



Teachers' Perception of a Two-Tier RtI Pilot to Support English Learners' Reading Performance

Akeem Alphanso Nash¹ 

Citation: Nash, A. A. (2026). Teachers' Perception of a Two-Tier RtI Pilot to Support English Learners' Reading Performance. *Colomb. Appl. Linguistic. J.*, 28(1), pp. 75-90.

Received: 24-Nov.-2025 / **Accepted:** 04-Mar.-2026

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.14483/22487085.22952>

Abstract

Educational institutions use response-to-intervention (RtI) to identify, support, and monitor students with poor academic or behavioral performance. In this qualitative descriptive case study, the problem was students' poor English reading performance at an international school in northern China. The purpose was to explore teachers' perceptions of the influence of a one-month, two-tier response-to-intervention pilot on students' English reading proficiency in a content and language integrated learning (CLIL)-oriented primary school in northern China, with Tier 1 comprising whole-class supports and Tier 2 targeted small-group work. This study aimed to address a specific gap by implementing a month-long project designed to support reading in a CLIL-oriented school while documenting teachers' perceptions of the model. Using purposive sampling, five English literature teachers were selected to reflect on their experiences developing a two-tier intervention framework and discuss their perceptions of the framework's influence on young English language learners' reading proficiency. Based on the results and findings, participants highly valued RtI and the theoretical structure of each tier. They perceived Tier 2 as effective, but they noted that the lack of practical structure and professional support is an obstacle to helping students meet grade-level benchmarks. These perceptions suggest that school leaders could standardize RtI support to strengthen implementation as perceived by teachers.

Keywords: ELT, English teaching in China, response-to-intervention, teachers' perceptions

¹ King's Academy Binfield, England. Email: akeem.nash@kingsacademies.uk



Percepción de docentes sobre un piloto de Rtl de dos niveles para apoyar el rendimiento en lectura de estudiantes de ILE

Resumen

Las instituciones educativas utilizan la respuesta a la intervención (Rtl) para identificar, apoyar y monitorear a estudiantes con bajo rendimiento académico o conductual. En este estudio de caso descriptivo cualitativo, el problema fue el bajo rendimiento en lectura en inglés de los estudiantes de una escuela internacional en el norte de China. El propósito fue explorar las percepciones de los docentes sobre la influencia de un piloto de respuesta a la intervención de dos niveles y un mes de duración en la competencia lectora en inglés de los estudiantes, en una escuela primaria orientada al aprendizaje integrado de contenidos y lengua (CLIL) en el norte de China, donde el Nivel 1 comprendía apoyos para toda la clase y el Nivel 2, trabajo dirigido en grupos pequeños. Este estudio tuvo como objetivo abordar una brecha específica mediante la implementación de un proyecto de un mes diseñado para apoyar la lectura en una escuela orientada al CLIL, a la vez que se documentaban las percepciones de los docentes sobre el modelo. Mediante un muestreo intencional, se seleccionaron cinco docentes de literatura en inglés para que reflexionaran sobre sus experiencias en el desarrollo de un marco de intervención de dos niveles y compartieran sus percepciones sobre la influencia de dicho marco en la competencia lectora de los jóvenes aprendices de inglés como lengua extranjera. Con base en los resultados y hallazgos, los participantes valoraron altamente la Rtl y la estructura teórica de cada nivel. Percibieron el Nivel 2 como efectivo, pero señalaron que la falta de estructura práctica y de apoyo profesional constituye un obstáculo para ayudar a los estudiantes a alcanzar los estándares correspondientes a su grado. Estas percepciones sugieren que los líderes escolares podrían estandarizar el apoyo de la Rtl para fortalecer su implementación, según la percepción de los docentes.

Palabras clave: ELT, enseñanza de inglés en China, modelo de respuesta a la intervención, percepciones de profesores

Introduction

Some Grade 4 students at a private, internationalized school in China have demonstrated poor reading skills in English literature. Based on the school's grade-level English literature curriculum, aligned with the American Common Core State Standards (CCSS), *poor reading* is characterized by a student's limited comprehension of information; inadequate maneuver of structure, genre, and the author's craft; inability to extend meaning and deepen their understanding; weak grasp of organization, purpose, and language use; and limited vocabulary repertoire ([National Governors Association Center for Best Practices & Council of Chief State School Officers, 2010](#)). This study presents a descriptive case of teachers' perceptions during a one-month, two-tier response-to-intervention (RtI) pilot in a content and language integrated learning (CLIL)-oriented primary school in northern China, with Tier 1 comprising whole-class supports and Tier 2 involving targeted small-group work.

At the research site of this study, nicknamed *Osea Bilingual* for confidentiality, Grade 4 English language learners (ELLs) receive 70% of formal instruction in English and 30% in Chinese, aligning with the definition of a transitional bilingual program ([Polanco & Luft de Baker, 2018](#)). The primary teaching approach is CLIL, which, with adequate scaffolding, ensures that students are exposed to and develop authentic English language proficiency ([Mahan et al., 2021](#)). Some students have been immersed in the program for at least five years, involving a significant portion of their kindergarten learning experience. Based on internal data, a higher proportion of Grade 4 students were classified in the school-defined *urgent intervention* band. According to the school's policy, this meant that students required compulsory, targeted support. The results originated from the school's STAR Reading (developed by Renaissance Learning) test scores, recorded between Fall 2022 and Spring 2023.

English Language Teaching in China

Private and internationalized schools in China have primarily depended on a fusion of national and Western-influenced teaching methodologies ([Zhou, 2023](#)). While this approach has produced undisputed and comparable academic results to those of high-performing schools in other countries ([Poole et al., 2022](#)), it has also—perhaps unintentionally—fed into the English- or Western-based education hegemony. However, in the public sector, with limited resources and the inexistence of a formal national or regional bilingual education program that offers practical guidance for English language teaching ([Lei & Medwell, 2022](#)), ELLs in public schools are disadvantaged ([Li et al., 2024](#)). Furthermore, coupled with the educational inequalities in foreign language learning, the Chinese government continuously regulates and, to some extent, censors Western-influenced English language education ([Ho, 2020](#)), an attempt often disguised as a protection of national interests.

