

Original Paper

Aligning Tourism English Learning With Workplace Tasks Through College-Enterprise Partnerships

Weiyu Lian^{1*}

¹ Xinjiang Vocational University, Urumqi, China

* Weiyu Lian, Xinjiang Vocational University, Urumqi, China. Email: 758187856@qq.com

Received: September 13, 2026 Accepted: September 26, 2026 Online Published: October 14, 2026

doi:10.22158/eltls.v8n5p66

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.22158/eltls.v8n5p66>

Abstract

College–enterprise partnerships offer access to work, but that access does not specify what students learn in English. This framework-development study combines project document analysis with descriptive secondary analysis of 896 student, 63 enterprise, and 57 vocational English teacher questionnaire records. An ESP-informed audit examines whether the instruments and teaching resources identify communication purposes, audiences, genres, opportunities for English use, learning support, and performance criteria. The documents specify occupational activities more clearly than language demands; the surveys provide contextual signals about participation and mentoring rather than measures of English needs or project effects. The proposed framework links each identified gap to a language task, a responsible mentor, a feasible participation arrangement, and evidence for assessment. Its contribution is a context-specific integration of ESP task design and work-integrated learning under seasonal, staffing, and supervision constraints. Policies issued in 2025–2026 guide prospective alignment rather than explain earlier data. The framework requires local needs analysis and pilot evaluation, given the uncertain survey provenance and lack of implementation evidence.

Keywords

tourism english, english for specific purposes, college–enterprise partnerships, work-integrated learning, needs analysis, vocational english teachers

1. Introduction

Tourism English students must do more than recall vocabulary about destinations or reproduce a prepared commentary. They may need to clarify a visitor's request, explain the purpose of an educational activity, negotiate a change with a service provider, or report an incident accurately. These activities require students to select language in response to another person's understanding and to the

demands of the work. College–enterprise partnerships offer access to such situations. Their educational value, however, depends on whether participation includes preparation, supported practice, feedback, and opportunities to revise performance.

This problem is especially relevant to educational travel, referred to here as study travel. In the Chinese policy context, study travel connects organized travel with inquiry and experiential learning outside school (Ministry of Education of the People's Republic of China [MOE], 2016). A student preparing to support such activities needs knowledge of tourism services and learning activities as well as communication skills. English may be relevant when interacting with international visitors, explaining information to overseas partners, or producing bilingual resources. Its relevance must be established for the task and audience: a domestic excursion does not become an English-learning experience simply because tourism English students participate in it.

The present study develops an English-teaching analysis from a vocational education reform project on the joint development of an industry college. In this article, an industry college means an organizational arrangement through which a vocational institution and enterprises coordinate curriculum, teachers, practical learning, and resources. It does not necessarily denote a separately incorporated institution. The project application envisages cooperation with two kinds of providers, an educational travel business and a nature education organization. Earlier project publications discuss cooperation structures and curriculum development (Li, 2024, 2025). The question addressed here is narrower: how can those structures support identifiable language-learning opportunities and credible assessment?

This is a framework-development study informed by documents and descriptive survey evidence, not a completed design-based intervention. No iterative implementation or learning-outcome evaluation is reported. The contribution is a set of explicit links between language tasks and the arrangements needed to teach and assess them when workplace access is seasonal, mentoring capacity is limited, and operational duties require supervision. These links combine established ESP and work-integrated learning (WIL) principles to make the basis of local design decisions explicit.

Three sequential questions organize the analysis. RQ1: What participation and teaching conditions are reported in the project documents and supplied survey records? RQ2: Which information needed for ESP course design is explicit or missing in the questionnaires and lesson plans, judged against communication purpose, audience, genre, opportunity for English use, learning support, and performance criteria? RQ3: Given those conditions and gaps, what task, mentoring, and assessment arrangements can be proposed using ESP and WIL research and prospective policy alignment? RQ1 and RQ2 establish the design problem that RQ3 addresses.

2. Literature and Policy Context

2.1 Needs Analysis and Task Specification

English for Specific Purposes (ESP) connects course decisions with the purposes for which learners need language. Hutchinson and Waters (1987) emphasize learning as well as target use, while

Basturkmen (2010) links needs analysis, specialist discourse, and course development. In a tourism partnership, this requires more detail than a statement that students need communication skills. Course designers need to know who communicates with whom, what information must be exchanged, which genres occur, what makes an exchange difficult, and what counts as successful completion. A confirmation email and an explanation for a child may concern the same itinerary while requiring different language choices.

Long (2005) provides a basis for examining language needs through the tasks people perform. Serafini et al. (2015) also stress methodological care in selecting sources and methods for specialized needs analysis. These perspectives suggest that enterprise managers, working staff, students, and teachers provide different kinds of evidence. Managers may identify service expectations; staff can describe recurring exchanges; students can explain difficulties; teachers can identify teachable features. Agreement among them cannot be presumed from the existence of three questionnaires.

Recent studies illustrate the value of connecting needs evidence to curriculum decisions. Smith et al. (2022) link task-based needs analysis with curriculum evaluation in an academic English setting. Kholidi et al. (2022) examine English needs and difficulties among tourism employees in Malaysia. Segura Arias (2024) uses evidence from students, graduates, and employers to distinguish broad tourism English needs from more specific occupational requirements. These studies support a context-sensitive approach rather than the transfer of a fixed tourism vocabulary list. Their findings do not establish the needs of the present institution, but their methods help identify what its existing instruments would have to measure.

Task-based language teaching offers a further design principle. Ellis (2009) distinguishes communicative tasks from activities that primarily rehearse linguistic forms. A useful tourism task gives learners a reason to understand and exchange information and produces an outcome beyond correct grammar. This does not remove the need for vocabulary, pronunciation, or explicit instruction. It places that support around a communicative problem, such as agreeing on a feasible schedule or ensuring that a participant understands an instruction.

2.2 Connecting College Learning and Work

Work experience does not automatically produce the learning an institution intends. Guile and Griffiths (2001) treat the relationship between education and work as a pedagogical issue. Billett (2009) similarly argues for deliberate integration of experiences across academic and practice settings. In the present context, a placement becomes relevant to English education when students prepare for an exchange, take a supported role, receive feedback, and return to the curriculum with something that can be analyzed. Time spent at an enterprise is a measure of participation, not a direct measure of language development.

