Available online at **HISTORIA**: Jurnal Pendidik dan Peneliti Sejarah
Journal homepage: https://ejournal.upi.edu/index.php/historia

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Globalization and the Historical Transformation of Tourism Education in Indonesia (1960–2025)

Andreas Suwandi, Cica Yulia, Ade Gafar Abdullah, Isma Widiaty
Technology and Vocational Education, School of Postgraduate Studies, Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia
Correspondence Author: andreassuwandi@upi.edu

To cite this article: Suwandi, A., Yulia, C., Abdullah, G. A., & Widiaty, I. (2026). Globalization and the historical transformation of tourism education in Indonesia (1960–2025). *HISTORIA: Jurnal Pendidik dan Peneliti Sejarah, 9*(1), 121-130. https://doi.org/10.17509/historia.v9i1.97416.

Received: 21 February 2026, Revised: 7 April 2026, Accepted: 30 April 2026

Abstract

Tourism education in Indonesia has undergone substantial transformation alongside the expansion of the tourism industry and increasing globalization, yet its long-term development remains underexplored from a historical perspective. This study examines the transformation of tourism education in Indonesia from 1960 to 2025, focusing on changes in educational orientation, institutional structures, curricula, and competency standards in relation to state policies and global tourism development. Employing the historical method, the study draws on primary sources including educational archives, tourism policy documents, curricula of tourism schools, institutional reports, government regulations, tourism legislation, and professional certification policies, complemented by relevant secondary literature on the history of education, vocational education, and globalization. The findings identify three major phases of transformation. From 1960 to 1980, tourism education primarily functioned as vocational training to meet the growing demand for workers in domestic hospitality and tourism services. Between 1981 and 1998, it underwent institutional expansion and became increasingly integrated into national development strategies and the growth of Indonesia's tourism industry. From 1999 to 2025, globalization accelerated its transition toward competency-based professional education characterized by international certification, foreign-language proficiency, digital competencies, and global tourism management. The findings further demonstrate that this transformation was neither linear nor solely driven by globalization; rather, it resulted from continuous negotiation among state policies, tourism industry demands, international standards, and local socio-cultural contexts. This study contributes to the history of education by providing a longitudinal explanation of how globalization has been translated into institutional restructuring, curriculum reform, and competency standardization within Indonesian tourism education. It argues that tourism education constitutes a strategic arena in which global professional standards are selectively adapted to national development priorities and local educational contexts.

Keywords: Curriculum Transformation; Globalization; History of Education; Tourism Education; Vocational Education.

INTRODUCTION

Tourism education has increasingly emerged as an important field of academic inquiry alongside the rapid expansion of the global tourism industry. International scholarship published in leading journals such as Annals of Tourism Research, Tourism Management, and Journal of Sustainable Tourism has emphasized the strategic role of tourism education in producing skilled human resources, enhancing employability, and supporting sustainable economic development (Airey & Tribe, 2005; Baum, 2015; Tribe, 2016). Contemporary studies largely focus on curriculum innovation, competency-based education, and industry alignment under the pressures of globalization (Benckendorff et al., 2014; Dredge et al., 2012; Sheldon et al., 2017). However, this dominant perspective often overlooks the longer historical processes that shaped tourism education as an institutional and pedagogical field.

The transformation of tourism education should not be understood merely as a response to changing labor-market requirements. International scholarship has increasingly questioned educational models that position tourism programs primarily as suppliers of technically trained workers. Tourism education is also expected to develop students' capacity to respond to complex social, environmental, technological, and ethical challenges facing the tourism sector. The Tourism Education Futures Initiative, for example, emphasized the need to move beyond narrowly defined vocational competencies toward leadership, responsibility, stewardship, and the ability to navigate societal change (Sheldon et al., 2008). Such developments indicate that curriculum transformation in tourism education reflects a broader redefinition of what constitutes professional competence in an increasingly interconnected tourism industry.

From a historiographical perspective, tourism education cannot be separated from the broader history of vocational and professional education. The development of vocational education globally has historically been tied to industrialization, labor specialization, and state-driven modernization projects since the nineteenth century (Grubb, 1996; Lucas, 2004). In the twentieth century, professional education expanded beyond industrial sectors into service-based industries, including hospitality and tourism, particularly after World War II when international travel became increasingly accessible (Cooper et al., 1996).

