

Language Policy as a Focal Point in English-Medium International Schools

Clayton Lehman¹ & Brett Welch²

¹Centre for Academic English Studies at Surrey International Institute, Dongbei University, Dalian, Liaoning, China.

²College of Graduate Studies, Lamar University, Beaumont, TX 77710, USA.
Email: clwale@yahoo.com

Abstract

A language policy in an international school is a document that should state how language will be taught, learned, and used. In essence, a language policy can provide organization and cohesion for an international school as it works to deliver a curriculum to the students, and many students enrolled in international schools are English language learners (ELLs). This quantitative survey-based study aimed to investigate teacher adherence and knowledge of language policy in English-medium international schools. Also explored was the provision of professional development for working with ELLs and teacher self-efficacy when teaching ELLs in relation to language policy knowledge. Compared to previously reported data, key findings showed a rise in the percentage of teachers reporting their school had a language policy and a lower percentage of teachers reporting they were consistently following the policy. Additional findings were that less than half of the participants reported their school provided a medium or higher frequency of professional development for working with ELLs, and teachers who had knowledge of the language policy had higher self-efficacy levels when teaching ELLs than teachers who had no knowledge of a language policy.

Keywords: International school, language policy, professional development, self-efficacy

1. Introduction

As the English-medium international school market continues to expand, more and more schools are enrolling students whose native language is not English (ICEF Monitor, 2020). Although ISC Research (2021) has reported that 5.68 million students were enrolled in international schools in July 2021, the exact number of those students who are English language learners (ELLs) is unknown. However, ISC Research (2019) reported that more than 80% of enrollment consisted of local non-expatriate students. Additionally, a growing number of expatriate students are from non-native English-speaking countries (Lehman, 2020). With such large numbers of ELLs, it is imperative that English-medium international schools develop an organized plan for teaching, learning, and using language within the school. A formally developed language policy that is in writing can enable an international school to implement an organized and cohesive approach to the teaching and learning of the language(s) used within the school.

1.1 Aim and Research Questions

This study aimed to investigate international school teacher adherence and knowledge of language policy. Also, the study aimed to explore the provision of professional development for working with ELLs and teacher self-efficacy when teaching ELLs in relation to language policy knowledge. The following questions were developed to guide the study.

- What is the present state of teacher knowledge of school language policy?
- What differences exist in language policy knowledge between ELL teachers, Primary teachers, and Secondary English teachers?
- How often are teachers adhering to their school's language policy?
- What amount of professional development for working with ELLs is being provided to teachers?
- How does language policy knowledge compare with the perceived frequency of the provision of professional development for working with ELLs?
- How does language policy knowledge compare with teacher-reported levels of self-efficacy when teaching ELLs?

2. Literature Review

2.1 Language Policy

A school language policy can be a formal policy in written form or an informal policy. A formal policy is purposefully constructed to show what an organization "intends to do or not to do" (Birkland, 2014, p. 203). Further, a formal language policy should be developed to provide structure and order, and it should be accessible to all stakeholders. However, when a formal language policy is not constructed and documented for stakeholders to access, implied policy develops through the "practices of its teachers and administrators, and it can be inferred from their interactions with students" (Corson, 1999, p. 3). A language policy can be found in each school, whether the stakeholders realize it or not, and that language policy can be followed, interpreted, misconstrued, or not followed, for better or worse.

2.2 Knowledge of Language Policy

Even if a school has a formally developed language policy in written form, each teacher will decide how often they will follow the policy. Before school staff members decide to follow the school language policy and to what extent, there first needs to be knowledge of the policy. Investigating international school teachers' knowledge of language policy in their school, Lehman and Welch (2020) found that 61.5% of 387 teachers knew there was a policy in their school, while 13.4% knew there was no policy. Further, 25.1% of the teachers revealed a lack of knowledge concerning the existence of a written language policy in their school (Lehman & Welch, 2020). According to Fullan (2007), most policy makers concentrate on identifying problems and developing policy to solve those problems, yet policy implementation often falls short, with the policy never completing a policy cycle (Anderson, 2003). Although a written language policy may exist in an international school, this does not guarantee staff knowledge or compliance.