Akkerman and Bakker (2011) explain how differences between settings can create learning opportunities through boundary crossing. A route brief, a learner information sheet, or an assessment rubric can help teachers and practitioners discuss the same activity from different perspectives. Such a

document is useful only when it changes coordination: the enterprise needs it to convey service requirements, the teacher uses it to identify language demands, and the student uses it to plan and revise work. Bouw et al. (2021) extend this concern to the design of vocational curricula across school and work. Their account supports attention to scheduling, social participation, and the organization of knowledge, all of which matter in seasonal tourism.

The OECD (2023) situates these issues within the broader need for vocational systems that respond to changing skills demands. Responsiveness should include students' capacity to move between employers and roles. A partnership that teaches only one provider's routine may offer immediate operational convenience while limiting educational breadth. The task sequence proposed below therefore includes transferable actions such as requesting clarification, adapting an explanation, documenting a decision, and using feedback.

2.3 Assessment and Intercultural Communication

Constructive alignment requires intended outcomes, learning activities, and assessment to address the same performance (Biggs, 1996). If the intended outcome is explaining a study-travel activity in English to an unfamiliar audience, an attendance record or a general internship satisfaction score is insufficient. Gulikers et al. (2004) provide a framework for designing assessment in relation to professional practice. This supports assessment through realistic purposes, audiences, products, and criteria, while leaving room for controlled simulations when access to live work is limited.

Feedback also requires a student response. Carless and Boud (2018) emphasize learners' capacity to interpret and use information about their work. Molloy et al. (2020) develop this learner-centered view through a framework of feedback literacy. In a tourism English course, the practical consequence is that a mentor comment should lead to a revised email, another explanation, or a recorded account of how the student changed a decision. A portfolio that stores only final products conceals this process.

Intercultural competence broadens the criteria for successful communication. Byram (2021) connects language education with interpreting perspectives and responding to cultural difference. The Council of Europe (2020) adds resources for describing mediation, including making information accessible to others. For educational travel, this suggests assessing how students explain unfamiliar ideas, check understanding, and adapt to an audience. The proposal below uses these perspectives as design resources; it does not claim that the resulting local rubric is a validated CEFR test.

2.4 Historical Policy Context and Prospective Alignment

Policy documents serve two different purposes in this study. The study-travel guidance of 2016, the 2021 general English curriculum standard, the revised internship provisions, and the 2023–2025 industry–education integration action plan were available before the May 2024 project application. They provide historical reference points, although availability does not prove that any one document caused a local decision. The 2023–2025 plan supports enterprise participation in curriculum and practical training but is treated as a time-bounded historical initiative, not an ongoing program in 2026 (National Development and Reform Commission [NDRC], 2023). The 2021 English standard concerns

the general higher vocational curriculum rather than the full specialist Tourism English program (MOE, 2021a).

The education development plan for 2024–2035 was issued in 2025, despite the earlier year in its title (Communist Party of China Central Committee & State Council, 2025). It and the Tourism English teaching standard issued in 2025 postdate all survey records and the initial application. The latter provides a specialist curricular reference for program 570203 (MOE, 2025). The February 2026 opinion addresses coordinated reform of programs, courses, teaching materials, teachers, and practical training, including institutional–enterprise cooperation (MOE, 2026). These later documents guide prospective alignment of the proposed framework. They are not used to explain what shaped the 2024 responses, and no compliance outcome is inferred from them.

The revised internship provisions inform the design's attention to supervision and role boundaries (MOE, 2021b). Live participation, classroom simulation, employment, and commercial route development are not interchangeable arrangements. Before using a task in a workplace, the institution must establish applicable responsibilities and protections. The framework does not prescribe remuneration or assume that revenue sharing replaces an internship agreement. Policy thus defines matters to resolve before implementation; it does not validate a teaching intervention.

3. Method

3.1 Case Boundaries and Source Selection

The case concerns a Tourism English reform project at a vocational institution in China. The application was prepared in May 2024, and the interim report is dated October 2025. The project seeks to connect language education, tourism services, and study-travel guidance through enterprise cooperation. Its application identifies six areas of inquiry, including partnership value, implementation problems, influencing factors, cooperation content, model development, and evaluation. It also proposes comparisons involving enterprises, students, and teachers. These are project intentions; the presence of a proposed method in an application does not show that the method was completed.

Table 1 identifies the documents used for the present analysis. The archive includes duplicate representations, such as a Word file and a PDF of the same report, and an achievement compilation containing materials also supplied separately. These were treated as alternate representations of the same source. The analysis did not count duplicated pages as additional evidence. General expenditure forms and a request concerning a different online English teaching project were not used to establish findings about this partnership.

Table 1. Documentary Corpus and Evidentiary Role

Source	Content examined	Evidentiary role
A Project application dated May 2024	Objectives, two intended enterprise partners, methods, outputs, timetable	Planned research and institutional commitments
B Interim report dated October 2025	Reported course activity, participation narrative, problems and proposed remedies	Project team's retrospective account
C Two published papers	Li (2024); Li (2025)	Related accounts of cooperation and resource constraints; used to locate prior claims, not as independent confirmation
D Cooperation briefing dated May 2025	Route development, allocation of roles, proposed revenue sharing and future agreement	Recorded negotiation and intentions
E Fourteen lesson plans	Objectives, cases, assignments and written reflections in Study Travel Tutor Practice	Occupational teaching resources and proposed activities
F Questionnaire instruments and three response exports	896 student records, 63 enterprise records, 57 teacher records; student 19 items, enterprise 17 main items plus a ranking item, teacher 22 items in the administered version	Descriptive stakeholder evidence and instrument audit

Note. Source letters identify the materials in the findings. The supplied blank teacher form has 18 items, whereas the response export has 22; analysis follows the administered version. Corporate names are described by provider type because the analytical focus is the educational arrangement. Record counts do not establish a probability sample or unique participating organizations.

