



System Alignment and English Proficiency: A Comparative Conceptual Analysis of English Language Education in New Zealand, the Netherlands, and Indonesia

Angely Christia Sumendap¹, Andika Guruh Saputra², Sukarno³

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

Article Info	ABSTRACT
Article history: Received May 26, 2026 Revised Jun 03, 2026 Accepted Jun 23, 2026 Keywords: Comparative Education; Curriculum Design; English Proficiency; Language Policy; System Alignment.	This study employs a comparative conceptual analysis to examine how language policy, curriculum design, pedagogy, and language exposure shape English proficiency outcomes in New Zealand, the Netherlands, and Indonesia, representing English-dominant, high-performing non-native English-speaking, and EFL contexts respectively. Drawing on peer-reviewed literature, policy documents, curriculum frameworks, and international proficiency reports, the study introduces <i>system alignment</i> as a conceptual framework referring to the coherence among policy, curriculum, pedagogy, assessment, and language exposure in supporting meaningful language use. The findings indicate that New Zealand demonstrates the highest level of alignment through immersive exposure and integrated educational practices, while the Netherlands achieves strong alignment through communicative teaching, CLIL implementation, and extensive societal exposure to English. In contrast, Indonesia exhibits weaker alignment due to the limited functional role of English, form-focused instruction, and restricted opportunities for authentic language use. The study argues that English proficiency is better explained by system alignment than by instructional time alone, contributes to SLA and comparative education scholarship by highlighting the importance of system-level conditions in language learning, and suggests that English education reform in Indonesia requires coordinated improvements in policy, curriculum, pedagogy, and language exposure rather than isolated reforms. <i>This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC license.</i>



Corresponding Author:

Angely Chrstia Sumendap,
English Education,
Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta,
Yogyakarta, 55281, Indonesia.
Email: angelychrstia.2025@student.ac.id

1. INTRODUCTION

English proficiency has become an important indicator of educational quality, global competitiveness, and participation in international academic and professional communities. As a

global lingua franca, English functions not only as a system of grammar but also as a medium for communication, knowledge exchange, business, science, and technology (Almohawes, 2024; Yenn & Borres, 2025). Consequently, countries with higher levels of English proficiency tend to demonstrate stronger integration into the global economy and greater international engagement (Zulhaidir et al., 2025). However, similar years of formal instruction do not necessarily produce comparable proficiency outcomes. Differences in learning outcomes are influenced by multiple factors, including educational quality, teaching practices, language environments, opportunities for communication, and learners' exposure to authentic English.

To examine how these factors operate across different educational systems, this study focuses on New Zealand, the Netherlands, and Indonesia. These countries were selected because they represent three contrasting configurations of English language education: an English-dominant context (New Zealand), a high-performing non-native English-speaking context (the Netherlands), and a large English as a Foreign Language (EFL) context (Indonesia). New Zealand provides an environment in which English functions as both the first language and the primary medium of instruction, while the Netherlands consistently achieves high proficiency despite English not being the national language. Indonesia, by contrast, continues to report comparatively lower proficiency outcomes despite extensive formal English instruction. Examining these contrasting contexts provides a theoretically meaningful basis for understanding why English proficiency outcomes vary across educational systems.

Research in Second Language Acquisition (SLA) has long emphasized the importance of meaningful language use, exposure, and interaction in language development. The Input Hypothesis (Krashen, 1985), Interaction Hypothesis (Long, 1996), and Output Hypothesis (Swain, 1985) collectively suggest that successful language learning depends not only on formal instruction but also on opportunities for comprehensible input, interaction, and language production. Similarly, studies in curriculum, bilingual education, and language policy demonstrate that curriculum orientation, pedagogical practices, and the societal role of English influence learners' opportunities to develop communicative competence (Kirkpatrick & Liddicoat, 2017). Taken together, these perspectives indicate that language learning outcomes emerge from the interaction of multiple educational dimensions rather than from any single factor.