Some schools, however, have the political privilege of adopting Western-based English teaching and learning models to establish comparable standards ([Wang & Lam, 2017](#)), and other economically fortunate families have access to the prevalence of extracurricular English language training across the country ([Li, 2022](#)). Nevertheless, these cases of privilege and access are not representative of the wider society, nor do they prevent widespread reports that Chinese ELLs' reading anxiety is on the rise and their performance in decline ([Gao et al., 2019](#); [Jia, 2025](#)).

Using RtI to address poor reading

Against the backdrop of increasingly poor reading performance among Chinese ELLs ([Wang et al., 2020](#)), the scope of this study involves teachers' perceptions of RtI in addressing the problem. RtI is a multi-tiered academic framework used to address diverse learning challenges regardless of their background ([Al-Onizat, 2021](#); [Fuchs & Fuchs, 2005](#)). As further discussed in this paper, RtI has been explored and analyzed in the United States and other countries through social science research, yielding positive results and guidance for corrective and future implementations ([Pettit & Kuo, 2020](#)). As seminal proponents of RtI, [Fuchs and Fuchs \(2005\)](#) reported that schools utilize the framework to identify learning challenges early, provide tailored support, and monitor progress to inform subsequent decision-making.

Intervention for poor reading

Intervention implies providing tools to help low-achieving students improve their learning outcomes ([Bangs & Binder, 2016](#); [Ludwig et al., 2019](#)). ELLs empowered with tools to master reading have access to a broader range of information and skills development in the target language ([Debski & Rabiej, 2021](#)). While low-level readers are not entirely restricted from learning through reading, ELLs who struggle to comprehend written texts also tend to have lower confidence levels and experience further communication difficulties ([Hwang et al., 2020](#)). Consequently, targeted reading interventions for ELLs are known to bolster their reading confidence and communicative competencies ([Shelton et al., 2023](#); [Taylor et al., 2022](#)), fostering a more inclusive pathway to language mastery.

Improving ELLs' reading skills can be complex, as several factors may have contributed to their underperformance ([Kupchyk & Litvinchuk, 2020](#)). Without a specific or formal research objective, *Osea Bilingual* implemented an English literature Rtl program to address its students' poor reading. Since limited information is available regarding teachers' perceptions of Rtl on Chinese ELLs' reading levels, the contribution of this study is twofold: it provides context-specific, practitioner-centered evidence on Rtl in a non-Western, CLIL-oriented primary school setting; and it delineates practice constraints that shape any perceived effectiveness, potentially informing implementation in similar schools.

Theoretical framework

[Vygotsky's \(1978\)](#) social constructivism theory provides a springboard for designing, implementing, and assessing Rtl, understanding that social interactions with more knowledgeable others aid the learning process. Organizing a 'social' program like Rtl may support other linguistic enhancements, such as speaking and writing ([Zhang, 2023](#)), as developing subskills like vocabulary usage in receptive skills (*e.g.*, reading) can enhance performance in the productive skills (speaking and writing) ([Suseno et al., 2022](#)). The support that students receive in this social-like Rtl program is usually offered within a multi-tiered system that differentiates students who need little to no support, some support, or intensive support ([Fuchs & Fuchs, 2005](#); [Ludwig et al., 2019](#)).

Through Rtl, teachers provide early and targeted assistance ([Fuchs & Fuchs, 2005](#)). [Ludwig et al. \(2019\)](#) advised educators to offer early reading support and warned against waiting until students acquire a certain level of oral proficiency or require intensive remedial assistance before intervening in an academic lag. In addition, [Lamb \(2014\)](#) found that Rtl was a popular restorative program for students with poor reading skills. However, several obstacles undermined its usefulness: poor instructional quality in whole-class instruction, problems with early identification and monitoring, and a failure to respond to classroom diversity ([Lamb, 2014](#); [Venghaus et al., 2023](#)). These perceptions support the notion that Rtl is beneficial. However, instructional leaders who lack an in-depth understanding of Rtl implementation may obtain unsatisfactory results or have less favorable perceptions of the framework.

Using a multi-tiered system to address reading

Rtl comprises three tiers of support ([Björn et al., 2018](#); [Fuchs & Fuchs, 2005](#)). In Tier 1, teachers provide learners with whole-class, high-quality instruction, which may include diverse scaffolding techniques ([Ludwig et al., 2019](#)). [Alahmari \(2019\)](#) noted the critical role of educators in implementing Tier 1, explaining that teachers strive to meet the needs of all students and conduct ongoing assessments to track progress. These studies corroborated that Rtl is valid across all academic disciplines since it aims to help students struggling in their respective subjects.

Tier 2, typically a push-in approach, is reserved for students who do not make adequate progress in Tier 1 and who are determined to benefit from additional remedial classes ([Preston et al., 2016](#)). This second tier of support typically focuses on small-group differentiation led by the classroom teacher or learning support to address specific learning gaps through differentiated instruction. These gaps could range from phonemic awareness to vocabulary development ([Brandes & McMaster, 2017](#)). As a preferred remedial program for primary school teachers, [Ruiz \(2020\)](#) emphasized that, in Tier 2, more culturally responsive teaching can be applied to meet cultural learning needs. The primary goal of Tier 2 is to ensure that the students receive additional support to achieve the aim of their zone of

proximal development ([Vygotsky, 1978](#); [Vygotsky, 1978](#)). Recurrent progress monitoring occurs in Tiers 2 and 3, which may result in reclassifying students for Tier 1 intervention.

Tier 3, referred to as the *pull-out approach*, is reserved for learners who have made inadequate progress in Tier 2 and require intensive pedagogical assistance, usually through one-on-one tutoring or even smaller group sessions ([Ludwig et al., 2019](#)). In Tier 3, an individualized education plan may be drafted and followed depending on the school's policies and practices. ELLs may be pulled out of their classroom and assisted in a different space that reduces distraction or optimizes learning resources.

Instructional challenges of Rtl

As with other educational interventions, implementing Rtl for reading enhancement poses various challenges ([Goldenberg, 2013](#)). One challenge concerns the lack of literacy specialists or teachers with sufficient resources to remediate poor reading through whole-class or small-group instruction ([Ruiz, 2020](#)). Given the wide and unpredictable range of reading deficits, intervention success depends on practitioners' ability to tailor instruction to diverse student needs and continuously monitor progress to adjust strategies as needed ([Shelton et al., 2023](#)).

