

Identifying and Understanding the Language Curriculum Across the World

Christine N. Ferrer¹, Aubrey S. Somera²

¹Tarlac Agricultural University, ²Lipit National High School, SDO Ilocos Sur
Dagupan City, Philiphine

E-mail: ¹cnferrer@tau.edu.ph &

²aubreysomera3@gmail.com

Abstract

This article compares and contrasts the Language Curriculum in the United States, United Arab Emirates, Mongolia, Philippines and Indian Language Curriculum for the year 2022. This is a comparative analysis; a research journal conducted to analyze the ideological, cultural, and political-economic elements that impact the development of language curricula in five different countries. Furthermore, the educational goals and ideologies that underpin both curricula are discussed. A very intriguing conclusion emerges when considering the curricula's unspoken aims. All the five (5) nations' language and literature curricula emphasize the significance of citizenship and character education and are interwoven into curricula instruction. Meanwhile, the US language curriculum prioritizes creating American identity, with a focus on improving learning for the professional workforce and career-ready persons, which will help the global economy in the future. Meanwhile, moral and religious training is prioritized in the United Arab Emirates, Mongolia, Philippines and Indian language curriculum. Language education or curriculum are intertwined in nation-building. After examining, comparing, and contrasting both curricula, the author discovered that the US successfully instills character education to mold the worldview and characteristics of its population derived from their clear ideology, whereas the United Arab Emirates, Mongolia, Philippines and India are rather unexplained and ambiguous. As a result, this article demonstrates that there is an opportunity for development for educators and educational leaders in the United Arab Emirates, Mongolia, Philippines and India to be more explicit in determining which character is best exposed in the language curriculum.

Keywords: Language Curriculum, Literature Curriculum

1. Introduction

One of the most important symbols of social conduct is language. We utilize language to communicate crucial social messages about who we are, where we come from, and whom we associate with through language's usual movement of information (Goldberg et al., 2015). Language is a medium of communication among members of society. Language is an important part of cultural expression. It is the technique used to communicate group identity's customs and ideals (Parra, 2016).

According to Garcia (2016), the language functions' significantly tied to a language's social character since there are interdependence and mutual conditionality relationships between language occurrence and society with its intrinsic culture.

Further, language is an essential component of civilization. It elevated man from a primitive to a plane that he was capable of achieving. The language was the only way for a man to become a man (Axel, 2014). As per Abad (2005), the one important distinction between humans and animals is that humans are the exclusive possessors of language. Animals, without a doubt, have some degree of communication ability, but it is not only inferior to human language in degree but also profoundly different in kind. Moreover, it is frequently surprising to learn how much we may assess a person's origin, character, and intentions based only on their language, dialect, or, in some cases, the choice of a single word (Chun, 2016).

Language is one of the most noticeable, visible, and essentially important of man's faculties. The value of language to man and society cannot be overstated (Durano, 2008). As a personal entity, language is not only a tool of communication between persons, but it is also a means of expressing one's individuality.

Language shapes the individual from birth, according to sociology. Additionally, Rogers (2014) stated that a child learns the majority of what he or she knows about the world through language. As a result, a language subject was developed by different educational institutions around the world that focus on language meaning, concept, and acquisition, as well as home language, school language, spoken language, and written language. It also discusses the purposes of language and the link between language and culture, specifically it was called language curriculum (Roca & Valdes, 2016).

Language curriculum development, like other areas of curricular activity, is concerned with ideas and techniques for learning design, management, and evaluation (Department of Education, 2016). However, although language curriculum development has generated a significant educational business in general educational practice, what is intended by language curriculum development in language instruction is frequently fairly narrowly defined (Kubanyiova & Crookes, 2016). The emphasis has been focused on language syllabuses rather than the larger processes of curricular reform. As a result, there was a dearth of literature on language curriculum development until recently. Such debate, which can be found in language teaching publications from the 1940s, 1950s, early 1960s, and 2000s, is largely concerned with techniques for selecting linguistic material for language courses.

Subsequently, the United States has no national curriculum in terms of language (Teale & Thompson, 2019). As a result, curriculum creation, instruction, and material have been dispersed among districts or states. This allows each state's leaders complete power to create their own curriculum. In terms of language curriculum, the United States includes language and literature education (CCSS, 2020), which includes both literary and non-literary works. For the past two decades, most states have maintained that literary instruction should be based on educational standards developed by each state (Teale & Thompson, 2019). These are the

principles that students should strive for.

Unlike in the United States, where the curriculum is centralized and formed by the Ministry of Education and Culture, the curriculum in India is centralized and developed by the Ministry of Education and Culture (Ministry of Education and Culture, 2018). The Indian language and literature curriculum serves as a strategic basis for knowledge. Students should grasp how to use the Indian language and literature effectively in order to master other knowledge.

In the United Arab Emirates (UAE), the education sector is experiencing substantial educational reform, particularly in terms of teaching and evaluation techniques across all subject areas. The Abu Dhabi Education Council (ADEC) has mandated the revamping of English language teaching and assessment in grades 6-12 through the introduction of English Continuous Assessment Rich Task (ECART), a framework that assists teachers in implementing ongoing and alternative assessments in the English as a Foreign Language classroom (EFL).

As a result of English's global status and widespread use in the UAE, where it has become "associated with business, modernity, and internationalism" (Clarke, 2007, p.584), the Ministry of Education recognized the importance of reforming English teaching and learning in schools and higher education institutions. The UAE government recently mandated that public institutions utilize English as the medium of teaching, putting pressure on K-12 schools to graduate students who are fluent in English (Fox, 2007).

As a consequence of the implementation of a unique English language framework termed "English Continuous Assessment Rich Tasks," the Abu Dhabi Educational Council (ADEC) has brought about enormous improvements in the curricula and assessment of English language (ECART).

Strydom and Velu (2011) state that the ECART "is mandatory for all students following the ADEC program" (p.55). However, the attitudes of Emirate EFL instructors regarding the ECART, particularly the new teaching and evaluation procedures incorporated in it, and how such ideas may affect their classroom practices, remain a relatively unexplored subject. For language reform to be effective in the UAE, Emirate teachers' attitudes about language teaching, learning, and assessments must align with the ECART's content, aims, and assessments. As a result, instructors' beliefs are an essential aspect that should be investigated for ECART success.

Currently, the UAE considers education to be essential to the country's growth ambitions. As a result, the government saw educational reform as a crucial element in sustaining the UAE's prosperity and development by delivering well-educated and highly competent individuals to occupy positions in the corporate and governmental sectors. The revision of language curricula in UAE schools is part of a bigger reform agenda advocated by the UAE Ministry of Education and Youth in its "UAE Education Vision 2020."

This educational plan advocated for fundamental changes in the principles, practices, and methods of teaching/learning employed in schools (UAE Ministry of Education and Youth, 2000). There has been a push to modify the conventional teaching techniques that have been common in UAE schools to a more learner-centered approach in which students take responsibility for their own learning (Truscott, 2010).

