



Educational System Alignment and English Proficiency: A Comparative Inquiry into Indonesia, Singapore, Malaysia, and the Philippines

Andika Guruh Saputra¹, Angely Christia Sumendap², Sukarno³

^{1,2,3}English Education, Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta, Indonesia

Article Info

Article history:

Received May 09, 2026

Revised Mar 12, 2026

Accepted Jun 03, 2026

Keywords:

Curriculum Design;
English Proficiency;
Language Policy;
Pedagogical Practices;
System Alignment.

ABSTRACT

This study addresses the persistent gap in English proficiency between Indonesia and several Southeast Asian countries despite the widespread provision of English instruction in schools. Previous studies have often examined language policy, curriculum, pedagogy, and exposure as separate factors, providing limited understanding of how these elements interact within an educational system. Therefore, this study investigates how these components collectively influence English learning outcomes. Using a conceptual and comparative analytical approach, the study synthesizes secondary data and relevant literature to explain differences in English proficiency across Southeast Asian contexts. The findings indicate that proficiency is shaped less by the length of instruction than by the alignment of educational components. In Indonesia, English is primarily treated as a school subject, resulting in limited exposure and few opportunities for meaningful language use. In contrast, countries such as Singapore, Malaysia, and the Philippines integrate English into content learning through bilingual or English-medium instruction, supported by communicative curricula and interactive teaching practices. This alignment promotes sustained exposure and authentic language use in academic and social settings. The study contributes a system-alignment perspective that explains proficiency differences beyond individual educational factors. The findings imply that improving English outcomes requires stronger coherence among language policy, curriculum, pedagogy, and exposure opportunities rather than simply increasing instructional time.

This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC license.



Corresponding Author:

Andika Guruh Saputra,
English Education,
Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta,
Jl. Colombo No.1, Karangmalang, Catur Tunggal, Kec. Depok, Sleman, Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta 55281
Email: andikaguruhsaputra96@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

English proficiency has become an important indicator of educational quality in the global era, particularly in Southeast Asia where multilingual practices intersect with global economic and educational demands. Despite years of formal English instruction, Indonesia continues to demonstrate lower English proficiency levels compared to neighboring countries such as Singapore, Malaysia, and the Philippines (T. Chen, 2025; Clarke, 2025). According to the 2025 EF English Proficiency Index (EF EPI), Indonesia remains in the low proficiency category, while Singapore, Malaysia, and the Philippines demonstrate significantly higher proficiency performance. These differences suggest that instructional duration alone does not necessarily guarantee successful

language outcomes. As Kirkpatrick and Liddicoat (2017) argue, language education outcomes are strongly shaped by how English is positioned within educational policy, curriculum, and classroom practice.

This issue contributes to broader discussions in curriculum studies, bilingual education, and second language acquisition (SLA). Curriculum quality is no longer viewed merely as content organization, but as the alignment among learning objectives, pedagogy, assessment, and communicative competence development (Wahdini et al., 2025). In this study, the focus is positioned on curriculum architecture, referring to how curriculum structures, pedagogical practices, and language exposure interact systematically to support language development. SLA perspectives further emphasize that language learning develops through meaningful interaction and contextualized exposure rather than passive memorization of grammatical rules (Almohawes, 2024). Atkinson et al. (2025) additionally explain that language development is shaped by interaction, identity, and learning environments.

Previous studies have examined curriculum orientation, bilingual education, and language policy in relation to English proficiency outcomes. Form-focused approaches tend to emphasize grammatical accuracy and examination performance, often limiting communicative language use (Cocca, 2019; Doloh & Hadiyanto, 2025; Jomaa, 2025; Wolf, 2022). In contrast, communicative approaches contribute positively to learner engagement and confidence, particularly when supported by meaningful classroom interaction (Cheng, 2021). Research on bilingual and immersion education similarly demonstrates that sustained language exposure and functional language use support stronger language outcomes (Johnson, 2010; Lee, 2025; Reljic et al., 2015; Serafini et al., 2020). In Southeast Asia, countries such as Singapore, Malaysia, and the Philippines implement different language policies and bilingual practices, producing different levels of English exposure and communicative opportunities within education systems (Azman et al., 2024; Curdt-Christiansen & Sun, 2016; Jain & Wee, 2019; Tupas & Martin, 2016).

