

Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP): Overview, Misconceptions, and Considerations for Implementation

Denchai Prabjandee*

denchai@buu.ac.th

Abstract

The question of the best way to teach English has been the central focus for teachers for many years. Prior researchers have attempted to find teaching approaches, methods, or techniques to educate English language learners. One of the most recent approaches is the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) model, which is increasingly used in the United States. The model has been empirically validated as an effective approach for English Language Learners (ELLs) at all levels and contexts. As a result of this success, other educators may consider implementing this model in the English classrooms. This paper presents a historical overview of the SIOP model, discusses misconceptions, and attempts to investigate the applicability of the approach in the Thai context. The author argues for the SIOP approach in its potential to develop language learning achievement and support English language learners in Thailand to become successful language learners.

Keywords: sheltered instruction observation protocol, SIOP, language teaching approach

Introduction

What is the best way to teach English?

In the landscape of Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), the question above has been a thought-provoking inquiry to ponder since it is undeniable that the English language is vital for individuals to master. As a result, educational institutions around the world have tried to find ways to prepare their learners to master English proficiency. A recent approach, the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) model, was developed in the United States. Prior studies

* อ.ดร. ภาควิชาบัณฑิตศึกษานานาชาติการจัดการทรัพยากรมนุษย์ คณะศึกษาศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยบูรพา

(e.g., Changes & Francis, 2011; Echevarría, Short, & Powers, 2006; Macías, Fontes, Kephart, & Blume, 2013; Whittier & Robinson, 2007) have reported successful results of this model in many levels and contexts. As a result of this success, other educators may need to consider implementing the SIOP model in their contexts.

As is the case of other countries around the world, the importance of English in Thailand is paramount. It is believed that English strengthens the nation's ability to negotiate in the international arena and it is a vehicle to access knowledge. Even though English is perceived to have paramount effects, studies have shown that teaching and learning English in Thailand has not been successful. Thai learners were reported having inadequate English proficiency in all skills: reading, writing, speaking, and listening (Prabjandee, 2014). This deficit situation leads educators to urgently solve this problem. A number of factors have been identified. One of such factor is probably we do not have systematic framework to teach our learners. Since the SIOP model has been validated in many contexts, educators in Thailand may need to consider this alternative approach to help Thai learners master English proficiency. It is important to note that the purpose of this paper is not to argue that the SIOP model is the best way to teach English, rather I hope to introduce the model and encourage educators to implement the model in their classrooms. Next section presents an overview of the SIOP model.

A Journey to the SIOP Model

It was the fall semester in a small mid-western city where the red and gold leaves were swaying slowly by the soft autumn wind. Excitedly, I drove to an elementary school to observe a class as a part of an assignment for an independent study during my doctoral studies in the United States. I remembered vividly that my advisor said to me with a smile, "This observation will help you understand the educational context in the US throughout your doctoral studies. You will learn a new approach to teach English and I am sure that you will love this experience." Her promising words increased my curiosity to learn about this new instructional approach.

When I met Mrs. Joy¹, she led me to the classroom where I met students from different ethnic and cultural backgrounds. Their innocent eyes stared at me with curiosity of who I was. After I introduced myself, the students smiled excitedly as if they had a new friend. Over time, the students embraced me as part of their experience; many of them asked about me when I did not show up.

During that semester, I spent 90 hours observing, researching, and teaching those culturally and linguistically diverse learners. I learned about the instructional approach called, Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) that Mrs. Joy had implemented in the classroom. I was impressed with its comprehensive, effective, and empirically grounded characteristics. After that experience, I could not resist going back

to the SIOP classrooms while doing several studies at different schools for the next four years. In those years, I was constantly engaged in reflecting upon the SIOP approach and how it might be implemented in Thailand. This paper is an attempt to present the reflections of the SIOP approach, consisting of an overview of the SIOP approach, misconceptions, and considerations for implications in a Thai context. The next section summarizes the educational changes in the United States.

Educational Changes in the United States

SIOP was developed because of two vital educational changes in the United States: the educational reform and the diversity of learners (Echevarría, Vogt, & Short, 2008). The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 demands that all schools use standard-based instruction for all learners, regardless of their English proficiency. Every state mandated schools to implement subject-matter standards (mathematics, science, social studies, and language arts) and to assess the learners' knowledge accordingly through high-stake testing to ensure that they meet the standards (Short, Fidelman, & Louguit, 2012). It became apparent with the No Child Left Behind Act that schools are accountable for the success of their learners (Echevarría et al., 2008).