Furthermore, EFL teachers were advised to shift away from using standardized examinations to assess language learners and toward including more alternative and genuine assessment approaches that "occur as part of the learning process rather than as an artificial add-on" (Truscott, 2010, p.5).

The Abu Dhabi Education Council (ADEC), which governs schools in Abu Dhabi, Al Ain, and the Western region, has mandated massive reform in the teaching and assessment of all subject-matter areas in order to fulfill its vision of a New School Model, which was intended to "improve student learning experiences and raise the academic outcomes of Abu Dhabi students to an internationally competitive level" (Abu Dhabi Education Council, 2010, p.2). ADEC was founded in 2005 and is known as "the supra-government education agency entrusted with overhauling education in Abu Dhabi's capital city and eponymous emirate" (Gallagher, 2011, 7 p. 62).

Furthermore, ADEC is in charge of establishing educational standards that regulate K-12 schools in the emirate of Abu Dhabi. According to their website, ADEC seeks to develop education and educational institutions in the Emirate of Abu Dhabi, to implement innovative educational policies, plans, and programs aimed at improving education, and to support educational institutions and staff in achieving national development objectives in accordance with the highest international standards.

Additionally, because language had previously been infrequently studied in Mongolia, teachers were nearly nonexistent when language like English began to spread throughout the country following the democratic revolution. Prior to 1990, the study of language curriculum was restricted to a small group of students at the National University of Mongolia's interpreter program, and skilled teachers of the language were few and far between (Ibid, 5).

As a result, the Education Ministry decided that, in order to address the critical shortage of language curriculum instructors, a large-scale effort to retrain former Russian teachers was required. The government began educating teachers in academic-year intensive training programs in 1992. Since the first class graduated, over 400 Russian language instructors have been educated to teach English, and the bulk of them are now teaching in secondary schools in both the city and the countryside (Ibid, 5). Each major state institution in Ulaanbaatar's capital (National University of Mongolia, University of the Humanities, Mongolian Technical University, and Mongolian Teacher's Institute) has created bachelor's and master's degree programs in language teacher training.

As of 2003, there were 634 language curriculum instructors employed in public secondary schools, 64 in public college or university departments, and around 50 in private secondary schools or universities (Mongolian Ministry of Education, Culture and Science, 2003). Because of the growing importance of language curriculum in the early 1990s, the study of the language increased dramatically in secondary schools and private institutes throughout the country.

As a result, the government determined that an official strategy on language instruction was required if substantial reforms were to be implemented at the national level. Although some substantial but unofficial innovations in language education had been implemented for several years prior (such as the teacher retraining courses noted above), the Ministry of Education did not issue an official policy decision on English language instruction until 1995.

In addition, in 1998, the Ministry of Education formed a cooperation with the Soros Foundation to provide a set of English textbooks for secondary schools. Until then, language curriculum lessons in public secondary schools were unstandardized, and teachers were unable to accurately assess their pupils' skills using defined criteria. Teachers were also having a tough time arranging classes because teaching tools and textbooks were nearly totally unavailable. The first series of textbooks for grades 5-10 was completed in 2000 (the entire series is currently being reedited to include new material), and now that the textbooks are being used in every state secondary school in the country, the Ministry of Education has been able to draft an official series of changes to its national language curriculum.

The language teaching curriculum standards, which were revised in 2003 and will be officially implemented in 2005, address the following areas: (a) all language classes and teachers' syllabi should be based on specific competencies in the four skills found in the national textbook series, (b) testing and evaluation will be based on these competencies, (c) the communicative and constructivist approaches to learning will be stressed (d) if teachers employ themes and subjects outside of the textbook, they must be culturally and educationally acceptable, and (e) grammar instruction should be integrated and assessed with the four skills, rather than as a distinct subject (Mira, 2003).

As language curriculum becomes more popular, new advances in language curriculum education in Mongolia are anticipated to emerge in the next few years. The MPRP administration issued an official white paper on language curriculum education in 2000. It stated that the Ministry of Education, in collaboration with participating international organizations, should seek to diversify the language curriculum resources of schools across the country, update language curriculum to a level consistent with "international" standards, and build English "villages" for summer school programs. However, given the recent defeat of the MPRP by the Democratic Coalition in the June 2004 legislative election, it is uncertain whether these pledges would be fulfilled. In addition, the newly formed coalition has not yet established its formal position on language curriculum instruction.

Meanwhile, in the Philippines, it has been noticed that a 10-year basic education curriculum is still overburdened and that students cannot legally engage in contracts for work and business after they graduate from high school (Calderon, 2014). It was also discovered that when kids graduate from high school, they lack maturity and competency in a variety of academic areas. In actuality, records reveal that the performance of basic education pupils in the Philippines in national achievement tests (NATs) across topics remained much below the Department of Education's objective of 75%. Because of recent regional developments and the need to educate ICT-literate persons, the Philippine government has pushed for a new basic education curriculum that aims to deliver a quality 12-year basic education program for Filipino children.

Along with these advancements, the curriculum is being reviewed, and the language curriculum is being improved in order to generate a pool of talents that have a good grasp of the English and Filipino language. However, several textbook authors and classroom instructors have indicated that they are having difficulty adopting the K-12 language curriculum in terms of English for a variety of reasons (Pazzibugan, 2018; Valerio, 2020). For example, instructors reported being perplexed about re-planning their classes as a result of curricular revisions (Valerio, 2020). Some writers found problems in aligning the specified skills each week into one consolidated and cohesive lesson while authoring textbooks. One source of these difficulties is the language curriculum's lack of clarity and precision. Before teachers can effectively execute a language curriculum, they must thoroughly comprehend its fundamental concepts and consequences for classroom practice (Carless, 1998; Rahman, 2014; Smit, 2015), as well as the pedagogical principles it promotes (Wang, 2018). As a result, the new language curriculum must be clear, explicit, cohesive, and connected with proven pedagogical ideas such as 21st-century learning. However, keep in mind that education is a complicated institution that is enmeshed in a cultural, economic, and political environment.

One important aspect of the curriculum reform is the incorporation of a 21st-century learning framework to assist students in succeeding in the 21st-century environment (DepEd Order No. 55, 2015; SEAMEO INNOTECH, 2012). The K to 12 curricula extends education by including a two-year senior high school with technical and vocational subjects. However, this education reform should not only focus on educating students for competitive jobs and entrepreneurship, closing development gaps, reducing overcrowding in the curriculum, and incorporating ICT. Equally important is transforming them into socially conscious and productive citizens and providing them with the tools they need to resist the exploitative and oppressive aspects of globalization that benefit only the global elite (Jackson, 2014). Although clarity, specificity, coherence, and alignment of a curriculum to 21st-century learning and language learning principles are important components for successful curriculum implementation, they may not be sufficient conditions to enhance language education. Other factors to consider include learners' overall well-being, a safe and healthy learning environment, pedagogical processes that facilitate

learning (UNICEF, 2018), facilities (Chun, Kern, & Smith, 2016), teachers' roles and responsibilities (Kubanyiova & Crookes, 2016), implicit language practices, and the degree to which the curriculum is understood, valued, and implemented (Wiley & Garcia, 2016).