Another obstacle concerns ELLs' motivational levels or the disengagement factors that affect instruction and learning ([Han et al., 2019](#)). ELLs may lack motivation to participate in Rtl sessions, particularly Tiers 2 and 3, or feel disengaged in school, feeling 'targeted' because of poor performance ([Tong et al., 2021](#)). Studies have found that ELLs often perceive intensive interventions as stigmatizing ([Darling-Hammond et al., 2020](#)). Therefore, despite the fact that Rtl is a 'social' program, Tiers 2 and 3 can cause students to feel isolated and profiled, affecting their confidence level and classroom interactions.

Research objective

The problem under study is students' poor English reading performance at an international school in northern China. Although some scholars have found that teachers implement various strategies to address below-average reading ([Sun, 2022](#); [Tong et al., 2021](#)), ranging from traditional to contemporary interventions, the literature gap that this study targets is narrow: empirical, qualitative accounts of teachers' perceptions of a two-tier Rtl pilot implementation for reading in English as a foreign language within an international, CLIL-based primary school setting in mainland China. Based on existing knowledge, studies in China have either examined Rtl feasibility in other phases or contexts or reported statistical outcomes rather than practitioner perceptions, or they do not situate Rtl within CLIL literacies ([Yeung et al., 2023](#); [Zhang et al., 2019](#)).

The purpose of this qualitative descriptive case study was to explore teachers' perceptions regarding the influence of a two-tier Rtl pilot on students' English reading proficiency at an international elementary school in northern China. The following question guided data collection and data analysis in response to the research problem:

How do teachers perceive the influence of Rtl on Chinese ELLs' reading performance?

Methodology

A qualitative study was conducted to address the identified problem and achieve the purpose of the study. Given the focus on exploring teachers' perceptions, a qualitative methodology was appropriate for collecting information-rich data that are not statistical in nature but can validate human subjects' experiences and observations ([Creswell & Creswell, 2022](#)). This qualitative descriptive case study was conducted during a one-month two-tier Rtl pilot at *Osea Bilingual*. Given the study's focus on exploring perceptions of a bounded implementation period rather than executing iterative action-reflection cycles with planned adjustments, a descriptive case design was the most apposite and transparent frame ([Creswell & Creswell, 2022](#)).

This descriptive case study proceeded through a diagnostic and planning phase, a one-month implementation of Tier 1 and 2 supports, and post-implementation data collection via interviews and reflective journals. In the diagnostic stage, the first step was to identify the problem and determine which students required intervention. The second step involved planning intervention sessions to address poor reading among Grade 4 students (those ranked as requiring urgent intervention). [Table 1](#) summarizes the Rtl tiers and strategies employed with two classes of 30 students, providing a data-driven mapping from diagnosed reading needs to the tiered strategies used in the pilot.

Table 1. *Summary of Rtl classroom plans*

Reading deficit (from screening)	Underlying L2 reading constructs	Tier 1: whole-class strategies used	Tier 2: targeted small- group strategies used (groups of 4-6)	Progress check (applied once fortnightly)
Limited comprehension of information, elements, and ideas	a) Inferencing b) Text-structure awareness	a) Pre-teaching key concepts and vocabulary. b) Connections to prior experiences and knowledge. c) Use of multimedia resources such as videos, images, and audio recordings.	Addressed in Tier 1 for learners during the pilot.	Lesson-embedded comprehension checks were recorded in session logs and reflective journals.
Inadequate maneuver of structure, genre, and the author's craft	a) Text-structure awareness	a) Explicit instruction in text structure and organization. b) Use of graphic organizers to identify key components of the text. c) Summarizing and paraphrasing.	Addressed in Tier 1 for learners during the pilot.	Work samples (structure maps/ summaries) were reviewed against the same focus.
Inability to extend meaning and deepen their understanding	a) Inferencing b) Interactive scaffolding	a) Collaborative discussion tasks.	a) Higher-level questioning. b) Guided practice in making inferences and drawing conclusions.	Lesson probes targeting inference/ explanation noted in session logs.
Weak grasp of organization, purpose, and language use	a) Text-structure awareness b) Interactive scaffolding	a) Explicit instruction of text features and organization b) Use of graphic organizers to identify key components of the text. c) Identifying the author's purpose.	a) Small-group guided practice on identifying purpose and evidence links.	Brief exit prompts focused on purpose and text-feature use.
Limited vocabulary	a) Vocabulary breadth/depth	a) Direct instruction of key words and phrases. b) Use of context clues and graphic organizers.	a) Small-group practice with taught vocabulary in a connected text. b) Context-clue application.	Curriculum-embedded vocabulary checks (taught-word retrieval/use)

Note: A total of 25 students received Tier 2 intervention across both classes for one month. Fidelity was supported through session checklists completed after each lesson and spot reviews of materials in order to confirm alignment with the planned focus. Deviations and rationale were documented in the audit trail. [Table 1](#) links Tier 1 and 2 strategies to the specific diagnosed needs identified in the screening profile, ensuring that the approach appeared data-driven rather than generic.

Participant selection and recruitment

This study's population consisted of 150 teachers of English as a foreign language. Participant sample selection was conducted using purposive sampling based on the following inclusion criteria: they had completed a one-year contract within the primary school division where reading interventions occurred, they had developed English interventions for at least one school term, and they were willing to volunteer in a single, bounded, and non-iterative pilot project. [Table 2](#) presents further demographic information that is relevant to this study.

Table 2. *Participant demographics*

Participant	Role at time of pilot	Primary responsibilities during pilot	Nationality	Years teaching (total)	Years teaching at <i>Osea Bilingual</i>	Years as reading specialist
P1	G4 All-subject lead classroom teacher	EL Tier 1 whole-class instruction; coordinated Tier 2 push-in within lessons	Chinese	15	6	13
P2	G4 All-subject lead classroom teacher	EL Tier 1 whole-class instruction; coordinated Tier 2 push-in within lessons	Canadian	18	6	18
P3	G1-4 English interventionist	EL Tier 2 targeted small groups	American	10	5	5
P4	G1-4 English interventionist	EL Tier 2 targeted small groups	Chinese	4	4	4
P5	G1-4 English interventionist	EL Tier 2 targeted small groups	Chinese	3	2	2

A recruitment email was sent to all teachers explaining the purpose, scope, and pilot process, including data collection procedures. Six teachers from the primary school division volunteered, but only five were selected (see [Table 2](#)) because one teacher did not consent to having their interview recorded or to sharing their reflective journals. The five participants were elementary-trained teachers between the ages of 28 and 52. One assumption was that the sample population was information-rich for the purpose of this study. Three of the participants were Chinese nationals who had been trained at a public teacher-training institution in China and had completed an internal reading specialist certification course designed by *Osea Bilingual*. The other two were foreign nationals who had completed their teacher training and reading specialist programs abroad.

