 2013). RateMyProfessor has over 15 million ratings, 7,000 schools, and 1.4 million professors, all user-generated (About RateMyProfessors.com, 2015).

**Research Objective Three**

Real-world applicability is a major component of hospitality courses (Feinstein, 2001; Lennon, 1989) so it was important to examine students’ opinions on the applicability of the course to their future career. Research objective three examined students’ opinions on the applicability of the course to their future career. Students rated their expectation of four areas related to applicability: a good understanding of the course is required to achieve their career goals; the class will give them a great deal of practical knowledge; the course will provide them with skills they can use in the workforce; lastly, being enrolled in a quantity food production lab is necessary for them to understand how a restaurant functions.

90% of students rated all of the topic areas as average expectation or above. Gaining practical knowledge and being provided with skills that can be used in the workforce solicited the highest level of expectation from the students. Students had an above average expectation for needing to understand the course in able to achieve career goals, and in helping them understand how a restaurant functions.

To determine if any significant differences existed between males and females and their perception of course applicability to the industry and future careers, a two sample t-test was performed for each of the following statements: this course will provide me with
skills that I can use in the workforce; I will gain a great deal of practical knowledge from this class; a good understanding of this course is required for me to achieve my career goals; and this course is necessary for me to understand how a restaurant works. Results of the t-tests are in Table 3.

When the respondents (n=81) were asked if they believed a good understanding of the course is necessary to achieve their career goals, there was a statistically significant difference between males (M=3.18) and females (M=3.89), t(79)=2.66 p ≤ .05. Therefore, we can reject the null hypothesis that there is no difference between males and females’ beliefs that a good understanding of the course is necessary for the respondents to achieve their career goals. Results of the remaining three t-tests show that there is no statistical significance between males and females, and their answers to the three statements.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Real World Applicability Means for Males and Females</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>t-value</td>
<td>p-value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This course will provide me with skills that I can use in the work force</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A good understanding of this course is required for me to achieve my career goals</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will gain a great deal of practical knowledge from this class</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This course is necessary for me to understand how a restaurant works</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although one t-test indicated a statistical significance between males and females, and their perception of understanding the course and its influence on their career goals, researchers should use caution when reviewing this result. The sex of the sample
population was skewed with 70 females and 11 males. Because of this, the data cannot be considered a true representation. A larger percentage of males would be required to validate the statistical significance.

**Research Objective Four**

Students were asked questions to determine their expectations of the instructor(s), as well as what they would consider to be the most important and desired qualities of the course instructor(s). Determining student expectations of their instructors are important in understanding overall student expectations because students’ perceptions of their teachers influence their perception of learning (Chandler, Weber, Finley, & Evans, 2013). Measuring student perceptions of course instruction is growing as a means of teaching evaluation (Gursoy & Umbreit, 2005).

*Expectations of the course instructor (n=82)*

A five-point Likert scale was developed to identify expectations of the course instructor; ratings included low expectation, below average expectation, average expectation, above average expectation, and very high expectation. Areas covered included timeliness, organization, knowledge, and consistency.

When asked about their expectation of the instructor(s), students responded that they have “very high expectations” of the following: the instructor will reply to emails within 48 hours (48.7%); that the instructor will be well organized and prepared (54.9%); they will grade consistently with the posted rubric (66.7%); and that the instructor will demonstrate clear knowledge on the subjects being taught (64.5%). When asked about instructor accessibility outside of designated office hours, the majority of respondents
(42.6%) had average expectations. For all questions asked, 95.0% of the responses were at “average expectation” or above.

*Importance of instructor qualities (n=68)*

Instructor qualities were ranked on a 4-point Likert scale of importance; ratings included not important, somewhat important, very important, and essential. Specific qualities identified included approachability, timeliness, knowledge, enthusiasm, organization, and the instructor being accommodating. Approachability (54.4%), enthusiasm (48.5%), organization (55.9%), and knowledge (65.6%) all ranked as “essential” qualities. Accommodation (50.0%) and timeliness (47.1%) were deemed as “very important qualities”. Each of the six qualities received one “not important” vote.

To determine if any significant differences existed between sex of the respondents and the importance they place on specific instructor qualities, a two sample t-test was performed for each of the following qualities: approachability, timeliness, knowledge, enthusiasm, organization, and accommodation. The values calculated were 1.04 (p=0.32), 0.91 (p=0.36), 1.03 (p=0.31), 1.16 (p=0.27), 0.70 (p=0.50), and 1.86 (p=0.07), respectively. Results are in Table 4.