This article aims to identify and understand the language curriculum across the world in this 21st-century learning. The report finishes with probable implementation issues, recommendations for future design and implementation, and implications for future research. This paper aims to demonstrate that a common language is one of the most significant elements of a community and that the continued use of the same language is the most definite indication of a people's historical continuity.

This shall also investigate the similarities and contrasts of the language curriculum in the United States, United Arab Emirates, Mongolia, Philippines and India for the year 2022. The author will look into what can be gained from the five different language curricula.

In a nutshell, these researchers above emphasize the importance of learner quality, learning environment, content, procedures, and sociopolitical, cultural, and historical contexts in the successful implementation of the language curriculum

2. Literature Review

This part discussed the collected literature and studies to support and guide the paper. Additionally, the collected supporting details came from books, journals, magazines, articles, published dissertations, and previous research that are in line with identifying and understanding the language curriculum across the world.

2.1 Policy of Language Curriculum

Policy support for the use of the mother tongue as a language of instruction is evident in Southeast Asian countries. To some extent, mother languages are employed in teaching. However, this does not imply that Mother Tongue is a language of teaching in all subject areas. Singapore allows numerous languages as subjects, but only prominent ones such as Malay, Mandarin, and Tamil (Ministry of Education, 2017).

In Thailand and Vietnam, mother tongue as a medium of teaching is still used in some action research programs (Djite, 2018). In Malaysian national-type primary schools, dominant mother languages are employed as the language of teaching. In various parts of the nation, non-dominant languages are taught as subjects (David and Govinsamy, 217; Nagarathinam, 2018). Mother Tongues are used as the language of teaching in all public schools in the Philippines, from kindergarten to Grades 1, 2, and 3. (DepEd, 2017). According to this assessment, the five Southeast Asian nations are gradually moving toward possible mother tongue-based multilingual education.

Furthermore, legislative developments in Southeast Asia over the last decade have mainly been promising in terms of the use of Mother Tongue languages in education and the latitude provided to ethnolinguistic minorities. If existing trends,

efforts, and lobbying continue in the following years, it is probable that the condition of non-dominant languages and ethnolinguistic minorities will improve in various Southeast Asian nations.

This is consistent with SEAMEO's (2019) conclusions that MTB-MLE has begun in these nations, as well as in other regions of the world. It is non-formal in character and generally begins with community and Non-Governmental Organization activities in adult and pre-primary education. As a result, the government's formal system may integrate local language components in the curriculum, primarily via speaking these languages or teaching them as topics in schools. This has prepared the path for more robust types of multilingual education, or even a shift in national language policy, as seen in Papua New Guinea (SEAMEO, 2019).

2.2 Language Curriculum in the Philippine Context

Several thousand languages are used in global academic institutions to transmit meaning. This language variety creates a plethora of issues in the educational system. Questions such as: What language should students learn, and what language should be used in schools for instruction? Require serious analysis in order to comprehend the current condition of language use in education. Indeed, the importance of language in cognition and learning processes is widely known (UNESCO, 2017).

Several studies conducted throughout the world have shown that using mother tongue as the primary medium of instruction in elementary school is successful. Improved academic skills (Cummins, 2010; Thomas & Collier, 2017; Walter & Dekker, 2018); stronger classroom participation (Benson, 2010; Dutcher, 1995); increased access to education (Benson, 2014); and development of critical thinking skills are among the benefits of mother tongue highlighted in these studies (Brock-Utne, 2016). Research has also found that bilingual education increases cultural pride (Cummins, 2010; Wright & Taylor, 1995), increases parent engagement (Cummins, 2010; Dutcher, 1995), and increases females' success (Benson, 2015; Hovens, 2012). Another significant advantage of mother tongue training is its basis for acquiring literacy in other languages (Cummins, 2010; Thomas & Collier, 2017).

Moreover, many youngsters are educated in languages that are not spoken in their immediate community in many parts of the world. According to studies, these youngsters are over-represented in the out-of-school population. As a result of increased attention to this issue, several nations have begun to experiment with the use of various Mother Tongue languages in education (UNESCO, 2015).

In the Philippines, experimental investigations on the use of mother tongue in the pre-elementary classroom had favorable outcomes in terms of literacy and second language development. Its importance is highlighted in the execution of DepEd Order No.16, s. 2012, also known as Guidelines on the Implementation of Mother Tongue-Based-Multilingual Education (MTB-MLE). According to this DepEd Order, the MTB-MLE will be implemented in all public schools, especially in Kindergarten, Grades 1, 2, and 3, as part of the K-12 Basic Education Program beginning in the

2012-2013 school year.

Because it was just adopted three (3) years ago, issues and obstacles have arisen. Some of these include a lack of supplies and infrastructure and insufficient teacher training. With the value of mother tongue-based instruction in learning processes in mind and awareness of national and local issues regarding its implementation, this study determined how Mother-Tongue-Based Multilingual Education is implemented in Southeast Asian countries, specifically Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, and Vietnam. It specifically assessed the parallels and variations in their implementation in terms of language policy, curriculum, and the qualifications and training of instructors. It also identified excellent practices and problems in the deployment of MTB-MLE. Following that, appropriate output was created to enhance teaching among local academic institutions and educators in the Philippines, which will ultimately aid in curricular improvement and possibly change.

2.3 Language Curriculum and Literature Education of U.S

Curriculum Development in the United States changed somewhat in 2010. It is the year in which the United States is on the verge of establishing what is known as a national curriculum. The Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) and the National Governors Association (NGA) have pushed most states in the United States to embrace Common Core State Standards (CCSS) (Teale and Thompson, 2019).

These requirements are intended to help ensure that all pupils are college and career ready in terms of literacy (CCSS, 2017). The other change between the previous standards is that the CCSS now provides literary teaching to all American secondary schools, which is known as "Reading Standards for Literature for Grades 9-12." (Teale & Thompson, 2019). The Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) and the National Governors Association lay the groundwork for this foundation, resulting from states' consistency in developing local education standards (CCSS, 2017). The standards are the result of an extensive study involving state departments of education, researchers, assessment makers, professional organizations, and educators from kindergarten through college, as well as parents, students, and society (CCSS, 2018).

Furthermore, the CCSS establishes a set of objectives for states, districts, schools, and instructors to use in incorporating the standards into local curricula (Jones & King, 2017). However, schools may modify the CCSS in a different way. Because the standards do not prescribe how teaching should be carried out, the contents and directions are up to instructors' and curriculum creators' discretion (CCSS, 2017). Teachers, for example, may utilize textbooks and literary books that differ from those used in other states.

Moreover, there has been no substantial change in the development process. The curriculum begins with a national parliament agreement, proceeds through the ministry of education and culture, which involves a variety of educational stakeholders such as scholars, curriculum developers, academic administrators, teachers, parents, and business actors, and finally reaches schools and classroom

teachers (Thomas, 1991 cited in Galam, 1997).