3.2 Document Analysis and Evidence Classification

Document analysis is suitable for examining how an organization defines activities and records its work, provided that the purpose and limitations of each document remain visible (Bowen, 2009). The present analysis compared the application, interim account, published arguments, negotiation record, teaching resources, and instrument content. Passages were organized under partnership responsibilities,

occupational tasks, language objectives, mentoring, participation conditions, assessment, and evidence gaps. The analytical unit was a statement of purpose, a reported event, a task or assignment, or a questionnaire item. The comparison focused on relationships among these units rather than on word frequencies.

Three distinctions guided interpretation. First, a planned activity was separated from an activity reported as undertaken. Second, a reported activity was separated from independently documented performance. Third, an existing occupational task was separated from the English adaptation proposed in this paper. For example, the briefing establishes that route-development responsibilities were discussed; it does not establish that a route was sold. A lesson-plan assignment establishes that an activity was specified; it does not show how students performed it. A teacher's written reflection provides a practitioner observation but cannot replace a scored language sample.

The questionnaire and lesson-plan audit used six information requirements synthesized from ESP needs analysis and constructive alignment (Long, 2005; Basturkmen, 2010; Serafini et al., 2015; Biggs, 1996): communicative purpose, audience, genre or interaction, actual opportunity to use English, learning support, and performance criteria. An occupational label such as "communication" did not establish an English-language purpose; a presentation assignment did not establish an audience or scoring criterion unless these were specified. The audit identifies explicit information and gaps in each source rather than assigning a numerical quality score. These dimensions organize RQ2; they are not a validated rating scale. The three response exports were then analyzed separately using counts and percentages. Single-choice categories were retained as recorded. Multiple-choice responses were split using the export's selection delimiter, with each option counted at most once per record. Percentages use the number of records in the relevant stakeholder group, not the number of selections, and can therefore sum to more than 100%. Administrative instructions embedded among answer options were not treated as substantive selections. The analysis did not combine the three instruments into a scale or estimate internal consistency across unrelated categorical items.

3.3 Survey Provenance and Data Quality

The enterprise export contains 63 records dated February 21–March 22, 2024, and the teacher export contains 57 dated February 20–March 10, 2024. The teacher respondents were English teachers in higher vocational education. The student export contains 895 records from February 2024 and one from October 15, 2024. Almost all responses therefore predate the May 2024 application. They describe earlier needs and cooperation conditions, not outcomes of the project or responses to the 2025–2026 policies. Recruitment procedures, invitation denominators, respondents' institutional affiliations, students' majors, and unique enterprise identities have not been established. The samples cannot be assumed to consist only of people from the focal institution or the Tourism English program. Response rates and population estimates are not reported.

All substantive question cells contain an entry, and no duplicate record identifiers or identical complete answer vectors were detected within an export. These checks do not establish that every answer is

meaningful or that all respondents are unique individuals. Free-text entries such as "no comment" are not treated as substantive findings. No record was deleted automatically. Student completion time had a median of 164 seconds; 44 records were completed in under 60 seconds. Appendix A reports a completion-time sensitivity check for selected items. This is a diagnostic exclusion exercise, not evidence of response validity, scale reliability, or sample representativeness.

There are material instrument problems. Of the 610 students reporting no school-arranged internship, 301 selected an internship duration of at least one month and 326 selected some remuneration. These answers may concern independently arranged work or reflect forced-response routing. They cannot be reconciled from the export. Internship duration and pay are therefore not used to characterize all students' actual placement experience. In the teacher survey, 19 of 57 respondents exceeded the stated three-option maximum on preferred training modes. That item is omitted from the substantive findings rather than silently truncated. The enterprise survey combines teamwork/communication and independent learning in one exported option in Item 6 and refers to secondary vocational students in some Item 8 options. Neither item is used to estimate a distinct college-graduate competence deficit. Headline findings use clearer questions and retain their original meaning.

3.4 Source Criticism and Research Limits

The institutional archive provides access to project planning and reporting, but its accounts may present planned improvements as completed achievements. Source B is a progress report written to describe project development, while Source C contains arguments from the same project environment. Their agreement is not independent confirmation. The survey groups cannot be linked to each other or to the project's later participants. Their responses permit comparison of concerns, not matched student-teacher-employer analysis. The survey percentages describe only the supplied records. Because their connection to project participants is unverified, they are not treated as a project baseline or as population estimates. Their role is to flag issues for design and local verification. Transferable propositions come from the reasoned connection between documentary gaps and established literature, not from generalizing these percentages.

The teaching materials require particular care. Their class labels refer to primary English education cohorts, while the project concerns Tourism English. Their dates also include an individual 2024 entry within a collection labeled for 2025. The plans can support analysis of available teaching resources, but not a claim that fourteen lessons were delivered to an identified Tourism English sample. The survey exports include administrative metadata, including IP addresses; these are not reproduced or used to infer personal characteristics. Findings are aggregated. Documentation of recruitment, informed consent, institutional review where applicable, and authorization for secondary analysis was not supplied. No ethics approval or exemption is asserted on the basis of these records.

4. Findings Informing Framework Development

4.1 *The Partnership Specifies Cooperation More Clearly than Language Learning*

Source A places competence development, curriculum reform, shared resources, and teacher development at the center of the proposed industry college. Source B reports a study-travel English course with participation by enterprise practitioners. Source D allocates route research and development to teacher-guided student teams and market operation to the enterprise. These materials provide a recognizable institutional logic: teachers connect projects to learning, students contribute to development work, and practitioners contribute occupational knowledge and service constraints.

The documents say less about how these activities develop English. References to communication and cultural explanation often leave the audience, genre, expected performance, and assessment evidence unspecified. Students could therefore complete a route proposal mostly in Chinese, gaining tourism knowledge with little documented English practice. Route development can still be worthwhile, but teachers need to identify the parts that require English, prepare students for them, and collect evidence of learning.

The two earlier papers help locate this contribution. Li (2024) discusses cooperation mechanisms, curriculum alignment with industry, and teachers with both academic and occupational expertise. Li (2025) considers resource constraints, the depth of cooperation, opportunities for practice, and teaching reform. The present paper builds on those concerns by specifying the transition from cooperation arrangements to assessable English performances. It does not treat the earlier papers as new data or reproduce them as an English translation.