However, many previous studies still examine curriculum design, bilingual education, language policy, or English proficiency separately. Comparative studies frequently describe structural differences among countries without sufficiently explaining how curriculum orientation, pedagogy, language policy, and language exposure interact systematically to influence English proficiency outcomes (Azman et al., 2024; Chakrabhand, 2025; Loh, 2022; Rahmawati et al., 2024). Therefore, this study positions itself by examining curriculum architecture, language policy, pedagogical practices, and language exposure as interconnected dimensions within Southeast Asian education systems.

To address this gap, the study aims to explain differences in English proficiency between Indonesia and selected Southeast Asian countries by examining the interaction between language policy, curriculum design, pedagogical practices, and language exposure. The study focuses on Indonesia as the primary context, with Singapore, Malaysia, and the Philippines serving as comparative cases. The findings are expected to contribute theoretically to discussions on curriculum quality and bilingual education, while also providing practical insights for policymakers, curriculum developers, and educators regarding communicative pedagogy and language exposure in English language learning.

The remainder of this article is organized as follows. Section 2 reviews relevant literature on curriculum quality, bilingual education, and language policy. Section 3 outlines the conceptual methodology employed in the study, followed by Section 4, which provides analysis and discussion. Finally, Section 5 concludes the study by summarizing key findings and implications.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Curriculum quality has long been recognized as an important factor influencing educational outcomes, particularly in English language learning. In language education, curriculum quality refers not only to content organization, but also to the alignment among learning objectives, pedagogy, assessment, and communicative competencies. Wahdini et al. (2025) argue that contemporary curriculum development increasingly emphasizes flexibility, contextualized learning, and

communicative competence to respond to global educational demands. From this perspective, curriculum quality may influence English proficiency because it shapes how learners interact with language inside and outside classrooms.

This study is theoretically grounded in communicative language teaching, bilingual education, and second language acquisition perspectives. These perspectives collectively suggest that language proficiency develops more effectively when learners are exposed to meaningful interaction, sustained language use, and contextualized communication rather than isolated grammatical instruction. Y. Chen et al. (2026) found that communicative approaches positively contribute to learner engagement and second-language self-efficacy, while Qin et al. (2024) emphasize that language learning becomes more effective when communication and cognitive engagement are integrated during instruction. In contrast, form-focused curricula often prioritize grammatical accuracy and examination performance, potentially creating a gap between linguistic knowledge and communicative ability.

Within this framework, curriculum quality is closely connected to bilingual education and language policy. Johnson (2010) explains that bilingual education supports language acquisition by integrating language use into academic and social interaction. Similarly, Serafini et al. (2020) report that bilingual and immersion programs generally produce stronger language outcomes because learners experience more consistent exposure and authentic communication. However, scholars also debate the implementation of bilingual policies. While bilingual systems may strengthen communicative competence, tensions frequently emerge between global competitiveness, national identity, and unequal educational access (Curdtt-Christiansen & Sun, 2016). This debate is particularly visible in Southeast Asia, where countries adopt different positions regarding the role of English within national education systems.

In Southeast Asia, Singapore, Malaysia, and the Philippines represent different approaches to English language policy and curriculum implementation. Singapore applies a highly institutionalized bilingual policy where English functions as the primary medium of instruction alongside mother tongue languages (Jain & Wee, 2019). Malaysia implements the Dual Language Programme (DLP), integrating English into selected academic subjects while maintaining the national language as a central identity marker (Azman et al., 2024). Meanwhile, the Philippines has historically implemented English Medium Instruction (EMI), positioning English as both an academic and social language (Tupas & Martin, 2016). In contrast, English in Indonesia is generally positioned as a foreign language subject with more limited classroom exposure and communicative practice opportunities.

