



The Implementation of Common ASEAN Tourism Curriculum (Catc) in Indonesia

Kamaludin Yusra, Nurachman Hanafi, & Yuni Budi Lestari

School of Education, Mataram University, Indonesia

Biodata:

Kamaludin Yusra is a lecturer at the English Language Department University of Mataram Indonesia. He received his Ph.D. in Applied Linguistics from Sydney University Australia. His interest includes Applied Linguistics, Sociolinguistics, Educational Research, Cross-cultural Understanding, Pragmatics, and English for Tourism (e-mail: kamaludin@unram.ac.id or angsowinda@hotmail.com).

Nurachman Hanafi is a professor of linguistics at the English Language Department University of Mataram Indonesia. He received his Ph.D. in Linguistics from La Trobe University Australia.

His interest includes Linguistics, Educational Research, Cross-cultural Pragmatics, and English for Tourism (e-mail: nurachman@unram.ac.id).

Yuni Budi Lestari is a lecturer at the English Language Department University of Mataram Indonesia. She received her MA in TESOL from Sydney University Australia. Currently, she is doing her PhD in TESOL at The University of Queensland, Australia. Her interest includes TESOL, Language Planning and Policy, Curriculum, and Educational Research, (e-mail: yunilestari@unram.ac.id or lestari2006@gmail.com).

Abstract

Tourism has become a global business that it requires professionals with globally accepted skills. Provision of such skills has been one of the major concerns of the ASEAN ministries of tourism and in collaboration with the Australian government they have set up an agreement to train tourism workers in the same curriculum in order to attain *ASEAN Common Competency Standards for Tourism Professionals (ACCSTP)*, *the Common ASEAN Tourism Curriculum (CATC)*, and *Regional Qualifications Framework and Skills Recognition System (RQFSRS)*. Out of six tourism sectors, housekeeping has been selected as the priority and all housekeeping-related English competencies have been collaboratively listed and tried out to tourism students in ASEAN countries. Studies at global-ASEAN and macro-national levels have reported that the trial was a great success and was suggested to be extended to other tourism sectors. However, studies at meso and micro levels have reported otherwise and a number of factors have hindered its success. This study contributes to this debate by explicating the views of the teachers and the students on the curriculum and their response to it when used in classroom.

Keywords: *Policy borrowing, teacher agency, student agency, CEFR*

Introduction

Tourism has been a promising industry since early 1980s. Initially, it was defined as the act of visiting places for pleasure but it then develops into a profession with knowledge and expertise relevant with comfort and services during traveling. Great income from it has created tourism as one of the main pillars of a nation's economy and Indonesia has also benefited from it as one of the sources for nation's revenues. Located in the tropical areas and having countless numbers of islands, it offers numerous tourism objects at seas, on the beaches, on lands and at mountains. Being tropical in its climate, it is open to be visited along the year. The latest statistics suggests

that visits by international tourists have drastically increased from year to year. In 2014, for instance, the number of international visitors amounted to 9.44 millions, increasing 7% from the number of previous years (BPS, 2015). In 2018 and 2019, the numbers of visitors were 10.58 and 10.87 million persons. Thus, the rate increases to 14% per annum. The central government has set as a target of 20 million tourists in 2020 (BPS, 2019). According to World Travel and Tourism Council (WTTC) (2018), Indonesia is the most frequently visited countries in the Southeast Asia, number three in Asia after Singapore and Thailand and number nine in the world.

The revenue from tourism is annually high. In 2015, deident from tourism sectors was US\$ 12.23 billions equalling to Rp 169 trillions. This source of revenue is the greatest second only to oil, coal, and palm oil. In 2019, the revenue from tourism was as high as US\$ 20 billions and this was the greatest source of revenue defeating natural and palm oil as the export primadona. In 2020, the government has targeted 20 million international visitors (BPS, 2019; Liputan6.com, 2019).

The increase in the number of visitors and revenue must be paired with that in the quality of tourism services. The Indonesian government has closely worked together in an intergovernmental basis (Zapp, 2019) with ASEAN and Australian governments and set up lists of competencies to be acquired by tourism professionals trained in each nation and these competencies are accreditable in other member nations. The agreement was documented in a document called *Mutual Recognition Arrangement (MRA)* (see Fukunaga, 2015), implemented in (a) ASEAN Common Competency Standards for Tourism Professionals (ACCSTP), (b) the Common ASEAN Tourism Curriculum (CATC), and (c) Regional Qualifications Framework and Skills Recognition System (RQFSRS) (see Hikcman & Irwin, 2013). To a great extent, this is an ASEAN version of *the Common European Frame of Reference (CEFR)* and the identities, human rights, human capabilities and human capital of the people have been highlighted (Zapp, 2019). Expected to cover all six divisions of labour in tourism, i.e. (a) housekeeping, (b) food production, (c) food and beverage services, (d) front office, (e) tour operation, and (f) travel agencies, the policy has developed and implemented housekeeping CATC covering a set of housekeeping competencies and a set of language-related tourism competencies where English plays a major role as the official language of the ASEAN nations (Croco & Bunwirat, 2017).

Professional, social, and language competencies specified in the documents have been widely implemented in tourism educational institutions in ASEAN countries including those in Indonesia and in West Nusa Tenggara Province. In general, as Mendoza and Sugiyarto (2017) report, the policy has been successfully implemented but there are gaps between nations that should be addressed so that common agreement can be achieved. Mendoza and Sugiyarto (2017) also mention that each ASEAN nations has different levels of readiness towards the

implementation of the policy particularly in terms of facilities, instruments, and human resources. Some countries could not sufficiently implement it because they lack training facilities and apparatus. Hickman and Irwin (2013) describe this gap as a “huge variance” between expectations and realities that the MRA can afford. Some nations (i.e. Brunei Darussalam, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, and Thailand) have all completed setting up the training institutions, while some others (i.e. Indonesia, Myanmar, and Viet Nam) are nearly finished with the establishment although still in need of setting up tourism professional organization at national level. Others (i.e. Cambodia and Lao PDR) are not at all ready. In the Philippines, some universities already highlighted the importance of CEFR proficiency for students’ communication strategies (Ventura-Caulan and Arellano-Tamayo, 2019; Batang, Egipto and Medriano, 2019).

The gaps that Hickman and Irwin (2013) describe above can also be found in reports of local implementation. In Vietnam, though claimed to be successful, gaps, as reported in Nguyen and Chaisawat (2011), exist due to these factors: (a) trainers have no sufficient qualification, professional works, and trainings, (b) the education and the training curricula have never actually been evaluated, revised, and appropriated with CATC, (c) limitations in the proportions of practice and internship in the curriculum, and (d) limitations in collaboration between tourism institutions and industries. In Thailand (see Fu, Kapiki, dan Mu, 2016), there is a mismatch in the skills required in tourism industries and those provided in tourism education institutions and there is an urgent need for curriculum re-engineering as to accommodate CATC, e-tourism and e-hospitality. In failed countries, following Mendoza et al., (2016) and Say (2019), the implementation was slowed down because the governments needed to restructure or invent institutions, rules and regulations managing the implementation of the policy.