The content standards are designed and documented by the Ministry of Education with the assistance of educational practitioners, curriculum creators, scholars, school administrators, and instructors. Teachers will execute and interpret the curriculum in the classroom as lesson designers, instructors, and evaluators. Parents are involved because they supervise the learning activity at home as prescribed by the curriculum.

Additionally, the stakeholders are reacting to the existence of these Common Core State Standards. These criteria have been formally approved by 47 of the 50 states (Jones and King, 2015). The Massachusetts Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (2016) improved the standards by designing its own curriculum, instruction, and assessment. In contrast, the state boards of education in Virginia and Nebraska have refused to adopt the standards since both states are in the process of redeveloping language curriculum and are still trusted by local teachers. Another reason for the rejection is the Federal Government's goal of pursuing money rather than excellence (State Education Standard, 2017).

Meanwhile, higher education is eager to participate in this endeavor. Because the standards seek to build college and career preparedness, higher education favorably reacts to these standards, allowing for easy tracking of college and worker language capacities. In contrast, underprivileged pupils, such as those with autism, react in the opposite way to this norm. This will be difficult for handicapped persons since they are expected to reach the criteria while still coping with their impairment (Marsh, 2019). People in the business sector, on the other hand, will be considerably more interested in the new language curriculum development since it will help their organization thrive by locating talented individuals sooner.

2.4 Language Curriculum and Literature Education of India

Because India is largely multicultural, the government grants local governments more flexibility to build their own curriculum in the topic of local knowledge. It is a reaction to the need for cultural identification as well as wisdom in shaping Indian identity. Furthermore, it is consistent with the development of language and literature curricula by utilizing local literature to maintain Indian culture (Rudy, 2018, cited in Inderawati, 2019).

As a reaction to the global world's poor academic competency, India has now introduced Curriculum 2013 (K-13). The modification is based on learning methodologies and curriculum organization (Ilma and Pratama, 2015). India has embraced text-based learning in the language and literature curriculum, in which language is treated as a text rather than as a set of rules (Ilma and Pratama, 2015). It more accurately reflects the speakers' ideals and ideologies.

Similarly, the curriculum 2013 for Indian language and literature has not yet been accepted by all provinces (Sufanti, 2016). Some provinces are still examining the curriculum, while others are ready to go and are in the process of implementing it. Any educational stakeholder will find benefits and drawbacks in the curriculum (Ilma

and Pratama, 2015).

One may believe that no adjustments are required because of the irregularity of curricular labeling in the Indian educational system. The other believes it is a magnificent plan for moral and mental change.

However, Indian society differs from that of the United States in terms of goals and practices. If the United States' reformation is more career-oriented, Indian society wants the language curriculum to be more cultural and morale-building in nature (Ministry of Education and Culture, 2018). This topic is important because all educational practitioners, from policymakers to teachers to parents, are worried about the decline of morality in Indian society. The new curriculum aims to establish cultural identity and moral values and form critical thinking (Ministry of Education and Culture, 2018).

2.5 Language Curriculum and Literature Education of United Arab Emirates

The issue of Arab pupils underperforming in Arabic language throughout elementary and secondary schools in the UAE, and failing to have the necessary written and spoken abilities, has been repeatedly emphasized over the years (Pennington, 2015b). It was recently claimed that Arabic is on the verge of becoming a foreign language in the UAE (Pennington, 2015b). In response to this unique problem, the MOE's 2015–2021 strategy prioritizes the development of students' Arabic language abilities as the primary priority in achieving its goals (MOE, 2015c). The proposal emphasizes the importance of rethinking the Arabic language curriculum and pedagogy.

The UAE, as an Arab country with a diverse population and official bilingual education in state-funded schools, provides an unusual setting for study on first language curriculum creation and regulations. According to internally gathered data, the Federal National Council (FNC) stated in 2013 the prevalent nature of inadequate Arabic literacy skills among UAE youngsters. Hundreds of youngsters are unable to read or write Arabic, making this a "new handicap" problem (Salem, 2013).

Currently, the Arabic language in schools is not given the attention it deserves in order to facilitate student development due to a lack of time. Furthermore, the quality of human resources and educational materials in Arabic is inferior to that of English courses, making it harder to improve and innovate (Al Farra, 2011). The director of the MOE's curriculum section stated that the Ministry is eager to improve Arabic language and has accepted the task (ECSSR, 2011). As a result, the MOE has commenced work on an Arabic language development document that contains a framework for skill accumulation from elementary to secondary school pupils (UK Years 1 to 11).

Today's children in the UAE are more likely to have superior English reading and writing abilities than Arabic. Since 2013, the issue of Arabic literacy among schoolchildren has been in the limelight, with frequent media and public dialogues urging for the MOE to take rapid and reactive action to solve the issue.

The UAE's curriculum development issues have contributed to the spread of Arabic language illiteracy. MOE efforts to improve Arabic reading skills may be perceived as contradictory to its reforms aimed at globally competitive, 21st-century abilities. However, the MOE's 2010-2020 policy emphasizes bilingualism in future education reform initiatives, with an emphasis on increasing students' skills in both Arabic and English. With these problems in mind, the UAE has declared that Arabic is the official language of all national entities, and has designated Arabic skill development as a core and top priority in the Ministry of Education vision (Gallagher, 2011).

Moreover, when complex and 'wicked' policy domains develop, the policy literature finds that learning between policy players and the formation of policy networks are desired in policymaking (Rittel and Webber, 2019). In the case of the Arabic language curriculum, the multifaceted issues confronting policymakers participating in policymaking necessitates MOE involvement in finding forms of collaborative learning or policy networks. As a result, MOE's development of the Arabic language curriculum policy community has the potential to have an influence in areas where the difficulties described earlier may be addressed. For example, by enlisting the help of external scholars, these policy communities can establish a practice of policy and curriculum assessment. Similarly, the policy community can help to build local capacity in policy and curriculum by supporting chances for UAE citizens to participate in learning processes with international experts.

2.6 Language Curriculum and Literature Education of Mongolia

There had previously been limited chances to investigate how Mongolians acquire and learn English due to the country's scarcity of English-speaking students until barely a decade ago. The issue of language acquisition among the population has grown critical as the number of students and users has constantly increased since 1990, making English the most frequently studied language in Mongolia. As a result, a better knowledge of how Mongolians learn English can lead to more successful teaching techniques by native and nonnative teachers in the nation, as well as the development of more appropriate curriculum. Finally, another fundamental reason why it is critical to investigate Mongolian students' learning abilities is that English speakers throughout Mongolia, like in many other countries, are beginning to construct their own type of nonstandard English. According to Bhatt, "linguistic and literary originality in English is driven less by its native speakers and more by nonnative speakers, who outnumber native speakers 4:1." (2017).

In many cases, "Mongolian English" functions as a language of communication, and it influences the learning and general usage of the language in the nation. Appreciating the evolution of Mongolian English can thus provide additional insights into how English is learned in the country. Observing the different areas where learners either show a significant degree of interference between the L1 and L2, have special learning challenges, or have unexpected ease can aid teachers in explaining Mongolian pupils' individual requirements.