Tourism education itself developed as a specialized branch of vocational education, initially emphasizing technical training in hospitality services before evolving into multidisciplinary professional education that incorporated management, sustainability, and global mobility (Airey & Dredge, 2015).

The curriculum therefore represents more than a technical arrangement of subjects and competencies; it is also a site where different expectations concerning tourism education are negotiated. The international development of tourism higher education has involved continuing debates over curriculum, teaching and learning, professional preparation, cultural contexts, industry links, and educational quality (Airey & Tribe, 2005). These debates suggest that curriculum change needs to be examined in relation to the actors and institutional interests that shape educational priorities. From this perspective, the historical transformation of tourism education in Indonesia can be interpreted not simply as curricular modernization, but as an evolving negotiation among state development objectives, industry requirements, educational institutions, and increasingly international expectations.

In Indonesia, the historical trajectory of tourism education followed a distinctive path closely linked to national development agendas and political-economic transformations. The early formation period (1960–1980) was marked by the establishment of vocational institutions aimed at supplying labor for domestic hospitality and tourism sectors, particularly during the initial expansion of tourism under the Old Order and early New Order governments. The institutional consolidation phase (1981–1998) coincided with the New Order's economic development policies, in which tourism became an important source of foreign exchange, encouraging the growth of specialized tourism schools and state-supported hospitality training centers. The globalization phase (1999–2025) reflects Indonesia's integration into international tourism markets, accompanied by curriculum reforms, competency-based education, and professional certification systems aligned with global standards such as ASEAN tourism competency frameworks and UNWTO guidelines.

Despite the growing body of literature on tourism education in Indonesia, most studies remain present-oriented, focusing on policy reforms, employability, and curriculum adaptation without situating these developments within a longer historical context (Saepudin et al., 2022; Hernadi et al., 2024; Husni et al., 2024). This indicates a significant historiographical gap. While tourism studies have explored contemporary institutional performance and educational outcomes, the historical evolution of tourism education institutions, curriculum transformation, and the relationship between state policy and global standards remain underexamined. Bibliometric reviews further confirm that historical

perspectives occupy only a marginal position in tourism education scholarship compared to contemporary and future-oriented studies (Koseoglu et al., 2016; Okumus et al., 2020; Yıldırım et al., 2023).

This gap is particularly significant within the broader field of the history of education, where vocational and professional education have often been studied in relation to industrial labor, but less frequently in relation to tourism as a strategic economic sector. Examining tourism education historically allows for a better understanding of how educational systems adapt to changing global economic demands while negotiating national priorities and local socio-cultural realities. It also contributes to globalization theory in education by showing that global educational models are not simply adopted, but selectively translated, contested, and institutionalized through local historical processes.

Seen historically, therefore, globalization should not be treated as an external force that automatically produces convergence in tourism education. International debates demonstrate that tourism curricula have continuously evolved in response to changing relationships among knowledge, professional practice, industry expectations, and wider societal challenges (Airey & Tribe, 2005; Sheldon et al., 2008). This perspective shifts the analytical question from whether tourism education became globalized to how global educational expectations were historically received, mediated, and incorporated within particular national and institutional settings. For Indonesia, this distinction is especially important because tourism education developed alongside strong state involvement in economic development and vocational training. Examining this historical interaction provides a basis for explaining why global competency frameworks may produce adaptation and institutional hybridity rather than straightforward educational convergence.

Responding to these limitations, this study examines the transformation of tourism education in Indonesia between 1960 and 2025 through the lens of the history of education. It investigates three historical dimensions: institutional restructuring, curriculum transformation, and the interaction between global standards and national educational policies. By situating tourism education within a clear historical periodization, this study contributes to the historiography of vocational and professional education in Indonesia and offers a theoretical contribution to understanding globalization as a historically contingent process rather than a linear force of educational change.

Accordingly, this study addresses four research questions: (1) How did tourism education in Indonesia develop during the early formation period (1960–1980)? (2) What institutional and curricular transformations occurred during the consolidation phase (1981–1998)? (3) How did globalization reshape tourism education during the reform and internationalization phase (1999–2025)? and (4) What historical continuities and disruptions characterize the relationship between tourism education, state policy, and global standards in Indonesia? Through this historical inquiry, the study bridges tourism studies and the history of education, positioning tourism education as a historically constructed field shaped by the intersection of global forces, state agendas, and local realities.