In Indonesia, the implementation of MRA programs particularly CATC has been seen as a great success and numerous tourism education institutions have been assigned as accrediting agencies for the six sectors of tourism (see Hickman & Irwin, 2013): Bandung College of Tourism (STP Bandung), Bali College of Tourism (STP Bali), Medan Academy of Tourism (Akpar Medan), Makassar Academy of Tourism (Akpar Makassar), Sahid Institute of Tourism, Pelita Harapan University, and Dhyana Pura Hotel & Tourism Institute. These institutions have been known to have established *good practices* and they have been assigned to assist other local institutions to follow and develop their examples. Using local resources, the local institutions have attempted their best at implementing the policy but very limited studies, if any, have been reported examining the agency of these institutions. This study is expected to fill the gap by examining responses of local institutions, teachers, and students in West Nusa Tenggara to the implementation of CATC.

Moreover, even at the so-called accredited tourism education institutions, there are still wide gaps to be filled so as to ascertain that the products are qualifiable within ASEAN standards. Maulina and Khaerudin (2019) mention that even at STP Bandung the students' competencies, including English competencies, are still below ASEAN standards due to these factors: (a) the curriculum has not been appropriated with CATC, (b) the trainers and the training programs have not yet fulfilled the standards of CATC, and (c) the education and the training programs used are locally made. Suharlan (2017) reports that these local curricula were made and developed with helps from accredited institutions particularly in development of syllabus, materials and learning program with documents of CATC as the bases, but the results still fell short of the ASEAN targets. Note that CATC are simply written documents listing sets of competencies for the tourism students to acquire and no details of learning materials and programs. Development of these materials requires cooperation between teachers, students, practitioners, and professional association, but cooperation like this is not really easy to materialize.

In West Nusatenggara, tourism education institutions also work collaboratively with accredited institutions in the implementation of CATC. Tourism Polytechnics of Lombok has worked together with STP Bandung, STP Bali, dan Makassar Tourism Academy in increasing the quality of teaching staff and the quality of the training services that they provide. The result of such collaboration has not been evaluated. Other tourism education institutes have also collaborated with each other in the implementation of the CATC either through self-funding or funded by the Indonesian ministry of tourism. The State Community Academy of West Lombok has similarly worked with The State Community Academy of Bali in this matter and the effect of this cooperation was impeded with macro and micro hinderance. Kurniarini (2019), for instance, has shown that the implementation of English CATC at the West Lombok institute was unsuccessful because the students' English competency and learning motivation was very low. Besides, the learning materials do not follow the CATC and the lecturers do not have the capacity to adapt the materials to the ASEAN standards. The curriculum has not also involved practitioners and subject specialists and the learning environments do not support learning for the acquisition of the ASEAN competencies.

The West Lombok institute is one of such institution in West Nusatenggara. Yet, they are faced with the same challenges of providing quality tourism-related English competencies acceptable and creditable by tourism practitioners in ASEAN countries. What actually happens at these institutions in the implementation of CATC need to be carefully investigated and this is the merit of the current study. It will discuss how English CATC were implemented, what good practices are learned, what factors facilitated or inhibited its implementation, and how the institutions overcome

those inhibitions. But, let us, first of all, clear the theoretical foundations before further discussion can be pursued.

CATC as CEFR-Like Curricular Documents

As curricular documents, *CATC* are derived from *ASEAN Common Competency Standard (ACCS)* covering these fields of services: engineering, nursing, and tourism (Hickman and Irwin, 2013). The ACCS is then developed into curricula for education and training in each field and job-related English competencies are parts of the main menu.

In field of tourism, the ACCS has been developed further into *Common ASEAN Tourism Curriculum (CATC)* covering six tourism sectors: housekeeping, food production, food and beverage services, front office, tour operation, and travel agencies. Involving experts, practitioners, and stakeholders in tourism, the curricula are based on the standard competencies codified in *ASEAN Common Competency Standard for Tourism Professional (ACCSTP)* listing professional knowledge, skills and attitudes in each sector. As lists of professional skills, the documents are designed for uses as practical as tool boxes for fixing service problems in each sector in ASEAN countries. These CATC are still in need for contents, learning materials, and appropriate methods of delivery. In 2019, The CATC for housekeeping has been developed and tried out and the result was reported to be satisfying and plans have been made to develop CATC for other sectors.

In Indonesia, the CATC have been ratified since 9 November 2012 with a consideration that, for a greater influx of tourists, tourism requires quality services. Thus, skillful tourism workers must be provided and the implementation of the CATC has been viewed as a solution. The CATC are used as guidelines for Indonesian tourism education institutes to attain the ASEAN-standardized competencies in tourism sectors. As these competencies have been agreed upon by tourism ministers of ASEAN countries, the attainment certifies and accredited qualification and competencies of ASEAN tourism workers and enables them with flexible movement across ASEAN countries. For the six sectors above, thirty-two types of tourism jobs and thirty-two lists of competencies have been approved. While these jobs require specific professional skills, all of them require active and communicative English competencies. In this perspective, the implementation of English CATC at tourism education institutes will be the panacea for the gap. Millar, Mao and Moreo (2013) report a great gap between the needs of tourism industries and the quality of skills that tourism education institutes can provide. The latter offer general skills while the former require more technically specialized skills (Weber et al, 2013). Hickman and Irwin (2013), for example, described that Indonesia faces a huge gap between English speaking ability of tourism workers expected to run comfortable tourism English encounters and the English

competencies that Indonesian tourism institutes can actually provide with their alumni. They reported cases that tourists complained about Indonesian tourism workers: low English competencies, unable to communicate communicatively, unable to understand tourists' English, and, consequently, failing to fulfil tourists' expectations. Hickman and Irwin (2013) strongly conclude that complaints with tourism at developing countries are associated with poor English competencies of the service providers, unlike those in developed countries with unsatisfactory level of services.

Hickman and Irwin (2013) provide a 4-scale rating for the assessment of gaps in tourism English competencies. *Rating 1* indicates 'a big gap' where English is not integrated into tourism education, not a national language, and competency is very limited. *Rating 2* indicates a 'significant gap' where English is not integrated into the curriculum, not a national language, but the workers have imperfect English communication ability. *Rating 3* is a 'small gap' where where English is not integrated into the curriculum, not a national language, but the workers have sufficient English communication ability. *Rating 4* indexes an 'insignificant gap' where where English is integrated into the curriculum, one of the national languages, and the workers have perfect English communication ability. Hickman and Irwin (2013) have categorized Indonesian situations into rating 1 suggesting that the gap between expectations and realities in Indonesian tourism is huge and English competencies of its tourism workers are still very low.

