Second Language Acquisition Instructional Models in English-Medium International Schools: Past, Present, and Future

İngilizce Eğitim Veren Uluslararası Okullarda İkinci Dil Edinimi Eğitim Modelleri: Dünü, Bugünü ve Geleceği

Clayton Lehman[1] (iD) Brett Welch[2] (iD)

[1]Centre for Academic English Studies at Surrey International Institute, Dongbei University, No. 217 Jianshanjie, Shahekou District, Dalian, Liaoning, China, clwale@yahoo.com

[2] College of Graduate Studies, Lamar University, P.O. Box 10034, Beaumont, TX 77710 U.S.A.

Abstract: The international school market continues to expand, and an increasing number of English language learners (ELLs) are enrolling in English-medium international schools. As new schools start and existing schools evaluate their second language acquisition model(s), care should be taken to implement a model that provides ELLs with the necessary support for English language acquisition. Understanding current practice and teacher preference can enable school leaders to make more informed decisions when implementing or revising an SLA instructional mode (IM). The purpose of this research study is to build upon previous research findings through further examination of the frequency of SLA IM used in English-medium international schools. Additionally, the researchers sought to compare the preferred SLA IMs between ELL, Primary, and English teachers. Findings from this quantitative survey-based study reinforce previous findings that the hybrid push-in and pull-out SLA IM is the most implemented SLA IM in English-medium international schools. Additionally, the hybrid SLA IM continues to be the preferred SLA IM in English-medium international schools.

Keywords: Second language acquisition, instructional model, international schools, push-in support

Öz: Uluslararası okul sektörü genişlemeye devam etmektedir ve artan sayıda İngilizce öğrenen İngilizce eğitim veren uluslararası okullara kaydolmaktadır. Yeni okullar açıldıkça ve mevcut okullar ikinci dil edinim modellerini değerlendirdikçe İngilizce öğrenenlere dil edinimi için gerekli desteği sağlayan bir modelin uygulanmasına özen gösterilmelidir. Mevcut uygulamayı ve öğretmen tercihini anlamak, okul liderlerinin ikinci dil edinimi öğretim yöntemini uygularken veya revize ederken daha bilinçli kararlar vermesini sağlayabilir. Bu çalışmanın amacı, İngilizce eğitim veren uluslararası okullarda kullanılan ikinci dil edinimi öğretim yönteminin sıklığının detaylı incelenmesi yoluyla önceki araştırma bulgularına katkı sağlamaktır. Ayrıca araştırmacılar, İngilizce öğrenenler, İlkokul ve İngilizce öğretmenleri arasında tercih edilen ikinci dil edinimi öğretim yöntemlerini karşılaştırmaya çalışmaktır. Nicel ankete dayalı çalışmadan elde edilen bulgular, hibrit sınıf içi ve sınıf dışı ikinci dil edinimi öğretim yönteminin İngilizce eğitim veren uluslararası okullarda en çok uygulanan ikinci dil edinimi öğretim yöntemi olduğuna dair önceki bulguları desteklemektedir. Dahası, hibrit ikinci dil edinimi öğretim yöntemi İngilizce eğitim veren uluslararası okullarda tercih edilmeye devam etmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimler: İkinci dil edinimi, öğretim modeli, uluslararası okullar, sınıf içi destek

Introduction

The international school market is continuing to increase. As of July 2021, International School Consultancy (ISC) Research reported that 12,373 international schools were operating worldwide (ISC Research, 2021), with projections on track to reach 16,000 schools by 2026, as predicted by ISC in 2016 and 2019 (ISC Research, 2016; 2019a). These figures show unprecedented growth since 2000 when ISC (2015) reported there were 2,580 international schools in operation. With this growth, the number of non-expatriate local students enrolled in international schools has increased.