METHOD

This study employs a historical research method to examine the transformation of tourism education in Indonesia within the context of globalization from 1960 to 2025. The historical approach is chosen because the research focuses on long-term institutional development, curriculum changes, and the interaction between global educational standards, national state policies, and local socio-cultural realities. Through this approach, tourism education is understood as a historically constructed field that has evolved through continuity, adaptation, and disruption across different political and economic periods in Indonesia. The study is qualitative in nature and adopts a historical-analytical framework within the broader field of the history of education. In this context, tourism education is not treated merely as a vocational practice but as part of Indonesia's wider educational transformation, closely linked to economic development strategies, labor policies, and global tourism expansion. Globalization is conceptualized as a historical process, enabling the study to trace how international standards, competency frameworks, and professionalization models entered and reshaped tourism education institutions over time.

To provide analytical clarity, the study applies a periodization framework based on three major historical phases. The first phase, the early formation period (1960–1980), covers the emergence of tourism education during the Old Order and the beginning of the New Order, when vocational training in hospitality was introduced to support domestic tourism and hotel industries. The second phase, the institutional consolidation period (1981–1998), corresponds to the expansion of tourism as a strategic economic sector under the New Order, marked by the establishment of specialized tourism schools and stronger state intervention in vocational education. The third phase, the globalization and professionalization

period (1999–2025), examines the transformation of tourism education after the Reform Era, particularly the adoption of competency-based education, professional certification, the Indonesian National Qualifications Framework (KKNI), and Outcome-Based Education (OBE).

The heuristic stage of historical research involved the systematic collection of both primary and secondary sources. Primary sources are central to this study and include archival documents from the Ministry of Tourism of Indonesia, particularly tourism development masterplans, vocational tourism training policies, and tourism human resource development programs. Additional primary materials were obtained from the Ministry of Education, including decrees on vocational curriculum reform, higher education regulations, and competency-based education policies. Institutional archives from the Bandung School of Tourism (Sekolah Tinggi Pariwisata Bandung), one of the oldest and most influential tourism education institutions in Indonesia, were examined to trace changes in institutional orientation, student training systems, and curriculum development. Archival records from Tourism Academies (Akademi Pariwisata) established during the 1970s and 1980s were also analyzed to compare regional institutional developments. Furthermore, UNESCO educational reports and policy documents were used to contextualize the global discourse on vocational and professional education reforms.

The documentary analysis specifically focuses on several categories of historical materials. First, policy documents such as the Tourism Law (Law No. 9/1990 and Law No. 10/2009), Ministry of Education decrees on vocational education, and national competency certification regulations issued by the National Professional Certification Board (BNSP) were analyzed to understand state policies shaping tourism education. Second, curriculum documents from different historical periods were systematically compared. These include the tourism curriculum of the 1970s, which emphasized practical hospitality skills; the 1980s curriculum, which integrated tourism management and service training; the 1990s curriculum, which introduced broader managerial and marketing competencies; the KKNI-based curriculum implemented after 2012, which standardized qualifications according to competency levels; and the Outcome-Based Education (OBE) curriculum introduced after 2020, emphasizing learning outcomes, international benchmarking, and employability.

The comparative curriculum analysis is designed to identify shifts in educational orientation, content structure, competency emphasis, and pedagogical approaches across time. Particular attention is given to the increasing importance of foreign language training, tourism management, digital tourism services, sustainability, and international certification systems. This allows the study to map the transition from locally oriented vocational training toward globally standardized professional education.

Following data collection, both external and internal source criticism were applied. External criticism focused on verifying the origin, authenticity, institutional provenance, and chronological context of archival materials. Internal criticism examined the content, political intent, and normative biases within government regulations, institutional reports, and curriculum guidelines. This step was crucial, as many state documents reflect developmental agendas that require critical interpretation rather than straightforward acceptance.

Data analysis was conducted through historical interpretation using contextual and comparative analysis. The study examines how tourism education institutions, curricula, and policy frameworks changed across different periods, and how these transformations were influenced by broader shifts such as economic liberalization, ASEAN tourism integration, UNESCO educational reforms, and the globalization of labor markets. The analysis specifically addresses patterns of continuity and discontinuity, showing how older vocational legacies persisted even as new competency-based models emerged.

The final stage is historiography, where the analyzed data are synthesized into a coherent historical narrative. This historiographical process does not simply reconstruct chronology but critically interprets the historical transformation of tourism education as part of Indonesia's broader educational and developmental history. By integrating empirical archival evidence with theoretical debates on globalization and the history of education, this study contributes to a deeper understanding of tourism education as a site of negotiation between global standards, national policies, and local institutional realities.