4.2 *Stakeholder Responses Identify Participation and Teaching Conditions*

Table 2 reports the selected survey descriptions once, retaining counts, denominators, and item wording. The records suggest interest in participation alongside limited school-arranged internship experience, broad enterprise concerns about communication and supervision, and teacher interest alongside uneven training provision. These patterns help identify questions for a partnership to check locally. They do not establish the initial conditions of the focal project because the respondents cannot be linked to its participants.

Students' preference for worthwhile work and their reported concerns about low-cost labor, major mismatch, and enterprise engagement suggest asking whether a placement has an explicit learning purpose and bounded duties. The responses are perceptions, not verified misconduct or prevalence among experienced interns. Enterprise communication items do not specify English; they justify investigating communicative tasks, not asserting an English-language deficit. Teacher responses flag support and training as design considerations, without establishing which support would improve teaching.

Table 2. Selected Descriptive Survey Results

Respondent group and item	Response or selected option	n/N (%)
Students, Item 3	Partnership learning very/relatively important	839/896 (93.6)
Students, Item 4	Very/relatively willing to participate	832/896 (92.9)
Students, Item 7	Never undertook a school-arranged internship	610/896 (68.1)
Students, Item 15	Work content is the leading personal priority	449/896 (50.1)
Students, Item 16, multiple choice	Hope to learn knowledge and gain experience	737/896 (82.3)
Students, Item 18, multiple choice	Concern about being used as cheap labor	399/896 (44.5)
Enterprises, Item 9, multiple choice	Graduates need better teamwork and communication	51/63 (81.0)
Enterprises, Item 10, multiple choice	Colleges should better align with enterprise needs	52/63 (82.5)
Enterprises, Item 12	Workplace and school mentors jointly supervise	19/63 (30.2)
Enterprises, Item 14, multiple choice	Lack of cooperation mechanisms constrains participation	43/63 (68.3)
Enterprises, Item 15, multiple choice	Concern about student safety	47/63 (74.6)
Teachers, Item 11	Willing to improve combined teaching and occupational expertise	54/57 (94.7)
Teachers, Item 14	No related training attended	24/57 (42.1)
Teachers, Item 16	No enterprise-based professional practice	14/57 (24.6)
Teachers, Item 18, multiple choice	Institutional support affects enterprise participation	46/57 (80.7)
Teachers, Item 19	Evaluation/incentive arrangements incomplete or absent	45/57 (78.9)

Note. Counts refer to questionnaire records, not verified unique institutions. Percentages are rounded to one decimal place. Multiple-choice percentages use respondents as the denominator. These are descriptive sample results, not estimates of population prevalence or intervention effects. Enterprise Item 12 is reported as recorded and is not restricted to respondents with independently verified placements.

The proposed framework uses these descriptions as prompts for local inquiry rather than weights for selecting tasks. For example, selecting joint supervision in the enterprise questionnaire records a reported arrangement; it neither establishes that mentoring occurred nor that it was effective. Sources B and D provide the case-specific basis for considering participation continuity and division of responsibilities, while ESP and WIL research informs the pedagogical response. Additional descriptive values and the completion-time check appear in Appendix A. No cross-group statistical comparison is made because the instruments and samples differ.

4.3 Questionnaire Coverage against ESP Information Requirements

The student form covers awareness of partnerships, willingness to participate, previous internship experience, expected roles, compensation, perceived benefits, and shortcomings. Items 12–18 are particularly relevant to why students participate and what they regard as a worthwhile placement. They can inform the conditions of a course or practicum. They do not directly identify which English exchanges students face, how frequently they occur, or where communication breaks down.

The enterprise form asks about staff characteristics, recruitment preferences, skills, existing cooperation, internship supervision, constraints, and expected institutional support. Its communication category is broad. It does not distinguish greeting a visitor from negotiating a schedule, explaining an educational objective, or composing a written confirmation. One prompt also shifts from college graduates to secondary vocational students in its response options. That inconsistency would need correction before the form could support comparisons about the target population.

The teacher form concerns the development of teachers with both teaching and occupational expertise, often termed dual-qualified teachers in Chinese vocational education. Its later items ask about qualification status, relevant certificates, training, enterprise experience, and barriers. These are useful for planning staff support, but credentials and time in an enterprise do not by themselves show an ability to teach or evaluate tourism communication. The form needs a closer connection to the language tasks teachers would jointly design with practitioners.

Against the six audit dimensions, the instruments cover broad opportunities and support more clearly than language-specific purposes, audiences, genres, or criteria. An internship-experience item does not establish an opportunity to use English, and a professional certificate does not establish performance on a particular language task. Table 3 retains the structural correspondence between instrument coverage and missing information. The proposed additions in Section 5.5 specify how those gaps could be investigated; they have not been administered.

Table 3. Questionnaire Coverage and Missing ESP Information

Instrument coverage	Information already requested	Missing language-specific information
Student items 1–11	Awareness and reported internship experience	Actual English-use opportunities and audiences
Student items 12–19	Motives, benefits and difficulties	Communicative purposes, genres and task difficulty
Enterprise items 4, 6, 9 and 10	Broad competence priorities	Audiences, recurring exchanges and success criteria
Enterprise items 11–17	Supervision and participation constraints	Access to English tasks and available language support
Teacher items 9–22	Qualifications, training and institutional support	Task-design, feedback and assessment practices

Note. Item locations refer to the administered instruments. The forms have different purposes and are not pooled into a single scale.

4.4 Lesson Plans Specify Occupational Tasks more Clearly than English Performance

Source E moves from the study-travel tutor's role and professional knowledge to activity design and the work undertaken before, during, and after a trip. Lesson 10 asks for presentations of activity designs. Lessons 11-13 address preparation, facilitation, and evaluation, while Lesson 14 includes confirmation documents and coordination with receiving organizations. These are promising foundations for language tasks because each has a practical purpose and an identifiable recipient.