In 2019, ISC Research (2019b) reported that local non-expatriate students formed more than 80% of the international school enrollment; however, the 80% figure has been reported as far back as 2012 (Lewandowski, 2012), possibly further. Additionally, there is a growing number of expatriate students from non-native English-speaking countries (Lehman, 2020). Therefore, many students enrolled in an English-medium international school are English language learners (ELLs). With such a large number of ELLs, of concern is the appropriateness of the second language acquisition (SLA) instructional model (IM) being employed.

A poorly implemented SLA IM can have a long-lasting effect on the students who are learning the targeted language in addition to the curriculum (Zen, 2001). Further, a poorly implemented SLA IM can impact the amount of comprehensible input (Krashen, 1981) an ELL receives and influence the learning environment ELLs are placed in, which impacts the status of an ELL's affective filter (Krashen, 1981). Because teachers are those in the classroom providing instruction, examining their opinions and preferences can enable school leaders to make more informed decisions concerning the SLA IM(s) to implement within their school's context.

Mainstream with No Support

The mainstream with no support model is an SLA IM in which the classroom teacher provides instruction without an ELL/EAL/ESL specialist teacher. This model is sometimes labeled as an inclusionary model since ELL students are

included in the mainstream classroom; however, opponents of the mainstream with no support model often consider the model to place ELL students in a sink-or-swim situation. This sink or swim environment is even more treacherous when many teachers in international schools lack training for working with ELL students. Studying international school teachers in the Ukraine and Eastern Europe, Spencer (2021) found that the majority of participants reported not having received training in working with ELL students during their initial teacher training. Of additional concern is the lack of professional development opportunities provided to teachers by international schools. Studying the provision of language-specific professional development for teachers in international schools in East Asia, Lehman (2021) found that more than half of the 548 participants reported their school provided low, very low, or no professional development opportunities for teachers working with ELL students. Many international schools enrolling high numbers of ELLs use mainstream with no support SLA IM. Researching SLA IMs in international schools in East Asia, Lehman and Welch (2020a) found that 13.4% (*N*=543) of participants reported using the mainstream no support SLA IM in their school and that only 4.6% preferred this SLA IM.

Push-in

For the push-in SLA IM, ELL specialists go into the classroom to work with ELL students studying in a mainstream class. The use of this model has been increasing, and Lehman and Welch (2020a) found that 13.6% of participants reported their school using this model. Further, Lehman and Welch (2020a) found that 18.5% preferred the push-in model over other SLA IMs. However, the push-in SLA IM can lead to contention and confusion unless the policy documents or school leadership transparently establishes expectations and provides structures of support facilitating the push-in SLA IM. For example, White (2017) documented ELL teachers' challenges when pushing into the mainstream classroom. Some of these challenges included loss of professional autonomy and identity and a vague understanding of teacher roles and responsibilities in various scenarios. Studying administrator and teacher knowledge of school language policy, Lehman and Welch (2020b) found that only 54% (*N*=363) of administrators and teachers reported that the school language policy specifically defined the roles of the classroom teachers and ELL/EAL/ESL teachers. Of the remaining percent, 32% reported that the school language policy did not define the roles, and 14% did not know. For the push-in model to succeed, there need to be transparent and clearly defined expectations established followed by attentive leadership who provide the necessary support structures to facilitate the push-in SLA IM.

Pull-out

For many years, international schools relied on the pull-out SLA IM (Carder, 2014), which is still used in many schools (Shoebottom, 2009). Some pull-out programs offer a side-by-side ELL curriculum, while others pull students out of various classes for individualized or small group ELL lessons. Educators who favor the pull-out SLA IM regard the pull-out sessions as providing safe zones for ELLs and increasing ELL teacher autonomy and independence (White, 2017). Opponents of the pull-out SLA IM believe the model is not inclusive and that ELLs are missing valuable instruction taking place in the mainstream classroom. Additionally, there is concern that some pull-out instruction focuses too much on developing survival English and basic interpersonal communicative skills instead of developing the academic language needed to participate in the school's core curriculum (Li, 2018). However, research findings by Baecher and Bell (2017) studying ESL teacher instructional time revealed that ELL students received more minutes of instruction from the ESL teacher during pull-out lessons than during push-in lessons. Lehman and Welch (2020a) found that 16.9% of participants reported using the pull-out model. While the pull-out model is considered the traditional SLA IM, only 5.9% revealed it as their preferred SLA IM (Lehman & Welch, 2020a).