Despite these insights, existing comparative studies have often remained descriptive, focusing on isolated variables or specific national cases without adequately explaining how different educational dimensions interact to shape proficiency outcomes (Almohawes, 2024; Azman et al., 2024). To address this gap, the present study adopts a comparative conceptual analysis to examine how language policy, curriculum design, pedagogical practices, and language exposure interact across New Zealand, the Netherlands, and Indonesia. The study is guided by the concept of system alignment, defined as the degree of coherence among language policy, curriculum design, pedagogical practices, assessment systems, and opportunities for language exposure. A highly aligned system is characterized by mutually reinforcing components that consistently support meaningful language use, whereas a fragmented system contains inconsistencies that constrain language development.

The novelty of this study lies in introducing system alignment as a conceptual framework for explaining cross-national variation in English proficiency outcomes. Rather than treating policy, curriculum, pedagogy, or exposure as separate variables, the study argues that proficiency outcomes are better understood through the degree to which these dimensions work together as an integrated educational system. In doing so, the study contributes to SLA scholarship by extending attention from learner-level processes to the broader educational conditions that shape opportunities for input, interaction, and output. It also contributes to comparative education research by providing a framework for explaining why educational systems produce different language learning outcomes. Practically, the study offers insights for educational reform in Indonesia by suggesting that improvements in English proficiency are more likely to result from strengthening alignment among

policy, curriculum, pedagogy, assessment, and language exposure than from isolated reforms targeting a single dimension.

2. RESEARCH METHOD

This study employs a comparative conceptual analysis to examine how language policy, curriculum design, pedagogical practices, and language exposure shape English proficiency outcomes in New Zealand, the Netherlands, and Indonesia. This approach was selected to explain systemic mechanisms underlying differences in English language education through the synthesis of theoretical and empirical literature rather than statistical analysis or primary data collection (Creswell, 2014; Mackey & Gass, 2016). The study analyzed 68 sources, including peer-reviewed journal articles, policy documents, curriculum frameworks, academic books, and international proficiency reports obtained from Scopus, Web of Science, ERIC, Taylor & Francis Online, SpringerLink, and official government repositories. Only publications published between 2010 and 2026 were included. Sources were selected based on their relevance to English language education, language policy, curriculum studies, bilingual education, comparative education, and Second Language Acquisition (SLA), while non-peer-reviewed publications, duplicate records, and methodologically weak studies were excluded.

The units of analysis were the English language education systems of New Zealand, the Netherlands, and Indonesia, representing English-dominant, high-performing non-native English-speaking, and EFL contexts respectively. Singapore and Malaysia were not included because English functions as an official or semi-official language in those contexts, making them less comparable to Indonesia. Data were coded into four analytical dimensions: language policy, curriculum design, pedagogical practices, and language exposure, which was operationalized as the frequency, diversity, and authenticity of learners’ contact with English across educational, social, digital, and media environments. Proficiency outcomes were interpreted through international proficiency indices, national reports, and empirical studies. The analysis combined logistic synthesis, defined as the systematic integration of findings from multiple sources to construct a coherent explanatory framework, and cross-national comparison to identify similarities and differences across the four dimensions. To ensure objectivity and credibility, all countries were analyzed using the same analytical framework, while evidence was triangulated across multiple source types and databases to minimize literature selection bias.

3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Result

a. Language Policy: The Functional Status of English

Language policy determines how English is positioned and functionally used within an education system. This positioning, in turn, shapes the nature, frequency, and quality of language contact that learners experience throughout their education.

Table 1. Language Policy Comparison

Country	Status of English	Role in Instruction	Societal Use	Exposure Level
New Zealand	L1/Official Language	All subjects (100%)	Pervasive (all domains)	Immersive
Netherlands	Foreign Language	CLIL +Dedicated subject	High (media, digital)	Very High
Indonesia	EFL	Subject only	Limited	Low

As shown in Table 1, the three systems occupy fundamentally different positions in terms of English’s functional role. In New Zealand, English is the societal language and the unambiguous medium of all instruction across subjects and year levels. Learners are embedded in a language environment where English functions pervasively across academic, social, and institutional domains.

This constitutes what may be termed immersive exposure learners do not require deliberate policy to encounter English, as it saturates the learning environment by default.