The need for high quality tourism workers prompted the massive emergence of tourism education institutions in the early 21st century. Butler (1999) mentions that public interest in establishing private and public tourism education institutions were very high prompting the massive emergence of such schools. The need for tourism workers could be accommodated by the institutions but the qualification and the quality were still unsuitable with the needs of the industry. This in turn created high rate of educated unemployment. However, according to World Trade Organization (2019), the balance between the need for and the provision of professional tourism workers had been reached in 1996 and 14,000 skilled workers were introduced to the field. Nonetheless, the number of institutions has drastically increased and in 1998 the number has doubled and the outputs outnumbered job opportunities. Giroux (1993) and Evans (1993) suggest tourism education institutions to aim at general tourism knowledge without specialized tourism skills, but this solution runs into the danger of increasing educated but unskilled unemployment rate. Here, CATC can provide a genuinely comprehensive solution; the competency is based on ASEAN standards and trainees have the flexibility to work in either ASEAN countries where their skills are required.

The CATC has 242 standard competencies including tourism related English competencies. They were developed based *Competency-Based Training (CBT)* and evaluated with *Competency-Based Assessment (CBA)*. The *CATC* for English has 8 competencies which are further elaborated into 32 sub-competencies and evaluation criteria. This list is presented in Table 1.

Table 1: List of English Competencies in CATC

| No | Competencies | Sub-competencies |
|----|--|--|
| 1 | Communicate in English on the telephone | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Take general enquiries by phone b. Respond to customer requests or orders c. Make calls to place orders d. Handle customer complains e. Make complaints |
| 2 | Converse in English at a basic operational level | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Participate in simple conversations on familiar topics with work colleagues. b. Respond to simple verbal instructions or requests. c. Make simple requests d. Describe routine procedures e. Express like, dislike, and preferences f. Identify different forms of expression in English |
| 3 | Deliver short oral presentation in English | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Prepare for an oral presentation b. Deliver a short oral presentation c. Evaluate a short oral presentation |
| 4 | Gather and present product information | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Gather and organise information b. Research and analyse information c. Present information |
| 5 | Facilitate outgoing phone calls | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Identify elements and facilities of the host enterprise telephone system. b. Demonstrate appropriate telephone communication skills c. Place outgoing calls on behalf of the enterprise d. Place outgoing calls on behalf of the guests |
| 6 | Use oral English to convey a complex exchange of ideas | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Discuss problem solving strategies b. Respond to hypothetical questions c. Discuss abstract concept |

| | | |
|---|----------------------------------|---|
| | | d. Express opinions |
| | | e. Discuss preferred learning styles |
| 7 | Write a short message in English | a. Demonstrate the ability to take message from oral input b. Write short instructional messages c. Write short messages of appreciation, apology, and explanation for absence. |
| 8 | Coach others in job skills | a. Prepare for on job coaching b. Coach colleagues on the job c. Follow up coaching |

Source: ASEAN. 2013. *ASEAN Mutual Recognition Arrangement (MRA) on Tourism Professionals Handbook*. Jakarta: Association of Southeast Asian Nations.

As a curricular document, the CATC for English above appears to be simple, but the criterion of attainment is very high. The attainment is certified from Certificate Level II to Advanced Diploma. Tourism workers in the six sectors must obtain each certificate for each sector because they have their own specified competencies and different levels of attainment. The certificate, the diploma and the degree are recognized in all ASEAN member countries and thus devotion to CATC and the CATC is essential.

Responses to CATC

Local responses to global policy documents are dependent upon teacher agency and student agency. The teachers and the students should take agentic actions due to discrepancies between what the policy makers at macro and meso levels expect to take place and what is actually performed by the teachers and the students at micro levels (see Baldauf, 2006). CATC as a form of language policy are explicated by people with authority and they usually have expertise, influence and bureaucratic power (Zhao & Baldauf, 2012). People with expertise are those with tourism education and experiences. People with influence usually have the power to influence other people due to their roles in the society: for example, hotel owners, travel agents, religion feagures, and community leaders. Those with power are usually political leaders and bureaucrats at tourism ministerial offices. In the case of CATC, the bureaucrats from Australian tourism offices are categorizable as those with power because they provide financial supports for the policy. With minimum, if any, involvement of lecturers and students in the formation, the policy is describable

as a form of “policy dumping” (Hamid & Nguyen, 2016; Phan & Hamid, 2016) since they have no choice but to accept and implement them.

Contemporary analyses of policy have sifted away from analysing the policy-making processes at macro levels to the policy-responding processes at micro levels. Borg (2001) has analysed this matter and found that in the last three decades policy analyses focused on responses of policy implementers. These responses have become some sorts of ‘new policies’ at micro levels developed based on their own beliefs on the right processes of learning disregarding what is right according to the policy. In the current study, the beliefs of the teachers and the students about the contents, the competencies, the teaching strategies, and the methods of evaluating competency attainment are more important than those in the global policy documents like the CATC. Several studies have shown that tutors will implement a policy if they have the expertise on the policy contents and the facilities to implement them (see Ng & Boucher-Yip, 2017; Harris, 2017). Otherwise, they will reject or resist them (Pessoa & Freitas, 2012) and this might be the case with tourism education institutions in Vietnam (Nguyen & Chaisawat, 2011), Indonesia (Premono, 2010; Rofaida, 2013), Cambodia (Say, 2019), Philippines (Mendoza & Sugiyarto, 2017) and other ASEAN countries. Other studies have actually shown that lecturers and students exercise agency by taking strategic actions to overcome problems (e.g. by taking extra English courses) and attain the targeted competencies (Molina, 2017; Chen & Goh, 2011).

In general, however, micro-level responses to a global policy like CATC can be described as dedication, accommodation and resistance responses (see Ali, 2013). The response is dedicative when the policy implementers devote themselves into adopting the policy as the only learning guideline. The response is accommodative when the lecturers and the students adapt the policy with their own conditions. The response is resistant when the micro-level implementers neglect the policy and appoint their own programs. Studies at Bandung Tourism College (Premono, 2010) and at Bali Tourism College (Rofaida, 2013) where CATC were implemented report that the lecturers used their own documents and neglected the policy, although the institutions themselves are the Indonesian models of good practices. The responses of the lecturers and the students, however, are accommodative because they identified the gaps between the available competencies and the targeted competencies, the ways of narrowing them, and the capacities, facilities, and instruments required to fill them.