Hybrid

The hybrid model occurs when both push-in and pull-out are used in combination, and a sizeable number of educators favor this particular SLA IM. Lehman and Welch (2020a) found that 44.2% of participants reported the use of this model. Further, Lehman and Welch (2020a) found that 52.4% of the participants preferred the hybrid SLA IM of push-in and pull-out. Studying teacher perceptions of the effectiveness of the push-in and pull-out models and learning outcomes, Reynolds, Jia, Nolin-Smith, and O'Brien (2013) concluded that both models of instruction were flawed and that a hybrid model could provide solutions. According to findings reported by Baecher and Bell (2017), the hybrid model provided more instructional time than did the push-in model; however, this was not always the case when the instructional time of the hybrid model was compared with the pull-out SLA IM. Studying teacher opinions of push-in and pull-out as part of inclusive schools, Demo, Nes, Somby, Frizzarin, and Zovo (2021) found that teacher opinions were affected by individual student needs and contextual factors. If schools and school leaders are willing to take individual student needs and contextual matters into consideration, the hybrid model appears to offer a flexible SLA IM, and the percentage of time devoted to push-in or pull-out can be altered based on student need, ELL teacher schedules, and mainstream and elective class schedules. Without these considerations, the positive and negative forces described above for the push-in and pull-out SLA IMs are still at play.

Intensive English

The intensive English SLA IM consists of English courses that can last from a few weeks to a semester or more (Brevetti & Ford, 2017; Szasz, 2010). Intensive English classes are usually taught by an ELL specialist or someone who has received training for working with ELLs. Proponents of the intensive English SLA IM believe ELLs should acquire sufficient English skills before entering the mainstream classroom. On the contrary, others argue that ELLs in intensive English programs are interacting with other students in the mainstream, thereby robbing them of valuable English inputs that enable them to acquire the target language quicker. Lehman and Welch (2020a) found that 9.6% of the participants reported their school was using an intensive English SLA IM, and 17.3% preferred the intensive English model.

After-school, Before-school, or Weekend Activity

ELL instruction outside of regular school hours is part of the afterschool, before-school, weekend activity SLA IM. Because this model occurs outside of regular school hours, an additional ELL fee is often charged in addition to school tuition. Some consider this model to be an intensive language model; however, the students attending after-school, before-school, and weekend ELL instructional programs still attend mainstream classrooms during the school day. Similar to the mainstream with no support SLA IM, this model places ELLs in mainstream classes, which can lead to a sink-or-swim situation. After-school, before-school, and weekend ELL instructional programs are often not focused on providing instruction that reinforces the school's core curriculum and instead burdens ELLs with an additional curriculum, which places additional stress on ELLs (Li, 2018). Additionally, the limited number of hours and infrequency for language instruction provided via weekend language programs does not always produce the desired linguistic outcomes (Li and Wen, 2015). Lehman and Welch (2020a) found that 2.2% of the participants reported their school was using an after-school, before-school, weekend activity SLA IM, and 1.3% preferred this SLA IM.

Purpose and Research Questions

The purpose of this research study was to build upon previous research findings through further examination of the frequency of SLA IM used in English-medium international schools. Additionally, the researchers sought to compare the preferred SLA IMs between ELL, Primary, and English teachers. To guide the study, the researchers developed the following questions.

- What is the frequency of SLA models being used in international schools?
- What are the preferred SLA IMs of ELL, Primary, and English teachers?
- What are the differences in the preferred SLA IMs between ELL, Primary, and English teachers?

Method

Research Design

The researchers used an observational quantitative research design consisting of a cross-sectional survey for each of the groups listed above. A cross-sectional survey does not manipulate a variable; instead, the survey collects data at a single point in time (Creswell, 2012). The researchers used random sampling as school websites were searched for potential participants' names, positions, and contact information. The researchers sent potential participants a survey request to their school email address, and all participants were working in an international school when they completed the survey.