Against the same audit dimensions, the plans identify occupational purposes and possible products, including written work and presentations. Confirmation documents also imply a recipient, but that alone does not establish an English-speaking audience. Most task instructions do not establish English as the medium, specify actual English-use opportunities or linguistic support, or define criteria for comprehensibility and interaction. The finding is thus about available curriculum content. Converting that content into Tourism English requires an additional design step rather than merely changing a course title.

For instance, a confirmation-letter activity could become an English email exchange in which two groups hold different information about participant needs and venue availability. Its outcome would be an agreed arrangement, with a record of questions and revisions. A presentation of an activity plan could become an explanation to an unfamiliar visitor followed by unscripted questions. These adaptations preserve the occupational purpose while making information exchange and audience

understanding visible. They are proposed extensions of the lesson plans, not descriptions of observed lessons.

4.5 Participation Continuity Is a Teaching Condition with Unresolved Causes

Source B records more than thirty initial expressions of interest in part-time participation, twelve students who actually participated, four or five who continued in the sector, and two remaining at an internship or employment stage. The report discusses seasonal demand, remuneration, outdoor conditions, and career expectations. These are consequential observations for partnership design, but the archive does not include dated rosters, consistent follow-up intervals, or individual trajectories. The figures are therefore a reported sequence, not a verified cohort retention rate. No percentages are calculated from them.

The account suggests a question for English education: whether students have sufficiently continuous access to meaningful tasks and feedback. If participation is brief or irregular, students may repeat introductory duties without progressing to more demanding communication. Equally, students may leave for reasons unrelated to teaching quality. Ryan and Deci's (2020) account of motivation helps avoid reducing participation to a single financial incentive; competence, agency, and social support can also matter. Here these remain explanatory possibilities. The documents do not establish which factors caused any student's decision.

Source B proposes preparing students during quieter periods and involving them in supervised work when demand rises. Source D proposes a future revenue-sharing arrangement. Neither source supplies evidence that these mechanisms increased language proficiency or retention. They are useful design resources whose educational and operational effects require separate evaluation.

4.6 How the Findings Inform Design Choices

The transition from findings to design requires an inference at each step. Missing language specifications in the documents justify adding an explicit language brief, but do not determine its exact content. Reports of seasonal participation justify planning for interrupted access, but do not establish that simulation will remedy it. The survey descriptions can raise related questions, while task selection still requires local needs evidence. Table 4 makes these distinctions explicit. Each row links a source-grounded problem to a design response, a pedagogical rationale, and something that must be checked during implementation.

Table 4. Evidence and Rationale for Proposed Design Decisions

Evidence and its limit	Design response and rationale	Evidence needed in a pilot
Sources A, D and E specify work activities without a complete English brief	Add purpose, audience, genre and language objectives to each task; ESP needs analysis guides specification	Practitioner confirmation of target exchanges and learner needs

Evidence and its limit	Design response and rationale	Evidence needed in a pilot
Source B reports seasonal and discontinuous participation, without verified trajectories	Schedule preparation, bounded live roles and a simulation alternative; WIL connects experience across settings	Records of task access and attendance; comparable performance samples
Source D allocates operational roles; surveys flag mentoring and support concerns without verifying practice	Separate enterprise feasibility feedback from English feedback, then schedule revision	Mentor time logs, feedback records and revised student work
Source E contains assignments but no scored English performances	Pair a task product with interaction evidence and explicit criteria; constructive alignment guides assessment	Task products, interaction samples and estimates of rater agreement
Enterprise records include management and safety concerns, not verified incidents	Require clear student role boundaries and supervised escalation; internship provisions inform planning	Authorized duty descriptions, supervision records and task feasibility assessments

Note. These links are design inferences, not causal findings or evidence that the responses are effective.

5. A proposed Framework for Tourism English Learning

5.1 Converting Partnership Projects into a Task Sequence

The framework combines a trip-cycle task sequence with participation conditions that a task list alone leaves unresolved: seasonal access, limited teacher and practitioner time, and supervision of live duties. Its contribution is to connect language design explicitly with partnership arrangements. The tasks in Table 5 draw on established ESP and task-based principles (Long, 2005; Ellis, 2009), while the decisions in Table 4 specify how they might remain teachable within the documented constraints.

The proposed design links each project to four questions: What must be accomplished at work? What English communication does that require? What support will the student receive? What evidence will show the quality of the performance? A teacher and an enterprise mentor should answer these questions together before allocating students to a project. This preserves the application's commitment to joint curriculum development while giving that commitment an observable teaching function.

The sequence begins with a project brief containing the audience, educational purpose, service constraints, and student responsibilities. Students analyze a model, attempt a task with support, receive feedback, and attempt a related task with fewer supports or a changed audience. Field participation can

then extend this preparation where genuine English use is available. Where it is not, an English simulation should be identified as such and assessed separately from the actual service activity. Table 5 illustrates how this can work across the trip cycle. These are proposed tasks, not student products collected in the study. Before any live activity, institutional staff must authorize operational duties and supervision; simulation should remain clearly distinguished from workplace participation.

Table 5. Proposed Alignment of Occupational Tasks and English Evidence

Occupational task	English learning focus	Evidence for assessment
Clarify a client's learning needs	Open and follow-up questions, paraphrasing and confirmation	Recorded consultation and a written needs summary
Propose an educational itinerary	Sequencing, justification and explanation of alternatives	Route proposal and responses to questions
Confirm arrangements with a provider	Specific requests, quantities, dates and polite clarification	Initial email, reply and revised confirmation
Explain an activity to participants	Accessible vocabulary, concise instructions and checks of understanding	Briefing followed by participant questions
Interpret an exhibit or local practice	Explaining unfamiliar concepts without unsupported generalizations	Short commentary adapted for two audiences
Respond to a service disruption	Clarifying the problem, communicating options and appropriate escalation	Supervised role-play and factual handover note
Review the completed activity	Summarizing evidence and explaining revisions	Reflective report with a revised task product

Note. Tasks follow the trip cycle; teachers should select and adapt them after local needs analysis.