However, because no data on the issue of English acquisition among Mongolian students had previously been gathered, an observational research was performed in 2003 at the National University of Mongolia to fulfill this purpose. Over the course of the academic year, two English classrooms with 15 and 17 senior year students (ages 19-25) each were observed. Both classes were general English courses with students testing at an intermediate to high-intermediate level at the start of the course.

As English has grown in popularity in many Asian nations, it has lately been adopted and taught as one of the key foreign languages as part of China's educational reforms in Autonomous Regions. As a result, trilingual education has emerged as a new phenomenon in language instruction in China's ethnic minority regions (Guo Tianxiang, Menggen qiqige and Tang Suge, 2013, pp.48-50). However, in most universities in Inner Mongolia, English is mostly taught by Chinese teachers in the learner's L2 Chinese, rather than in their native Mongolian. Even some Mongolian teachers teach English to Mongolian learners mostly in Chinese, but occasionally in Mongolian, neglecting the fact that for the vast majority of Mongolian English learners, their mother language skill exceeds that of their L2 Chinese and L3 English. One of the main reasons is that there are no adequate textbooks developed specifically for Mongolian English learners in Mongolian.

Furthermore, while they were students, the Mongolian instructors were taught English by Chinese teachers using materials written in both Chinese and English. As a result, they acquire accustomed to thinking in Chinese, making it simpler for them to teach English in Chinese as the primary medium language. Even some Mongolian instructors who do not speak Chinese fluently are teaching Mongolian students English in both Chinese and English. Mongolian instructors can teach English in Mongolian since there is no legislation requiring them to teach English to Mongolian students learning English in Chinese in the Inner Mongolian Autonomous Region. In summary, three languages are employed in the Mongolian learner's English teaching and learning process at university, with the learner's L2 Chinese dominating in most circumstances. Recent theoretical and empirical work has investigated concerns such as instructors' use of L1 and TL in L2 and FL classrooms, student motivation, exposure to language curriculum input, and suitable teachers' use of the L1, with the goal of promoting TL learning at cognitive considerations.

Many SL and FL educators emphasize that if students' motivation is high, they should be exposed to information in the TL (Krashen quoted in Turnbull, M & Arnett, K, 2017, p.205), because L2 educators and researchers have long acknowledged the importance of student motivation on language curriculum learning.

However, how much exposure to language curriculum information is ideal from a theoretical and pedagogical standpoint has been a hot matter of debate. According to MacDonald (2018), instructors' maximum use of the language curriculum in the classroom has an effect on student motivation, and depending on it too much may de-motivate pupils to study (cited in Turnbull, M & Arnett, K, 2016, p.206).

However, the use of L1 in teaching and learning is intended to improve the efficiency of second language acquisition. In the language classroom, L1 has been used effectively for a variety of purposes. For example, the mother tongue can be used as a resource for learners to draw background knowledge; most learners prefer to use L1 as an effective learning strategy in the form of translation technique; L1 use can lower affective barriers to enhance L2 acquisition. Cook believes that students' L1 may be exploited as a resource rather than an obstacle to successful learning, resulting in more authentic users of the language curriculum.

According to Van Lier (2015, p.38), teachers' use of the learner's L1 promotes intake, and teachers can use L1 "judiciously" to facilitate the intake procedure, and teachers' use of the L1 can provide an enhanced form of input that is more easily processed, and as a result, the learners can understand the language curriculum better. Brooks and Donato (2019, p.262) assert that learners can use their L1 to impart meaning to and maintain communication in the language curriculum.

According to previous related studies on teachers' uses of L1 and language curriculum, it is widely assumed that it is more effective to learn a foreign language through learners' most familiar language, which is always their native language in most cases considering intake, while language curriculum can be used to provide plenty of language curriculum input. There has been minimal research on how learners' second languages may be utilized in language curriculum learning. However, three languages are involved in the L3 teaching and learning of Mongolian adults at university in Inner Mongolia: Mongolian, Chinese, and English. L2 proficiency and exposure, according to Tremblay Marie-Claude (2016, p.109), play an important influence in third language acquisition.

However, according to the notion of recency in third language acquisition, which might have an impact on cross-linguistic influence (Cenoz Jasone, 2011, p.8), Chinese is more actively utilized in teaching and learning than Mongolian learners' native tongue in the majority of situations.

2.7 The Educational Purposes and Philosophies of the Language Curriculum

Language curriculum is meant to foster autonomous critical thinking (Stotsky, 2018). Language activities or non-literary works, as well as writing tasks, may broaden student analysis and form their knowledge, which stimulates intellectual growth and enhances autonomous critical thinking (Stotsky, 2018).

Students participate as readers and listeners to grasp what an author or speaker is saying and question the author's and speaker's assumptions to investigate the logic (CCSS, 2017). Similarly, language and literature lessons are designed to improve students' critical, logical, creative, and inventive thinking skills (Ministry of Education and Culture, 2018). However, in actuality, the United States, Philippines, and India may face distinct challenges. The notion of critical thinking is well-known in Western society, which has grown up with more liberal norms. Children are even trained to speak out for themselves and to be self-sufficient.

In contrast, students in Indian and Philippine society still show respect for senior voices as a sign of civility. It is socially acceptable for parents to exercise authority over their children. As a result, pupils are hesitant to express themselves, for example, by voicing their disagreement. As a result, critical thinking activities in class and social life may suffer.

The language curriculum includes an integrated literacy paradigm with the capacity to think critically (CCSS, 2018). It stresses the ability to communicate ideas in the expository and expressive speech by reading, writing, listening, and researching (Stotsky, 2018). Furthermore, students must acquire, interpret, analyze, synthesize, and report ideas and information and write what they read (CCSS, 2018). As a result, it may help develop the ability to do research to answer questions and solve difficulties (CCSS, 2018).

Similarly, the Indian language and literature curriculum is intended to provide a basis for knowledge and literacy. The program is designed to assist pupils in developing higher-order thinking abilities that will help them grasp other subjects (Ministry of Education and Culture, 2018). It is also meant to improve student's literacy skills, such as their ability to communicate accurately and nicely in both speech and writing. Furthermore, the curriculum has now transitioned to text-based learning, in which language is considered text that is used to communicate an individual's viewpoint, attitude, beliefs, and ideology and mold human thinking capacity (Ilma and Pratama, 2015).

However, in the Philippines, literacy development in language curriculum is meant to prepare students for college, workforce training, and life in a technology culture (DepED, 2017). Language curriculum integration is required to develop highly competitive individuals capable of reading complex and informational texts from varied backgrounds for college life and to mold capable workforces early in a highly competitive environment.