Tomlinson (2011) offers several criteria that lecturers can use when accommodating expectation of a policy document like CATC with local conditions. Firstly, the responses should facilitate students to attain the target competencies easily, comfortably, and confidently. Secondly, the learning materials and activities should be relevant and useful to students’ life in the short and in

the long run so that they will invest in learning. Thirdly, the materials should be clear in purposes. Next, the materials and the activities should accommodate individual learning styles of the students and maximize real and authentic language uses. If these fail to take place, the roles of the lecturers might shift from implementers to makers of policy at micro-levels (Baldauf, 2006) and, if this is the case, Holliday (2001) suggests the students' expectation should be the priority in the decision.

Methods

Research Design: The study is ethnographic in nature and the thoughts, actions, and strategies employed by the lecturers and the students implementing the CATC are observed and elaborated.

Population: The study covers all the lecturers and the students at five tourism education institutions in West Nusa Tenggara (NTB), Indonesia, four belonging to the government (i.e. TDMU, MTP, SCMWL, and TAL), and one is run by a private organization (i.e. MTC).

Sample: Sample was selected in proportional, dimensional, and purposive techniques. The lecturers of Housekeeping English classes at each institution were purposively selected while the students were proportional selected: six male and six female, two for each category of high, average and low English competencies.

Data Collection: Data were collected from documents, observation, questionnaires, interviews, and language skill assessments. Documents were in the forms of CATC, syllabi, student assignments, and learning materials. Observations were non-participant with video recording instruments. Likert-scale questionnaire with 5 options were also administered to teacher and students to collect information about their perceptions of English trainings that they had undertaken. Semi-structured interviews were administered to lecturers and students prior to and after observations. Assessment of language competencies were administered by certified assessors and procedures at the participating universities.

Data Analysis: Data were descriptively analysed by identifying, classifying, describing, and explaining the responses. Responses in the video-transcripts were colour-coded, classified as adoption, accommodation or resistance, described with definition and examples, and explained by discussing them with findings from other studies.

Findings and Discussion

The study discusses how English CATC were applied, what good practices are observed, what factors enabled or subdued its implementation, and how the institutions solved those limitations.

Implementation of CATC

Implementation of CATC is inseparable with teacher factors, facility factors, and student factors. Table 1 shows teacher factors in education, trainings and TOEFL-based English competence. Only 58% of the lecturers have obtained master's degree which is the minimum level of education for lecturing at higher education level according to Indonesian law, while 42% still require further education, and none of them have a doctorate level. This indicates that the education qualification of English teachers is still below the national standard. Their competence in English based on documented TOEFL scores varied: low (300-400) 11%, (400-499) 58%, high (500-549) 24%, and very high (550 or higher) 7%. The majority (almost 70%) being low, teachers' English competence still requires improvement. All of them have acquired basic and advanced trainings in English, teaching, and assessment of English language skills as parts of education backgrounds, but only 44% have actually received CATC-related trainings obtained trainer, master trainer, and assessor qualification. As these are essential for competence as well as work and worker mobility as discussed above, the CATC-related trainings are highly and urgently needed. Similar situations have also been found in other parts of Indonesia (Premono, 2010; Rofaida, 2013), Vietnam (Nguyen & Chaisawat, 2011), Thailand (Fu, Kapiki, & Mu, 2016) and Cambodia (Say, 2019).

Table 1: Teachers' Background

| COLLEGE | EDUCATION | | | TRAININGS | | ENGLISH COMPETENCE | | | |
|-------------------|------------------|-------|----|------------------|-------|---------------------------|---------|---------|------|
| | S1 | S2 | S3 | TBT | OT | 300-400 | 401-499 | 500-549 | >550 |
| TDMU | 5 | 6 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 2 |
| MTC | 4 | 7 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 1 |
| MPT | 2 | 6 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 0 |
| SCMWL | 2 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 |
| TAL | 6 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 0 |
| Total | 19 | 26 | 0 | 20 | 25 | 5 | 26 | 11 | 3 |
| Percentage | 42.22 | 57.78 | 0 | 44.44 | 55.56 | 11.11 | 57.78 | 24.44 | 6.67 |

Other supporting factors come from the quality of learning facilities that trainers and institution can provide. Table 2 shows supporting facilities that teachers and institution have in order to equip students with the CATC competencies. The table indicates that only half (58%) of the lecturers

have developed their own plans (LP) for the English lesson and plans for individual and group performances of the students (SP) and 68% of them have forms for assessing the performances (AF). This indicates that not all teachers are well equipped for the implementation. While all teachers have English textbook (TB), it is, nonetheless, irrelevant with CATC for Housekeeping English and the content is general. While all institutions have sufficient number of service (SV) (with a ratio of 1.09) and field (FD) (with a ratio of 16.8) laboratories for teacher of each class to train students with real-work English, they have limited language (LAN) (with a ratio .2 compared to the number of classes) and workshop (WS) (with a ratio of .16 to class numbers) facilities to better prepare them before the internship program. With a ratio of 5.2, each English class have more choices of business units where students can practice English, there is an urgent need for more partnership with other more institutions (INS), networks (NW) and stakeholders (SH) for internship programs. The need for more time, partnership and internship programs have been recommended in the studies of CATC implementation in Vietnam (Nguyen & Chaisawat, 2011), and other ASEAN countries (Mendoza, & Sugiyarto, 2017; Mendoza, Desiderio, Sugiyarto, & Salant, 2016).

Table 2: Learning and Supporting Facilities

| COLLEGE | TEACHERS' KITS | | | | LABORATORY | | | | BUSINESS PARTNERS | | | |
|--------------|----------------|-----|------|-----|------------|-----|------|------|-------------------|-----|-----|----|
| | LP | SP | TB | AF | LAN | WS | FD | SV | INS | SH | BU | NW |
| TDMU | 5 | 5 | 1 | 10 | 2 | 2 | 10 | 8 | 4 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| MTC | 5 | 5 | 1 | 8 | 1 | 1 | 12 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 |
| MPT | 8 | 8 | 1 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 29 | 20 | 5 | 5 | 7 | 7 |
| SCMWL | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 23 | 12 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 4 |
| TAL | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 10 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Total | 26 | 26 | 5 | 28 | 9 | 7 | 84 | 49 | 20 | 23 | 26 | 27 |
| Ratio | .58 | .58 | 1.00 | .62 | .2 | .16 | 16.8 | 1.09 | .44 | .51 | 5.2 | .6 |

There are problems with students in terms of learning motivation, English entry behaviour, and learning strategies. Unfortunately, as shown in Table 3, the students are not very motivated in learning English. While the majority of them see English as essential for their jobs, only 15% of them are motivated to learning English and the majority (68%) see it as difficult to learn. With simple grammar-based multiple choice English tests, we found that only 9% of the students are qualifiable as higher education students and the great majority (almost 90%) fall within basic and

elementary levels. Such low competency in English was shared with Malaysia (see Ahmad Afif et al, 2019) but the students there took more active, communicative learning. In our study, we found with Likert-scale inventories that the students see passive strategies like morization (MEM) of words and grammars as the best learning strategy and cognitive (COG), compensatory (COMP), and social (SOC) strategies are rarely practiced. With low language competency at entry, low motivation, and mechanical learning strategies in play, it is not possible to the teachers and the students to arrive at the standard competencies set up in the CATC. In the works of Gursoy, Rahman and Swanger (2012) as well as King and Tang (2020), high English language proficiency is expected in tourism industry is part of both transferable and relevant subject skills (Stewart & Knowles, 2000) as it is essential to other skills such as communication, problem solving, and other team work and management skills (Raybould & Wilkins, 2005).