The Netherlands occupies a different but highly favourable position. English is not the national language; Dutch remains the language of daily life and formal education at most levels. Nevertheless, the Netherlands consistently ranks among the top countries in the EF EPI, reflecting the effectiveness of early, integrated English instruction combined with high societal exposure through English-language media, digital content, and international commerce. Dutch education policy encourages Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) from early secondary education, and exposure extends beyond school through pervasive consumption of undubbed English television, online platforms, and internationally oriented professional contexts. This creates conditions that functionally approximate extensive bilingual exposure even within a formally monolingual society.

Indonesia presents a marked contrast. English is designated a foreign language, taught as a standalone subject typically for two to three hours per week in secondary schooling. It has no role as a medium of instruction for other subjects, and its use in daily social and media contexts while growing, remains limited compared to Dutch or New Zealand contexts. As Doloh and Hadiyanto (2025) observe, when English is confined to designated classroom periods and carries no functional utility in learners' broader social environments, motivation and authentic practice opportunities remain structurally restricted.

b. Curriculum Design: Orientation and Integration

Curriculum orientation determines whether language is framed as a body of knowledge to be mastered or as a communicative practice to be developed. This distinction profoundly influences how learners engage with English and the degree to which classroom learning transfers to authentic communicative contexts.

Table 2. Curriculum Design Comparison

Country	Orientation	Primary Focus	Integration with Content	Assessment Emphasis
New Zealand	Communicative Integrated	Literacy across curricula	Full (English is the medium)	Competency-based
Netherlands	Communicative CLIL	Interaction & meaning-making	High (CLIL subjects)	Mixed: competency + exam
Indonesia	Form-focused	Grammar, vocabulary, exam	Low (standalone subject)	Exam-oriented

In New Zealand, English curriculum design is inseparable from the broader National Curriculum, which positions literacy the ability to read, write, and communicate across disciplines as a cross-curricular competency. English is not an isolated subject but the medium through which all learning occurs. The New Zealand Curriculum emphasizes the development of learners who are confident communicators, reflective thinkers, and active participants, with language development conceived as an integrated and ongoing dimension of all subject learning.

The Dutch curriculum reflects a communicative orientation explicitly shaped by European language education frameworks, particularly the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR). English education in the Netherlands targets functional communicative competence aligned to B1/B2 or higher CEFR levels by the end of secondary schooling. Curricula emphasize reading, speaking, listening, and writing in meaningful contexts, with CLIL programmes providing additional integration of English into subject learning in science, social studies, and other disciplines. Research consistently documents that this communicative and integrated design, combined with rich out-of-school exposure, produces learners with high productive and receptive language competence (Dalton-Puffer, 2011; Lasagabaster, 2011).

Indonesia's curriculum has historically been characterized by a form-focused orientation, emphasizing grammatical structures, vocabulary acquisition, and preparation for national examinations. Although recent curriculum revisions have incorporated communicative elements, the structural reliance on grammar-based instruction and standardized examination formats continues to shape classroom practice in ways that prioritize declarative knowledge over functional competence. As (Chen et al., 2026) document, communicative language teaching significantly enhances learner engagement and self-efficacy; its absence constrains the development of productive language skills even among learners who perform adequately on formal tests.

c. Integrated Analysis: System Alignment and Proficiency Outcomes

The findings of this study indicate that proficiency differences across New Zealand, the Netherlands, and Indonesia are most coherently explained by variations in system alignment the degree to which language policy, curriculum design, pedagogical practices, and exposure mutually reinforce conditions for meaningful language use and acquisition.