Meanwhile, the Indian language and literature curriculum stress literacy development in order to form not just knowledge but also moral understanding. Students are expected to be more informed as well as more kind in their daily lives. Furthermore, there is a historical argument that language curriculum has always been associated with national identity (Applebee, 1974; Frye, 1962; Stotsky, 1994; Willinsky, 1998, 2001 cited in Skerrett, 2018). Meanwhile, the language curriculum in America trains students to be self-governing citizens of the United States (Stotsky, 2018). They offer pupils common ground by describing key works in American cultural history so that the English language arts curriculum may act as a unifying force in schools and society (Stotsky, 2018).

Further, the language curriculum's goal is in line with the nation's culture, in which everyone is encouraged to pursue their aspirations as a means of achieving success (Jones and King, 2017). It also teaches history and politics through analyzing known works of our nation's literature from a range of genres and traditions, encouraging the philosophical, cultural, political, religious, ethical, and social influences of the historical time that influenced the characters, storylines, and locales

(California Department of Education, 2017).

Meanwhile, the language and literature curriculum aims to produce devout and well-behaved individuals (Ministry of Education and Culture, 2018). As a result, moral development through literary works is emphasized in Indian, Philippines, and U.S classrooms, where students can acquire numerous moral teachings from literary works. It is meant to build a national and cultural identity with positive characteristics, religious, social, and knowledge (Ministry of Education and Culture, 2018).

3. Conclusion and Implication

Comparing the language curriculum in the United States, Mongolia, United Arab Emirates, Philippines and Indian language and literature curriculum broadens the authors' understanding of what can be learned from the US curriculum and how it can be tailored for the Indian and Philippines context.

In this article, the author wants to emphasize the significance of establishing particular values in pupils while they are learning language and literature. After examining, comparing, and contrasting both curricula, the author believes there is potential for development in character education in the language curriculum in India and in the Philippine countries. The language curriculum in the United States is constructed with the country's ideological standpoint in mind.

The Common Core State Standards are designed to generate college and career-ready students who will contribute to the development of the country. The standards may be useful in promoting economic opportunity by preparing students to be lucrative business resources. Business agents may gain because the CCSS and higher education work together to improve learning for the professional workforce.

Furthermore, higher education may benefit since the curriculum will transfer capable and prepared high school graduates to colleges. In other words, it makes it easier for colleges to adapt students' strengths and match them with entry-level courses (Jones and King, 2017). Students will be directly streamed in their skills and preferences by then, making the admission process easier for them.

However, the implementation of this language curriculum should prioritize marginalized populations. Those who lose may include disabled persons who require more assistance and are less proficient in employment training. If the US language curriculum prioritizes economic gain over moral training, the language curriculum is a type of moral instruction in the Mongolia, United Arab Emirates, Philippine and India setting. The instruction might aid in the advancement of character education. Some experts believe that moral and ethical traditions may be conveyed through literacy instruction (Skerrett, 2020). As a result, it helps some academics and educators, particularly those who teach language and literature lessons or learning areas, contribute to developing the nation's character (Inderawati, 2018).

Nonetheless, instructors in Mongolia, United Arab Emirates, Philippines and India continue to struggle to comprehend and follow the language curriculum because it is not explicitly stated in any guidelines. Teachers may be perplexed as to which

characteristics should be taught and which are required in the classroom, or if they can use the students' mother-tongue or code-switching.

In comparison to the values and moral training provided in the American curriculum, they successfully embed the ideology in the majority of society, whether it is good or harmful. This is a really intriguing discovery that highlights the curriculum's substance and implementation. America does not have a specific religious and moral curriculum and does not place a strong emphasis on it, but ideology, moral values, and characteristics are interwoven and reinforced through the English language arts curriculum. This is possible because America has publicly declared its philosophy.

The educational design derived from the concept is then implemented. Even textbooks chosen and taught in the classroom have ideological principles, although the Philippines' understanding of ideology remains enigmatic and imprecise. Despite the fact that the Philippines', Mongolia, United Arab Emirates, and India have various circumstances, particularly in terms of culture and belief systems, we may still learn from the United States. That does not imply that we should accept its ideals and views.

On the other hand, the Philippines', Mongolia, United Arab Emirates, and India can benefit from the introduction of the language curriculum. America effectively instills character and moral education in its population in order to develop their worldview (thinking) and characteristics derived from its ideology.

Additionally, the author strongly advised educators and educational authorities to be more specific in determining which character should be highlighted in the curriculum. They should also decide what supporting measures would help them achieve their educational goals, such as choosing textbooks that teach more ideological beliefs rather than just grammatical rules. As a higher education teacher who is interested in character and language education, the author would like to conduct additional research on the Philippine language and literature textbooks because this has not been extensively covered in this paper and is an important factor in teaching character education that can help foster the Philippines' worldview and personality regarding language curriculum.

Moreover, as the language curriculum has grown in popularity in many Asian nations, it has lately been adopted and taught as one of the key foreign languages as part of China's educational reforms in Autonomous Regions. As a result, trilingual education has emerged as a new phenomenon in language instruction in China's ethnic minority regions (Guo Tianxiang, Menggen qiqige, and Tang Suge, 2013, pp.48-50).

However, in most universities in Inner Mongolia, English is mostly taught by Chinese teachers in the learner's L2 Chinese rather than in their native Mongolian. Even some Mongolian teachers teach English to Mongolian learners mostly in Chinese but occasionally in Mongolian, neglecting the fact that for the vast majority of Mongolian English learners, their mother language skill exceeds that of their L2 Chinese and L3 English.

One of the main reasons is that there are no adequate textbooks developed specifically for Mongolian English learners in Mongolian. Furthermore, while they were students, the Mongolian instructors were taught English by Chinese teachers using materials written in both Chinese and English. As a result, they become accustomed to thinking in Chinese, making it simpler for them to teach English in Chinese as the primary medium language. Even some Mongolian instructors who do not speak Chinese fluently are teaching Mongolian students English in both Chinese and English. Mongolian instructors can teach English in Mongolian since there is no legislation requiring them to teach English to Mongolian students learning English in Chinese in the Inner Mongolian Autonomous Region.

In summary, the findings of this article were obtained mainly through data collected through journal collection and case analysis with the use of different journals, previous articles, and thesis related to language curriculum. In addition, within the Arabic language curriculum policy community in the UAE.

In this section, the author reflects that the UAE language curriculum follows: 1) a structure for policy development; 2) a systematic model for the integration of interaction, learning, and evidence utilization in policymaking; 3) a model enhanced by individual capacities for learning; and 4) a model capable of supporting evidence utilization in policymaking. The language curriculum as a structure for policy development

The concept of language curriculum was defined through the literature review as an interaction structure for collaborative learning. In particular, a structure in policymaking that allows policymakers to engage with diverse participants in an attempt to exchange learning for policy improvement. When faced with challenging policy problems related to language curriculum, as argued by Rittel and Webber (1973), such as the challenge of addressing the Arabic language curriculum policymaking in the UAE, policymakers require collective problem-solving approaches.

In conclusion, with regard to the purpose of this article, language curriculum and its modes of interaction provided new insights to consider. The language curriculum in the five countries was involved in more than supporting or informing policy; it was involved in the actual process of creating, piloting, and implementing policy. As such, for learning - the central concept in language curriculum - frequency of interaction is argued to suggest its successful utilization (Huberman, 2010; Dentler, 2014; Peterson and Emrick, 2013).