Role of the researcher

The researcher of this study also worked in the primary school division as a Grade 5 English literature teacher and shared a professional relationship with the participants. However, the researcher held no supervisory or performance-based evaluative authority over the participants but used a neutral, school-wide invitation with voluntary, non-incentivized consent and strict confidentiality procedures to safeguard trustworthiness and avoid undue influence. The researcher's responsibility included recruiting participants, collecting and analyzing data, and maintaining an audit trail, including recruitment records, consent logs, reflexive memos, and coding decisions, in order to document procedures and strengthen credibility.

Rtl pilot procedure, context, and curriculum

The participants conducted a computer-adaptive baseline assessment using the school's prescribed diagnostic reading tool (STAR Reading) to identify students struggling in English reading. These assessments focused on key areas such as comprehension, fluency, phonemic awareness, and vocabulary. The two classes with the lowest scores were selected as the pilot groups.

Rtl implementation

During the one-month implementation phase of the Rtl interventions, when students received tier-based reading support for 40 minutes a day (Monday to Thursday, 160 minutes per week over one month), the two lead teachers in separate classes used prescribed, short fiction and informational texts to implement whole-class reading strategies, including guided reading sessions, shared reading, and vocabulary-building exercises (see [Table 1](#) for a comprehensive overview of the specific reading strategies implemented).

Students nominated for Tier 2 intervention also used the same resources as those in Tier 1 while receiving more differentiated support from the interventionists (two Chinese locals and one foreign national) to address the individual weaknesses identified in the diagnostic phase. After each session, teachers were encouraged to document changes in student engagement and reading abilities through reflective journals. They could discuss student progress, refine strategies, and ensure fidelity to the Rtl model.

The teachers were also encouraged to occasionally check progress based on students' identified deficits using the fidelity checklists provided by STAR (vocabulary and comprehension checks), record the results for the purpose of framing their perceptions of the program's influence, and compare the results weekly against the baseline indicator. One assumption was that the teachers' journal entries were accurate, complete, and based on students' actual reading performance during the interventions, which shaped their perception. The students deemed eligible to exit Tier 2 interventions were assessed solely by the participants using vocabulary and comprehension fidelity checklists after weekly meetings.

After the month-long pilot program, the teachers participated in semi-structured interviews and submitted reflective journals summarizing their perceptions of Rtl's influence on ELLs' reading performance. In preparation for data analysis, the interviews were transcribed *verbatim* using Transcribe, an online application for speech-to-text transcription. All transcriptions were revised for accuracy, clarity, and consistency. The teachers' reflective journals were then scanned for any personally identifying data, which were removed to maintain anonymity.

Data collection

Reflective journals and semi-structured interviews using open-ended questions were used for data collection. Consistent with [Pollock et al. \(2022\)](#), the interview protocol and reflective journal prompts were vetted by three subject matter experts knowledgeable in English language teaching and Rtl. Using subject matter experts for field testing was relevant to ensure that the interview questions were fair and unbiased and did not influence participants' responses in favor of any specific outcome. Since the interview questions were open-ended, another assumption was that the participants could speak openly and elaborate on their responses to the predefined and follow-up questions. Each face-to-face interview lasted approximately 20 minutes and was confidentially stored on a password-protected computer. In addition to the interviews, the participating teachers wrote and provided reflective journals in which they documented their experience developing the prescribed teaching plans used for the intervention. Besides their perceptions of Rtl in English literature teaching, they reflected on the factors they believed contributed to students' formative results.

The five semi-structured interviews totaled approximately 100 minutes of audio. Likewise, the *verbatim* transcription of each interview comprised approximately 2700 words (six single-spaced pages, each containing 450-500 words). During the four-week implementation, the participants provided an average of one page of reflection per session, resulting in an overall total of 80 entries (corpus size of almost 30 000 words). From the data preparation process, the analyzed corpus consisted of roughly 43 500 words, including interview transcripts and teacher journals.

Ethical considerations

The three ethical principles established in The Belmont Report were addressed to ensure participants were protected, respected, and treated equally ([Anabo et al., 2019](#)). All participants were autonomous in their decision to participate after being informed about their involvement and rights, including the right to discontinue participation without any repercussions. They were assured confidentiality throughout the process and were informed that all identifying data would remain anonymous and would be destroyed after three years. Furthermore, measures were taken to protect them from harm or retaliation while benefiting from the study. The benefits included being allowed to verify data analysis and being informed individually about the study's results.

Data analysis

Braun and Clarke's six-step thematic analysis (2006) was employed for this qualitative descriptive case study, in order to examine the interview transcripts and reflective journals. Step 1 involved becoming familiar with the data by thoroughly reading and re-reading the materials. Secondly, initial codes were generated using MAXQDA, which systematically identified and labeled significant features across the dataset. Thirdly, themes were manually developed, and the codes were organized into themes. These themes were subsequently reviewed, refined, and defined to represent the data accurately. Finally, a report of the findings was drafted and is presented below.

While adhering to Braun and Clarke's descriptive thematic analysis using MAXQDA (2006), the unit of analysis was a meaningful text segment of variable length (short to multi-sentence) from interview transcripts and reflective journals, with overlapping codes permitted. Segments were eligible for multiple codes when they addressed more than one idea. Coding proceeded inductively at the semantic level, with limited Rtl-informed sensitizing concepts used to orient attention. In addition, a structured codebook (code name, definition, inclusion/exclusion criteria, exemplar quotation) was developed during first-cycle coding and refined across subsequent passes.