These differences indicate that English proficiency outcomes cannot be explained solely by instructional duration. Instead, language policy, curriculum orientation, pedagogical practices, and language exposure interact systematically in shaping learning outcomes. Kirkpatrick and Liddicoat (2017) further argue that differences in language policy across Southeast Asia strongly influence classroom interaction, communicative opportunities, and the functional role of English within education systems. Lee (2025) similarly emphasize that multilingualism should be viewed as an educational resource rather than a barrier because meaningful language exposure contributes significantly to communicative development.

Despite extensive studies on curriculum quality, bilingual education, and English proficiency, these dimensions are often discussed separately. Comparative studies frequently describe structural differences among countries without sufficiently explaining how policy, curriculum, pedagogy, and exposure interact within broader educational systems (Rahmawati et al., 2024). As a result, limited conceptual understanding exists regarding why countries with similar years of English instruction may produce significantly different proficiency outcomes. Therefore, this study seeks to examine curriculum quality, bilingual education, language policy, and language exposure as interconnected dimensions influencing English proficiency outcomes in Southeast Asian education systems.

3. RESEARCH METHOD

This study employed a conceptual and comparative analytical approach to examine differences in curriculum quality and English proficiency outcomes between Indonesia and selected Southeast

Asian countries, namely Singapore, Malaysia, and the Philippines. The conceptual approach was chosen because the study aimed to explain how language policy, curriculum design, pedagogical practices, and language exposure interact systematically in shaping English proficiency outcomes rather than statistically testing causal relationships. In conceptual research, knowledge is constructed through critical interpretation, logical synthesis, and comparative analysis of previous studies within broader sociocultural and educational contexts (Johnson, 2010; Kirkpatrick & Liddicoat, 2017). This approach was considered appropriate because English proficiency is influenced by interconnected systemic factors that cannot be fully explained through isolated statistical variables alone.

The study relied on secondary data consisting of peer-reviewed journal articles, academic books, international reports, and EF English Proficiency Index (EF EPI) data. Literature sources were selected systematically using purposive sampling based on four relevance criteria: publication credibility, recency of publication, thematic relevance to English language education, and contextual relevance to Southeast Asian education systems. The selected literature focused on curriculum design, bilingual education, language policy, pedagogical practices, communicative language teaching, and language exposure. Sources lacking methodological clarity or academic credibility were excluded from the analysis.

To reduce selection bias, the study included literature representing multiple perspectives regarding English language education, including studies supporting communicative approaches as well as research discussing challenges in bilingual education and curriculum implementation. This strategy was intended to avoid relying only on literature that supported a single argument and to provide a more balanced conceptual interpretation of the regional English proficiency gap.

The EF EPI data were included because they provide large-scale international English proficiency indicators based on data from approximately 2.2 million test takers across 123 countries and regions. The index was considered sufficiently reliable for comparative analysis because it is widely used in international discussions of English proficiency trends and presents standardized proficiency classifications across countries. In addition, EF EPI findings have frequently been discussed alongside other international English assessments such as IELTS and TOEFL, allowing broader interpretation of national English proficiency conditions.

The units of analysis were the national education systems of Indonesia, Singapore, Malaysia, and the Philippines. The comparison focused on four dimensions: language policy, curriculum design, pedagogical practices, and language exposure. These dimensions were operationalized by examining how English is positioned within national curricula, how communicative competence is emphasized in instructional practice, how classroom pedagogy supports language interaction, and how learners are exposed to English both inside and outside educational settings (Lee, 2025; Serafini et al., 2020). In this study, a “better” curriculum referred to a curriculum that demonstrates stronger alignment between communicative objectives, pedagogical implementation, and opportunities for meaningful language use.

Data were collected through a structured literature review and analyzed using logical synthesis and systematic cross-country comparison. Logical synthesis was used to integrate findings from multiple studies and identify recurring patterns related to English language learning outcomes. Meanwhile, systematic cross-country comparison examined similarities and differences among the selected countries based on the four analytical dimensions. The comparison process involved identifying policy orientation, curriculum characteristics, pedagogical implementation, language exposure, and English proficiency outcomes before interpreting broader systemic relationships. This approach aligns with the perspective that comparative analysis should explain structural interactions rather than merely describe differences among countries (Rahmawati et al., 2024).