Language curriculum as a structure for supporting policy development has multiple implications for policymakers, experts, and researchers. Policymaking institutions that are interested in promoting learning within their decision-making processes can purposefully initiate interaction structures by adopting the model of the language curriculum. This will require organizations to provide resources that support learning and interactions, such as time and access to learning opportunities. In the case of language curriculum development in the five countries where there is a shortage in curriculum, policy, and subject expertise, language curriculum as an

interaction structure for policymaking offers a greater opportunity for supplementing current shortages of expertise in MOE by engaging external experts.

In the long run, these interactions with external experts can support enhancing the skills and knowledge of policy actors involved in the learning community. For the practitioners, subject experts, and researchers involved, the language curriculum as an interaction structure in policy development presents an opportunity to develop personal knowledge of policymaking in the five different countries.

REFERENCES

- Abad, L. (2005). Code-switching in the classroom: A clash of two languages. *Faculty Research Journal of Miriam College*. 36-52.
- Abu Dhabi Education Council. (2010). *New school model: School leadership handbook*. Retrieved from www.adec.ac.ae/.../Publications/ADEC-Leadership%20english.pdf
- Abu Dhabi Education Council. (2011). *English continuous assessment*. Retrieved from alandalus-sch.com/documents/ADEC-ECART.pdf
- Al Farra, S. (2011) 'Education in the UAE: A vision for the future', in ECSSR (ed.) *Education in the UAE: Current status and future developments*. Abu Dhabi: The Emirates Centre for Strategic Studies and Research, pp. 219-238.
- Axel, J. (2014). Filipino in the United States: Heritage Language Perspectives. In T. Wiley, J. K. Peyton, D. Christian (Eds.), *Handbook of heritage, community, and native American languages in the United States: Research, policy, and educational practice* (pp. 297-307). New York: Routledge.
- Benson, C. (2010). The Primary Bilingual Education Experiment in Mozambique, 1993 to 1997. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. Retrieved from <http://www.lingref.com/isb/4/019ISB4.PDF>
- Calderon, M. (2014). A critique of K-12 Philippine education system. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 2, 541–550.
- California Department of Education. (2017). *English language arts content standards for California public school*. California: The California Department of Education. Retrieved from <http://www.cde.ca.gov/be/st/ss/documents/elacontentstnds.pdf>
- Carless, D. (1998). A case study of curriculum implementation in Hong Kong. *System*, 26, 353–368. doi:10.1016/s0346-251x(98)00023-2
- Chun, C. (2016). Addressing racialized multicultural discourses in an EAP textbook: Working toward a critical pedagogies approach. *TESOL Quarterly*, doi:10.1002/tesq.216
- Chun, D., Kern, R., & Smith, B. (2016). Technology in language use, language teaching, and language learning. *The Modern Language Journal*, 100, 64–80. doi:10.1111/modl.12302

Ferrer, N., Christine & Somera, S., Aubrey. (2022). Identifying and Understanding the Language Curriculum Across the World.

IJOTL-TL (2022, May), 7(2): 194-216. DOI [10.30957/ijotl.v7i2.706](https://doi.org/10.30957/ijotl.v7i2.706).

- Common Core State Standards Initiative. (2017). Common core state standards for English language arts & Literacy in history/social studies, science, and technical subjects. Washington, DC: National Governors Association Center for Best Practices & Council of Chief State School Officers. Retrieved from http://www.corestandards.org/wpcontent/uploads/ELA_Standards1.pdf
- Cummins, J. (2010). Language, power, and pedagogy. Bilingual children in the crossfire. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Department of Education. (2012). Policy guidelines on the implementation of grades 1 to 10 of the K to 12 basic education curriculum (BEC) effective school year 2012–2013. Retrieved from http://www.deped.gov.ph/sites/default/files/order/2012/DO_s2012_31.pdf
- Department of Education. (2013). NAT overview and 2012 test results. Retrieved from <http://depedqc.ph/announcements/2013-NAT-GUIDELINES/2013%20NAT%20Overview%20-%20QC.pdf>
- Department of Education. (2015). Utilization of language mapping data for mother tongue-based multilingual education (MTB-MLE) program implementation. Retrieved from http://www.deped.gov.ph/sites/default/files/order/2015/DO_s2015_55_0.pdf
- Department of Education. (2016). K to 12 curriculum guide for English. Retrieved from http://www.deped.gov.ph/sites/default/files/page/2016/English%20CG_0.pdf
- Djite, P. H. (2018). The Language Differences: Language and Development in the Greater Mekong Sub-Region. Canada: Multilingual Matters
- Durano, F. (2008). Attitudes towards English and Filipino codes-switching amongst high school students in Ormoc City, Philippines (Unpublished master's thesis). Sweden: Malmo University.
- ECSSR. (2011) 'Development of the Curriculum in the UAE'. Available at: http://www.ecssr.ac.ae/ECSSR/print/ft.jsp?lang=enandftId=/FeatureTopic/ECSSR/FeatureTopic_1451.xml
- Galam, R. G. (1997). Curriculum development in Indian, Malaysia, and Singapore. Alipato: A Journal of Basic Education, 2(1 & 2).
- Gallagher, K. (2011). Bilingual education in the UAE: factors, variables and critical questions. Education, Business and Society: Contemporary Middle Eastern Issues. 4 (1), 62-79.
- Garcia, O., & Kleyn, T. (2016). Translanguaging with multilingual students: Learning from classroom moments. London: Taylor and Francis.
- Goldberg, D., Looney, D., & Lusin, N. (2015). Enrollments in languages other than English in the United States institutions of higher education. Modern Language Association of America. Retrieved from https://apps.mla.org/pdf/2013_enrollment_survey.pdf
- Guo Tian xiang, Meng gen qi qi ge, Tang Suge. (2003). Considerations on the Reform of Bilingual and Trilingual Teaching in Inner Mongolia. Journal of Inner Mongolia Normal University. Vol.15, No.1, 48-50.

Ferrer, N., Christine & Somera, S., Aubrey. (2022). Identifying and Understanding the Language Curriculum Across the World.

IJOTL-TL (2022, May), 7(2): 194-216. DOI [10.30957/ijotl.v7i2.706](https://doi.org/10.30957/ijotl.v7i2.706).