2.3 Adherence to the Language Policy

Although a school may possess and publicize having a language policy, it may never implement the policy, in which case it becomes just a paper policy often contrived for accreditation or authorization purposes (Lehman & Welch, 2020). Although a language policy may be implemented, this does not automatically mean that the staff will follow the policy (Darling-Hammond, 1990; Duggan, 2017; García & Menken, 2010; Lehman & Welch, 2020; Shohamy, 2006), and professional development is sometimes needed to help staff understand and comply with the policy. Investigating how often international school teachers followed their school's language policy, Lehman and Welch (2020) found that only 42.2% of 232 teachers reported following the school language policy consistently. While 36.6% of the teachers reported

following the policy most of the time, 16.8% reported to some extent, followed by 2.2% very little and 2.2% not at all (Lehman & Welch, 2020). Even when a school has a written language policy, teachers will consciously decide to follow, interpret, or recreate the language policy in their classrooms, and sometimes student learning may be dampened in the process (Menken, 2008; Shohamy, 2006; Throop, 2007).

2.4 Professional Development

When developing, evaluating, or revising a school language policy, schools should carefully consider identifying the language(s) used during instruction and when the language(s) will be used during instruction and outside of instruction. Additionally, the language policy should establish a plan for providing professional development (PD) to teachers on teaching and using the language(s) and working with language learners within the school. When reviewing or forming a language policy, the International Baccalaureate (2011) recommended that schools identify and examine staff practices and beliefs concerning language use and learning. The International Baccalaureate further stressed the need for professional development for working with language learning students in tandem with forming a school language policy (International Baccalaureate, 2011). Unfortunately, many international schools are falling short in providing professional development to staff for working with ELLs. In a study of secondary teachers in international schools in Eastern Europe, Spencer (2021) discovered that most participants reported having received no training during their initial teacher study for working with ELL students. Examining the provision of language-specific professional development for working with ELLs in English-medium international schools, Lehman (2021) found that slightly more than half of the 500 teacher and administrator participants reported that their school provided a low or very low frequency of PD for working with ELLs or none at all. Without contextualized PD for working with ELLs, the self-efficacy of teachers teaching ELLs can be negatively affected (Tran, 2015).

2.5 Teacher Self-Efficacy

As of July 2021, ISC Research (2021) reported that over 550,000 staff were working in more than 12,300 international schools. Further, by 2030, the number of staff in international schools is believed to meet or exceed 1,000,000 (ISC Research, 2019). It is assumed that most of the teachers needed to fill teaching positions in the upcoming years will be from the United Kingdom and the United States. However, many teachers in those countries do not receive adequate training for working with ELLs during their pre-service training (Mehmedbegović et al., 2015) or do not receive an adequate amount of training and preparation for teaching ELLs (Spencer, 2021; Villegas et al., 2018). Since most of the teachers in English-medium international schools are working with ELLs, a lack of training for teaching ELLs can lead to feelings of inadequacy, frustration, and overwhelmingness (Walker et al., 2004), resulting in less than desirable student academic outcomes.

3. Methodology

3.1 Participants

To find participants for the study, the researchers developed a list of potential participants by searching for names, positions, and contact information on international school websites. Each participant received a survey request sent to their school email address to ensure they were employed in an English-medium international school. Overall, the participants were located in Africa, Asia, the Middle East, and South America, with most being in East Asia. In total, the researchers sent a survey request to 3,606 teachers, of which 476 were ELL teachers, 1,836 were Primary teachers, and 1,294 were Secondary English teachers. The qualifying question

for the study was for participants to reveal their knowledge of their school's language policy (see Appendix). After participants who did not answer the qualifying question were removed, a total of 298 teacher responses formed the data set. Of the 298 participants, 92 were ELL teachers, 122 were Primary teachers, and 84 were Secondary English teachers. The ELL teacher group was a combination of whole-school, Primary, and Secondary ELL teachers. The surveys were completed during May and June of 2021.

3.2 Design and Instruments

The researchers employed an observational quantitative research design with random sampling using cross-sectional surveys to collect data. A cross-sectional survey gathers data at a fixed point and does not manipulate a variable (Creswell, 2012). Each group of participants received a separate survey containing questions that applied to their group; when cross-comparisons were to be made, the questions were identical. All survey questions for the present data set were identical.