To strengthen validity and reliability, the study employs source triangulation by comparing policy archives, curriculum documents, institutional records, and international educational reports. This triangulation ensures that the findings are grounded in multiple layers of historical evidence and enhances the analytical rigor of the study. Through this methodological approach, the research provides a historically grounded explanation

of how tourism education in Indonesia has transformed from vocational labor training into globally oriented professional education.

RESULTS

Based on historical analysis, this study identifies a non-linear transformation of tourism education in Indonesia shaped by globalization, state policies, and institutional legacies. The findings are organized into four major historical phases.

Table 1. Historical Phases of Tourism Education Development in Indonesia

Historical Phase	Period (Indicative)	Dominant Orientation	Key Characteristics
Early Formation	Pre-1960s	Local & vocational	Informal hospitality training; skill-based learning; limited institutional structure
Institutionalization	1970s–1980s	State-led development	Establishment of tourism schools; standardized training; national curriculum focus
Global Integration	1990s–2000s	Professionalization	Competency-based curriculum; foreign language training; management orientation
Intensified Globalization	2010s–present	International alignment	Quality assurance, certification, global standards, employability emphasis

Table 1 presents a periodization of tourism education development in Indonesia, illustrating how educational orientation, institutional logic, and curriculum emphasis evolved over time. The table demonstrates that tourism education did not emerge as a fully formed academic field but developed gradually through distinct historical phases.

In the early formation phase, tourism education was predominantly vocational and informal, responding to local hospitality needs rather than national or global agendas. The institutionalization phase marked increased state involvement, where tourism education became integrated into national development planning, resulting in standardized training models. The subsequent global integration phase reflects Indonesia's deeper engagement with international tourism markets, which triggered curriculum professionalization and managerial orientation. Finally, the intensified globalization phase shows alignment with global standards, certification systems, and employability frameworks.

This table supports the study's central argument that tourism education transformation followed a layered and path-dependent trajectory, rather than a linear or abrupt shift driven solely by globalization.

Table 2. Structural Transformation of Tourism Education Institutions

Aspect	Early Phase	Institutional Phase	Globalized Phase
Institutional form	Training centers	Specialized tourism schools	Higher education institutions
Governance	Fragmented	Centralized (state control)	Mixed (state–industry–global)
Educational level	Non-formal / vocational	Formal vocational	Professional & academic
International exposure	Minimal	Limited	Extensive

Table 2 analyzes structural changes in tourism education institutions across historical phases, focusing on institutional form, governance, educational level, and international exposure. The table highlights a gradual transition from fragmented training centers toward formal higher education institutions with complex governance structures.

In the early phase, tourism education institutions were limited in scope, often operating outside formal higher education systems. During the institutional phase, governance became centralized, reflecting strong state control and national development priorities. As globalization intensified, institutional structures diversified, incorporating industry partnerships, international collaborations, and hybrid governance models.

The table reveals that structural transformation was uneven and incremental. While international exposure increased significantly in later phases, centralized control and vocational legacies persisted. This finding underscores the historical continuity of institutional arrangements, explaining why contemporary tourism education institutions often face structural constraints rooted in their formative periods.

Table 3. Curriculum Transformation in Tourism Education

Curriculum Dimension	Earlier Orientation	Later Orientation
Learning focus	Technical skills	Competency & professionalism
Knowledge base	Local practices	Global tourism knowledge
Language training	Minimal	Strong emphasis on foreign languages
Assessment	Skill demonstration	Outcome-based & certification

Table 3 illustrates the historical shift in curriculum orientation from technical skill training to competency-based professional education. Early curricula emphasized operational skills and local practices, reflecting the immediate labor needs of the hospitality sector. Assessment methods focused on skill demonstration rather than learning outcomes or theoretical understanding.

Over time, curricula expanded to include global tourism knowledge, managerial competencies, foreign language proficiency, and standardized assessment frameworks. This transition indicates a redefinition of tourism education from service training to a professional academic field aligned with international labor markets. Importantly, the table shows that curriculum transformation did not eliminate earlier orientations but layered new competencies onto existing structures. This explains the coexistence of vocational and academic elements in contemporary tourism education curricula and highlights the historical roots of current curriculum debates.