Apart from the educational reform, many school districts in the US have enrolled culturally and linguistically diverse learners (Echevarría et al., 2008). These learners are known as English Language Learners (ELLs), who have entered

the classrooms with a wide range of English proficiencies, educational backgrounds, ages, and socioeconomic statuses (Boyson & Short, 2003). Among these learners, there are refugees that are not literate in their native languages and have limited English proficiency (Short, 2000). These ELLs immigrated to the US because of wars in their home countries and many suffer from psychological trauma from losing family members. These ELLs did not have schooling experience, such as holding a pencil, sitting in a desk, working in groups, or taking a test. These ELLs need to develop English proficiency, content knowledge, and familiarity of school routines (Short, 2000). Additionally, there are also immigrant learners who arrive in the US with strong academic backgrounds. Many of them have above grade-level knowledge, but they do not have adequate English proficiency. These ELLs typically need to develop proficiency in English and take some courses such as US history (Short, 2000). Furthermore, ELLs are also born in the US. They are identified as ELLs because they speak other languages at homes and they did not pass a screening test. Even though these ELLs were born learning English, they typically need academic literacy (Short, 2000).

The diversity of ELLs turns them into unsuccessful learners, which has a profound impact on the US economy and society (Rong & Preissle, 2009). Prior studies have shown that ELLs dropped out of schools, and they underperformed on assessments (Gratt & Holcomb, 2005). Therefore, many schools have

attempted to find ways to accommodate ELLs learning in a new school system. The need for a unique approach is legitimate since these ELLs are diverse in terms of their circumstances. What is the best way to teach culturally and linguistically diverse learners? Inspired by this fundamental yet seminal question, the researchers at the Center for Research on Education, Diversity, and Excellence developed a new instructional approach called SIOP to educate ELLs (Short & Echevarría, 1999). The next section presents the characteristics and a historical development of SIOP.

Characteristics of the SIOP Model

SIOP is a type of sheltered instruction, which emerged as a content-based instruction in 1980s and 1990s (Daniel & Colin, 2015). Since then, sheltered instruction has been used increasingly to prepare students to meet high academic standards (Echevarría et al., 2008). Sheltered instruction generally refers to “a subject such as mathematics, science, or history taught through English wherein many or all of the students are second language learners” (Short, Echevarría, & Richards-Tutor, 2011, p. 364). The term “sheltered” refers to the refuge that the instruction provides to second language learners who do not have grade-appropriate English proficiency from the English-only instruction in order to make the content comprehensible (Fritzen, 2011; Macías, Fontes, Kephart, & Blume, 2012). In other words, sheltered instruction “serves as a support until the student is ready

for mainstream classes” (Echevarría & Graves, 2007, p. 8).

Guided by sheltered instruction, SIOP was initially developed as a classroom observation tool to examine the extent that teachers used sheltered instruction in the classrooms (Echevarría et al., 2008). To develop SIOP, the literature on bilingual education, language literacy, special education, and classroom management were reviewed. The tool was implemented and refined based on teacher feedback. After its initial development, the developers received a research grant from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education to continue the SIOP project (Echevarría et al., 2008). With the new research grant, SIOP was used as a checklist for teachers to reflect upon their sheltered instruction practices. During this time, SIOP evolved into a lesson preparation framework, and it became widely known as the SIOP model (Short et al., 2012).

The SIOP model is an instructional framework for lesson planning to make content concepts accessible to ELLs and simultaneously enhance the four domains of language skills: reading, writing, listening, and speaking (Short, Echevarría, & Richards-Tutor, 2011). The model shared many characteristics with other effective instructional methods, such as differentiated instruction, cooperative learning, and reading comprehension instruction (Echevarría, 2005). The model is comprised of 30 features (see the Appendix), grouped into eight components: *lesson preparation, building background,*

comprehensible input, strategies, interaction, practice and application, lesson delivery, and review and assessment (Echevarría et al., 2008).

The model incorporates recommended practices for high quality instruction for ELLs that allows flexibility for teachers to tailor strategies for individual learner development (Echevarría, 2005). Before discussing in depth, it is important to point out the characteristics exemplifying what appear to be typical SIOP classrooms.