Table 3. Integrated Analysis: System Alignment and Proficiency Outcomes

Country	Policy	Curriculum	Pedagogy	Alignment	Expected Outcome
New Zealand	Student-centred	Active, agnetic	High (discussion, inquiry)	Continuous / Immersive	Very High Outcome
Netherlands	Student-centred / Mixed	Active, collaborative	High (ask-based)	High (especially in CLIL)	High Proficiency
Indonesia	Teacher-centred	Passive / receptive	Low (imited interaction)	Limited / Li mixed	Low-Moderate Proficiency

To facilitate comparison, exposure categories were determined based on the frequency, diversity, and authenticity of learners' contact with English across educational, social, digital, and media environments. High exposure refers to sustained daily interaction with English through multiple channels, including classroom instruction, media consumption, online communication, and community use. Moderate exposure refers to regular but less extensive opportunities for English use, while limited exposure indicates that contact with English occurs primarily within formal classroom settings. Similarly, system alignment was assessed conceptually by examining the degree of coherence among language policy, curriculum design, pedagogical practices, and language exposure. Systems were considered highly aligned when these dimensions mutually reinforced opportunities for meaningful language use and acquisition.

As summarized in Table 5, New Zealand represents a system in which full alignment is achieved by default: English is simultaneously the societal language, the instructional medium, the curriculum focus, and the social environment. No deliberate policy intervention is required to achieve alignment because English pervades all dimensions of learners' lives. This represents the strongest possible configuration for language development, though it is also the least replicable for non-English-speaking contexts.

The Netherlands demonstrates that strong alignment is achievable even in a non-native-speaking context. Dutch language policy supports early and integrated English education; curricula are oriented toward communicative competence within a European framework; pedagogical practice emphasizes task-based and interactive learning; and high out-of-school exposure particularly through undubbed media sustains and extends formal instruction. These elements operate in coherent mutual reinforcement, creating a system in which English proficiency development is supported across multiple simultaneous channels.

Indonesia illustrates the consequences of systemic fragmentation. English is classified as a foreign language subject, limiting its curricular role; the curriculum retains a form-focused orientation that prioritizes structural knowledge over communicative use; teacher-centred pedagogical practices restrict interaction and output opportunities; and out-of-school exposure remains insufficient to compensate for limited in-school language use. These dimensions do not

reinforce one another; instead, they collectively constrain the conditions for meaningful language acquisition, producing lower proficiency outcomes despite extended years of formal English study. The finding that instructional duration does not compensate for systemic misalignment is consistent with Kirkpatrick and Liddicoat (2017) argument that the functional positioning of English within a system is more determinative of outcomes than the mere inclusion of English in the curriculum.

It is important to note that the relationships identified in this study should not be interpreted as evidence of direct causality. As a conceptual comparative analysis based on secondary data, the study identifies patterns of association between system alignment and proficiency outcomes rather than establishing causal effects. Nevertheless, the consistent pattern observed across the three national contexts suggests that alignment functions as a plausible explanatory mechanism through which educational systems create or constrain opportunities for language development. Furthermore, the findings contribute to SLA and comparative education theory by extending attention from individual learner variables toward system-level conditions that shape language learning opportunities. The concept of system alignment provides a framework for understanding how policy, curriculum, pedagogy, and exposure interact to influence proficiency outcomes across different educational contexts. Finally, Indonesia should not be interpreted as a homogeneous category. Significant variation exists across regions, schools, and socioeconomic contexts; therefore, the Indonesian case presented here reflects broad national-level patterns rather than all local educational realities.

An important implication of this integrated analysis concerns the direction of reform for contexts similar to Indonesia. Isolated changes such as revising curriculum content or introducing new examinations are unlikely to produce significant proficiency gains if they are not accompanied by corresponding changes in policy, pedagogy, and exposure. System-level reform that increases the functional presence of English, supports communicative pedagogy, and creates new contexts for authentic language use outside the classroom including through digital media, CLIL-style integration in selected subjects, and extracurricular English environments is more likely to shift outcomes meaningfully.

Discussion

The research results show that differences in English proficiency between New Zealand, the Netherlands, and Indonesia are influenced not only by the length of formal education, but primarily by the level of integration of the education system in supporting the functional use of English. These findings demonstrate that language policy, curriculum design, pedagogy, and level of language exposure work interconnectedly to shape successful English acquisition.