These statistics indicate that between males and females, we fail to reject the null hypothesis, and that any difference between the two groups is due to chance. Although no significant differences were noted, it was observed that males tended to rate approachability and enthusiasm higher while females rated timeliness, knowledge, organization, and accommodation higher.
Table 4

Importance Rating Means for Males and Females

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approachability</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When compared to studies focusing on teaching effectiveness, the ranking of instructor qualities are very similar. Sander et al. (2000) study on teacher, learning, and assessment preferences asked students to rank teacher qualities. The top-ranking qualities, in order, were approachability, teaching skills, enthusiasm, knowledge, and organization. Although the teacher qualities between the two studies were not on the same scale, a top-ranked quality was an “essential” skill, therefore, supporting the results.

These qualities were also among those rated as a top-quality in Voss and Gruber’s study, *The Desired Teaching Qualities of Lecturers in Higher Education* (2006). After coding the subjects’ responses, the top eight desired qualities of lecturers were determined. They included expertise, approachability, communication skills, teaching skills, friendliness, enthusiasm, humor, and teaching methods. While there is a little variance from the previous study, they still share similar qualities.
CHAPTER 5. CONCLUSIONS

Chapter 5 includes three sections. First, the research findings will be summarized and discussed. Next, limitations of the research study will be addressed. Lastly, suggestions for future research will be presented.

Summary of Research

Descriptive statistics calculated on the demographics of the students showed that 85.3% of the sample population had previous industry experience, with the largest portion being waiters/waitresses, cashiers, and dishwashers. These jobs reflect the younger sample population of this study as they require less skill than other positions, such as managerial. The most frequent age group selected for the questionnaire was 18-20 (57.3%).

Results from the study showed that the topic students had the highest expectation of learning was menu planning. Topics with the lowest expectation rating of “topic not covered at all” were nutritional analysis and cash handling. A trend emerged within the survey responses. Topics that were expected to be thoroughly covered were those that are typically back of the house operations, whereas the topics expected to be adequately covered or lower were predominately back of the house operations. This suggests that students expect the majority of information covered to be related to back of the house, in-kitchen operations.

Data collected from the study showed that respondents had an average expectation of using technology in the classroom, as well as expecting online components to be used to further learning. A very high expectation of being provided with an equipment manual was expressed.
Students who had previously taken the course were the primary source of influence on the respondents. Other courses with the instructor, and students who have not yet taken the course were tied for the second most influential source. Self-reported sources from respondents included advisors, other courses within the department, and how they thought the class should function.

High expectations were reported for the course providing the students with valuable skills that they can use in the workforce, as well as practical knowledge. The researcher found significant difference in males and females, and their perception of how a good understanding of the course would be necessary for them to achieve their career goals. There were no significant differences found within males and females, and their responses to the other questions regarding applicability to the industry and workforce.

Two sample t-tests comparing male and female ratings of instructor qualities failed to prove any statistical significance. Although the results were statistically insignificant, the responses were consistent with findings of previous studies on teacher qualities. Approachability, teaching skills, knowledge, and enthusiasm were all top-ranked instructor qualities among all three studies (Voss & Gruber, 2006; Sander et al., 2000).

**Limitations of Study**

While reviewing survey responses, there was a portion of the responses that were only partially complete, and several respondents selected the same answer for all questions. In order to keep the data valid and remove the possibility of questions being answered just to complete the survey, these responses were removed, thus, resulting in a much smaller sample than originally anticipated and received. In general, there was also a
very small response rate in comparison to the amount of students the survey reached. Because of this the results from this research study are not generalizable.

Variance in the format of hospitality programs across the nation is a limitation to this study. The content of the questionnaire was formed around Iowa State University’s hospitality program. While the other two schools participating in the study have similar programs, they do not necessarily offer the same classes or have the same requirements. Because of this, information in the questionnaire may not have been applicable to all students participating.

**Recommendations for Instructors and Future Research**

With nearly half of the respondents reporting that they expected technology to be used in the course, as well as online components to advance learning, instructors should consider integrating technology into the course. This could include interactive online learning components, or industry technology such as point-of-sales systems. Instructors should also consider placing a greater emphasis on the managerial aspects of food production. With only six percent of survey respondents reporting having prior managerial experience, it is clear that this could be an area that students have minimal experience in, and could greatly benefit from.

In order to get a higher response rate, as well as increasing the generalizability of the results, future researchers should attempt to contact more hospitality programs across the nation for survey distribution. To address the limitation of the differences within the various hospitality programs, researchers should consider also asking the departments to provide information about their quantity food production lab and the course syllabus to assist in making the survey instrument more relevant to all schools involved in the study.
This study was very quantitative in nature. While it yielded valuable information, due to the Likert-scale format of answering questions, there was great room for both interpretation and misinterpretation. An alternate version of this study that utilized qualitative methods such as focus groups or interviews, along with the quantitative data, could provide researchers with a more in-depth reasoning behind the answers. For example, the question that asks students what has directly influenced their expectations of the course, the students could elaborate on how or why those external forces influenced their decisions, not just the “what” factor.