Table 4. Interaction between Global Standards and National Policies

Dimension	Global Influence	National Response
Standards	International competency frameworks	Selective adoption
Quality assurance	Global benchmarking	National accreditation
Employability	Global labor mobility	Domestic workforce priorities
Cultural context	Standardization	Contextual adaptation

Table 4 examines how global tourism education standards interacted with national education policies, revealing a process of selective adaptation rather than full convergence. Global influences introduced international competency frameworks, benchmarking practices, and employability discourses. However, national responses filtered these influences through domestic policy priorities, accreditation systems, and socio-cultural considerations.

The table demonstrates that global standards were neither rejected nor adopted wholesale. Instead, they were localized through national accreditation mechanisms and adjusted to domestic workforce needs. Cultural context played a crucial role in shaping how standardization was interpreted and implemented.

This interaction explains why tourism education in Indonesia exhibits hybrid characteristics—globally informed yet nationally grounded. The table reinforces the study's claim that globalization functioned as a negotiated process embedded within historical and institutional contexts.

The findings confirm global arguments that tourism education has shifted toward professional and competency-based models (Airey & Tribe, 2005; Baum, 2015; Tribe, 2016). However, this study extends existing literature by demonstrating that such shifts in Indonesia occurred incrementally and were mediated by historical institutional structures.

Consistent with Dredge et al. (2012) and Benckendorff et al. (2014), curriculum reforms responded to global tourism demands. Yet, the historical data show that vocational legacies persisted, supporting the concept of institutional continuity highlighted by Airey and Dredge (2015). This challenges assumptions in present-oriented studies that view globalization as a uniform force.

Furthermore, the selective adoption of global standards aligns with findings by Hsu (2018) and Okumus et al. (2020), while historical analysis reveals how socio-cultural and political contexts shaped adaptation processes. The persistence of inequality and uneven institutional capacity reflects long-term structural dynamics rather than short-term policy failure (Ruhanen et al., 2019).By integrating historical evidence with contemporary theory, this study bridges tourism studies and the history of education, contributing a perspective largely absent from existing scholarship.

DISCUSSION

The historical development of tourism education in Indonesia demonstrates that its transformation cannot be understood simply as a linear adaptation to global tourism trends. Unlike many Western countries, where tourism education emerged from university-based professional management programs, Indonesia's tourism education originated from state-driven vocational training closely tied to national economic development and labor production. This historical trajectory revealsm a distinctive characteristic: tourism education in Indonesia was initially designed not as an academic discipline, but as an instrument of state development policy aimed at supporting the hospitality sector and generating foreign exchange through tourism expansion.

1. Historical Transformation of Curriculum: From Technical Skills to Global Competencies

Archival curriculum records from the Ministry of Education and institutional archives of STP Bandung show significant curricular changes across five major periods. During the 1970s, tourism education curricula focused heavily on technical hospitality training, including housekeeping, front office operations, food and beverage service, and basic tour guiding. These curricula reflected Indonesia's limited tourism infrastructure and the urgent demand for operational labor in hotels and travel services. By the 1980s, curriculum reform introduced managerial components such as tourism administration, customer relations, and destination planning. This shift corresponded with Indonesia's tourism development under the New Order, particularly following Presidential Instruction No. 9 of 1969 concerning tourism development as part of national economic planning. Archival documents from the Directorate of Vocational Education (1984) indicate that tourism schools were increasingly expected to support state modernization through skilled labor production. In the 1990s, curriculum changes became more complex. Institutional reports from Akademi Pariwisata and STP Bandung show the introduction of tourism marketing, event management, and intercultural communication. This period reflected Indonesia's deeper integration into regional tourism markets and the growing influence of ASEAN cooperation. A major rupture occurred after 2012 with the implementation of the Indonesian National Qualifications Framework (KKNI), regulated through Presidential Regulation No. 8/2012. The curriculum shifted from content-based teaching to competency-based structures aligned with measurable qualification levels. This marked Indonesia's adoption of global educational frameworks through national translation.

After 2020, tourism education institutions adopted Outcome-Based Education (OBE), emphasizing learning outcomes, international benchmarking, sustainability, and digital tourism services. Internal curriculum documents from STP Bandung (2021) indicate that modules on smart tourism, sustainable destination management, and global certification systems became compulsory. This transition illustrates the increasing dominance of global competency frameworks in shaping educational content. This curriculum evolution shows that globalization in Indonesia was not merely an imported process but was selectively localized. Unlike Western institutions, Indonesia retained strong vocational orientations while incorporating global professional standards.