To establish content validity, three international school educators, who did not participate in the study, served as experts in the field (Creswell, 2012) and reviewed the research questions and survey questions. The researchers used four survey questions for the current study (see Appendix). Each of the four survey questions had an acceptable universal agreement (S-CVI=1.00) (Polit & Beck, 2006). The first question was the qualifying question and asked teachers to report on their knowledge of their school's language policy. In the introductory email, potential participants were notified of the intentions of the research study. Additionally, the primary researcher provided a website link that allowed potential participants to view the research questions, additional information about the study, and primary researcher biographical information. The website also provided a contact box so potential participants could ask questions before and after choosing to complete the survey. The potential participants were not promised any reward and were not coerced into completing the survey. Participation was voluntary, and when taking the survey, none of the questions were mandatory. The researchers used Survey Monkey to host the surveys; all data were stored in password-protected digital devices.

3.3 Data Analyses

The researchers used IBM SPSS 27 to perform Pearson chi-square tests (χ^2) and Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance with an alpha level of .05. The Pearson chi-square test can evaluate nominal data and can measure the distribution of frequencies (Creswell, 2012; McHugh, 2013). The Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance is a nonparametric test used to compare three or more groups (Salkind, 2013). For each of the omnibus chi-square tests, the expected count and adjusted residuals calculated by SPSS are provided in accompanying tables, and adjusted residuals that exceed ± 2.0 are given in bold print (Sharpe, 2015). For post hoc analysis of the Kruskal-Wallis results, the researchers used SPSS software to calculate pairwise comparisons with a Bonferroni correction.

First, the researchers sought to compare language policy knowledge by teacher groups. Overall, 298 teachers responded to the question enquiring about language policy knowledge. When asked if the school has a language policy, 67.79% (202) percent answered yes, 10.40% (31) answered no, and 21.81% (65) of participants answered they did not know. The results of a Pearson chi-square test revealed a statistically significant difference in the knowledge of language policy between ESL/EAL teachers (Group 1: $n = 92$) and Early Years/Primary teachers (Group 2: $n = 122$) and Secondary English teachers (Group 3: $n = 84$), $\chi^2 (4, N = 298)$

= 9.860, $p = 0.043$. See Table 1 for post hoc analysis, including expected counts (EC) and the adjusted residuals (AR); adjusted residuals in bold are those that exceed ± 2.0 (Sharpe, 2015).

Table 1. Does the school have a language policy?

Teachers	I do not know	Yes	No	Total
ELL Teacher	11	69	12	92
EC	20.1	62.4	9.6	
AR	-2.8	1.8	1.0	
Primary Teacher	36	76	10	122
EC	26.6	82.7	12.7	
AR	2.7	-1.7	-1.0	
English Teacher	18	57	9	84
EC	18.3	56.9	8.7	
AR	-.1	.0	.1	

Then, participants who knew their school had a language policy were asked if they followed the policy. Seventeen participants chose not to answer the question. See Table 2 for the participant responses.

Table 2. To what extent the language policy is followed.

Language Policy	Do not follow	Very little	To some extent	Most of the time	Consistently	Total
Teachers	3	3	44	74	61	185*
Percentage	1.6%	1.6%	23.8%	40.0%	33.0%	

*17 participants chose not to provide a response

Next, all participants were asked to reveal how much professional development for working with ELLs is provided to teachers in their school. Three participants did not respond to the question. Table 3 presents the participant responses.

Table 3. Frequency of professional development for working with ELLs.

Participants	None	Very low	Low	Medium	High	Very high	Total
Teachers	30	66	63	98	28	10	295*
Percentage	10.2%	22.4%	21.3%	33.2%	9.5%	3.4%	

*3 participants did not respond

The researchers wanted to examine the differences in the frequency of professional development for working with ELLs between the three groups of language policy knowledge. The results of a Pearson chi-square test revealed no statistically significant difference in the knowledge of language policy and frequency of professional development for working with ELLs between Yes to language policy (Group 1: $n = 199$) and No to language policy (Group 2: $n = 31$) and I Do Not Know to language policy (Group 3: $n = 65$), $\chi^2 (10 N = 298) = 15.518$, $p = 0.114$. See Table 4 for post hoc analysis, including the expected counts (EC) and the adjusted residuals (AR); adjusted residuals in bold are those that exceed ± 2.0 (Sharpe, 2015).

Table 4. Frequency of professional development for working with ELLs according to language policy knowledge.