Setting and Participants

Participants were located in countries in Africa, Asia, the Middle East, and South America; most participants were in East Asia. The researchers sent a survey request to 476 ELL teachers, 1,836 Primary teachers, and 1,294 Secondary English teachers. Overall, 3,606 teachers received a survey request. A total of 274 survey participants responded to the survey question used for this research study. Of the 274 participants, 90 were ELL teachers, 108 were Primary teachers, and 76 were Secondary English teachers. The surveys were completed during May and June of 2021. The potential participants were not promised any reward and were not coerced into completing the survey. Participation was voluntary, and when completing the survey, none of the questions were mandatory.

Instruments

Each group of participants received a separate survey; however, the survey questions for this study were identical across the groups. To establish content validity, three international school educators, who did not participate in the study, served as experts in the field (Creswell, 2012; Salkind, 2013) and reviewed the research questions and survey questions.

For this study, two survey questions were used (see Appendix). In the introductory email, potential participants were informed of the intentions of the study. Additionally, a website link was provided, allowing potential participants to view the research questions and additional information about the study, including biographical information about the primary researcher. The website also provided a contact box so potential participants could ask questions before and after choosing to complete the survey. The researchers used Survey Monkey to host the surveys; all data were stored via a password-protected laptop and password-protected external hard drive.

Measures and Data Analysis

The researchers used SPSS software (v. 27) to perform Pearson chi-square tests (χ^2) with an alpha level of .05. The Pearson chi-square test is a nonparametric test used to measure the distribution of frequencies (Salkind, 2013). Additionally, the Pearson chi-square test can evaluate nominal data (Creswell, 2012; McHugh, 2013). For the omnibus chi-square tests, the expected count, adjusted residuals, and Bonferonni corrected p values calculated by SPSS are provided in an accompanying table (Beasley & Schumacker, 1995; Garcia-Perez & Nunez-Anton, 2003; Sharpe, 2015). Adjusted residuals that exceed +/-2.0 and statistically significant Bonferroni corrected p values are given in bold print. All assumptions for the Pearson chi-square test were met (McHugh, 2013).

Results

To obtain a picture of current SLA IM usage, the researchers asked participants to reveal which model(s) were currently in use in their school. Table 1 reports the responses.

To understand the differences between the three groups, the researchers asked participants to identify their preferred SLA IM. Table 2 reports the responses.

The results of a Pearson chi-square test revealed that there were statistically significant differences in the preferred SLA IM between ELL teachers (Group 1: $n = 90$) and Primary teachers (Group 2: $n = 108$) and Secondary English teachers (Group 3: $n = 76$), χ^2 (10, $N = 274$) = 31.061, $p < 0.001$. Further, the Likelihood ratio was $p < .001$. See Table 3 for the expected counts, adjusted residual and adjusted Bonferroni

Correct *p* values (Beasley & Schumacker, 1995; Garcia-Perez & Nunez-Anton, 2003; Sharpe, 2015).

Table 1: Implemented SLA IM (*N* = 274)

SLA IM	In use	Percentage*
Mainstream no support	45	16,4
Push-in	57	20,8
Push-in and pull-out	155	56,6
Pull-out	71	25,9
Intensive English	40	14,6
After-school, before-school, or weekend activity	25	9,1

*Some participants reported more than one SLA IM

Table 2: Preferred SLA IM (*N* = 274)

SLA IM	Preferred	Percentage
Mainstream no support	14	5,1
Push-in	40	14,6
Push-in and pull-out	162	59,1
Pull-out	11	4,0
Intensive English	42	15,3
After-school, before-school, or weekend activity	5	1,8