Findings

The findings are hereby reported as teachers' perceptions from the single-phase pilot, within the framework of a descriptive case. Consistent with research studies conducted in the United States ([Taylor et al., 2022](#); [Zhang et al., 2019](#)), the participants perceived Rtl positively and perceived Tier 2 as the most effective within the pilot's constraints. Moreover, despite the absence of a statistical analysis of post-intervention reading scores, the teachers' perceptions of Rtl were rich in detail and contained balanced observations, noting the factors that both affected and enhanced Rtl's success. Since pre- and post-percentages are presented for descriptive context only, no inferential analyses were conducted. Accordingly, this study's results are framed in terms of the teachers' perceptions rather than causal effects.

The participants valued Tier 2 because small-group interaction allowed for interactive scaffolding (immediate prompts, modeling, corrective feedback) that supported inferencing and text-structure use in real time. Tier 2 also created safer conditions for students to attempt strategies publicly, which teachers linked to greater participation and confidence. Where vocabulary breadth/depth was targeted, teachers described better access to grade-level texts; where text-structure awareness was taught, they reported clearer pathways for summarizing and organizing ideas.

With greater emphasis on the qualitative data, the general findings, summarized by themes and subthemes with their frequency ranking in [Table 3](#), were that teachers highly valued Rtl and the theoretical structure of each tier, that they perceived Tier 2 as highly effective but with no associated causal inference, and that the lack of institutional structure and professional support remains an obstacle in helping students meet their grade-level benchmark. In subsequent paragraphs, these three significant interrelated themes are discussed, having been refined using thematic analysis.

Table 3. *Categorization of themes and their frequency*

Major theme	Sub-themes	f	%	Sample extracts
Tier 2 supporting differentiated instruction and inclusive education	Tailored instruction boosting performance	11	24.4	"I have realized that when the interventionist helps out, students who used to show signs of underperformance are better prepared to achieve the learning objectives and are more engaged" – RJ. "Rtl should be a critical feature of our English literature curriculum. I don't think it should continue to be seen as a luxury but a necessity for underperforming students" – IN.
	Equitable access and inclusive practice	9	20	"[Rtl] is not just a nice-to-have but an essential part of moving away from the current one-size-fits-all remedial program we have" – IN.
Tier 2 intervention enhancing engagement	Preference for targeted small-group instruction	8	17.8	"Going into classes as an English specialist to work with small groups, I realize that students prefer that almost one-on-one support even though it is not one-on-one because in the general class, they do not respond to me as positively" – IN.
	Individualized attention and confidence-building	7	15.6	"I've also seen that more individualized attention makes it easier for them to ask questions without feeling embarrassed due to their limited oral skills or lack of jargon" – RJ "There is no doubt in my mind that the individual attention that students get, even in small group support, makes them feel more confident to decode words, even if the pronunciation or ascribed meaning of the word is incorrect" – IN
Lack of institutional structure and support	Insufficient interventionist capacity and resources	6	13.3	"I definitely believe that the school could invest more in hiring more interventionists. Furthermore, it's not just us as locals who can work as interventionists. I don't know why foreign teachers who have fewer classes don't offer support as interventionists, too" – IN. "The resources interventionists take to the class are useful, but I don't understand why these can't be bought in bulk for all general English literature classes" – JR.
	Time and organizational constraints	4	8.9	"The need to track and monitor student progress can be time-consuming and requires a high level of organization and attention to detail. However, to begin with, we don't even have many interventions going on. Maybe it is because of your study why we are having these this term. But I definitely think we need more time for interventions" – IN.

Note: RJ refers to excerpts taken from reflective journals, and IN are those from the interview transcripts.

In [Table 3](#), f denotes the number of coded segments assigned to each sub-theme across the corpus, and % denotes each theme's share of total coded segments. All coding and theme development were undertaken by a single coder (the researcher), and credibility was supported through contemporaneous analytic memoing and an audit trail. Other strategies to enhance credibility involved the triangulation of interviews with teacher journals and member checking at the theme level via a one-page summary shared with participants, after which minor clarifications were incorporated to ensure codes convey participants' intended meaning ([Ahmed, 2024](#)).

Supporting differentiated instruction and inclusive education

One prominent theme that emerged during data analysis concerned Tier 2 in relation to the importance of Rtl in supporting differentiated instruction and inclusive education. The participants' accounts tied the perceived benefits of Tier 2 intervention to differentiated instruction, which they believed increased the impact of explicit attention to vocabulary and text structure, enabling comprehension monitoring and summarizing during reading tasks. The

teachers believe that RtI should become a critical feature of the English literature curriculum in order to create an inclusive learning community and support underperforming students. Consistent with the literature, the participants articulated that RtI allowed students to receive tailored instruction and encouraged them to avoid one-size-fits-all teaching strategies. In addition to the extracts provided in [Table 2](#), the following samples justify this thematic identification:

The implementation of the RtI model has had a positive impact on the reading [performance] of my students. I know that it is too early to say definitively that RtI is widely successful, but from adjusting my teaching styles to include differentiated instructional strategies, I see where students improve daily. When the interventionist helps out in classes, too, I note that students who were lost in class previously are now more focused and engaged. I really like RtI for our new English curriculum. (Participant 3, interview)

As I reflect on these [RtI] sessions, I have come to realize it's been useful in supporting my students and how disadvantaged other groups are who do not have adequate access [to RtI]. Over these past weeks, I think the more I've used RtI, the more I've seen it has allowed me to really address my students' reading needs, which stands in stark contrast to the model the school encourages us to use more. It's clear that students who once felt abandoned can benefit from a real approach that works, moving away from the current one-size-fits-all remedial program we have. (Participant 4, reflective journal)

Intervention-enhancing engagement

Building on the importance of RtI, another prominent theme that emerged was the perceived effectiveness of Tier 2, as all the participants validated it as a valuable practice to help students better understand the covered topics. In Tier 2, an English as a foreign language specialist entered the class as a teaching assistant and helped low-level readers during each lesson's practice and production components. Explanations centered on interactive scaffolding in small groups: the interventionists could model inferencing moves, prompt the use of organizers, and recycle target lexis, which teachers associated with increased strategy use and willingness to participate. The participants believed that distracted and disengaged students became more focused and engaged when a teaching assistant met with them in small groups or individually during the practice or production activities. The following sample justifies the theme:

In my experience, Tier 2 interventions have been the most effective in supporting the reading development of my English language learners. In Tier 1, yes, I tried to use differentiated strategies, but class time is limited, so I believe that when the [teaching assistant] is present, the students are better able to meet the learning objectives. These interventions are targeted to address the specific needs of students who are not making adequate progress in the whole-class setting. So, I strongly believe that by providing more intensive and individualized support in Tier 2, students have been able to make significant gains in their reading skills. (Participant 2, interview)