Context: The SIOP model is used in an English as a Second Language (ESL) context, where English is taught in the classroom and it is regularly used outside of the class as a survival mode of communication. The model is implemented in elementary schools and secondary schools depending on the enrollment of ELLs.

Goal: The goal of the SIOP classrooms is to developing academic language in English, so SIOP is a dual-focused instruction on language and content, giving the language a more urgent need for ELLs.

Teachers: In the SIOP classrooms, teachers are mostly native speakers of English or fluent in the English language, so they are both language and content experts.

Learners: The most challenging part in the SIOP classrooms is the diversity of learners since they entered the classrooms with diverse backgrounds.

In summary, the SIOP model is a second language enhancement packaged into content teaching by language and content experts.

A Snapshot of a SIOP Classroom

In this section, I present a portrait of how the SIOP model was implemented. Given the limited space in the journal, the portrait is only a snapshot of an ESL teacher, Mrs. Joy, who implemented several features of the SIOP model in her 30-minute classroom session. Mrs. Joy taught at the Sunshine School in the mid-western area of the US. The school used an ELL pullout model, taking out individuals or a group of ELLs from their mainstream classrooms to develop oral language and content knowledge (Crawford, 2004). The portrait presented here is an attempt to help Carlos, a newly arrived fourth-grade ELL from Mexico who knew very little English, develop oral language by using the SIOP model². As you read, think of the 30 features in the eight components (Echevarría et al., 2008).

SIOP Classrooms	SIOP Features
<p>It was the first day of the cold weather. I was literally freezing after it had been hot and warm throughout the summer. Winter is coming. I turned on the car heater and drove to the Sunshine School to observe Mrs. Joy’s classroom. After I checked in for a visitor badge at the principal’s office, I walked to Mrs. Joy’s classroom. Carlos walked in with a hoodie over his head and Mrs. Joy greeted Carlos.</p> <p>Mrs. Joy: How are you doing? Carlos: Good (then smiled). Mrs. Joy: Can you say “Good Morning” to Mr. Denchai? Carlos: (Reluctantly) Good morning. Denchai: Morning, Carlos!</p> <p>Carlos looked exhausted. He went to get his paper at the back of classroom, took a seat at a round table, and started to write sentences about dates. Mrs. Joy got a chair and sat by him. I observed their interaction off in the distance, taking notes.</p> <p>Today is Monday, October... Yesterday was Sunday, October... Tomorrow will be Tuesday, October...</p> <p>While writing, Carlos forgot how to spell October. He walked to the bulletin board where Mrs. Joy put an envelope of vocabulary as a place of reference. He pulled out cards and picked the one that said “October.” Mrs. Joy went to get a planner and gave it to Carlos. She turned to me and said “You missed his birthday party yesterday.” I smiled and decided to join them at the table. Carlos pointed to the planner on October 7 and murmured something I did not understand. Mrs. Joy was surprised “Your brother’s birthday?” Carlos had just told me that October 7 was his brother’s birthday!</p> <p>After Carlos had finished writing sentences about dates, Mrs. Joy asked him “Do you want to write about your birthday? Yesterday was...” Carlos nodded and began to write. He stopped at the word birthday.</p> <p>Mrs. Joy: How do you spell birthday? Carlos: (Whispered quietly) I don’t know. Mrs. Joy: Go get the dictionary. Carlos: (Walked to the shelf) This one? Mrs. Joy: No, the black one.</p> <p>Carlos picked up the Oxford picture dictionary. Mrs. Joy said, “I will help you.” She opened the dictionary to find the word birthday and found a picture of a birthday party, as shown below.</p>	<p><i>Feature 16:</i> Provide frequent opportunities for interaction</p> <p><i>Feature 10:</i> Use speech appropriate for students’ proficiency</p> <p><i>Feature 6:</i> Plan meaningful activities</p> <p><i>Feature 22:</i> Provide activities that integrate all language skills</p> <p><i>Feature 20:</i> Provide hand-on materials</p> <p><i>Feature 5:</i> Adapt content to levels of students’ proficiency</p> <p><i>Feature 7:</i> Explicitly link concepts to students’ backgrounds and experiences</p> <p><i>Feature 15:</i> Use a variety of question types</p> <p><i>Feature 18:</i> Provide sufficient wait time for students to response</p> <p><i>Feature 12:</i> Use a variety of technique to make content concepts clear</p>