The exposure categories presented in Table 1 were derived from the functional role of English across educational, social, digital, and media environments. “Immersive” exposure refers to contexts in which English serves as both the primary language of instruction and the dominant language of everyday communication, as observed in New Zealand. “Very high” exposure describes contexts where English is not the societal language but is frequently encountered through education, media consumption, digital platforms, and professional interactions, as exemplified by the Netherlands. “Low” exposure refers to contexts in which English is largely confined to formal classroom instruction with relatively limited opportunities for authentic use outside school, as observed in Indonesia. These categories were developed through comparative interpretation of evidence from policy documents, curriculum frameworks, and previous empirical studies rather than through quantitative measurement.

New Zealand demonstrates the highest level of system alignment because English functions simultaneously as a community language, a medium of instruction, and a tool for everyday communication. The immersive environment allows learners to receive continuous language exposure both inside and outside the classroom. Furthermore, the communicative and student-centered curriculum supports the development of communicative competence through discussion,

inquiry learning, and active participation. This creates consistent opportunities for authentic interaction, thus supporting the development of English fluency and confidence.

The Netherlands demonstrates that high levels of English proficiency can still be achieved even if English is not the national language. This occurs due to the integration of education policies, communicative language teaching approaches, the use of CLIL, and extensive exposure to English through digital media and international professional life. English learning not only occurs as a subject but is also integrated into other content learning. Thus, students have the opportunity to use English in meaningful and authentic contexts.

In contrast, Indonesia exhibits a systemic fragmentation where the various components of English language education do not optimally support each other. English is still positioned as a foreign subject with limited learning time and minimal use in daily life. Although the curriculum has begun to adopt a communicative approach, learning practices are still dominated by grammar-oriented instruction, memorization, and exam-oriented learning. Teacher-centered pedagogy also limits students' opportunities to interact and actively produce language.

These findings reinforce the view that successful English learning cannot be achieved simply by increasing class hours or revising the curriculum. Authentic exposure and opportunities to use English play a crucial role in developing communicative competence. In the Indonesian context, limited exposure outside the classroom results in students having few opportunities to use English functionally, resulting in slower development of productive skills such as speaking and interaction compared to receptive skills or grammatical knowledge.

It is important to distinguish correlation from causality in interpreting these findings. The comparative patterns identified in this study suggest a strong association between system alignment and English proficiency outcomes; however, the conceptual nature of the analysis does not allow direct causal claims. While countries exhibiting higher levels of alignment also demonstrate higher proficiency outcomes, the study cannot conclusively establish that system alignment alone causes those outcomes. Other contextual factors, including socioeconomic conditions, historical language policies, institutional resources, and cultural attitudes toward English, may also contribute to proficiency development. Therefore, the findings should be interpreted as identifying plausible explanatory relationships rather than definitive causal effects.

Research also shows that communicative language teaching and the integration of language with real-world contexts are more effective in increasing student engagement, self-efficacy, and communicative skills than form-focused approaches. Studies in New Zealand and the Netherlands demonstrate that when communicative pedagogy is supported by a consistent social environment and educational policies, students are better able to develop English skills actively and meaningfully.

Furthermore, this research emphasizes the importance of system alignment in English language education. Alignment occurs when language policy, curriculum design, pedagogical practices, assessment, and the social environment work together to create opportunities for sustainable language acquisition. The findings suggest that alignment is a more powerful explanatory factor than any individual dimension because none of the three countries achieved their outcomes through policy, curriculum, pedagogy, or exposure alone. Rather, proficiency outcomes emerged from the degree to which these dimensions mutually reinforced one another. New Zealand and the Netherlands demonstrate high levels of coherence across educational and social environments, whereas Indonesia exhibits inconsistencies among policy intentions, classroom practices, and opportunities for authentic language use. Consequently, system alignment provides a more comprehensive explanation for cross-national differences in English proficiency than isolated educational variables.