Looking back at how Tier 2 has worked in the classroom, I can honestly say it's been a game-changer for some of the students. Going into classes as an English as a foreign language specialist to work with small groups or one-on-one, I've noticed that some students who were often distracted and disengaged come alive during the small-group sessions...I've also seen that more individualized attention makes it easier for them to ask questions without feeling embarrassed due to their limited oral skills or lack of jargon. Tier 1 is a charm, but Tier 2 is giving these students the boost they need to stay engaged and keep up. (Participant 5, reflective journal)

Lack of institutional structure and support

Finally, the participants frequently discussed the lack of institutional structure and support as an obstacle to the permanent implementation of RtI. All participants recognized that RtI was not a permanently approved practice at the school, so they thought leaders could do more to institutionalize the framework and support struggling students. They believed that having more English literature interventionists could help to mitigate the issue and create a more robust English literature curriculum. The participants also noted that limited specialist time constrained systematic attention to vocabulary depth, inferencing routines, and text-structure, diluting the perceived benefits of a reading intervention model. The following sample supports this theme:

One of the main challenges I have faced in implementing the Rtl model with my students is the need for additional resources and support. Implementing the Rtl model requires a significant amount of time, planning, and collaboration among teachers and other professionals. I often do not have enough time to research all the strategies to implement differentiated strategies and cater to all learners, so I definitely believe that the school could invest more in hiring more interventionists. Additionally, the need to track and monitor student progress can be time-consuming and requires a high level of organization and attention to detail. The interventionists could also be in charge of this, but if those at the top do not see the need, what can we do? (Participant 1, interview)

One thing that kept coming up during our discussions was the lack of institutional structure to really make Rtl work. If we are the content experts with expertise in learning support and we all find Rtl helpful, I now see a gap between leadership and teaching, which could be exacerbating academic deficits. Also, it would help to have more dedicated support within a formal program for the students who need it most. (Participant 2, reflective journal)

Interpretations, discussion, and implications

In this work, the results are interpreted through an applied-linguistics lens appropriate to CLIL. The teachers perceived that Tier 2 small-group work made interactive scaffolding possible at the point of need, supporting inferencing (linking ideas and filling gaps), text-structure awareness (using genre and organizational cues for comprehension and summarizing), and vocabulary breadth and depth (moving beyond exposure to reinforced form-meaning-use). This mechanism helps to explain why the participants reported higher participation, more visible strategy use, and greater confidence during reading tasks.

Moreover, this finding is consistent with the meta-analytic conclusion provided by [Ludwig et al. \(2019\)](#): ELLs are more likely to experience an increase in reading performance when a systematic intervention is applied early in their educational training. Pragmatically, Rtl does not seem to be an add-on but rather the way to develop a teaching cycle of *assess, review, and revise*, which could suffer modifications in content areas but could lead to constant development. Therefore, the advice by [Ludwig et al. \(2019\)](#) that refraining from waiting for students' reading grades to plummet before offering targeted support is rationally prudent.

Secondly, the predominance of Tier 2 intervention indicates that small-group, specialist-assisted instruction may be of paramount importance in the case of ELL. Tier 2 small-group models, with one or more interventionists providing tailored support, were described as being particularly helpful for boosting learner confidence and linguistic risk-taking ([Ruiz, 2020](#); [Pettit & Kuo, 2020](#)). This preferred intervention tier aligns with the argument presented by [Fuchs and Fuchs \(2005\)](#) that, due to their intermediate intensity, Tier 2 interventions typically strike the optimal balance between resource investment and student impact.

The participants' perceptions indicate a potential value in prioritizing collaboration time and specialist roles to maintain fidelity to Rtl and maximize reading gains. Leaders are encouraged to position Rtl as more than just a differentiating factor or marketing strategy but as a framework that yields actual, positive results. In fact, extending Rtl beyond English literature into other curriculum disciplines could lead to similar enhancements, as noted by this study's participants. While applicable to this study, appreciating that Vygotsky's social constructivist learning theory (1978) transcends disciplines is a starting point for improving success across academic departments ([Amna et al., 2021](#)). Therefore, while support may not come in the form of a multi-tiered system, even due to extenuating circumstances, understanding and acting on the need for targeted or individualized instruction is critical for meaningful learning.

Nevertheless, as highlighted by the participants, despite Rtl's obvious advantages, the absence of an institutional structure for the framework and specific support can be an insurmountable obstacle to sustainability. The participants reported that a lack of institutional support, *e.g.*, failing to acquire resources to support interventions or disregarding scheduling concerns, can make developing Rtl burdensome. This fact can be compared to Goldenberg's advice (2013) that evidence-based programs require organizational investment and clear leadership support to be effective.

Implementing systemic levers, such as incorporating Rtl into master schedules, providing clear job descriptions, sourcing well-needed teaching aids, and offering professional development training, would stabilize the delivery of interventions ([DiMarco & Guastello, 2021](#)). In addition, consistent with the literature on cautious leadership support

(Zuckerman & O'Shea, 2021), while RtI has been widely adopted in the United States and other countries and is commonly used in K-12 schools (Duguay *et al.*, 2013), at *Osea Bilingual*, instructional leaders must be cautioned that this system is not a panacea for effective teaching and learning and does not substitute a model for diagnosing learning disabilities (Reynolds & Shaywitz, 2009), another topic that may warrant future research in this non-native English environment (Kim & Helphenstine, 2017).

Research implications

As an implication, this brief study shows that teachers found the structured approach of RtI to be accessible and beneficial for their students. Based on reported perceptions and descriptive indicators, it is recommended that the RtI program be extended to examine feasibility and perceived utility over longer durations, with future work via quantitative or mixed methods evaluating effects on reading scores. Incorporating student perceptions into future research could also provide deeper insights into the program's impact on student engagement and achievement.

In addition, this study could be repeated with a larger sample size to evaluate the teachers' perceptions of RtI. It would also be interesting to conduct a quantitative or mixed-methods study to evaluate the impact of RtI on students' reading scores and assess more teachers' perceptions of RtI. Notwithstanding, since the results of this study align with the existing literature, program leaders should consider adapting RtI as an institutional strategy to support underperforming students.