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

In this section, it is explained the results of research and at the same time is given the comprehensive discussion. Results can be presented in figures, graphs, tables and others that make the reader

understand easily (Bayraksan & Love, 2015; Jiang & Guan, 2016) The discussion can be made in several sub-chapters.

Results

1. Language Policy (Function of English)

Language policy determines how English is positioned and utilized within an education system, which in turn shapes the nature and frequency of language use in learning contexts. In Southeast Asia, differences in policy orientation significantly influence whether English functions as a subject of study or as a medium for communication and knowledge construction (Kirkpatrick & Liddicoat, 2017; Lee, 2025).

Table 1. Language Policy

Country	Status of English	Role in Instruction	Exposure Level
Indonesia	EFL	Subject only	Low
Singapore	MOI	All subjects	Very High
Malaysia	Partial MOI (DLP)	Selected subjects	Moderate
Philippines	EMI	Wide use	Very High

As presented in Table 1, Indonesia positions English primarily as a foreign language subject rather than a medium for broader academic communication. This position limits students' opportunities to use English beyond designated classroom sessions. However, the findings do not suggest that Indonesian English education is entirely ineffective. Instead, the analysis indicates that English exposure remains structurally restricted compared to systems where English functions as a medium of instruction or institutional communication.

In Singapore and the Philippines, English operates not only as a school subject but also as a functional language for academic interaction and wider communication. Malaysia demonstrates a more hybrid model through the Dual Language Programme (DLP), where English is integrated into selected academic subjects. These policy differences appear to influence the continuity of language exposure and opportunities for communicative use.

Rather than implying direct causality, the comparative findings suggest that systems providing broader functional roles for English tend to create more sustained language interaction opportunities. This pattern supports Kirkpatrick & Liddicoat (2017) argument that language policy shapes not only curriculum structure but also communicative practices within educational systems.

2. Curriculum Design

Curriculum orientation influences whether English is approached primarily as grammatical knowledge or as a communicative tool for interaction and meaning-making.

Table 2. Curriculum Design

Country	Orientation	Focus	Integration
Indonesia	Form-focused	Grammar, exam	Low
SG/MY/PH	Communicative	Meaning, use	High

Table 2 demonstrates differences in curriculum emphasis across the selected countries. Indonesian curriculum implementation continues to emphasize grammatical structure, accuracy, and examination performance. Although communicative activities have gradually been introduced in recent curriculum reforms, classroom implementation still tends to prioritize form-focused learning practices.

In contrast, Singapore, Malaysia, and the Philippines demonstrate stronger communicative integration, where English is used more actively across learning activities and academic interaction. In these contexts, language learning is more closely connected to problem-solving, discussion, and content learning rather than isolated grammar instruction alone.

The findings suggest that curriculum architecture influences how learners perceive and use English. When language is positioned mainly as examinable knowledge, opportunities for authentic communication may become more limited. Conversely, communicative-oriented curricula appear to support broader functional engagement with the language. Nevertheless, curriculum orientation alone cannot fully explain proficiency outcomes because implementation quality, policy support, and sociolinguistic context also contribute significantly to language development.

3. Pedagogical Practices (Learning Process)

Pedagogical practices determine how curriculum is implemented and how learners interact with the language during instruction. The effectiveness of teaching lies in whether it promotes active engagement and meaningful language use (Doloh & Hadiyanto, 2025).

Table 3. Pedagogical Practices

Country	Teaching Style	Student Role	Language Use
Indonesia	Teacher-centered	Passive	Limited
SG/MY/PH	Student-centered	Active	High

The comparative findings indicate that Indonesian classrooms still frequently apply teacher-centered approaches characterized by explanation, translation, and controlled exercises. However, this does not mean that all Indonesian classrooms are entirely passive. Rather, the findings suggest that opportunities for extended communicative interaction remain relatively more limited compared to the selected neighboring countries.

In Singapore, Malaysia, and the Philippines, classroom practices tend to involve more discussion, collaborative learning, and task-based interaction. These approaches position learners as active participants who use English for communication rather than merely studying language structures. Such practices appear to support stronger engagement and more frequent language production opportunities.