SIOP Classrooms	SIOP Features
 <p>Mrs. Joy asked Carlos, “Can you see the word birthday? What sound does it make /b/?” Carlos answered, but it was not correct. Mrs. Joy asked me to write the sound of /b/. I wrote the letter “b” on a piece of paper. Carlos found it in the dictionary and he copied it down on his paper. After Carlos had finished, Mrs. Joy took a moment to ask questions about Carlos’s birthday.</p> <p>“What did you have yesterday?” she inquired. Carlos stared up at the ceiling trying to process the information.</p> <p>I helped him out by using gestures and rewording it “What did you eat yesterday?” Carlos knew what it was, but he couldn’t remember the word.</p> <p>Mrs. Joy told him “You had cup cakes.”</p> <p>“Cup cakes,” repeated Carlos.</p> <p>Mrs. Joy asked further questions “What color did you have?”</p> <p>“Blue”</p> <p>After this conversation, Mrs. Joy pulled out a piece of paper that they had worked on yesterday. On the paper, I saw a drawing by Carlos. It was like a human. Mrs. Joy talked about “Pinata.” I didn’t know what it was. So, she asked, “Can you tell Mr. Denchai what a Pinata is?” He smiled. So, Mrs. Joy replied, “It is a Mexican tradition. You hang a Pinata on the ceiling and inside you have a lot of candy. You are blindfolded and try to hit the Pinata. If you can break it open, the candy will fall out.”</p> <p>When Mrs. Joy explained it to me, Carlos smiled and nodded continuously. It seemed that he got it. On the paper to the right, Carlos wrote English words and to the left he wrote Spanish.</p>	<p><i>Feature 15:</i> Use a variety of question types</p> <p><i>Feature 18:</i> Provide sufficient wait time</p> <p><i>Feature 7:</i> Explicitly link concepts to students’ backgrounds and experiences</p> <p><i>Feature 8:</i> Explicitly link past learning and new concepts</p>

SIOP Classrooms	SIOP Features
<p>Fiesta Party Dulses Candy Familia Family Juguetes Toys Regala Present Mrs. Joy asked Carlos, “What present did you get yesterday?” She pointed to the picture of presents in the dictionary. “Car,” Carlos responded. Mrs. Joy further told Carlos to draw a picture of the present that he got. He drew a picture of a car. “Can you write the word car?” Mrs. Joy asked. Carlos shook his head, so Mrs. Joy opened the dictionary and showed him the word. Carlos copied the word down. Mrs. Joy asked, “What did I gave you?” “Pen,” he said. Mrs. Joy asked Carlos to write the word pen and he could do it. After that Mrs. Joy reminded him that he went to the front office and they gave him a pencil. It was time for Carlos to go back to his room, so Mrs. Joy told him, “Good work for today.”</p>	<p><i>Feature 30: Conduct assessment of student comprehension</i></p>

As illustrated in the snapshot, Mrs. Joy employed more than half of the SIOP features in this lesson. It is important to note that teaching Carlos is difficult because he did not have adequate English proficiency to comprehend lessons; however, Mrs. Joy did not use Carlos’ first language as an easy way out to teach him. Instead, she tried to use a variety of scaffolding techniques to make content concept comprehensible. The lesson learned from this example is that translation is not needed when the teachers know how to implement the SIOP model.

Does SIOP Work?

After its inception, the SIOP model has been tested empirically with several groups

of participants (K-12 and college), in different content areas (e.g., language arts, social studies, science), and across contexts such as in the United States (e.g., Changes & Francis, 2011; Echevarría, Short, & Powers, 2006; Macías, Fontes, Kephart, & Blume, 2013; Whittier & Robinson, 2007), and in Columbia (e.g., Alejandro & Murillo, 2013; Salcedo, 2010). The SIOP developers reported that the model has been used internationally (Short et al., 2012). The SIOP model provides empirically promising evidence to support the claim that the model could be used to improve achievement, academic language, knowledge of content concepts, and literacy.

In the review of research on academic literacy development using the SIOP model,

Short et al. (2011) described three studies to test the effectiveness of the model. The three studies examined teacher change over time, student achievement on standardized assessments and researcher-developed instruments. The results indicated that ELLs with SIOP-trained teachers implementing with fidelity performed significantly better on academic language and literacy than ELLs with teachers who were not trained using the SIOP model. Similar results were also found in a middle-school science class in the United States (Echevarría et al., 2011) and high-school ESL and content classes in New Jersey (Short et al., 2012). These prior studies pointed out the effectiveness of the SIOP model increased public attention to this approach throughout the US and internationally (Daniel & Conlin, 2015). Since several studies have reported its effectiveness, educators, who seek to find an alternative approach to educate English learners in their contexts, should start to consider the SIOP model.