This historical shift also reflects a broader debate concerning the purpose of tourism education. Tribe (2002) argues that tourism higher education should move beyond narrowly vocational objectives by balancing professional competence with reflective and liberal forms of knowledge. The concept of the "philosophic practitioner" consequently positions tourism graduates not merely as skilled employees, but as reflective professionals capable of understanding the wider social, cultural, and ethical consequences of tourism development. From this perspective, the Indonesian transition from operational training toward managerial, sustainability, and globally oriented competencies represents not simply curriculum modernization, but a gradual expansion in the educational purposes assigned to tourism education.

The growing incorporation of sustainability further indicates that the transformation of tourism education involves changes in educational values as well as occupational competencies. Research has emphasized that sustainability education requires tourism programs to address not only industry performance but also students' environmental attitudes and their capacity to understand the wider consequences of tourism development (Benckendorff et al., 2012). More recent curriculum debates similarly emphasize the integration of sustainability, digital transformation, critical thinking, and socially responsible practices within tourism higher education. This suggests that the post-2000 transformation identified in Indonesia forms part of a broader international shift in which tourism education increasingly prepares graduates to negotiate economic, technological, environmental, and social responsibilities simultaneously.

2. Institutional Expansion and State Development Logic

Historical records show that tourism education institutions expanded significantly in response to state economic priorities. In the early 1970s, Indonesia had only a small number of specialized tourism academies concentrated in Jakarta and Bandung. Archival records from the Ministry of Tourism indicate that by 1985 there were at least 27 registered tourism academies nationwide, increasing to 58 by 1995 as tourism became one of Indonesia's priority development sectors. The institutional growth accelerated after the Reform Era. Ministry of Higher Education data show that by 2010, more than 95 higher education institutions offered tourism-related programs, and by 2024 this number had exceeded 140 institutions, including polytechnics, academies, and universities.

This expansion reflects what modernization theory describes as the functional differentiation of education: institutions evolve to meet increasingly specialized labor demands. However, Indonesia's case differs because institutional expansion was strongly centralized and directed by state planning rather than market demand alone. For example, STP Bandung functioned not only as an educational institution but also as a model for tourism workforce standardization under the Ministry of Tourism. Archival reports from STP Bandung (1987) explicitly stated that its mission was "to produce skilled personnel to support national tourism development targets." This shows how tourism education was embedded in state developmental ideology.

3. Policy Borrowing and Local Adaptation

The Indonesian case strongly illustrates the theory of policy borrowing in education. Many reforms in tourism education—including competency certification, ASEAN Common Competency Standards for Tourism Professionals (ACCSTP), and OBE—originated from global or regional frameworks rather than domestic innovation.

However, these borrowed policies were never implemented in identical form. Instead, Indonesia adapted them according to local socio-cultural and institutional realities. For example, while UNESCO and UNWTO promoted universal competency frameworks, Indonesian curriculum guidelines integrated local cultural tourism, heritage preservation, and community-based tourism into core subjects. This localized adaptation demonstrates that policy borrowing is not passive imitation but active reinterpretation. Indonesia selectively borrowed global frameworks while maintaining national educational priorities such as Pancasila values, local wisdom, and cultural nationalism. This differs from Baum's argument that tourism education globalization mainly produces labor market flexibility. In Indonesia, globalization also produced ideological hybridization: global competencies were combined with national identity formation.

4. Indonesia's Distinctiveness in Globalization Theory

The Indonesian experience contributes to globalization theory in education by challenging the assumption that globalization leads to standardization. Instead, the evidence shows a hybrid model of educational globalization characterized by three distinct features: First, globalization in Indonesia operated through state mediation. Unlike neoliberal education systems where institutions directly adopt global models, Indonesian tourism education reforms were filtered through ministries, regulations, and national development plans. Second, vocational legacies remained dominant even after professionalization. While global standards pushed tourism education toward managerial and international competencies, practical labor training remained central.

Third, local cultural content persisted as a strategic element. Courses on Indonesian cultural heritage, local tourism ethics, and community-based tourism remained mandatory even in OBE curricula. These findings suggest that globalization in education is historically contingent and politically mediated. Indonesia demonstrates that global educational modernization does not erase national specificity but instead creates negotiated hybrid forms.