Importantly, the findings should not be interpreted as evidence of direct causation between pedagogical style and national proficiency outcomes. Instead, the analysis indicates a recurring pattern in which interactive pedagogical environments are more consistently associated with sustained communicative language use.

4. Exposure (Quantity & Quality)

Exposure represents the cumulative outcome of policy, curriculum, and pedagogy, determining how frequently and meaningfully learners encounter English (Serafini et al., 2020).

Table 4. Exposure

Country	Frequency	Context	Overall Exposure
Indonesia	Low	Classroom only	Limited
Singapore	Very High	School + society	Extensive
Malaysia	Medium	Program-based	Moderate
Philippines	Very High	School + daily life	Extensive

The findings reveal that differences in English proficiency are associated not only with instructional duration, but also with the frequency and context of language exposure. In Indonesia, exposure is largely concentrated within formal classroom settings, limiting opportunities for repeated communicative interaction.

In contrast, Singapore and the Philippines demonstrate broader exposure extending beyond classrooms into academic, professional, and social contexts. Malaysia presents moderate exposure because access to bilingual learning opportunities varies depending on institutional participation in programs such as DLP.

The analysis suggests that meaningful and continuous exposure may create more favorable conditions for language acquisition. Nevertheless, exposure should not be understood solely in quantitative terms. The quality of interaction, communicative purpose, and learner engagement also appear to influence language development outcomes.

Integrated Analysis (Why the Gap Exists)

The findings of this study indicate that the gap in English proficiency is best explained by differences in system alignment. Language policy, curriculum design, pedagogical practices, and exposure function as interconnected components that shape learning outcomes.

Table 5. Integrated Analysis

System	Policy	Curriculum	Pedagogy	Exposure	Outcome
Indonesia	Less integrated	Form-focused dominant	More teacher-centered	Limited	Lower proficiency trend
SG/MY/PH	More integrated	More communicative	More interactive	Higher	Higher proficiency trend

The findings suggest that the English proficiency gap cannot be explained through a single variable alone. Instead, the analysis indicates that stronger alignment between policy orientation, curriculum implementation, pedagogical practices, and language exposure tends to create more supportive conditions for communicative language development.

Indonesia demonstrates a comparatively less integrated system in which English remains separated from broader academic and social use. Meanwhile, Singapore, Malaysia, and the Philippines demonstrate stronger integration between educational policy, communicative curriculum orientation, classroom interaction, and language exposure.

An important finding of this study is that longer instructional duration does not automatically produce higher proficiency outcomes. The comparison instead highlights the importance of systemic coherence and functional language use within educational environments. Therefore, the regional proficiency gap may be better understood as a reflection of differences in educational system alignment rather than differences in instructional time alone.

Discussion

The findings of this study indicate that differences in English proficiency between Indonesia and selected Southeast Asian countries are associated with differences in systemic alignment among language policy, curriculum orientation, pedagogical practices, and language exposure. Rather than identifying a single dominant cause, the comparative analysis suggests that English proficiency outcomes emerge from how these educational components interact within broader institutional structures. This finding extends previous comparative studies that often describe curriculum or policy differences separately without examining how these dimensions operate as interconnected systems (Chakrabhand, 2025; Rahmawati et al., 2024).

At the policy level, the study found that the functional positioning of English significantly shapes opportunities for communicative language use. In Indonesia, English is primarily positioned as a foreign language subject, limiting its role mainly to formal classroom instruction. In contrast, Singapore and the Philippines institutionalize English as a medium of instruction, while Malaysia applies a hybrid approach through the Dual Language Programme (DLP) (Azman et al., 2024; Jain & Wee, 2019; Tupas & Martin, 2016). The comparative findings suggest that systems providing broader academic and social functions for English tend to create more sustained exposure and interaction opportunities. However, the findings should not be interpreted as implying that Indonesia's English policy is entirely ineffective or that medium-of-instruction policies automatically guarantee higher proficiency. Instead, the analysis indicates that broader functional integration of English may support more continuous communicative engagement within educational environments (Kirkpatrick & Liddicoat, 2017; Lee, 2025).