Conclusion

Guided by the research question, this study documents that English as a foreign language teachers perceive RtI as a vital program to be added to the English literature curriculum. This type of intervention may also have long-term benefits, as these are the same problems that students exhibit in high schools (Taylor *et al.*, 2022; Widiyaningsih *et al.*, 2019). This result coincides with the literature, which shows overwhelming support for instituting RtI in schools, particularly for ELLs struggling with the target language (Al-Onizat, 2021; Duguay *et al.*, 2013; Pettit & Kuo, 2020; Taylor *et al.*, 2022).

Teachers considered that the RtI model was a systematic and data-driven approach to identifying and supporting students who are struggling academically. The participants understood that the primary goal of the RtI model was to provide targeted interventions at various levels of intensity and frequency to help students succeed in their learning; however, school leaders needed to offer more support to institutionalize the program.

The main limitation of this study concerns generalizability. With only five participants, it is difficult to generalize the findings to a larger population. While qualitative research is generally not intended to be generalizable, the small sample size used in this study may limit the extent to which the findings accurately reflect the general perceptions of other teachers and leaders. Notwithstanding, consistent with qualitative research practices, the findings are equally valid and reliable, resonating with the broader literature review.

References

- Ahmed, S. K. (2024). The pillars of trustworthiness in qualitative research. *Journal of Medicine, Surgery, and Public Health*, 2, 100051. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.glmedi.2024.100051>
- Alahmari, A. (2019). A review and synthesis of the response to intervention (RtI) literature: Teachers implementations and perceptions. *International Journal of Special Education*, 33(4), 894-909. <http://www.internationalsped.com/>
- Al-Onizat, S. H. H. (2021). The effectiveness of response to intervention (RTI) diagnostic program in diagnosing and improving the difficulties of reading and writing in a Jordanian sample. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 16(6), 236-246. <https://doi.org/10.5897/ERR2020.3936>

- Amna, S., Huma, K., & Farah, D. (2021). Social constructivism: A new paradigm in teaching and learning environment. *Pernnial Journal of History*, 2(2), 403-421. <https://doi.org/10.52700/pjh.v2i2.86>
- Anabo, I. F., Elexpuru-Albizuri, I., & Villardón-Gallego, L. (2019). Revisiting the Belmont Report's ethical principles in internet-mediated research: Perspectives from disciplinary associations in the social sciences. *Ethics and information technology*, 21(2), 137-149. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10676-018-9495-z>
- Bangs, K. E., & Binder, K. S. (2016). Morphological awareness intervention: Improving spelling, vocabulary, and reading comprehension for adult learners. *Journal of Research and Practice for Adult Literacy, Secondary, and Basic Education*, 5(1), 49-56. <https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5061501/>
- Björn, P. M., Aro, M., Koponen, T., Fuchs, L. S., & Fuchs, D. (2018). Response-To-Intervention in Finland and the United States: Mathematics learning support as an example. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9, 800. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.00800>
- Brandes, D. R., & McMaster, K. L. (2017). A review of morphological analysis strategies on vocabulary outcomes with ELLs. *Insights into Learning Disabilities*, 14(1), 53-72. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1165732.pdf>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3, 77-101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2022). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (6th ed.). Sage Publications.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Flook, L., Cook-Harvey, C., Barron, B., & Osher, D. (2020). Implications for educational practice of the science of learning and development. *Applied Developmental Science*, 24(2), 97-140. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10888691.2018.1537791>
- Dębski, R., & Rabiej, A. (2021). Emergent literacy in bilingual children. *Socjolingwistyka*, 35, 77-87. <https://doi.org/10.17651/socjoling.35.5>
- DiMarco, D., & Guastello, E. F. (2021). Principals and professional learning communities: Breaking down barriers to effective response to intervention in secondary schools. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 12(23), 24-28. <https://doi.org/10.7176/JEP/12-23-03>
- Duguay, A., Massoud, L., Tabaku, L., Himmel, J., & Sugarman, J. (2013). *Implementing the common core for English learners: Responses to common questions*. Center for Applied Linguistics. https://www.cosa.k12.or.us/sites/default/files/materials/events/16_cal_practitioner-brief-implementing-common-core-for-english-learners.pdf
- Fuchs, D., & Fuchs, L. S. (2005). Responsiveness-To-Intervention: A blueprint for practitioners, policymakers, and parents. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 38(1), 57-61. <https://doi.org/10.1177/004005990503800112>
- Gao, Y., Zheng, L., Liu, X., Nichols, E. S., Zhang, M., Shang, L., Ding, G., Meng, X., & Liu, L. (2019). First and second language reading difficulty among Chinese-English bilingual children: The prevalence and influences from demographic characteristics. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 2544. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02544>
- Goldenberg, C. (2013). Unlocking the research on English learners. *American Educator*, 37(2), 4-11. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1014021.pdf>
- Han, T., Takkaç-Tulgar, A., & Aybirdi, N. (2019). Factors causing demotivation in EFL learning process and the strategies used by Turkish EFL learners to overcome their demotivation. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 10(2), 56-65. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.all.s.v.10n.2p.56>
- Ho, W.-C. (2020). *The influence of politics in Hong Kong's education system 23 years after its handover from the United Kingdom to China* (EJ1293246). ERIC. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1293246.pdf>
- Hwang, J. K., Mancilla-Martinez, J., McClain, J. B., Oh, M. H., & Flores, I. (2020). Spanish-speaking English learners' English language and literacy skills: The predictive role of conceptually scored vocabulary. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 41(1), 1-24. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0142716419000365>
- Jia, X. (2025). *English reading anxiety among Chinese high school students: Current status and countermeasures* [Conference article]. 2025 11th International Conference on Humanities and Social Science Research. https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-38476-440-2_22
- Kim, K., & Helpenstine, D. T. (2017). The perils of multi-lingual students: "I'm not LD, I'm L2 or L3.". *Journal of International Students*, 7(2), 421-428. <https://doi.org/10.32674/jis.v7i2.388>
- Kupchyk, L., & Litvinchuk, A. (2020). *Differentiated instruction in English learning, teaching and assessment in non-language universities* (EJ1287405). ERIC. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1287405.pdf>
- Lamb, V. (2014). *Obstacles in the implementation of response to intervention* (EJ1230746). ERIC. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1230746.pdf>