Language Policy	None	Very low	Low	Medium	High	Very high	Total
Yes	15	42	39	75	22	6	199
EC	20.2	44.5	42.5	66.1	18.9	6.7	
AR	-2.2	-.8	-1.1	2.3	1.3	-.5	
No	6	11	6	5	2	1	31
EC	3.2	6.9	6.6	10.3	2.9	1.1	
AR	1.8	1.9	-.3	-2.1	-.6	-.1	
I do not know	9	13	18	18	4	3	65
EC	6.6	14.5	13.9	21.6	6.2	2.2	
AR	1.1	-.5	1.4	-1.1	-1.0	.6	

*3 participants did not respond

Lastly, the researchers explored the differences in teacher self-efficacy when teaching ELLs between the three categories of language policy knowledge. A Kruskal-Wallis test showed that teachers who had no knowledge of their school's language policy reported a significantly lower self-efficacy than teachers who had knowledge of their school's language policy and teachers who knew a written language policy did not exist in their school, $H(2, N = 294) = 8.976$, $p = .011$. Teachers that did not know if a language policy existed in their school ($MR 119.71$) reported a lower level of self-efficacy when working with language learners than teachers who knew there was a language policy ($MR 156.40$) and teachers who knew their school did not have a language policy ($MR 146.58$). Post hoc pairwise comparisons with a Bonferroni correction revealed a statistically significant difference ($p = .008$) in the reported self-efficacy when teaching ELLs between teachers who had no knowledge of their school's language policy and teachers that knew a language policy existed in their school.

4. Discussion

4.1 Teacher Knowledge of Language Policy

Comparing teacher knowledge of language policy in the current study with those reported by Lehman and Welch (2020), the percentage of teachers revealing that a language policy existed

in their school increased. Comparison of the data from the two studies in Table 5 shows that teacher knowledge of language policy in English-medium international schools is increasing.

Table 5. Knowledge of language policy comparison.

Teacher Group	Current Percentage	Previous Percentage*
Yes	67.8	61.5
No	10.4	13.4
I do not know	21.8	25.1

*Lehman & Welch (2020)

Furthermore, the data may suggest that more schools are implementing a language policy. While some schools use a whole-school language policy, others use a policy for each school section. Moreover, although there may be a whole-school language policy, the primary and secondary sections sometimes interpret and implement the policy differently.

Examining language policy knowledge across the three groups of teachers reveals some statistically significant differences. For example, more primary teachers (29.5%) revealed no knowledge of their school's language policy compared to Secondary English teachers (21.4%) and ELL teachers (12.0%). Further, ELL teachers (88.0%) were more knowledgeable of whether the school had a language policy than Primary (70.5%) and Secondary teachers (78.6%). If teachers are unaware of the existence of a language policy, then a classroom language policy evolves or is created by teachers through "their interactions with the students" (Corson, 1999, p. 3), which may or may not be in alignment with the school language policy, whether formal or implied.

4.2 Teachers Following the Language Policy

Although teachers may know their school has a written language policy, they will decide what level they will adhere to the policy or create a policy for their classrooms (Menken, 2008; Shohamy, 2006; Throop, 2007). Table 6 shows a comparison of the current data with previous findings by Lehman and Welch (2020) concerning teachers adhering to the school language policy.

Table 6. Comparison of adherence to the language policy.

Teachers	Do not follow	Very little	To some extent	Most of the time	Consistently
Current Study	1.6%	1.6%	23.8%	40.0%	33.0%
Previous Study*	2.2%	2.2%	16.8%	36.6%	42.2%

* Lehman & Welch (2020)

The data set shows that two-thirds of English-medium international school teachers do not consistently adhere to the language policy, and a comparison of percentages shows a considerable decrease in the percentage of teachers consistently following the language policy. School leaders should seek to understand why such a sizeable percentage of teachers choose

not to follow the school language policy. While some teachers may have purposefully decided not to follow the language policy for reasons of their own, others may lack knowledge and training and do not understand how to follow and implement the policy in their classrooms. School leaders need to understand that having a language policy in their school does not ensure that staff will understand and follow the policy (Darling-Hammond, 1990; Duggan, 2017; García & Menken, 2010; Lehman & Welch, 2020; Shohamy, 2006), and professional development may be needed to develop staff understanding and compliance with the policy.

4.3 Professional Development

Professional development should be an integral aspect of any educational facility, and school leaders should ensure the staff receives professional development to foster understanding and aid in implementing the language policy (International Baccalaureate, 2011). Because the language policy is a document stating what the school "intends to do or not to do" (Birkland, 2014, p. 201), school leaders need to recognize that the language policy is an integral component of an English-medium international school.