The same route can support different levels of challenge. A beginning learner might complete a supported confirmation using a glossary and a partially structured message. A more advanced learner could compare alternatives and resolve inconsistent details in a live exchange. The task purpose remains stable while the amount of support and the complexity of the interaction change. Teachers can then examine progress without equating independent speech with the absence of all preparation.

5.2 *An Illustrative Museum Task*

A museum or science center provides a broadly transferable setting. In the proposed classroom task, one student group represents an educational travel team and another represents the venue. The team has information about participants' interests and time constraints; the venue has information about available sessions and access arrangements. Neither group initially has everything needed to finalize the visit. They must ask questions, resolve an incompatibility, and produce a concise written agreement in English. The teacher can supply language for clarification and confirmation without scripting the entire exchange.

Students next prepare a short explanation of one exhibit or activity. Peers adopt visitor roles with differing prior knowledge and ask questions that the speaker has not seen. The enterprise mentor comments on practical feasibility and factual accuracy; the English teacher comments on comprehensibility, wording, organization, and response to misunderstanding. Each student revises one explanation and identifies the feedback that led to the change. This creates a record connecting instruction, performance, and revision.

The activity tests communication through decisions and audience response, not memorization alone. If the partner cannot identify the agreed time or required materials, the communication has not achieved its purpose even when individual sentences are grammatical. Conversely, minor grammatical errors need not obscure a successful exchange. The assessment should therefore distinguish task completion from language control and report both. This example is a new design proposal grounded in the occupational activities found in the archive; no effectiveness result is claimed for it.

5.3 *Joint Mentoring and a Manageable Teaching Calendar*

Joint mentoring requires a division of work that can be sustained. The English teacher should identify language demands, prepare scaffolding, and guide analysis of performance. The enterprise mentor should check occupational feasibility, clarify routine procedures, and explain why certain communications matter. Both should agree on task briefs and review a small set of student work before assessing independently. The student's role is to seek clarification, keep a record of feedback, and show how it has informed the next attempt.

The quieter part of a business cycle can support resource development, rehearsal, and teacher–practitioner discussion. During busy periods, students can take bounded roles under supervision. Debriefing and revision should have scheduled time rather than depend on a mentor's remaining availability. The timing must follow the local enterprise calendar and the institution's teaching arrangements; the particular months described in the case report should not become a universal schedule for other colleges.

Teacher development can also produce practical evidence. Instead of reporting only the number of days a teacher spends with a business, a partnership can record the task briefs, language materials, and assessment examples developed from that experience. This connects the teacher questionnaire's concern with enterprise exposure to a concrete contribution to teaching. It also makes it possible to

identify when a practitioner needs help turning occupational knowledge into an explanation suitable for learners.

5.4 Assessment through Products and Interaction

Assessment should combine a product with evidence of interaction and revision. A polished itinerary shows organization, but a question-and-answer exchange reveals whether its author can explain decisions. An email records a final arrangement, but the draft and reply show how misunderstandings were repaired. Table 6 proposes four performance dimensions. They are not a reduced version of Gulikers et al.'s (2004) five dimensions of assessment authenticity. That framework addresses the task, physical context, social context, result or form, and criteria or standards. Here, the task sequence specifies the task; live or simulated participation specifies the physical context; learner and mentor roles specify the social context; the paired product and interaction specify the result; and Table 6 develops local performance criteria. The framework thus informs the assessment arrangement, while the local criteria specify the English performances to be judged.

Language comprehensibility and audience adaptation draw on the communicative focus of the course and mediation perspectives (Council of Europe, 2020). The revision dimension also draws on feedback literacy (Carless & Boud, 2018; Molloy et al., 2020). The proposed criteria need locally defined performance levels, examples, and pilot testing with teachers, practitioners, and students. They must not be used for consequential grading before such work, or as a substitute for authorization to undertake safety-sensitive duties.

Table 6. Proposed Dimensions for a Local Assessment Rubric

Dimension	Observable evidence	What weak performance would look like
Task completion and accuracy	Required information is conveyed and the arrangement is feasible	Missing or conflicting details prevent completion
Comprehensibility and language control	Meaning is accessible through suitable wording and delivery	Language or delivery repeatedly obscures essential meaning
Interaction and audience adaptation	Student clarifies, checks understanding and adjusts explanations	Student repeats a script despite signs of misunderstanding
Use of feedback and professional judgment	Revision addresses a specific problem and respects role boundaries	Revision is cosmetic or the student makes unsupported commitments

Note. Descriptors illustrate the proposed dimensions; scores, cutoffs and proficiency levels are not specified.

Rater preparation should use examples of actual or simulated student work. Teachers and practitioners can first make independent judgments, compare reasons, and revise ambiguous descriptors. The goal is to establish shared interpretations before making claims about score reliability. Students should see the criteria before the task and practice applying them to an example. This can help them request feedback on a specific difficulty rather than simply asking whether their English is good.

Scores should remain distinct from participation and employment outcomes. A student may communicate successfully yet choose another employer; another may stay with the partner while receiving few opportunities to use English. A useful evaluation records language performance, access to tasks, quality of mentoring, and subsequent choices separately. The relationships among these variables can then be investigated rather than built into a single success indicator.

5.5 Revising the questionnaires and planning evaluation

The existing forms can be retained as a starting point for partnership conditions, with an added task-specific component and corrected routing. For students, each task in Table 5 could be followed by questions on whether the task has been encountered, how often it occurred within a stated period, how difficult it was, what support was available, and whether English was actually used. Those without experience should have an explicit response option rather than be forced to rate a difficulty they have not encountered. School-arranged internships should be distinguished from independently arranged work. Expectations and reported experience should be analyzed separately. Teacher training preferences need an enforced selection limit or removal of that limit, and conflated enterprise response options need separation before readministration.

Enterprise respondents could identify common communication partners, provide sanitized examples of routine documents, and describe the consequences of inaccurate communication. Teachers could report their experience of designing those tasks, responding to learner errors, and moderating assessment. A short interview after the questionnaire would help interpret differences between a manager's expectations and a student's available duties. This sequence follows the rationale of multi-source needs analysis while remaining a proposal for future data collection (Long, 2005; Serafini et al., 2015).