- Lei, M., & Medwell, J. (2022). The changing role of Chinese English-as-foreign-language teachers in the context of curriculum reform: Teachers' understanding of their new role. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 904071. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.904071>
- Li, H., Meng, L., Mu, K., & Wang, S. (2024). English language requirement and educational inequality: Evidence from 16 million college applicants in China. *Journal of Development Economics*, 168, 103271. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jdeveco.2024.103271>
- Li, X. (2022). Preschool English language provision in China under the government ban. *Cogent Education*, 9(1), 2152257. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2022.2152257>
- Ludwig, C., Guo, K., & Georgiou, G. K. (2019). Are reading interventions for English language learners effective? A meta-analysis. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 52(3), 220-231. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022219419825855>
- Mahan, K. R., Brevik, L. M., & Ødegaard, M. (2021). Characterizing CLIL teaching: New insights from a lower secondary classroom. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 24(3), 401-418. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2018.1472206>
- National Governors Association Center for Best Practices, & Council of Chief State School Officers (2010). *Common core state standards for English language arts, literacy in history/social studies, science, and technical subjects*. <https://learning.ccsso.org/common-core-state-standards-initiative>
- Pettit, S. K., & Kuo, N.-C. (2020). Response to intervention for English language learners (ELLs): Using data collection, goal setting, and district level support for instructional improvement. *Journal of Contemporary Research in Education*, 7(1), 6. <https://egrove.olemiss.edu/jcre/vol7/iss1/6>
- Polanco, P., & Luft de Baker, D. (2018). Transitional bilingual education and two-way immersion programs: Comparison of reading outcomes for English learners in the United States *Athens Journal of Education*, 5(4), 423-444. <https://doi.org/10.30958/aje.5-4-5>
- Pollock, T., Levy, Y., Li, W., & Kumar, A. (2022). *Subject matter experts feedback on experimental procedures to measure user's judgment errors in social engineering attacks (EJ1332790)*. ERIC. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1332790.pdf>
- Poole, A., Liujinya, Y., & Yue, S. (2022). "We're away from everything": Understanding the struggles faced by internationalized schools in non-urban contexts in China. *SAGE Open*, 12(1), 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440221081026>
- Preston, A. I., Wood, C. L., & Stecker, P. M. (2016). Response to intervention: Where it came from and where it's going. *Preventing School Failure*, 60(3), 173-182. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1045988X.2015.1065399>
- Reynolds, C. R., & Shaywitz, S. E. (2009). Response to intervention: Ready or Not? Or, from wait-to-fail to watch-them-fail. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 24(2), 130. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0016158>
- Ruiz, M. I. (2020). Beyond traditional response to intervention: Helping rural educators understand English learners' needs. *Rural Special Education Quarterly*, 39(1), 35-53. <https://doi.org/10.1177/8756870519894661>
- Shelton, A., Hogan, E., Chow, J., & Wexler, J. (2023). A synthesis of professional development ELLs targeting: Literacy instruction and intervention for English learners. *Review of Educational Research*, 93(1), 37-72. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543221087718>
- Sun, X. (2022). Scaffolded extensive reading: A case study of an extensive reading programme in China. *Education*, 3(13), 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03004279.2022.2119092>
- Suseno, E., Purnomo, H., & Nuryana, A. (2022). The implementation of grammar translation method to better speaking competence supported by developing reading and listening skills. *International Journal of Indonesian Education and Teaching*, 6(1), 1602. <https://doi.org/10.24071/ijiet.v6i1.1602>
- Taylor, A. J., Wells, T., & Lein, A. E. (2022). Preservice teachers' perceptions and knowledge of response to intervention multitiered systems of support. *Kentucky Teacher Education Journal: The Journal of the Teacher Education Division of the Kentucky Council for Exceptional Children*, 9(1), 1-18. <https://digitalcommons.murraystate.edu/ktej/vol9/iss1/3/>
- Tong, F., Zhang, H., Zhen, F., Irby, B. J., & Lara-Alecio, R. (2021). Supporting home literacy practices in promoting Chinese parents' engagement in their children's English education in low-SES families: An experimental study. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 109, 101816. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2021.101816>
- Venghaus, J., Pilgrim, J., Morton, B., & Rex, C. (2023). Secondary administrators' perspectives of literacy interventions within a multitiered system of support. *NASSP Bulletin*, 107(2), 156-177. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01926365231178833>
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. (M. Cole, V. John-Steiner, S. Scribner, & E. Souberman, Eds.). Harvard University Press.
- Wang, N., Wang, H., Chang, F., Lu, F., & Dill, S.-E. (2020). Factors linked to cultivating successful readers: Evidence from rural China. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 103. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2020.101636>
- Wang, X., & Lam, C. B. (2017). An exploratory case study of an American-Style, play-based curriculum in China. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, 31(1), 28-39. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02568543.2016.1243175>

- Widiyaningsih, W., Yufrizal, H., & Sinaga, T. (2019). Promoting students' reading comprehension through explicit reading strategies. *Unila Journal of English Teaching*, 8(1), 18109. <http://jurnal.fkip.unila.ac.id/index.php/123/article/view/18109>
- Yeung, K. K.-y., Chan, R. T.-c., Chan, H.-y., Shum, K. K.-m., & Tso, R. V.-y. (2023). Word reading transfer in two distinct languages in reading interventions: How Chinese-English bilingual children with reading difficulties learn to read. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, 137, 104501. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ridd.2023.104501>
- Zhang, L., Liu, X., & Lin, Y. (2019). Teachers' perception of the response to intervention implementation feasibility in Chinese inclusive early childhood education. *International Journal of Developmental Disabilities*, 65(5), 387-395. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20473869.2019.1640995>
- Zhang, P. (2023). Problems encountered by Chinese high school English learners. *Journal of Education, Humanities and Social Sciences*, 8, 2202-2207. <https://doi.org/10.54097/ehss.v8i.4677>
- Zhou, Z. (2023). *Differences in the education system between China and the United States* [Conference article]. 2023 7th International Seminar on Education, Management and Social Sciences. https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-38476-126-5_61
- Zuckerman, S. J., & O'Shea, C. (2021). Principals' schema: Leadership philosophies and instructional leadership. *Journal of School Leadership*, 31(4), 274-296. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1052684620966063>