When forming a school language policy, International Baccalaureate (2011) recommended schools identify and examine the school's practices and beliefs concerning language use and learning. The language policy should be reviewed and revised during the policy cycle (Anderson, 2003) in conjunction with an examination of the school's practices and beliefs. Lastly, providing professional development for working with ELLs is critical for school leaders to raise staff buy-in and compliance with the school's language policy.

Although the omnibus chi-square analysis of the 3x6 contingency table (see Table 4) did not reveal an overall statistically significant difference, post hoc analyses of the expected counts and adjusted residuals reflected otherwise. For example, participants in schools who reported having a language policy had a lower than the expected count for reporting that their school did not offer any professional development for working with ELLs; further, fewer percentages of those participants reported very low and low frequencies of professional development. Comparing the data in Table 4 between participants who answered yes and answered no reveals a pattern of difference emerging concerning language policy and the frequency of professional development for teaching ELLs.

In the present study, a combined 46.1% of the participants revealed that their school offers professional development for teaching ELLs at the frequency of what they considered to be medium (33.2%), high (9.5%), and very high (3.4%). Whereas 53.9% of the participants revealed what they considered to be low or very low frequencies or none at all, which is in alignment with the findings by Lehman (2021) when a little more than half of the 500 international school staff participants reported their school provided a low or very low frequency of professional development designed to provide teachers with knowledge and training to teach ELLs or none at all. Overall, 67.8% of the participants in the current study revealed they knew their school had a language policy; however, only 46.1% answered that their school provided a medium to a very high frequency of professional development for working with language learners.

4.4 Teacher Self-Efficacy

Teachers who lack training in working with ELLs can have feelings of inadequacy and frustration and an overall feeling of being overwhelmed (Walker et al., 2004). As more international schools enter the marketplace, more non-native English-speaking students are enrolled. Additionally, more and more teachers are hired from countries with insufficient training for working with ELLs (Mehmedbegović et al., 2015; Spencer, 2021; Villegas et al.,

2018). Therefore, teacher self-efficacy for working with ELLs should be a concern that rises to critical importance.

Without a well-constructed language policy and professional development to help implement the policy, teachers may experience lower levels of self-efficacy while providing instruction to ELLs. The data in the current study revealed statistically significant lower levels of teacher self-efficacy when teaching ELLs between teachers who knew their school had a language policy versus teachers who did not know if their school had a language policy. This may show that a formally developed written language policy combined with knowledge of the policy provides teachers with an organized approach to how language will be taught, learned, and used in their school and may help provide teachers with support structures allowing them to have higher levels of self-efficacy when teaching ELLs.

5. Conclusion

This study aimed to investigate international school teacher adherence and knowledge of language policy. Also, the study aimed to explore the provision of professional development for working with ELLs and teacher self-efficacy when teaching ELLs in relation to language policy knowledge. A key finding of this study revealed that a slightly higher percentage of staff (67.8%) in English-medium international schools reported knowledge of a language policy in their school compared to staff (61.5%) in the previous study investigating language policy in international schools by Lehman and Welch (2020). Additionally, the present study showed a lower percentage of teachers who reported no knowledge of a language policy in their school and that there was a slight reduction in the percentage of teachers who revealed that they knew there was no language policy in their school. Additionally, the present study revealed a difference in Primary and Secondary teachers' knowledge of school language policy.

Another key finding of the current study showed a lower percentage of teachers (33.0%) in international schools that revealed their school had a language policy reported they followed the school language policy consistently compared to teachers (42.2%) in the previous study by Lehman and Welch (2020). Another key finding of the present study revealed that slightly more than half of the participants in the current study reported that their school provided low or very low levels of professional development for working with ELLs or none at all, which is in alignment with previous data concerning the provision of language-specific professional development provided to staff reported by Lehman (2021). Lastly, the current study revealed statistically significant higher levels of teacher self-efficacy when teaching ELLs by teachers who had knowledge of their school's language policy than teachers who were unsure if a language policy existed in their school.

5.1 Assumptions and Limitations

The researchers assumed that the participants truthfully answered questions on the survey and that the participants formed a representative sample as groups and as a whole. However, the study sample only consisted of those who responded to the survey request, which presented a limitation. Another limitation was that the study only included participants from schools whose contact information was available on the school website or the Internet.

5.2 Recommendations and Suggestions for Future Practice

The researchers recommend that international school leaders ensure that a formal written language policy is accessible to all stakeholders. Also, the researchers recommend that leaders of international schools examine the contents and implementation of the language policy and further ensure that support structures are in place to raise staff understanding and compliance

with the school language policy. Lastly, the researchers recommend that international school leaders provide staff with relevant professional development for working with ELLs and that it is in tandem with the contents of the language policy.