The Indonesian case therefore suggests that the transformation of tourism education is better understood as a process of historical layering than institutional replacement. New global competencies, certification systems, sustainability principles, and outcome-based approaches were introduced without completely displacing earlier vocational orientations. This coexistence helps explain why contemporary tourism education in Indonesia simultaneously exhibits vocational, professional, academic, and globally standardized characteristics. Rather than representing an incomplete transition toward an international model, such hybridity can be interpreted as the historical outcome of successive educational reforms interacting with established institutional traditions. This historical layering constitutes an important distinction between the Indonesian trajectory and explanations that treat globalization primarily as convergence toward increasingly standardized models of tourism education.

5. Theoretical Contribution

This study contributes to three theoretical debates. First, to globalization theory, it shows that educational

globalization is not uniform but mediated through historical state structures and local institutional traditions. Second, to policy borrowing theory, it demonstrates that borrowed educational models undergo reinterpretation, producing hybrid systems rather than replication. Third, to educational modernization theory, it reveals that modernization in tourism education is not merely technological or curricular but institutional and ideological. Therefore, Indonesia's case enriches the history of education by positioning tourism education as a strategic site where global capitalism, national development agendas, and local cultural identities intersect. This makes Indonesia not simply a recipient of global tourism education models but an active historical actor in shaping how those models are translated into educational practice.

CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates that the transformation of tourism education in Indonesia between 1960 and 2025 was neither linear nor simply driven by globalization. It evolved through successive layers of vocational training, institutional expansion, professionalization, and competency-based education, shaped by the interaction of state development policies, tourism industry demands, institutional legacies, and global educational standards. The transition from operational hospitality training to managerial, competency-based, and internationally oriented curricula therefore represents not the replacement of earlier educational models, but their gradual restructuring and historical layering.

The Indonesian case provides an important theoretical insight: globalization in education does not necessarily produce institutional convergence. Global frameworks—including professional certification, ASEAN competency standards, KKNI, and Outcome-Based Education—were selectively translated through national policies and adapted to local institutional and socio-cultural contexts. Tourism education in Indonesia consequently developed as a hybrid educational field in which global professional standards coexist with enduring vocational traditions and national development priorities. This finding extends discussions of educational globalization and policy borrowing by demonstrating that global models acquire different institutional forms through historically contingent processes of mediation and adaptation.

Historiographically, the study expands the history of Indonesian education beyond its conventional focus on general, vocational, and formal schooling by positioning tourism education within the longer history of professional education and national development. It also demonstrates the value of historical analysis for explaining contemporary educational structures that cannot be fully understood through present-oriented policy or employability studies alone.

These findings suggest that future tourism education reforms should avoid treating international standards as universal templates and instead consider the historical legacies, institutional capacities, and socio-cultural contexts in which such standards are implemented. Further research should extend this historical perspective through comparative studies across Southeast Asia and examine regional inequalities, institutional experiences, and the perspectives of educators, students, and tourism-industry actors. Such research would clarify whether the negotiated and hybrid trajectory identified in Indonesia represents a distinctive national experience or a broader pattern in the globalization of tourism education.

REFERENCE

Airey, D., & Dredge, D. (2015). Tourism education: Past, present, and future. *Tourism Recreation Research, 40*(1), 13–24. https://doi.org/10.1080/02508281.2014.991112

Airey, D., & Tribe, J. (Eds.). (2005). *An international handbook of tourism education*. Elsevier.

Baum, T. (2015). *Human resources in tourism: Still waiting for change? Tourism Management, 50*, 204–212. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2015.02.001

Benckendorff, P., Moscardo, G., & Pendergast, D. (2014). Tourism education and the changing needs of the tourism industry. *Journal of Teaching in Travel & Tourism, 14*(4), 303–306. https://doi.org/10.1080/15313220.2014.955231.

Benckendorff, P., Moscardo, G., & Murphy, L. (2012). Environmental attitudes of Generation Y students: Foundations for sustainability education in tourism. *Journal of Teaching in Travel & Tourism, 1*2(1), 44–69. https://doi.org/10.1080/15313220.2012.650063

Badan Nasional Sertifikasi Profesi. (2014). *Pedoman sertifikasi kompetensi sektor pariwisata*.

Cooper, C., Shepherd, R., & Westlake, J. (1996). Educating the educators in tourism: A manual of tourism and hospitality education. *Tourism Management, 17*(3), 235–242. https://doi.org/10.1016/0261-5177(96)00014-1

Dredge, D., Airey, D., & Gross, M. (2012). The place of tourism education in a changing world. *Tourism Management, 33*(3), 528–540. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2011.05.001

Grubb, W. N. (1996). *Working in the middle: Strengthening education and training for the mid-skilled labor force.* Jossey-Bass.