Table 3: Student Factors

| College | Motivation | | | English Entry Behaviour | | | | Learning Strategies | | | |
|-------------------|------------|-------|-------|-------------------------|-------|------|-----|---------------------|-------|------|-------|
| | LOW | AVE | HIGH | BSC | ELM | PRIN | ADV | COG | MEM | COMP | SOC |
| TDMU | 23 | 7 | 5 | 25 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 20 | 2 | 12 |
| MTC | 21 | 8 | 6 | 27 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 21 | 2 | 10 |
| MPT | 25 | 6 | 4 | 23 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 28 | 0 | 6 |
| SCMWL | 24 | 5 | 6 | 24 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 23 | 0 | 9 |
| TAL | 26 | 4 | 5 | 26 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 24 | 3 | 6 |
| Total | 119 | 30 | 26 | 125 | 30 | 16 | 0 | 9 | 116 | 7 | 43 |
| Percentage | 68.00 | 17.14 | 14.86 | 71.43 | 17.14 | 9.14 | 0 | 5.14 | 66.29 | 4.00 | 24.57 |

Poor quality of student input, teacher agency, and learning facilities leads to low attainment of English competencies based on the CATC. As shown in Tabel 4, only 39% of the students (68 out of 175) have actually qualified for high competency, while 53% of them (96 out of 175) fall within low category. Even when the average category is included in the statistics of success, the percentage is not higher than 45% indicating that the majority (55%) of student competencies in English is below target. In globalised world of hospitality and tourism, low English proficiency leads to unemployment (Ahmad Afif et al, 2019; Wang & Tsai, 2014) because hospitality industry, according to Millar, Mao and Moreo (2010), requires tourism professionals with competencies higher than those trained at tourism higher education.

Table 4: Students' Attainment of English Competencies

| College | High | | Average | | Low | | Very Low | |
|--------------|------|-------|---------|-------|-----|-------|----------|-------|
| | F | % | F | % | F | % | F | % |
| TDMU | 16 | 45.71 | 3 | 8.571 | 9 | 25.71 | 7 | 20.00 |
| MPT | 15 | 42.86 | 2 | 5.714 | 9 | 25.71 | 9 | 25.71 |
| MTC | 14 | 40.00 | 1 | 2.857 | 15 | 42.86 | 5 | 14.29 |
| SCMWL | 12 | 34.29 | 2 | 5.714 | 11 | 31.43 | 10 | 28.57 |
| TAL | 11 | 31.43 | 3 | 8.571 | 12 | 34.29 | 9 | 25.71 |
| Total | 68 | 38.86 | 1 | 6.29 | 56 | 32.00 | 40 | 22.86 |

Competencies being low, we need to identify which competencies and subcompetencies are below standard. Survey reveals, as shown in Table 5, that the students fail to obtain the competencies in oral presentation, orally exchanging of complex ideas, and orally coaching others on the job. In the oral presentation skill, the majority of the students fail miserably in preparing and evaluating short oral presentations although their ability to deliver the presentation is slightly higher. When involved in more intensive oral interaction, for example, in discussions of problems, concepts, and opinions, the students often lost words for relevant expressions due to limited English competence that they have. When coaching other on the job, the students were challenged with English and they failed to develop this communication skill while it is in itself essential in hospitality services (Lin, 2002) and essential soft skill of hospitality leadership (Sisson & Adams, 2013). When involved in less interactive actions, the scores are slightly higher but insignificant to assume difference. Other reading of the data might have something to do with students' perceptions of employability in hospitality and tourism industries. According to Wang and Tsai (2014), students place leadership and management skills at the bottom of competency list while internship programs were seen as the main modes of acquiring work-related competencies.

Table 5: Unattained Competencies

| No | Competencies | Sub-competencies | Mean Score | Category |
|----|--|---------------------------------------|------------|----------|
| 1 | Deliver short oral presentation in English | a. Prepare for an oral presentation | 1.93 | Very Low |
| | | b. Deliver a short oral presentation | 2.09 | Low |
| | | c. Evaluate a short oral presentation | 1.81 | Very Low |
| 2 | | a. Discuss problem solving strategies | 2.11 | Low |
| | | b. Respond to hypothetical questions | 2.16 | Low |

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|--|--------------------------------------|------|----------|
| 3 | Use oral English to convey a complex exchange of ideas | c. Discuss abstract concept | 1.73 | Very Low |
| | | d. Express opinions | 1.93 | Very Low |
| | | e. Discuss preferred learning styles | 1.74 | Very Low |
| | Coach others in job skills | a. Prepare for on job coaching | 2.00 | Low |
| | | b. Coach colleagues on the job | 1.97 | Very Low |
| c. Follow up coaching | | 2.07 | Low | |

Despite the weaknesses above, the students, as shown in Table 6, have fulfilled the minimum standards of competencies in making telephone call, conversation and messages as well as conversational operations and product presentation. However, all of the students obtained average scores in these competencies and, with a 2-hour session per week the time is far below intensive and rigorous English trainings. Wang and Tsai (2014) have shown that students have always placed more attention to skills related to specific jobs and English language skills in Table 6 are relevant with their jobs as housekeepers or front officers. Again, acquisition of job-related competencies alone would not increase their employability if they have no management skills (Gursoy, Rahman & Swanger, 2012; Millar, Mao & Moreo, 2013; Sisson & Adams, 2013).