5.3 Suggestions for Future Research

The researchers suggest research into why teachers in English-medium international schools choose not to follow the school's language policy. Further, the researchers suggest comparing and contrasting teacher and school section knowledge of language policy to understand if and why differences exist. Lastly, the researchers suggest research to identify why a sizable number of English-medium international schools provide no or low levels of professional development to staff concerning language policy implementation and for providing instruction to language learners when such a large population of students is composed of ELLs.

References

- Anderson, J. E. (2003). *Public policymaking: An introduction (5th ed.)*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.
- Birkland, T. A. (2014). *An introduction to the policy process: Theories, concepts and models of public policy making*. New York: Routledge.
- Corson, D. (1999). *Language policy in schools. A resource for teachers and administrators*. Mahwah and London: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research (4th ed.)*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1990). Instructional policy into practice: "The power of the bottom over the top." *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 12(3), 339-347. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1164357>
- Duggan, J. (2017). Interpreting and negotiating language policy at the local level: A case study from Catalan-speaking Spain. *Bellaterra Journal of Teaching & Learning Language & Literature* 10(2), 77-91. <https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/jt13.736>
- Fullan, M. (2007). *The new meaning of educational change (4th ed.)*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- García, O., & Menken, K. (2010). Moving forward: Ten guiding principles for teachers. In K. Menken & O. García (Eds.), *Negotiating language education policies: Educators as policymakers* (pp. 262-268). New York: Routledge.
- International Baccalaureate. (2011). *Language and learning in IB programmes*. Cardiff: International Baccalaureate Organization.
- ICEF Monitor. (2020, September 30). Continued growth for international K-12 schools with greater emphasis on mid-market segment. *ICEF Monitor*. Retrieved from <https://monitor.icef.com/2020/09/continued-growth-for-international-k-12-schools-with-greater-emphasis-on-mid-market-segment/>
- ISC Research. (2019). 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/>

- 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. (2020). 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>
- McHugh, M. L. (2013). The Chi-square test of independence. *Biochemia Medica*, 23(2), 143-149. <https://doi.org/10.11613/BM.2013.018>
- Mehmedbegović, D., Skrandies, P., Byrne, N., & Harding-Esch, P. (2015). *Multilingualism in London: LUCIDE city report*. London: LSE Language Centre.
- Menken, K. (2008). *English language learners left behind*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Polit, D. F., & Beck, C. T. (2006). The content validity index: Are you sure you know what's being reported? Critique and recommendations. *Research in Nursing & Health*, 29(5), 489-497. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nur.20147>
- Salkind, N. J. (2013). *Statistics for people who (think they) hate statistics* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications.
- 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>
- Shohamy, E. G. (2006). *Language policy: Hidden agendas and new approaches*. New York: Routledge.
- 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>
- Throop, R. (2007). Teachers as language policy planners: Incorporating language policy planning into teacher education and classroom practice. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, 22(2), 45-65. Retrieved from <http://repository.upenn.edu>
- Tran, Y. (2015). ESL pedagogy and certification: Teacher perceptions and efficacy. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 4(2), 28-42. <https://doi.org/10.5539/jel.v4n2p28>
- Villegas, A. M., Saiz de La Mora, K., Martin, A. D., & Mills, T. (2018). Preparing future mainstream teachers to teach English language learners: A review of the empirical literature. *The Educational Forum*, 82, 138-155. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131725.2018.1420850>
- Walker, A., Shafer, J., & Iiams, M. (2004). Not in my classroom: Teacher attitudes towards English language learners in the mainstream classroom. *NABE Journal of Research and Practice*, 2(1), 130-160. Retrieved from <https://www2.nau.edu/nabej-p/ojs>

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Appendix

Survey

1. Does the school have a language policy?

- I do not know if there is a language policy
- Yes, the school has a language policy.
- No, the school does not have a language policy.

2. If your school has a formal written language policy, do you follow the policy?

- There is no language policy
- I do not know if there is a language policy
- I do not follow the policy
- Very little
- To some extent
- Most of the time
- Consistently

3. Which of the following best describes the frequency of professional development specific to working with language learners provided to school staff?

- None
- Very low
- Low
- Medium
- High
- Very High

4. Overall, how would you rate your level of self-efficacy (confidence) when working with English language learners?

- Sliding bar from 0 to 100.