Discussion

Implemented SLA IM

Overall, the reported use of SLA IMs in the current study reflects similarities with previous data reported by Lehman and Welch (2020a), and Table 4 shows a side-by-side comparison. The sum of the percentages for the current data exceeds 100 because participants in the current study were asked to report all implemented SLA IMs in their school as opposed to the SLA IM implemented in their particular section (Lehman and Welch, 2020a); however, general comparisons can still be made. Table 4 shows that the hybrid push-in and pull-out model is the most commonly used SLA IM. With the hybrid model, push-in is used, and successful implementation of push-in will usually necessitate school leadership support, such as defining role expectations (Lehman & Welch, 2020b), to ensure the fluid functioning of the push-in support. Further, the school leadership should be aware that the push-in model can marginalize ELL teachers and students (White, 2017), and the leadership should strive to create a school culture that prevents marginalization. If schools and school leaders would strive to address individual student needs and consider contextual factors (Demo et al., 2021), a thoughtfully developed and individualized hybrid SLA IM could offer solutions to the drawbacks of separately implemented push-in and pull-out SLA IMs (Reynolds et al., 2013). In short, the hybrid SLA IM has the potential to offer tailored instruction to each learner (Reynolds et al., 2013). The rise in the use of the mainstream with no support SLA IM is concerning as the number of non-native English-speaking students enrolling in English-medium international schools continues to increase (ISC Research, 2019b; Lehman, 2020; Lewandowski, 2012). This increasing enrollment combined with the numbers and percentages of teachers not having received training for working with ELLs during their initial teacher training (Spencer (2021) or receiving low, very low levels of continued professional development or none at all (Lehman, 2021) is concerning.

Table 3: Preferred SLA IM (*N* = 274) with adjusted bonferroni *p* values

SLA IM	ELL *n* = 90	Primary *n* = 108	English *n* = 76	Total
Mainstream no support	2	3	9	14
	EC* 4,6	EC 5,5	EC 3,9	
	AR^ -1,52	AR -1,41	**AR 3,14**	
	p = ,12851	*p* = ,15854	***p* = ,00169**	
Push-in	12	15	13	40
	EC 13,1	EC 15,8	EC 11,1	
	AR -,41	AR -,27	AR ,73	
	p = ,68181	*p* = ,78716	*p* = ,46539	
Push-in and pull-out	61	74	27	162
	EC 53,2	EC 63,9	EC 44,9	
	AR 2,04	**AR 2,55**	**AR -4,92**	
	p = ,04135	*p* = ,01077	***p* = ,00000**	
Pull-out	2	4	5	11
	EC 3,6	EC 4,3	EC 3,1	
	AR -1,06	AR -,21	AR 1,34	
	p = ,28914	*p* = ,83367	*p* = ,18025	
Intensive English	12	10	20	42
	EC 13,8	EC 16,6	EC 11,6	
	AR -,64	**AR -2,25**	**AR 3,13**	
	p = ,52217	*p* = ,02445	***p* = ,00175**	
After-school, before-school, or weekend activity	1	2	2	5
	EC 1,6	EC 2,0	EC 1,4	
	AR -,62	AR ,03	AR ,62	
	p = ,53526	*p* = ,97607	*p* = ,53526	
Total	90	108	76	274

* Expected count ^ Adjusted residual

Table 4: Comparison of implemented SLA IMs

SLA IM	Current Percentage*	Previous Percentage^
Mainstream no support	16,4	13,4
Push-in	20,8	13,6
Push-in and pull-out	56,6	44,2
Pull-out	25,9	16,9
Intensive English	14,6	9,6
After-school, before-school, or weekend activity	9,1	2,2

*Some participants reported more than one SLA IM
^Lehman & Welch (2020a)

Also of concern is the rise in the use of the after-school, before-school, weekend activity SLA IM. This instructional model still places ELL students in the mainstream classroom, where they may be subjected to the stress of a sink or swim situation (Krashen, 1981). Additionally, as part of using an after-school, before-school, weekend activity SLA IM, ELL students are burdened with an additional curriculum (Li, 2018) while only receiving infrequent instructional time in the targeted language (Li and Wen, 2015).