Table 6: Attained Competencies

| No | Competencies | Sub-competencies | Mean Score | Category |
|----|--|---|------------|----------|
| 1 | Communicate in English on the telephone | a. Take general enquiries by phone | 3.28 | Average |
| | | b. Respond to customer requests or orders | 3.22 | Average |
| | | c. Make calls to place orders | 3.12 | Average |
| | | d. Handle customer complains | 3.03 | Average |
| | | e. Make complaints | 3.14 | Average |
| 2 | Converse in English at a basic operational level | a. Participate in simple conversations on familiar topics with work colleagues. | 3.2 | Average |
| | | b. Respond to simple verbal instructions or requests. | 3.12 | Average |
| | | c. Make simple requests | 3.06 | Average |
| | | d. Describe routine procedures | 3.04 | Average |
| | | e. Express like, dislike, and preferences | 3.1 | Average |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|------|---------|
| | | f. Identify different forms of expression in English | 3.15 | Average |
| 3 | Gather and present product information | a. Gather and organise information | 3.22 | Average |
| | | b. Research and analyse information | 3.13 | Average |
| | | c. Present information | 3.14 | Average |
| 4 | Facilitate outgoing phone calls | a. Identify elements and facilities of the host enterprise telephone system. | 3.08 | Average |
| | | b. Demonstrate appropriate telephone communication skills | 3.16 | Average |
| | | c. Place outgoing calls on behalf of the enterprise | 3.14 | Average |
| | | d. Place outgoing calls on behalf of the guests | 3.19 | Average |
| 5 | Write a short message in English | a. Demonstrate the ability to take message from oral input | 3.07 | Average |
| | | b. Write short instructional messages | 3.1 | Average |
| | | c. Write short messages of appreciation, apology, and explanation for absence. | 3.05 | Average |

Good Practices: Lesson Learned

Despite weaknesses in the scope and quality of competency mastery above, several good practices can be found in political, institutional, and instructional practices.

At macro-national level, the CATC for English have been dedicatively responded to with strong political supports from the national government. The program has been made in line with the national qualification framework (see Hickman & Irwin, 2013) which is a national agenda where all Indonesian workers graduating from specialized training institutions should acquire a particular set of knowledge, attitudes and competencies (see Premono, 2010; Rofaida, 2013). The documents of the CATC for English have become the main content of the knowledge and competencies for tourism-related fields. There has also been a strong financial support from the Indonesian ministry of tourism by setting up associations of tourism-related professionals. Meetings, conferences, trainings, and assessment of such professionals at national and local levels have been conducted and funded by the ministry. Certification of the teachers and the professionals as trainers, masters, master trainers and assessors have also been executed by the ministry (see also Hickman & Irwin, 2013).

At meso-institutional level, dedicative responses to the CATC can be seen in the mission statements, educational expences, and institutional programs. In the vision statements of the institutions, commitment to quality output has been the main focus where quality is used to refer to the notion of alumni having professional work-related competencies. These visions have been delineated further into mission statements where quality teachers, processes, students, and alumni have been the main emphases. Not only have local teachers and students been funded to visit and learn at national and international tourism institutes, national and international tourism experts have been invited to train them at home institutions and this is essential to upgrade students' competencies as expected by hospitality industries (Gursoy, Rahman & Swanger, 2012; Millar, Mao & Moreo, 2013; Wang and Tsai, 2014).. Cooperation among local tourism institutes has enabled them to plan ahead which institute invites which experts when and where and there has been no need for unnecessary competitions. Cooperation is also apparent in mutual collaboration in student internship programs. Sharing of schecules and tourism companies as internship partners has been common because internship students usually outnumber the companies. Being actively executed in the last five years, these innovative actions were not mentioned in Hickman and Irwin's (2013) report.

At micro-instructional level, the quality of the teachers and the students, to a great extent, has accommodated all the basic qualifications that the CATC for English has expected. Having been nationally and internationally trained, 44% of the English teachers have national and international certificates as trainers, masters, and master trainers of tourism English competencies, while 56% of them have obtained similar certificates in other fields of tourism. More than 56% of them have involved in national tourism teacher exchange programs and more than 10% have experienced studying and teaching at other tourism education institutions in other ASEAN countries. With such expertise, tourism teachers are expected to adapt the curriculum and students' competencies with 'the ever-changing needs of [the] enormous [tourism] industry' (Gursoy, Rahman & Swanger, 2012, p. 41). Local, national, regional, and international professionals have frequently been invited to share their expertises to teachers and students and these have primarily been the sources of real-life English practices for them. Several students have also been sent to other tourism institutes in Indonesia and in other ASEAN countries for profession-based trainings and they have also obtained local, national, regional, or international certificates of particular tourism-related professions.

Facilitating and Inhibiting Factors

The political, institutional, and instructional practices above have been the facilitating factors in the implementation of the CATC for Tourism English. Recently, however, they have also become the inhibiting factors.

At the national level, the national agenda as well as the strong ministerial and financial supports have recently weakened as the national financial recourses have shifted from tourism to infrastructure and then to combat corona virus. The construction of local MotoGP infrastructure has also devoured the fund for other purposes including tourism education. This event, nonetheless, introduces a new form of tourism for the local institutions to respond to. New hotels and restaurants being built for the 2023 grandprix open up new hopes and job opportunities for the students but the history of workforce import particularly for China has devastating effects on the students' learning motivation. With motivation trainings, the students are expected to stay positive in the prospect of their own future (Christou, 2002).

At meso institutional level, tourism education institutions are facing problematic situations. The commitment to producing alumni with competencies expected by tourism industries (see Gursoy, Rahman & Swanger, 2012; Millar, Mao & Moreo, 2013; Sisson & Adams, 2013; Wang & Tsai, 2014) is recently questioned as the government and the community expect the students to graduate on time and the average length of tenure is also essential part to the institutional accreditation. As a result, low competencies have been compromised. The support to staff and student development has also been compromised resulting from annually diminishing number of paying students. Educated unemployment has annually increased, prospective students have become very few, and the institutions lost the main sources of the revenue. The much-needed ASEAN internship and student exchange programs have also been conceded due to the financial losses. Some institutions solved the problem by recruiting sponsorship from their business partners.

At micro instructional level, the financial loss brings with it a price to pay. Some institutions have lost qualified trainers, masters, and master trainers and they can only freshly graduated English teachers with limited teaching experience, low English competence, and pedagogic skills. When participating in teacher exchange programs, they oftentimes become very passive. When invited to classes, expert teachers find difficulties working with the new teachers as they often loss self-confidence. Some students might be able to develop professional skills, but some others are unmotivated. While there are some opportunities for student exchange program for tourism trainings, the majority of the students cannot participate due to poor English. There are some certified trainings, but such trainings are incidental and unplanned so the students cannot accommodate the schedule with learning schedule. Online registration or online trainings have

become a major mode of practice. Video recording the events have become another alternative and sharing them online through social media has been the most popular choice for spreading the skills.

Conclusion

Tourism, as a global business, requires personels with global competencies. The ASEAN ministries of tourism in collaboration with the Australian government have standardized common competencies in common curricula and common systems of competency recognition. The article has investigated how these systems have locally worked with housekeeping and all housekeeping-related English competencies. While success stories in the housekeeping trial have been widely shared at global-ASEAN and macro-national levels, studies at meso and micro levels have reported otherwise. While a number of factors are found to have facilitated and others have hindered the success story, local tourism education institutions have agentially exercised agency in solving those challenges.