Additionally, further research could explore how the results of this research study compare to the actual formatting and syllabus of the course. Comparison of the expectations of course topics compared to the actual topics covered in the syllabus may help hospitality programs and instructors bridge any gaps that may exist. Information provided by students can also help hospitality programs become more effective by utilizing the types of materials or technology that students are expecting or wanting to use, versus what they may think is best suited for the course.
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APPENDIX A: HUMAN SUBJECTS EXEMPTION LETTER

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY
OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Institutional Review Board
Office for Responsible Research
Vice President for Research
1158 Pearson Hall
Ames, Iowa 50011-2307
515 294-3956
FAX 515 294-4487

Date: 10/1/2014
To: Kathrine Ginapp
7E MacKay Hall

CC: Dr. Eric A Brown
166 MacKay Hall
Dr. Thomas Schrler
5 MacKay Hall

From: Office for Responsible Research
Title: Meeting Students Expectations in a Quantity Food Production Lab/Simulated Restaurant Environment
IRB ID: 14-329
Study Review Date: 9/30/2014

The project referenced above has been declared exempt from the requirements of the human subject protections regulations as described in 45 CFR 46.101(b) because it meets the following federal requirements for exemption:

• (2) Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey or interview procedures with adults or observation of public behavior where
  • Information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human subjects cannot be identified directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects; or
  • Any disclosure of the human subjects' responses outside the research could not reasonably place the subject at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to their financial standing, employability, or reputation.

The determination of exemption means that:
• You do not need to submit an application for annual continuing review.
• You must carry out the research as described in the IRB application. Review by IRB staff is required prior to implementing modifications that may change the exempt status of the research. In general, review is required for any modifications to the research procedures (e.g., method of data collection, nature or scope of information to be collected, changes in confidentiality measures, etc.), modifications that result in the inclusion of participants from vulnerable populations, and/or any change that may increase the risk or discomfort to participants. Changes to key personnel must also be approved. The purpose of review is to determine if the project still meets the federal criteria for exemption.

Non-exempt research is subject to many regulatory requirements that must be addressed prior to implementation of the study. Conducting non-exempt research without IRB review and approval may constitute non-compliance with federal regulations and/or academic misconduct according to ISU policy.

Detailed information about requirements for submission of modifications can be found on the Exempt Study Modification Form. A Personnel Change Form may be submitted when the only modification involves changes in study staff. If it is determined that exemption is no longer warranted, then an Application for Approval of Research Involving Humans Form will need to be submitted and approved before proceeding with data collection.
Emails were sent regarding the distribution of the questionnaire to Dr. Richard Ghiselli, Dr. Carl Behnke, Dr. Shane Blum, Mrs. Dawn Fiihr, and Ms. Amber Kargol.

Response from Richard Ghiselli:

Hi Katie,

We would be interested in the results. As for distributing to our students – we can do the following. If you set this up on Qualtrics we can direct them that way. Basically they would have to volunteer. I have included Dr. Behnke on this email as he teaches the quantity foods course. Rich Ghiselli

Response from Shane Blum:

Katherine,

Sure, send me your survey and we will try to help.

Thank you.

Response from Dawn Fiihr:

Katie,

I can share the email with our listserv but it needs to come from me.

Response from Amber Kargol:

Katie, you can get your email all ready and I can send it to those particular majors.
APPENDIX C. EMAIL SCRIPT

Good Afternoon,

Below is the link for my thesis survey, *Meeting Student Expectations In A Quantity Food Production Lab/Simulated Restaurant Environment*.

https://iastate.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_bDu0yiUbxwd5w1v

If you are an undergraduate student who has not yet been enrolled in Tearoom (Quantity Food Production) and will be in the future, or will be taking the class for fun, please take the time to complete this survey. Your answers are anonymous; further information is provided in the survey prompt screen.

Please contact me if you have any additional questions.

Thank you,
APPENDIX D. CONSENT FORM AND QUESTIONNAIRE

Meeting Student Expectations In A Quantity Food Production Lab/Simulated Restaurant Environment

You are invited to participate in a study, "Meeting Student Expectations In A Quantity Food Production Lab/Simulated Restaurant Environment", conducted by Katie Ginapp, graduate student at Iowa State University. The purpose of this study is to evaluate student expectations prior to being enrolled in a quantity food production class. Your participation in this research study is voluntary, and you may withdraw at any time. If you decide not to participate in this study or if you withdraw from participating at any time, you will not be penalized.