Preferred SLA IM

Table 5 shows a side-by-side comparison of the current data for preferred SLA IM compared to the data reported by Lehman and Welch (2020a). The data in Table 5 reflects a modest increase in the preference for the hybrid push-in and pull-out SLA IM.

Table 5: Comparison of preferred SLA IM

SLA IM	Current Percentage	Previous Percentage^
Mainstream no support	5,1	4,6
Push-in	14,6	18,5
Push-in and pull-out	59,1	52,4
Pull-out	4,0	5,9
Intensive English	15,3	17,3
After-school, before-school, or weekend activity	1,8	1,3

^Lehman & Welch (2020a)

Except for a notable decrease in the preference for the push-in model on its own, the other SLA IMs are relatively the same. Further, it is interesting to see the pull-out SLA IM, the traditional SLA IM in international schools for many years (Carder, 2014), decline. If this decline is considered with the data reported by Baecher and Bell (2017), this may mean that ELLs are receiving less instructional time when compared to the push-in SLA IM. However, with a rise in the hybrid push-in and pull-out SLA IM, there is the potential that the decline may not be as significant. According to the data reported by Baecher and Bell (2017), both the hybrid SLA IM and the pull-out SLA IM provided ELLs with more instructional time than when only push-in was occurring. However, in the hybrid SLA IM, the amount of instructional time would be affected by the allotment of time devoted to each component, push-in and pull-out instruction.

From analyzing the data, the preferences of Secondary English teachers differed significantly from ELL and Primary teachers. This difference was most pronounced in their preference for the hybrid push-in and pull-out model. While the expected count for ELL and Primary teachers was exceeded, the reported numbers fell considerably short for the preference of the hybrid model by English teachers. However, each group of teachers chose the hybrid model as the preferred SLA IM (see Table 6). Further, the hybrid push-in and pull-out model was highly favored by the ELL and Primary teachers. Although not embraced by a high percentage of teachers, the intensive English SLA IM did fall in the upper half of each list. Lehman and Welch (2020a) found that the intensive English model was preferred more than implemented, and the current data shows that slightly more than one-fourth of the Secondary English teachers favor the intensive English SLA IM, more than ELL and Primary teachers. The bottom half of each list revealed that many teachers did not favor the mainstream with no support and the pull-out model, and the after-school, before-school, or weekend activity SLA IM was the least preferred model by each group of teachers.

Conclusion

The purpose of this research study was to build upon previous research findings through further examination of the frequency of SLA IM used in English-medium international schools. Additionally, the researchers sought to compare the preferred SLA IMs between ELL, Primary, and English teachers. After analyzing the current data and making comparisons with the previous data reported by Lehman and Welch (2020a), the hybrid push-in and pull-out SLA IM continues to be the most implemented SLA IM and appears to be growing in use. Additionally, the hybrid SLA IM is the preferred SLA IM, and the percentage of preference for this model has increased compared to the data reported by Lehman and Welch (2020a). Moreover, the hybrid SLA IM was reported to be the most preferred model by each of the three groups. It should be noted that slightly more than two-thirds of ELL teachers (67.9%) and Primary teachers (68.5%) preferred the hybrid model, while only 35.5% of Secondary English teachers expressed a preference for the hybrid model. While not receiving high percentages of preference, the intensive English SLA IM did place higher on the list than the mainstream with no support, the pull-out, and the after-school, before school, or weekend activity SLA IMs.

Assumptions and Limitations

The researchers assumed that the participants responded to questions with understanding and truthfulness. An additional assumption was that the researcher provided an appropriate array of responses from which participants were able to choose. The researchers further assumed that the participants from each of the three groups formed representative samples. Although assumptions for the Pearson chi-square tests were not violated, a limitation of the study was the number of participants for each group. Another limitation was that the study only included participants from schools whose contact information was available on the school website or the Internet.