References

- Ahmad Afip, Liyana, Hamid, M. Obaidul & Renshaw, Peter. (2019) Common European framework of reference for languages (CEFR): insights into global policy borrowing in Malaysian higher education, *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 17:3, 378-393, DOI: 10.1080/14767724.2019.1578195
- Ali, N. L. (2013). *Language Policy and Planning in Malaysia: Managing English-Medium Instruction at Tertiary Levels*. Unpublished PhD Dissertation, The University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia.
- Aouta, G. 2013. *An Analysis of Some Internal and External Factors Influencing Learners' in English Foreign Language*. A Dissertation. University of Biskra.
- ASEAN. 2013. *ASEAN Mutual Recognition Arrangement (MRA) on Tourism Professionals Handbook*. Jakarta: Association of Southeast Asian Nations.
- Baldauf, R.B. (2006). Rearticulating the case for micro language planning in a language ecology context. *Current Issue in Language Planning*, 7(2-3), 147-170. doi: 10.2167/cilp092.0
- Batang, B. L., Egipto, L., & Medriano, R. S. (2019). EFL Students' Performance in the Analysis of Syntactic Structures. *Asian EFL Journal*, 22 (1).
- Best, J. W. and Khan, J. 2006. *Research in Education*. New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India Pvt. Ltd.

- Biro Pusat Statistik (BPS). (2015). Jumlah Kunjungan Wisatawan Mancanegara Selama Tahun 2014 Mencapai 9,44 Juta Kunjungan, Naik 7,19 Persen Dibanding Kunjungan Selama Tahun 2013. <https://www.bps.go.id/pressrelease/2015/02/02/1104/jumlah-kunjungan-wisatawan-mancanegara-selama-tahun-2014-mencapai-9-44-juta-kunjungan--naik-7-19-persen-dibanding-kunjungan-selama-tahun-2013.html>. Diakses 12 Februari 2020 pukul 18.00 WITA
- Biro Pusat Statistik (BPS). (2019). Data BPS: Jumlah Turis ke Indonesia Naik 2,94 Persen di Agustus 2019. <https://www.merdeka.com/uang/data-bps-jumlah-turis-ke-indonesia-naik-294-persen-di-agustus-2019.html>. Diakses 12 Februari 2020 pukul 18.00 WITA
- Boman, Björn. (2020) What makes Estonia and Singapore so good?, *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 18:2, 181-193, DOI: 10.1080/14767724.2019.1701420
- Borg, S. (2011). Self-Perception and Practice in Teaching Grammar. *ELT Journal*, 55 (1): 21-29.
- Bowen, A. G. (2009). *Document Analysis as a Qualitative Research Method*. Qualitative Research Journal Vol. 9 No.2.
- Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. Pearson Education International: USA.
- Burns, A. (1999). *Collaborative Action Research for English Language Teachers*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Butler, R. W. (1999). Sustainable tourism: A state-of-the-art review. *Tourism geographies*, 1(1), 7-25.
- Chen, Z., and Goh, C. (2011). Teaching oral English in higher education: Challenges to EFL teachers. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 16, 333–345.
- Christou, Evangelos. (2002). Revisiting Competencies for Hospitality Management: Contemporary Views of the Stakeholders, *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Education*, 14:1, 25-32, DOI: 10.1080/10963758.2002.10696721
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Crocco, O. S., & Bunwirat, N. (2014). English in ASEAN: Key effects. *International Journal of the Computer, the Internet and Management*, 22(2), 22-27.
- Ellis, R. 1994. *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Evans, G. (1999). Networking for growth and digital business: Local urban tourism smtes and ict. In *Information and communication technologies in tourism 1999* (pp. 376-387). Springer, Vienna.
- Flick, U. 2006. *An Introduction to Qualitative Research*. London: Sage.

- Fu, J., Kapiki, S., & Mu, L. (2016). Reengineering Knowledge for e-Tourism and Hospitality Curriculum. *Journal of Tourism, Heritage & Services Marketing*, 2(2). Online at <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/77852/> MPRA Paper No. 77852, posted 23 Mar 2017 15:51 UT
- Fukunaga, Y. (2015). Assessing the progress of ASEAN MRAs on professional services. *ERIA discussion paper series*, 21.
- Giroux, H. A. (1994). Teachers, public life, and curriculum reform. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 69(3), 35-47.
- Good, T. M. and Brophy, J. 1990. *Educational Psychology: A Realistic Approach (fourth edition)*. London. Longman.
- Gursoy, Dogan, Rahman, Imran & Swanger, Nancy., (2012). Industry's Expectations from Hospitality Schools: What has changed?, *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Education*, 24:4, 32-42, DOI: 10.1080/10963758.2012.10696679
- Hamid, M. O., & Baldauf Jr, R. B. (2011). English and socio-economic disadvantage: Learner voices from rural Bangladesh. *Language Learning Journal*, 39(2), 201-217.
- Hamid, M. O., Zhu, L., & Baldauf, R.B., Jr. (2014). Norms and varieties of English and TESOL Teacher Agency. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 39(10).
- Hamid, M.O. 2014. World Englishes in international proficiency tests. *World Englishes*, 33 (2), 263–277. John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Hamid, M.O., and Nguyen, H.T.M. (2016) Globalization, English Language Policy, and Teacher Agency: Focus on Asia, *The International Education Journal: Comparative Perspectives*, 15 (1): 26-44.
- Harmer, J. 2001. *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. Third Edition England: Pearson Education.
- Harris, J. 2015. Teacher Agency during the Introduction of English Activities in Japanese elementary Schools. In Ng, P.C.L. and E.F. Boucher-Yip (Eds.) *Teacher Agency and Policy Response in English Language Teaching*. New York, Routledge, pp. 26-40.
- Hedge, T. 2000. *Teaching and Learning in the Language Classroom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hickman, A. and Irwin, J. 2013. *Gap Analysis on Implementation of MRA on Tourism Professionals*. Final Report. ASEAN Australia Development Cooperation Program Phase II (AADCP).