The procedure involves filling an online survey that will take approximately 15 minutes. Your responses will be confidential and we do not collect identifying information such as your name, email address, or IP address.

If you have any questions regarding this survey, please contact Katie Ginapp at kmginapp@iastate.edu. This research project has been approved by Iowa State University IRB for procedures involving human subjects.

If you agree to the above terms, please select yes; If not, please select no and you will be redirected from this survey.

☐ Yes
☐ No
I am 18 years of age or older:
☐ Yes
☐ No

I am required to take and will be enrolled in a quantity food production lab at my university:
☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Not required, but will be enrolled
Please select your age range:
- 18-20
- 21-22
- 23-26
- 27-29
- 30+
- Prefer not to disclose

Please select your sex:
- Male
- Female
- Prefer not to disclose

What is your current student status?
- Freshman
- Sophomore
- Junior
- Senior
- Graduate Student
- Non-degree Seeking Student

Have you had any previous food and beverage experience prior to taking the course?
- Yes
- No

If you answered yes to the question above, please select all that apply:
- Host/Hostess
- Waiter/Waitress
- Cashier
- Cook
- Dishwasher
- Busser
- Managerial Position
- Bartender
- Other __________________
Instructions: You will be taking a quantity food production lab at your school to complete your degree requirements. Please respond to these questions based on your current expectations of the class.

Please rate the following statements in regards to your perceived importance of items within the syllabus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Very High Importance</th>
<th>Above Average Importance</th>
<th>Average Importance</th>
<th>Below Average Importance</th>
<th>Low Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The course expectations will be clearly stated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The course materials will be well organized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructions for assignments will be clearly stated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course assignments will support the purpose of the course</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear evaluation criteria for the course will be identified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please rate the following statements in regards to your expectations of the course instructor(s):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very High Expectation</th>
<th>Above Average Expectation</th>
<th>Average Expectation</th>
<th>Below Average Expectation</th>
<th>Low Expectation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The instructor(s) of the course should reply to my emails within 48 hours</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructor(s) will be accessible outside of delegated office hours</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructor(s) will be well organized and prepared for each lab</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructor(s) grading will be consistent with the grading rubric posted</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructor(s) will demonstrate clear knowledge on the subject being taught</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please rate the following statements in regards to your expectations of the materials that will be covered:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very High Expectation</th>
<th>Above Average Expectation</th>
<th>Average Expectation</th>
<th>Below Average Expectation</th>
<th>Low Expectation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A difficulty in the course will be memorizing all of the information I need to know to successfully complete and pass this course</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This course will require me to put in a great deal of effort outside of lab</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This course will require me to put in a great deal of time outside of lab</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As long as I pay attention during the lecture, I will do fine in lab</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success in this course will require critical thinking</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is possible for me to earn a C+ or higher in this course without fully understanding</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the topics covered
Examples used in class will be relevant and current to today's industry
The lab component of this course will be well integrated with lecture portion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very High Expectation</th>
<th>Above Average Expectation</th>
<th>Average Expectation</th>
<th>Below Average Expectation</th>
<th>Low Expectation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technology will be used to advance my learning in this course</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment manuals will be provided for me to reference throughout the course</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The course will include online components to further my learning</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please rate the following statements in regards to your expectations of material supplements for the course:
Please rate the following statements in regards to your expectations of the real-world applicability of the course:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Very High Expectation</th>
<th>Above Average Expectation</th>
<th>Average Expectation</th>
<th>Below Average Expectation</th>
<th>Low Expectation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A good understanding of this course is required for me to achieve my career goals</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will gain a great deal of practical knowledge from this class</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This course will provide me with skills that I can use in the workforce</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being enrolled in a quantity food production lab is necessary for me to understand how a restaurant functions</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rate your expectation of learning each of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Topic Not Covered</th>
<th>Topic Briefly Covered</th>
<th>Topic Adequately Covered</th>
<th>Topic Thoroughly Covered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Organizing</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling &amp; Staffing</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Evaluation</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table Service</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Handling</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen Equipment Operation</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knife Skills</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recipe Conversion</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portioning</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Interaction Skills</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front-of-House Management</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back-of-House Management</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Portioning</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menu Planning</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutritional Analysis</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rank the following instructor qualities based on importance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor Quality</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Essential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approachability</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timeliness</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodating</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Identify what has influenced your expectations for the course (select all that apply):
- Students who have previously taken the course
- Students who have not yet taken the course
- Other classes I have taken with the course instructor(s)
- Other ________________