Table 6. Rankings of SLA IMs by percentage of preference

SLA IM Ranking	ELL Teachers	Primary Teachers	English Teachers
1st	Push-in and pull-out 67,9%	Push-in and pull-out 68,5%	Push-in and pull-out 35,5%
2nd	Intensive 13,3%	Push-in 13,9%	Intensive 26,3%
3rd	Push-in 13,3%	Intensive 9,3%	Push-in 17,1%
4th	Mainstream no support 2,2%	Pull-out 3,7%	Mainstream no support 11,8%
5th	Pull-out 2,2%	Mainstream w/no support 2,8%	Pull-out 6,6%
6th	After-school, etc, 1,1%	After-school, etc, 1,9%	After-school, etc, 2,6%

Recommendations for Future Practice

The researchers recommend that school leaders of English-medium international schools carefully consider teacher preference concerning which SLA IM(s) to implement or ways to improve the SLA IM(s) currently in use. Further, the researchers recommend schools implement an SLA IM that uses purposively hired staff who are provided with training in what are considered best practices for each SLA IM. Lastly, the researchers recommend that school leaders in schools that use the hybrid push-in and pull-out or the push-in SLA IMs develop support structures for the facilitation of push-in and provide transparent guidance in the roles of ELL and classroom teachers.

Suggestions for Future Research

With the continued rise in the use of push-in in English-medium international schools, the researchers suggest future research into the implementation and practice of push-in in international schools. Further research is suggested into what are considered best practices for push-in in English-medium international schools, including school management practices, student well-being, and hiring practices of teaching personnel. Lastly, the researchers suggest research into differences in teacher preference of SLA IMs between Primary and Secondary teachers, intending to help school leaders choose the most appropriate SLA IM(s) for each section.

Author Contribution Rates

The authors declare that CL contributed 85% and BW 15% to the article.

Ethical Declaration

The authors declare that the current study is not subject to the approval of the ethics committee and that the rules set by the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) were followed throughout the study. All parties were involved in the research of their own free will, and all participants were adult professionals.

Conflict Statement

The authors declare there is no conflict of interest with any institution or person within the scope of the study.

References

Baecher, L., & Bell, A. B. (2017). Opportunity to teach: Push-in and pull-out models of English learner instruction. *Journal of Education and Culture Studies*, *1*(1), 53-68. https://doi.org/10.22158/jecs.v1n1p53

Beasley, T. M., & Schumacker, R. E. (1995). Multiple regression approach to analyzing contingency tables: Post hoc and planned comparison procedures. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, *64*(1), 79-93.

Brevetti, M., & Ford, D. (2017). Unsung saviours? An educative history of intensive English programs in the US. *The International Journal of Social Science and Humanities Invention*, *4*(11), 4112–4119. https://doi.org/10.18535/ijsshi/v4i11.04.

Carder, M. W. (2014). Tracing the path of ESL provision in international schools over the last four decades (Part 1). *The International Schools Journal*, *34*(1), 85.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Demo, H., Nes, K., Somby, H. M., Frizzarin, A., & Dal Zovo, S. (2021). In and out of class–what is the meaning for inclusive schools? Teachers' opinions on push-and pull-out in Italy and Norway. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 1-19. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2021.1904017

Garcia-Perez, M. A., & Nunez-Anton, V. (2003). Cellwise residual analysis in two-way contingency tables. *Educational and psychological measurement*, *63*(5), 825-839. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164403251280

ISC. (2015). The international school consultancy [Brochure]. Faringdon, England: ISC Research.

ISC Research. (2016, July). Huge global demand for English-medium K-12 education. Retrieved from https://ie-today.co.uk/news/ huge-global-demand-for-english-medium-k-12-education/#:~:text= the%20new%202016%20Global%20Report,by%2041.5% 25%20in%20the%20past

ISC Research. (2019a). About the market. *ISC Research*. Retrieved from https://www.iscresearch.com/about-us/the-market

ISC Research. (2019b). ISC research. ISC Research. Retrieved from https://www.iscresearch.com

ISC Research. (2021). International school market growth. *ISC Research*. Retrieved from https://iscresearch.com/data/

Krashen, S. D. (1981). Bilingual education and second language acquisition theory. In California

State Department of Education (Ed.), Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework (pp. 50 79). Los Angeles: Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center California State University.