- Holliday, A. (2001). Achieving Cultural Continuity in Curriculum Innovation. In Hall, D.R., and Hewings, A. (Eds.) *Innovation in English Language Teaching: a Reader*. London and New York, Routledge, pp. 169-177.
- Johnson, B. and Turner, L.A. 2003. *Data Collection Strategies in Mixed Method Research*. In A. Tashakkari & C. Teddie (Eds.) *Handbook of Mixed Method in Social and Behavioral Research* (pp. 279-319). Thousand Oaks. CA: Sage.
- Johnson, B.J. 2006. *Foreign Language Learning: An Exploratory Study on the External and Internal Influences Affecting Success*. Thesis. Unpublished. Faculty of Baylor University.
- King, Brian & Tang, Candy Mei Fung (2020) Training Hotels in Asia: An Exploration of Alternative Models, *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Education*, 32:1, 43-54, DOI: 10.1080/10963758.2019.1654883
- Knupfer, N. N. and McLellan, H. 1996. *Descriptive Research Methodologies*. New York: MacMillan.
- Kurniarini, Ni Nyoman Yunike, 2019. *Factors Hindering The Attainment Of Asean Common Competency Standard Among Tourism Students at Akademi Komunitas Negeri (AKN) Lombok Barat*. Disertasi Master di Prodi Magister Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris, FKIP Universitas Mataram.
- Lightbrown, P. and Spada, N. 2006. *How Languages are Learned*. Third edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lin, S. C. (2002). Exploring the relationships between hotel management courses and industry required competencies. *Journal of Teaching in Travel & Tourism*, 2(3/4), 81–101.
- Liputan6.com. 2019. *Menpar Targetkan Devisa dari Sektor Pariwisata Capai 20 Miliar Dolar AS*. <https://www.liputan6.com/lifestyle/read/4087332/menpar-targetkan-devisa-dari-sektor-pariwisata-capai-20-miliar-dolar-as>. Accessed on 12 February 2020 at 18.00 WITA
- Maulina, L., & Khaerudin, I. R. (2019, March). Curriculum Evaluation on Hotel Administration Study Program at Bandung Tourism Higher Education. In *International Symposium on Social Sciences, Education, and Humanities (ISSEH 2018)*. Atlantis Press.
- McDonough, H. 1981. *Psychology in Foreign language Teaching*. London. Longman.
- Mendoza, D. R., & Sugiyarto, G. (2017). *The long road ahead: status report on the implementation of the ASEAN mutual recognition arrangements on professional services*. Asian Development Bank.
- Mendoza, D. R., Desiderio, M. V., Sugiyarto, G., & Salant, B. (2016). *Open Windows, Closed Doors: Mutual Recognition Arrangements on Professional Services in the ASEAN Region*. Asian Development Bank.

- Millar, Michelle., Mao, , Zhenxing, & Moreo, Patrick. (2010) Hospitality & Tourism Educators vs. The Industry: A Competency Assessment, *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Education*, 22:2, 38-50, DOI: 10.1080/10963758.2010.10696975
- Molina, S. C. 2017. English Language Teaching in China. In Ng, P.C.L. and E.F. Boucher-Yip (Eds.) *Teacher Agency and Policy Response in English Language Teaching*. New York, Routledge, pp. 7-25.
- Ng, P. C. L, and Boucher-Yip, E. F. (2017). Introduction. In Ng, P.C.L. and E.F. Boucher-Yip (Eds.) *Teacher Agency and Policy Response in English Language Teaching*. New York, Routledge, pp. 1-9.
- Nguyen, H., & Chaisawat, M. (2011). The current situation and future development of hospitality and tourism higher education in Vietnam. *Tourism, Hospitality and Culinary Arts*, 3(2), 57-67.
- Nunan, D. 1999. *Research Method in Language Learning*. Eighth Printing. Cambridge: CUP.
- Pessoa, R R and Freitas, M.T.D.H. 2012. Challenges in Critical Language Teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40 (4): 753-776.
- Phan, T.T.H., and Hamid, M.O. (2016). Learner Autonomy in Foreign Language Policies in Vietnamese Universities: an Exploration of Teacher Agency from a Sociocultural Perspective. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2016.1201231>
- Premono, A. (2010). Kompetensi keahlian Sekolah Menengah Kejuruan: antara kebijakan dan realita. *Jurnal Pendidikan Penabur*, 9(15), 50-61.
- Raybould, M., & Wilkins, H. (2005). Over qualified and under experienced: Turning graduates into hospitality managers. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 17(3), 203–216.
- Rofaida, R. (2013). Model Peningkatan Kompetensi Sumberdaya Manusia pada Sektor Pariwisata di Kota Bandung Sebagai Upaya Meningkatkan Daya Saing Sektor Pariwisata. *Jurnal Manajemen dan Bisnis Indonesia*, 1(1), 127-146.
- Say, B. (2019). *Implementation of the Common ASEAN Tourism Curriculum and its Effects on Cambodian Hospitality Training Programmes* (Doctoral dissertation, Auckland University of Technology).
- Selinger, H. W. and Shohamy, E. 1989. *Second Language Research Methods*. Oxford: OUP.
- Sisson, L, and Adams, A. (2013) Essential Hospitality Management Competencies: The Importance of Soft Skills, *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Education*, 25:3, 131-145, DOI: 10.1080/10963758.2013.826975

- Stewart, J., & Knowles, V. (2000). Graduate recruitment: Implications for business and management courses in HE. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 25(2/3/4), 98–108.
- Suherlan, H. (2017). Strategic alliances in institutions of higher education: a case study of Bandung and Bali Institutes of Tourism in Indonesia. *International Journal of Tourism Cities*.
- Tomlison, B. (2011). Introduction: Principles and Procedures of Materials Development. In Tomlison, B. (Ed.) *Materials Development in Language Teaching*. Cambridge, UK, Cambridge University Press, pp. 1-34
- Tsui, A. B., Shum, M. S., Wong, C. K., Tse, S. K., & Ki, W. W. (1999). Which agenda? Medium of instruction policy in post-1997 Hong Kong. *Language Culture and Curriculum*, 12(3), 196-214.
- Ventura-Cauilan, M. & Arellano-Tamayo, R. (2019). Communication Strategies of Cagayan State University Professors: Basis for the Conduct of Common European Framework Reference (CEFR) Proficiency Test in Higher Institution. *Asian EFL Journal*, 22 (1).
- Wade, C and Tavris, C. 1990. *Psychology*. Harper and Row, Publishers, New York .U.S.A.
- Wallas, M. J. (2001) “*Action Research for Language Teachers*”. Cambridge. University Press.
- Wang, Yao-Fen & Tsai, Chen-Tsang (Simon). (2014) Employability of Hospitality Graduates: Student and Industry Perspectives, *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Education*, 26:3, 125-135, DOI: 10.1080/10963758.2014.935221.
- Weber, Melvin R., Crawford, Alleah., Lee, Junghoon (Jay) & Dennison, Dori (2013) An Exploratory Analysis of Soft Skill Competencies Needed for the Hospitality Industry, *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism*, 12:4, 313-332, DOI: 10.1080/15332845.2013.790245
- William, M. and Burden, R. L. 1997. *Psychology for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: University Press.
- World travel and Tourism Council (2019). Tourism and Travel-Related Service. https://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/serv_e/tourism_e/tourism_e.htm. Accessed on 18 Marh 2020 at 19.00 PM
- Zapp, Mike (2019) Empowerment for individual agency: an analysis of international organizations’ curriculum recommendations, *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 17:2, 231-260, DOI: 10.1080/14767724.2019.1577717
- Zhao, S., and Baldouf, R. B. 2012. Individual Agency in Language Planning. *Language Problems and Language Planning*, 36 (1): 1-24.