Misconceptions of the SIOP Model

It is common that misconceptions often arise after an innovation is developed. As is the case of other innovations, the SIOP model has been reported to have been implemented in ways that the authors did not intend (Daniel & Conlin, 2015; Echevarría, 2005). The misconceptions of the SIOP model center around two issues: regarding the SIOP model as a step-by-step method and the presentation of the content and language objectives (Echevarría, 2005). It is important to discuss the misconceptions since

it is a springboard for educators, including in the Thai context, to consider before implementing this model in their classrooms.

The first misconception was that some researchers regarded the SIOP model as a step-by-step method, which was not initially intended by the developers (Short et al., 2012). Examples of misconceptions were by Settlage, Madsen, and Rustad (2005) arguing that the vocabulary presentation stage after presenting the learning objectives to learners in the SIOP model contradicted with the nature of inquiry science teaching. Nitiprateep (2015) implemented the eight components of the SIOP model as a set of instructional steps in an English classroom and found that she did not have enough time to cover the eight steps. With this misconception, it should be noted that the purpose of the SIOP model is to help teachers plan a lesson to make content comprehensible by considering those components as a flexible framework and apply it when necessary, not as a step-by-step instruction (Echevarría et al., 2008).

Daniel and Conlin (2015) offered that a possible reason why the model is misinterpreted as a step-by-step instruction is because the language of the features sends a mixed message between the teachers' and learners' actions, resulting in misunderstanding. They argued that, "the model focuses heavily on the teachers' actions, rather than on the students' ideas" (Daniel & Conlin, 2015, p. 172). To elaborate, Daniel and Colin (2015) said that among 30 features, there are 25 features focusing on

teacher actions (e.g., clear expiation of academic task) and there are three features focusing on student actions (e.g., students engaged approximately 90% to 100% of the time). Another possible explanation of why the SIOP model is interpreted as steps of instruction might be because the term “model” itself implies that there are steps in the framework. As a result, educators who attempt to use the SIOP model need to be aware that the model is not a step-by-step instruction.

Another misconception is that there are reports that the SIOP model requires teachers to present content and language objectives in every lesson (Echevarría, 2005). Many researchers argue that this practice is demanding. In her response to this misconception, Echevarría (2005) questioned the definition of a lesson and argued that “we don’t strictly interpret a lesson as a set of amount of time each day; it can extend over a couple days” (p. 60). Prior research has shown that writing content and language objectives is not a simple practice. Baecher, Farmsworth, and Ediger (2014) analyzed 107 lesson plans by pre-service teachers during a teaching practicum and pointed out that the pre-service teachers tended to have more difficulty writing language objectives than content objectives. The language objectives were too vague, undigested standard, not feasible, a description of an activity not goal, or a mismatch between objective and instruction (Baecher et al., 2014). These difficulties legitimized the need to train teachers to write appropriate learning objectives when planning a lesson.

Considerations for Implementation

Since the SIOP model has been tested empirically as an effective approach across levels and contexts, it is important for other researchers, educators, or teachers, particularly in Thailand, who seek an alternative approach to teach ELLs in their classrooms. Before implementing the SIOP model, it is vital to examine the lessons learned from implementation, since Thailand and the US are two different contexts. In this section, I have attempted to provide remarks for consideration based on my first-hand experience of observing, researching, and teaching in SIOP classrooms. The remarks in this paper are not prescriptive (not to be strictly followed); rather, they are theoretical (something to ponder).

What Curriculum is SIOP Appropriate For?

The above question is needed to consider before implementing the SIOP model in a Thai context. Even though the SIOP model was developed as an approach to make content concepts accessible to ELLs, I argue that the model could be used with all content areas (math, science, social studies, physical education, or language arts such as an English class). It is because the SIOP model consists of theoretical backgrounds and practices for integrating language and content from the literature of several related fields (Short et al., 2012). To answer the above question, it is important to consider the curriculum goal.