These findings also contribute to Second Language Acquisition (SLA) theory by extending attention beyond individual learner variables such as motivation, aptitude, anxiety, and cognitive processing toward the broader educational conditions that shape opportunities for language development. The study suggests that language learning outcomes are influenced not only by what learners do, but also by how educational systems create or constrain opportunities for meaningful

interaction and sustained language exposure. The findings are broadly consistent with classical SLA perspectives. The high levels of exposure observed in New Zealand and the Netherlands support Krashen's (1985) argument regarding the importance of comprehensible input, while the communicative and interactive learning environments align with Long's (1996) Long's (1996) Interaction Hypothesis and Swain's (1985) Output Hypothesis. However, the present study extends these perspectives by suggesting that opportunities for input, interaction, and output are themselves shaped by broader educational systems. Thus, language acquisition is influenced not only by learner-level processes but also by the degree of alignment among policy, curriculum, pedagogy, and exposure. From a comparative education perspective, the concept of system alignment offers a useful framework for explaining differences in language learning outcomes across national contexts.

Based on these results, English language education reform in contexts like Indonesia requires a systemic rather than piecemeal approach. Curriculum changes need to be accompanied by the development of communicative pedagogy, improved teacher competency, expanded exposure to English through digital media and extracurricular activities, and the integration of English into more authentic learning contexts. However, these findings should not be interpreted as uniformly applicable to all regions of Indonesia. Given substantial variation in educational resources, teacher quality, socioeconomic conditions, and linguistic environments across the country, the findings are intended to provide a national-level explanatory framework rather than a definitive account of every local context. Thus, English language education should focus not only on mastering language structures but also on creating coherent conditions that support meaningful language use in academic and social life.

4. CONCLUSION

This study examined how language policy, curriculum design, pedagogical practices, and language exposure interact to shape English proficiency outcomes in New Zealand, the Netherlands, and Indonesia. The findings indicate that differences in proficiency are more effectively explained by the degree of system alignment among these dimensions than by any single factor such as instructional time. The novelty of this study lies in moving beyond descriptive cross-national comparisons to propose system alignment as a conceptual framework for understanding variation in English proficiency outcomes. This contribution extends both Second Language Acquisition (SLA) and comparative education scholarship by highlighting how system-level conditions create or constrain opportunities for meaningful language use and language development.

For Indonesia, the findings suggest that improving English proficiency requires strengthening system alignment through communicative curriculum implementation, continuous teacher professional development, expanded opportunities for authentic language use, and greater integration of English within digital and extracurricular environments rather than simply increasing instructional hours. While the study provides a comparative explanation of English language education systems, it is limited by its reliance on secondary data and its focus on three national contexts. Future research may further examine the proposed framework through empirical investigations across a wider range of educational settings.

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>
- Azman, M. N. B., Chik, A., & Bodis, A. (2024). Malaysia's Dual Language Programme. *Current Issues in Language Planning*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14664208.2024.2442213>
- Chen, Y., Yin, H., & Faya Ornia, M. G. (2026). The application of communicative language teaching. *Frontiers in Education*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2026.1762227>
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Dalton-Puffer, C. (2011). Content and Language Integrated Learning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 31, 182–204. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190511000092>
- Doloh, F., & Hadiyanto, H. (2025). Contrasting English pedagogies. *International Journal of Language Teaching and Education*. <https://doi.org/10.22437/ijolte.v9i2.45683>
- Kirkpatrick, A., & Liddicoat, A. (2017). Language education policy and practice. *Language Teaching*, 50(2), 155–188. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444817000027>
- Krashen, S. D. (1985). *The Input Hypothesis: Issues and Implications*. Longman.
- Lasagabaster, D. (2011). English achievement and student motivation. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 5(1), 3–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2010.519030>
- Long, M. H. (1996). The Role of the Linguistic Environment in Second Language Acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 413–468). Academic Press.
- Mackey, A., & Gass, S. M. (2016). *Second language research: Methodology and design* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Swain, M. (1985). Communicative Competence: Some Roles of Comprehensible Input and Comprehensible Output in Its Development. In S. M. Gass & C. G. Madden (Eds.), *Input in Second Language Acquisition* (pp. 235–253). Newbury House.
- 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>
- Zulhaidir, Z., Susanti, L. R., Yadi, F., & Hudaidah, H. (2025). Analysis of English subject education. *AS-SABIQUN*. <https://doi.org/10.36088/assabiqun.v7i3.5663>