The curriculum findings further demonstrate that curriculum orientation influences how learners perceive English within schooling contexts. Indonesian curriculum implementation still tends to emphasize grammatical accuracy and examination preparation, despite recent reforms promoting communicative learning. Meanwhile, Singapore, Malaysia, and the Philippines demonstrate stronger communicative integration where English is more actively connected to academic interaction, collaborative learning, and content-based activities. This finding supports previous arguments that communicative curriculum orientations may provide more opportunities for functional language use compared to highly form-focused approaches (Y. Chen et al., 2026; Qin et al., 2024). Nevertheless, this study does not claim that communicative curricula alone determine proficiency outcomes. Rather, the findings indicate that curriculum effectiveness depends on whether communicative objectives are consistently supported through policy structures, pedagogy, assessment systems, and sociolinguistic environments (Wahdini et al., 2025).

An important analytical finding of this study is that pedagogical practices appear to function as institutional adaptations rather than isolated teacher preferences. Indonesian classrooms are comparatively more teacher-centered and examination-oriented, but the findings suggest that this condition should not be oversimplified as merely reflecting teacher resistance toward communicative pedagogy. Instead, broader structural pressures such as examination demands, curriculum expectations, classroom management realities, and institutional accountability systems may shape instructional decisions (Asyifa et al., 2025). Previous studies on washback effects in Indonesian education similarly demonstrate that assessment structures strongly influence classroom practices by encouraging grammar-focused and test-oriented instruction (Doloh & Hadiyanto, 2025). In contrast, Singapore, Malaysia, and the Philippines demonstrate learning environments that more consistently support collaborative interaction, task-based learning, and communicative language use. Therefore, the comparative findings suggest that pedagogical interaction is closely connected to systemic conditions rather than functioning independently from policy and curriculum structures.

The exposure dimension further reinforces the importance of systemic integration. The findings demonstrate that differences in proficiency are associated not only with instructional duration, but also with the frequency, continuity, and communicative quality of language exposure. In Indonesia, exposure remains largely classroom-based and structurally limited. Meanwhile, learners in Singapore and the Philippines encounter English across academic, social, and professional domains, while Malaysian learners experience more moderate exposure through bilingual educational initiatives (Serafini et al., 2020; Yenn & Borres, 2025). These findings support sociocultural and interactionist perspectives in second language acquisition, which emphasize that language development is strengthened through meaningful interaction and repeated contextualized use rather than isolated grammatical instruction alone (Almohawes, 2024; Atkinson et al., 2025).

A major contribution of this study lies in its integrated interpretation of the regional proficiency gap. Previous comparative discussions often isolate curriculum, policy, or pedagogy as separate explanatory variables. In contrast, this study suggests that the proficiency gap is more appropriately understood through the concept of systemic coherence. Singapore, Malaysia, and the Philippines demonstrate comparatively stronger alignment between policy orientation, communicative curriculum goals, classroom interaction, and language exposure. These components appear to reinforce one another in supporting functional language use. Indonesia, meanwhile, demonstrates comparatively weaker integration among these dimensions, where communicative curriculum aspirations are not always fully supported by exposure opportunities, instructional realities, and broader systemic conditions.

Importantly, the study does not establish direct causal relationships because the research employed a conceptual comparative approach rather than experimental or statistical modeling. Instead, causality is interpreted cautiously through recurring cross-country patterns and systemic comparison. The findings therefore suggest associative and structural relationships rather than deterministic causal claims. This distinction is important because language proficiency outcomes are

influenced by multiple sociocultural, political, institutional, and economic factors beyond curriculum or pedagogy alone.

Overall, the findings indicate that improving English proficiency may require broader systemic alignment rather than isolated curriculum reform or increased instructional duration alone. Communicative policy goals may become difficult to achieve when assessment systems, classroom realities, pedagogical traditions, and language exposure remain structurally disconnected. Consequently, the study suggests that English language development is more effectively understood as an emergent outcome of interconnected educational systems rather than the product of single instructional variables.