The next empirical study should collect a baseline language performance, a comparable later performance, and records of the learning opportunities between them. Assessment tasks should have similar demands without requiring learners to repeat the same memorized response. Where feasible, raters should not know whether a sample is from the earlier or later occasion. Reports should describe the sample, missing observations, task conditions, and scoring procedures. A change in scores without a comparison condition would remain evidence of change during participation, not proof that the partnership caused it.

Longitudinal participation records would address a different question. Each stage should have a date, a clear definition, and an identified cohort. Reasons for withdrawal should be sought respectfully, including from those who leave, rather than inferred from staff impressions. Only then would retention figures be interpretable. The current report's approximate counts can motivate such work, but they should not be converted retrospectively into a precise dataset.

6. Discussion

6.1 Contribution to ESP and Work Integrated Learning

The framework addresses a gap between specifying an English task and arranging a realistic opportunity to learn from it. ESP needs analysis explains why target purposes, audiences, and genres must be established (Long, 2005; Serafini et al., 2015). Tourism studies such as Kholidi et al. (2022) and Segura Arias (2024) provide context-specific evidence for curriculum decisions. The present study cannot replace that needs evidence with broad communication survey items. Instead, it adds a partnership-planning question to each proposed language task: who can provide the opportunity, feedback, and supervision, and under what conditions? The contribution is a context-specific operational synthesis of ESP needs analysis (Long, 2005) and school-work integration principles (Billett, 2009; Bouw et al., 2021). For tourism vocational education with seasonal access, limited time from teachers with both teaching and industry qualifications, and variable opportunities for authentic English use, Tables 4–6 translate these principles into linked decisions about task timing, live or simulated participation, feedback responsibilities, and assessable products.

This connection also gives a language-specific form to WIL accounts of learning across settings. Guile and Griffiths (2001) emphasize connectivity between education and work, and Billett (2009) argues for deliberate integration of experiences. The proposed task brief joins an occupational purpose to a language objective, a mentor responsibility, and a record of student performance. It could function as a boundary object in the sense discussed by Akkerman and Bakker (2011), but only if teachers and practitioners actually use it to coordinate different judgments. The documentary gaps make this coordination a priority for the proposed pilot.

The framework therefore treats feasible participation as part of curriculum design. A partner may offer meaningful occupational observation without frequent English interaction, or may offer live English work when teachers cannot observe it. In the first case, a clearly identified simulation could create assessable English practice; in the second, an agreed product and follow-up exchange could make some learning visible. These are conditional design options. Their value depends on the fidelity of the communication problem and access to feedback, not on labeling all workplace participation authentic language learning.

6.2 Assessment and Conditional Transfer

Assessment design and performance criteria serve different purposes. Gulikers et al. (2004) guides decisions about task and context, whereas the four dimensions in Table 6 specify what might count as

successful performance in this curriculum. Feedback use adds a record of revision rather than an assumption that receiving comments improves learning. A pilot must test whether students understand the criteria, whether raters interpret them consistently, and whether scores reflect the intended performances.

Transfer beyond the case concerns the design questions rather than the survey percentages. Colleges with seasonal partners can examine whether students have repeated opportunities to practice; those with little mentor time can examine whether feedback responsibilities are feasible; those with few English-speaking clients can distinguish occupational exposure from language simulation. The resulting tasks may differ substantially across institutions. What can be transferred for testing is the requirement to connect an identified need, a feasible arrangement, and observable learning evidence.

The 2025 specialist standard and the 2026 teaching-reform opinion provide prospective policy reference points for this connection. They do not retrospectively explain the 2024 records, and the completed 2023–2025 action-plan window remains historical context. Policy alignment helps specify the institutional conditions for implementation. The principal empirical limit remains the absence of a verified participant cohort and tested implementation; the specific provenance and instrument problems are documented in Section 3 and Appendix A rather than repeated here.

6.3 Questions for Empirical Evaluation

A subsequent pilot could test two propositions generated by the framework. First, task briefs that specify language demands and mentor responsibilities should make intended English practice easier to document than placement records alone. This would require comparing planned and actual opportunities, not merely counting completed forms. Second, a scheduled feedback-and-revision cycle should produce observable changes in how students complete related tasks. Comparable performances, evidence of feedback uptake, and calibrated ratings would be needed; improvement without an appropriate comparison would not establish causation. Negative findings would be informative if the record distinguished poor task fit, limited access, inadequate feedback, and measurement problems. Testing these propositions would connect the proposed arrangements with evidence of teaching and learning.

7. Conclusion

College–enterprise partnerships need to specify how occupational participation becomes an opportunity to learn English. The document analysis identifies missing links between workplace activities, language demands, mentoring, and assessment; the survey descriptions help identify practical questions about participation and support. The proposed framework connects these elements through task briefs that identify the intended communication, a feasible participation arrangement, the responsible mentors, and evidence of student performance. This provides a practical basis for coordinating ESP teaching across college and workplace settings, particularly where seasonal access and limited mentor time shape what

students can do. Local needs analysis and a documented pilot are the next steps for testing its educational value.

Acknowledgement

This study was supported by the 2024 “Sanrong” Foreign Language Teaching Reform Project, entitled “Pathways and Practices for College–Enterprise Co-development of an Industry College for Tourism English under Industry–Education Integration” (Project No. WYJZW-2024-1010).