Lehman, C. (2020). Parent knowledge and preferences of language learning and use in an international school in Viet Nam. *VNU Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities, 6*(5), 577-590. https://doi.org/10.33100/jossh6.5.ClaytonLehman

Lehman, C. (2021). Language-specific professional development: A comparison of for-profit and non-profit international schools. *International Journal of Research in Teacher Education, 12*(1), 61-76.

Lehman, C., & Welch, B. (2020a). Second language acquisition instructional models in English-medium international schools in East Asia. *Asia Pacific Journal of Educators and Education, 35(2)*, 1-16. https://doi.org/10.21315/apjee2020.35.2.1

Lehman, C., & Welch, B. (2020b). A quantitative investigation of language policy in international schools in East Asia. *Research in Educational Policy and Management, 2(2)*. https://doi.org/10.46303/repam.2020.1

Lewandowski, N. (2012, January 5). International education is becoming a goldmine. Retrieved from https://expatmarketing.com

Li, G. (2018). From stigma to strength: A case of ESL program transformation in a greater Vancouver high school. *BC TEAL Journal, 3* (1), 63-76.

Li, G. & Wen, K. (2015). East Asian heritage language education for plurilingual reality in the United States: Practices, potholes, and possibilities. *International Multilingual Research Journal, 9*(4), 274-290. https://doi.org/10.1080/19313152.2015.1086623

McHugh, M. L. (2013). The Chi-square test of independence. *Biochemia Medica, 23*(2), 143-149. https://doi.org/10.11613/BM.2013.018

Reynolds, K. M., Jiao, J., Nolan-Smith, K., & O'Brien, E. (2013). Teachers' perceptions of push-in or pull-out model effectiveness and learning outcomes. Retrieved from *Academia.edu*

Salkind, N. J. (2013). *Statistics for people who (think they) hate statistics* (3rd ed.).Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Spencer, J. (2021). Understanding EAL: International secondary school teachers' experiences and attitudes in Ukraine and Eastern Europe. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 1-16. https://doi.org/10.1177/14752409211033749

Szasz, P. (2010). State of the profession: Intensive English programs. *The CATESOL Journal, 21*(1), 194–201.

Sharpe, D. (2015). Chi-square test is statistically significant: Now what? *Practical Assessment,Research, and Evaluation*, *20*(1), 8. https://doi.org/10.7275/tbfa-x148

Shoebottom, P. (2009). Academic success for non-native English speakers in English-medium international schools: The role of the secondary ESL department. *NALDIC Quarterly*, *7*(1), 13-18. Retrieved from www.naldic.org.uk

White, J. (2017). Caught between the push and the pull: ELL teachers' perceptions of mainstream and ESOL classroom teaching. *NABE Journal of Research and Practice, 8*:1, 9-27. https://doi.org/10.1080/26390043.2017.12067793

Zen, D. (2001). What is wrong with ESL programs in schools? Washington, D.C.: Educational Resources Information Center. (ED482580)

Appendix

Survey Questions

1- Which of the following best describes the language acquisition model for working with ESL/EAL students in your school?
   - Mainstream classroom inclusion with no push-in or pull-out support (classroom teachers handle all aspects of student language acquisition)
   - Mainstream classroom with language teacher support (inclusion with push-in)
   - Mainstream classroom with both push-in and pull-out support
   - Mainstream classroom with students pulled out for support
   - Intensive English program before transitioning to the mainstream classroom
   - English language support is an after-school, before-school, or weekend activity

2- Please indicate which of the following best describes your preferred English language support model?
   - Mainstream classroom inclusion with no push-in or pull-out support (classroom teachers handle all aspects of student language acquisition)
   - Mainstream classroom with language teacher support (inclusion with push-in)
   - Mainstream classroom with both push-in and pull-out support
   - Mainstream classroom with students pulled out for support
   - Intensive English program before transitioning to the mainstream classroom
   - English language support is an after-school, before-school, or weekend activity