5. CONCLUSION

This study examined how language policy, curriculum design, pedagogical practices, and language exposure interact within Southeast Asian education systems to explain differences in English proficiency outcomes. The findings suggest that English proficiency is associated not with a single educational factor, but with the degree of systemic coherence among policy orientation, curriculum implementation, classroom practices, and opportunities for communicative language use. Compared to Indonesia, Singapore, Malaysia, and the Philippines demonstrate stronger integration between these dimensions, enabling more continuous and meaningful exposure to English across academic and social contexts.

A key contribution of this study lies in its integrated comparative perspective. Unlike previous studies that tend to examine curriculum, pedagogy, bilingual education, or language policy separately, this study conceptualizes English proficiency as an outcome of broader system alignment. The study therefore contributes a systemic comparative framework showing how communicative curriculum goals may become difficult to achieve when policy structures, assessment systems, classroom practices, and exposure opportunities operate inconsistently. In the Indonesian context, the findings indicate that communicative curriculum reforms alone may not substantially improve proficiency unless they are supported by assessment reform, increased functional exposure, and more interactive pedagogical environments.

The study also offers several policy implications. First, English language policy may need to move beyond treating English solely as an isolated subject by increasing opportunities for functional and communicative language use within academic activities. Second, curriculum reform should be accompanied by assessment reform so that communicative objectives are aligned with classroom evaluation practices. Third, teacher professional development programs should support interactive and communicative teaching approaches while considering contextual classroom realities. Finally, schools may require broader exposure-supporting environments through bilingual activities, digital learning resources, collaborative projects, and communicative classroom practices that encourage meaningful language interaction beyond examination-oriented learning.

Nevertheless, this study is limited by its reliance on secondary data and its focus on selected Southeast Asian countries, which may not fully represent the complexity of all educational contexts. In addition, the conceptual-comparative design does not establish direct causal relationships. Future research may therefore employ empirical classroom-based approaches to examine how policy, curriculum, pedagogy, and exposure interact in actual instructional settings. Further comparative studies involving additional countries and sociolinguistic contexts may also contribute to a broader understanding of systemic factors influencing English language education outcomes.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The researcher also acknowledges the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI)-assisted tools during the writing and development process of this study such as DeepL, QuillBot and Grammarly. These tools were utilized to support language refinement, idea organization, and platform development in order to improve clarity, readability, and accessibility for readers. Nevertheless, all research design, data

interpretation, analysis, and final academic decisions remained entirely the responsibility of the researcher.