References

- Akkerman, S. F., & Bakker, A. (2011). Boundary crossing and boundary objects. *Review of Educational Research*, 81(2), 132-169. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654311404435>
- Basturkmen, H. (2010). *Developing courses in English for Specific Purposes*. Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230290518>
- Biggs, J. (1996). Enhancing teaching through constructive alignment. *Higher Education*, 32(3), 347-364. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00138871>
- Billett, S. (2009). Realising the educational worth of integrating work experiences in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*, 34(7), 827-843. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070802706561>
- Bouw, E., Zitter, I., & de Bruijn, E. (2021). Multilevel design considerations for vocational curricula at the boundary of school and work. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 53(6), 765-783. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2021.1899290>
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27-40. <https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027>
- Byram, M. (2021). *Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence: Revisited* (2nd ed.). Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781800410251>
- Carless, D., & Boud, D. (2018). The development of student feedback literacy: Enabling uptake of feedback. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43(8), 1315-1325. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1463354>
- Communist Party of China Central Committee, & State Council. (2025). *Education development plan for 2024-2035*. https://www.moe.gov.cn/jyb_xxgk/moe_1777/moe_1778/202501/t20250119_1176193.html
- Council of Europe. (2020). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment—Companion volume*. Council of Europe Publishing. <https://www.coe.int/en/web/common-european-framework-reference-languages/cefr-companion-volume-and-its-language-versions>
- Ellis, R. (2009). Task-based language teaching: Sorting out the misunderstandings. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 19(3), 221-246. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1473-4192.2009.00231.x>

- Guile, D., & Griffiths, T. (2001). Learning through work experience. *Journal of Education and Work*, 14(1), 113-131. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13639080020028738>
- Gulikers, J. T. M., Bastiaens, T. J., & Kirschner, P. A. (2004). A five-dimensional framework for authentic assessment. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 52(3), 67-86. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02504676>
- Hutchinson, T., & Waters, A. (1987). *English for Specific Purposes: A learning-centred approach*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511733031>
- Kholidi, M. A., Azhan, N. A. S., & Ariawan, S. (2022). Needs analysis of English language use in tourism industry in Selangor, Malaysia. *LSP International Journal*, 9(1), 123-136. <https://doi.org/10.11113/lspi.v9.18285>
- Li, Y. (2024). College-enterprise co-development pathways for tourism English under industry-education integration: A case study of a study-travel industry college in Xinjiang]. *科研成果与传播*, (10), 199-202.
- Li, Y. (2025). Challenges and responses in a tourism English study-travel industry college under industry-education integration. *中文科技期刊数据库（文摘版）教育*, (4), 38-41.
- Long, M. H. (Ed.). (2005). *Second language needs analysis*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667299>
- Ministry of Education of the People's Republic of China. (2016). *Opinions of eleven departments on promoting study travel for primary and secondary school students* (教基一〔2016〕8号). https://www.moe.gov.cn/srcsite/A06/s3325/201612/t20161219_292354.html
- Ministry of Education of the People's Republic of China. (2021a). *English curriculum standard for higher vocational education at the junior college level*. https://www.moe.gov.cn/srcsite/A07/moe_737/s3876_qt/202104/W020210409562365459062.pdf
- Ministry of Education of the People's Republic of China. (2021b). *Notice of eight departments issuing the regulations on internship management for vocational school students* (教职成〔2021〕4号). https://www.moe.gov.cn/srcsite/A07/moe_737/s3876_qt/202201/t20220121_595529.html
- Ministry of Education of the People's Republic of China. (2025). *Teaching standard for the Tourism English major in higher vocational education* (570203). https://www.moe.gov.cn/s78/A07/zcs_ztzt/2017_zt06/17zt06_bznr/bznr_zyjzyjxbz/gdzyjy_zk/zk_jyytydl/jyytydl_yyl/202502/P020250207554206806460.pdf
- Ministry of Education of the People's Republic of China. (2026). *Opinions on deepening reform of key elements of vocational education teaching* (教职成〔2026〕1号). https://www.moe.gov.cn/srcsite/A07/zcs_zhgg/202602/t20260212_1428773.html
- Molloy, E., Boud, D., & Henderson, M. (2020). Developing a learning-centred framework for feedback literacy. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 45(4), 527-540. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2019.1667955>

- National Development and Reform Commission. (2023). *Action plan for empowering and improving industry-education integration in vocational education for 2023-2025* (发改社会〔2023〕699号). https://www.ndrc.gov.cn/xwdt/tzgg/202306/t20230613_1357506.html
- OECD. (2023). *Building future-ready vocational education and training systems*. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/28551a79-en>
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2020). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation from a self-determination theory perspective: Definitions, theory, practices, and future directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 61, Article 101860. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2020.101860>
- Segura Arias, R. A. (2024). Needs analysis: A tool to develop specificity in English for tourism courses at Universidad Nacional, Brunca Branch. *InterSedes*, 25(52). <https://doi.org/10.15517/isucr.v25i52.56864>
- Serafini, E. J., Lake, J. B., & Long, M. H. (2015). Needs analysis for specialized learner populations: Essential methodological improvements. *English for Specific Purposes*, 40, 11-26. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2015.05.002>
- Smith, G. F., Jung, H., & Zenker, F. (2022). From task-based needs analysis to curriculum evaluation: Putting methodological innovations to the test in an English for academic purposes program. *English for Specific Purposes*, 66, 80-93. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2022.01.001>

Appendix A. Supplementary survey descriptions and sensitivity check

The main text reports selected items once in Table 2. Other descriptive values retained from the original analysis are as follows. For student internship priorities, pay was selected by 231 of 896 respondents (25.8%), after work content. Multiple-choice concerns included major mismatch (356/896, 39.7%) and low enterprise engagement (325/896, 36.3%). Enterprise respondents selected student management as a concern in 54 of 63 records (85.7%), alongside the safety concern reported in Table 2. Respondents who did not select joint supervision in enterprise Item 12 selected workplace-mentor supervision, observation of a mentor, or informal allocation of duties. These entries describe answers, not independently verified practices or incidents.

Student completion time had a median of 164 seconds. Excluding the 44 records completed in under 60 seconds left 852 records. Willingness to participate was 93.0% (792/852), perceived importance 93.8% (799/852), and prioritization of work content 51.6% (440/852), against 92.9% (832/896), 93.6% (839/896), and 50.1% (449/896) in the full export. The differences were 0.1, 0.2, and 1.5 percentage points, respectively, after rounding. The 60-second cutoff is an analyst-selected diagnostic, not a validated exclusion rule; the main analysis retains all records.

Similarity under this exclusion does not establish reliability, response validity, unique respondents, representative sampling, or a connection to the focal project. It cannot resolve questionnaire routing, unknown recruitment, or unverified institutional and program affiliations. This check documents the

effect of one analytic decision on the reported descriptive percentages, allowing subsequent researchers to judge the extent to which these summaries depend on the completion-time threshold.