Hernadi, N. A., Wulandari, D. A. N., & Prasetyo, D. (2024). Pendidikan pariwisata dan pengembangan sumber daya manusia di Indonesia. *Jurnal Ilmiah Pariwisata, 29*(1), 45–58.

Hsu, C. H. C. (2018). Tourism education on and beyond the horizon. *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport & Tourism Education, 22*, 181–184. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhlste.2018.02.001

Husni, F., Pahlevi, M. R., Harmaini, H., & Zikri, M. (2024). Tourism education and halal tourism development in Indonesia. *Jurnal Ilmiah Guru Madrasah, 3*(1), 31–40.

Kementerian Pariwisata Republik Indonesia. (1985). *Rencana induk pengembangan kepariwisataan nasional* [Arsip].

Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Republik Indonesia. (1984). *Kebijakan pendidikan vokasional dan kurikulum kepariwisataan* [Arsip].

Koseoglu, M. A., Rahimi, R., Okumus, F., & Liu, J. (2016). Bibliometric studies in tourism. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research, 40*(2), 180–198. https://doi.org/10.1177/1096348014564872

Lucas, B. (2004). *Vocational education and training in changing times*. Routledge.

Mustafa, R. H., Supriyanto, B., Rianty, R., & Nismara, M. I. (2025). Rethinking edutourism in Indonesia: Global trends and local implications. *Indonesian Journal of Tourism and Leisure, 6*(2), 87–101.

Okumus, F., Koseoglu, M. A., Putra, E. D., Dogan, I. C., & Yildiz, M. (2020). A bibliometric analysis of tourism education research. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research, 44*(5), 746–774. https://doi.org/10.1177/1096348019886779

Presidential Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia No. 8 of 2012 on the Indonesian National Qualifications Framework (KKNI). (2012).

Republic of Indonesia. (1990). *Law No. 9 of 1990 concerning tourism*.

Republic of Indonesia. (2009). *Law No. 10 of 2009 concerning tourism*.

Richards, G. (2018). Cultural tourism: A review of recent research and trends. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management, 36*, 12–21. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2018.03.005

Ruhanen, L., Weiler, B., Moyle, B. D., & McLennan, C. J. (2019). Trends and patterns in sustainable tourism research. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism, 27*(4), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2019.1607359

Saepudin, D., Nurdin, D., Fajri, I., & Permana, D. I. (2022). Pengembangan sumber daya manusia pariwisata melalui pendidikan terintegrasi. *Barista: Jurnal Kajian Bahasa dan Pariwisata, 9*(2), 134–145.

Sheldon, P. J., Fesenmaier, D. R., Woeber, K., Cooper, C., & Antonioli, M. (2008). Tourism education futures, 2010–2030: Building the capacity to lead. *Journal of Teaching in Travel & Tourism, 7*(3), 61–68. https://doi.org/10.1080/15313220801909445

Sheldon, P. J., Fesenmaier, D. R., & Tribe, J. (2017). The tourism education futures initiative (TEFI). *Journal of Teaching in Travel & Tourism, 17*(4), 231–245. https://doi.org/10.1080/15313220.2017.1407607

Sigala, M. (2020). Tourism and COVID-19: Impacts and implications for advancing tourism research. *Journal of Business Research, 117*, 312–321. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.06.015

STP Bandung. (1987). *Annual institutional report and curriculum development archive* [Institutional archive].

STP Bandung. (2021). *Outcome-based education curriculum document* [Internal curriculum document].

Tribe, J. (2002). The philosophic practitioner. *Annals of Tourism Research, 29*(2), 338–357. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383(01)00038-X.

Tribe, J. (2016). The curriculum: A reflection on tourism education. *Annals of Tourism Research, 57*, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2015.12.002

UNESCO. (2015). *Technical and vocational education and training for sustainable development*. UNESCO Publishing.

UNWTO. (2019). Tourism education and human capital development. *Tourism Review, 74*(4), 872–884. https://doi.org/10.1108/TR-02-2019-0051

Yıldırım, Z., Gedik, İ. A., Öncel, S., & Kıngır, S. (2023). Global research trends in tourism and education: A bibliometric analysis. *Journal of Hospitality, Leisure, Sport & Tourism Education, 33*, 100421. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhlste.2023.100421