REFERENCES

- Almohawes, M. (2024). Second language acquisition theories and how they contribute to language learning. *World Journal of English Language*, 14(3), 181–193. <https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v14n3p181>
- Asyifa, F., Rodliyah, R. S., Amalia, L., & Mababaya, A. D. (2025). A comparative analysis of the Philippine and Indonesian English curricula at the elementary education level. *IJECA (International Journal of Education and Curriculum Application)*. <https://doi.org/10.31764/ijeca.v8i2.30813>
- Atkinson, D., Mejía-Laguna, J., Ribeiro, A., Cappellini, M., Kayyi-Aydar, H., & Lowie, W. (2025). Relationality, interconnectedness, and identity: A process-focused approach to second language acquisition and teaching (SLA/T). *The Modern Language Journal*, 109(S1), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12982>
- Azman, M. N. B., Chik, A., & Bodis, A. (2024). Malaysia's Dual Language Programme: A quest for equilibrium between globalization and national identity. *Current Issues in Language Planning*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2024.2442213>
- Bayraksan, G., & Love, D. K. (2015). Data-Driven Stochastic Programming Using Phi-Divergences. *The Operations Research Revolution*, (September), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1287/educ.2015.0134>
- Chakrabhand, C. (2025). Integrating multicultural education into primary school curricula in Southeast Asia: A comparative analysis of Indonesia, Malaysia, Thailand, and the Philippines. *Perfect Education Fairy*. <https://doi.org/10.56442/pef.v3i4.1258>
- Chen, T. (2025). Evaluating automated evaluation systems for spoken English proficiency: An exploratory comparative study with human raters. *Plos One*, 20(3). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0320811>
- Chen, Y., Yin, H., & Faya Ornia, M. G. (2026). The application of communicative language teaching in English education at Chinese universities. *Frontiers in Education*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2026.1762227>
- Cheng, X. (2021). Application of Multimedia Networks in Business English Teaching in Vocational College. *Journal of Healthcare Engineering*, 2021(Query date: 2026-05-29 15:33:42). <https://doi.org/10.1155/2021/5519472>
- Clarke, B. (2025). Determinants of L2 English Reading Proficiency among Thai Learners of English in Tertiary Education: A Multicomponent Perspective. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network*. <https://doi.org/10.70730/qhpy7996>
- Cocca, M. (2019). Affective variables and motivation as predictors of proficiency in English as a Foreign language. *Journal on Efficiency and Responsibility in Education and Science*, 12(3), 75–83. <https://doi.org/10.7160/eriesj.2019.120302>
- Curdt-Christiansen, X. L., & Sun, B. (2016). Nurturing bilingual learners: Challenges and concerns in Singapore. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 19(6), 689–703. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2016.1181606>
- Doloh, F., & Hadiyanto, H. (2025). Contrasting English pedagogies in Indonesian and Thai private schools. *International Journal of Language Teaching and Education*. <https://doi.org/10.22437/ijolte.v9i2.45683>
- Jain, R., & Wee, L. (2019). Language education policy. In *The Routledge international handbook of language education policy in Asia*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315666235-19>
- Jiang, R., & Guan, Y. (2016). Data-driven chance constrained stochastic program. *Mathematical Programming*, 158(1–2), 291–327. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10107-015-0929-7>
- Johnson, E. (2010). Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 13(4), 469–478. <https://doi.org/10.2307/23473608>
- Jomaa, N. J. (2025). Utilizing AI in learning English vocabulary among EFL Omani students: The relationship of academic performance and English proficiency. *Modern Methods for AI Integrated Language Curriculum*, (Query date: 2025-10-14 09:57:53), 1–31. <https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-9606-3.ch001>
- Kirkpatrick, A., & Liddicoat, A. (2017). Language education policy and practice in East and Southeast Asia. *Language Teaching*, 50(2), 155–188. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444817000027>

- Lee, S. Y. (2025). Toward optimal second language acquisition and proficiency: Addressing limited exposure and educational inequality in EFL contexts through home-based approaches and interdisciplinary insights. *Amperand*, 15(Query date: 2026-05-29 15:33:42). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amper.2025.100226>
- Loh, C. E. (2022). Innovating Towards Reading Excellence in the Singapore English Language Curriculum. *Education in the Asia Pacific Region*, 66(Query date: 2026-05-29 15:33:42), 301–317. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-16-9982-5_17
- Qin, J., Liu, D., & Lei, L. (2024). Cognitive linguistics-inspired language instruction. *Language Teaching*. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444824000119>
- Rahmawati, R., Saputra, A. H., & Madhakomala, R. (2024). Comparative study of education systems. *Siber International Journal of Digital Business*, 2(2). <https://doi.org/10.38035/sijdb.v2i2.118>
- Reljic, G., Ferring, D., & Martin, R. (2015). A meta-analysis on the effectiveness of bilingual programs. *Review of Educational Research*, 85(1), 92–128. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654314548514>
- Serafini, E. J., Rozell, N., & Winsler, A. (2020). Academic and English language outcomes for DLLs. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 23(8), 953–971. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2019.1707477>
- Tupas, R., & Martin, I. P. (2016). Bilingual and mother tongue-based multilingual education in the Philippines. In *Bilingual and multilingual education*. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-02324-3_18-1
- Wahdini, L., Murtini, M., Susandi, D., Rodiyah, S., & Sjafai, I. (2025). Reconstructing language curriculum. *EduLite*, 10(2), 377–394. <https://doi.org/10.30659/e.10.2.377-394>
- Wolf, M. K. (2022). Interconnection between constructs and consequences: A key validity consideration in K–12 English language proficiency assessments. *Language Testing in Asia*, 12(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-022-00194-1>
- Yenn, D., & Borres, A. (2025). English as a medium of instruction. *World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews*. <https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2025.26.1.1049>