- Ilma, Z., & Pratama, R. K. (2015, March). Transformation in Indian Language Curriculum: Pros and Cons between KTSP 2006 and Curriculum 2013 in India. Paper presented in International Conference on Trends in Economic, Humanities and Management (ICTEHM'15), Singapore. Retrieved from <http://icehm.org/upload/5097ED0315007.pdf>
- Inderawati, R. (2018). The application of literature for all and literature across curriculum concept by responding literary works to the enlightenment of character education in India context. *Journal of Teaching and Education*, 2(1), 13-24.
- Jackson, L. (2014). *Muslims and Islam in US education: Reconsidering multiculturalism*. New York, NY: Routledge
- Jones, A. G., & King, J. E. (2017). The common core state standards: A vital tool for higher education. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 44(6), 37-43.
- Kobayashi, H., & Rinnert, C. (2018). Task response and text construction across L1 and L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17, 7–29. doi: 10.1016/j.jslw. 2018.08.004
- Kubanyiova, M., & Crookes, G. (2016). Re-envisioning the roles, tasks, and contributions of language teachers in the multilingual era of language education research and practice. *The Modern Language Journal*, 100, 117–132. doi: 10.1111/modl.12304
- Marsh, W. W. (2019). Common core and the uncommon learner: How autism affects acquisition of common core state standards. *Contemporary School Psychology*, 19(2), 66-76.
- Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2018). *Massachusetts English language arts curriculum framework working draft*. Massachusetts, USA. Retrieved from <http://www.doe.mass.edu/frameworks/ela/0610draft.pdf>
- Ministry of Education and Culture. (2018). *Peraturan menteri pendidikan dan kebudayaan tentang kurikulum 2017 sekolah menengah atas/madrasah aliyah*. Retrieved from <https://suaidinmath.files.wordpress.com/2018/09/3-pmp-b-indsma-allson-1juni2018.pdf>
- Mira., Namsrai,. (2018) “Language Planning Policy in Mongolia.” Diss. University of Humanites, Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia.
- Mongolian Ministry of Education, Culture and Science. “Education Sector Strategy: 2000-2005”. Ulaanbaatar, 2000.
- Nagarathinam, R. (2018). Current policies, developments and challenges in mother tongue education amongst public schools in Malaysia. A paper presented at the Regional, Consultative Workshop on “Using the Mother Tongue as Bridge Language of Instruction in Southeast Asian Countries: Policy, Strategies and Advocacy” Bangkok, Thailand
- Parra, M. L. (2016). Critical approaches to heritage language instruction: How to foster students’ critical consciousness. In M. Fairclough & S. Beaudrie (Eds.),

Ferrer, N., Christine & Somera, S., Aubrey. (2022). Identifying and Understanding the Language Curriculum Across the World.

IJOTL-TL (2022, May), 7(2): 194-216. DOI [10.30957/ijotl.v7i2.706](https://doi.org/10.30957/ijotl.v7i2.706).

- Innovative Strategies for Heritage Language Teaching (pp. 166-189). Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Pazzibugan, D. (2018). 'K 12' still struggling. *Philippine Daily Inquirer*. Retrieved from <http://newsinfo.inquirer.net/419261/k-12-still-struggling>
- Pennington, M. (2015b). The first year of teaching. In J. C. Richards (Ed.), *Beyond training*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rahman, N. (2014). From curriculum reform to classroom practice: An evaluation of the English primary curriculum in Malaysia (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of York, England.
- Roca, A., & Valdés, G. (2016). *Innovative strategies for heritage language teaching: a practical guide for the classroom*. Georgetown University Press.
- Rogers, R. (2004). An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education. In R. Rogers (Ed.), *An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education* (pp. 1-18). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- SEAMEO INNOTECH (2019). *K to 12 toolkit: Resource guide for teacher educators, school administrators and teachers*. Quezon City, Philippines: Author
- Skerrett, A. (2019). Of literary import: A case of cross-national similarities in the secondary english curriculum in the united states and canada. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 45(1), 36-58.
- Smit, B. (2010). Teachers, local knowledge, and policy implementation: A qualitative policy-practice inquiry. *Education and Urban Society*, 37, 292-306. doi:10.1177/0013124505275426
- State Education Standard. (2017). The voices of non-adopters: Members of the virginia and nebraska state boards of education on why their states did not adopt the common core standards. *State Education Standard*, 12(2), 45-46.
- Stotsky, Sandra. (2018). *An english language arts curriculum framework for american public schools*. Arkansas, United States: The University of Arkansas. Retrieved from http://www.uaedreform.org/wpcontent/uploads/Stotsky-Optional_ELA_standards.pdf
- Strydom, R., & Velu, L. (2011). Choice as a learning incentive. In Whitby, K. Editor, *Action research in Abu Dhabi II* (55-57). CfBT Education Trust.
- Sufanti, M. (2018). *Pembelajaran Bahasa India Berbasis Teks: Belajar dari Ohio Amerika Serikat*. Magister Pengkajian Bahasa Pascasarjana Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta. Surakarta, Jawa Tengah. Retrieved from https://publikasiilmiah.ums.ac.id/bitstream/handle/11617/3363/2_Pembelajaran%20Bahasa%20India%20Berbasis%20Teks%20Belajar%20Dari%20Ohio%20Amerika%20Serikat.pdf?sequence=1
- Teale, S., & Thompson, P. (2019). Intrinsic motivations, literacy, and assessment practices: "That's my grade. That's me." *Educational Psychologist*, 32, 107-123.
- Teale, W.H. & Thompson, K. (2019, December). *Literature and the U.S. high school: current trends in curriculum, materials, and instruction*. Paper presented

Ferrer, N., Christine & Somera, S., Aubrey. (2022). Identifying and Understanding the Language Curriculum Across the World.

IJOTL-TL (2022, May), 7(2): 194-216. DOI [10.30957/ijotl.v7i2.706](https://doi.org/10.30957/ijotl.v7i2.706).

- at Seminario Internacional ¿Qué leer? ¿Cómo leer? Lecturas de Juventud, Santiago, Chile.
- Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. P. (2017). A national study of school effectiveness for language minority students' long-term academic achievement. George Mason University, CREDE (Center for Research on Education, Diversity & Excellence)
- Truscott, J. (2010). Madares al Ghad Program. Ministry of Education Document.
- Turnbull, M & Arnett, K. (2016). "Teachers' uses of the Target and First Language in Second and Foreign Language Classrooms." *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 22, 204-218.
- UAE Education Policy Forum (2010). Teachers and training in UAE. Retrieved on Nov 19th from http://tips.fohmics.com/Dsg2011/Portals/0/Teachers%20and%20Training_Ian%20Haslam.pdf
- UAE Ministry of Education & Youth. (2000). Education Vision 2020: Pillars, strategic objectives, projects and implementation programs for UAE education development. Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates.
- UNESCO. (2012). Why language matters for the millennium development goals. Bangkok, Thailand:
- UNESCO. UNESCO. (2015). Philippine Education for All 2015 review report. Retrieved from <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0023/002303/230331e.pdf>
- Valerio, M. (2020). Factors affecting English instruction of grade 7 K to 12 curriculum as perceived by high school English teachers of the Division of Quirino. *International Journal of English Language Teaching*, 3, 48–67.
- Wang, H. (2018). Language policy implementation: A look at teachers' perceptions. *Asian EFL Journal*, 30(1), 1–25.
- Wiley, T. G., & García, O. (2016). Language policy and planning in language education: Legacies, consequences, and possibilities. *The Modern Language Journal*, 100, 48–63. doi:10.1017/s0958344009000056