Originally, the goal of the SIOP model was to help ELLs succeed at schools in terms

of academic literacy and content knowledge. In Thailand, a curriculum that is appropriate for implementing the SIOP model might be of such kind. Theoretically speaking, educators may need to consider whether the focus of the curriculum is content-driven or language-driven (Met, 1998). Lyster and Ballinger (2011) elaborated that in a content-driven curriculum, the goal is to promote both content knowledge and language development, so assessment of both is needed. However, in a language-driven curriculum, the goal is to enhance language knowledge, so assessment of content knowledge is not necessary (Lyster & Ballinger, 2011). Recently, a more integrated approach to teaching content and language has been the focus in the field as Dalton-Puffer (2011) argued that conceptualizing the teaching of content and language as a single unified approach is needed. As a result, it is important for teachers and educators in Thailand to think of the two parts (content and language) as one process.

What Do Teachers Need to Do?

Before answering the above question, perhaps the first question is about what kind of teachers in Thailand should implement the SIOP model in their classrooms. Since teachers who successfully implemented the SIOP model in the US are content and language experts, they do not have limitations in terms of content knowledge and English proficiency. Thai teachers who attempt to employ the SIOP model may need to have similar characteristics, being content and language experts. With this reason, teachers

who have decent proficiency in English and content knowledge are legitimate as foreign and Thai teachers in international programs, English programs, Mini-English programs, and Thai English teachers in the regular programs. These teachers are those who can use English as a medium of instruction in the classrooms.

Some may argue that if learners did not have adequate English proficiency, it could affect the success of implementing the SIOP model. This situation often arises since inquirers see learner's English proficiency as a barrier to understanding the lessons, leading to the practice of using English and translating into the Thai language. With this practice, content knowledge is not accessible through comprehensible inputs, but through translation. What happens after using regular translation is that learners will wait for the translation; thus learning does not occur because of the use of an English language medium. In the SIOP classrooms in the US, ELLs are even more diverse culturally, linguistically, psychologically, and academically than Thai learners. It is even more challenging to teach ELLs than teaching Thai learners. Teachers in the US are still able to use the SIOP model successfully. As a result, I argue that the learners' English proficiency is not a deficit and it rarely affects the success of implementing the SIOP model.

What do teachers need to do to implement the SIOP model? First of all, teachers need to be meticulous in lesson planning since it is the most important step when using the SIOP model. Teachers need to put themselves

in the learners' shoes, anticipating challenges and cognitive loads that learners may encounter while learning through the medium of English instruction. The following questions might be useful while planning a SIOP lesson.

- What content knowledge do the learners need to master after the lesson?
- What important vocabulary words do the learners need to learn?
- How to meaningfully present the vocabulary to learners?
- What kind of language and skills do learners need to use in order to complete a task, an exercise, an activity, or a practice?
- How do the language and tasks help learners access to content concepts?
- What supports are provided to learners during instruction?
- What are activities to assess the learners' knowledge of the content or the language?

It is important to note that these questions are part of the eight components in the SIOP model (Echevarría et al., 2008). Also, teachers do not need to use all 30 features in one lesson. It is highly recommended that all 30 features should be implemented in one year in order to see successful results.

What do We Do to Successfully Implement SIOP?

In Thailand, the implementation of an innovative approach has been typically conducted through a top-down process; an authority issues a policy enforcing practitioners to practice the policy. This top-down process

often neglects the practitioners' readiness in making changes to their practices. It is common that changing a practice requires time, effort, and energy, so it is important for educators to be strategic to train teachers to understand the importance of the SIOP model, characteristics of the model, and how to use it in the classroom. With this reason, I argue that a series of professional teacher development, a sequence of implementation fidelity, and a reward policy are needed to successfully drive the SIOP implementation.

In the US, SIOP developers have trained teachers through a series of professional development programs, consisting of three aspects: a) workshops, b) classroom observations and coaching, and c) technical assistance via electronic media (Short et al., 2011). In the workshops, the SIOP developers use "a participatory approach with modeling, hands-on activities, cooperative mini-projects, analysis of videotaped instruction, and integration of research and theory to help teachers incorporate the model into their teaching" (Short et al., 2011, p. 368). After the workshops, classroom observations and coaching are conducted to provide teachers with feedback for improvement. Informal assistance through electronic media is also included to support teachers. With these development programs, it is evident that using the SIOP model in the classroom successfully often takes time by participating in professional development with follow-up assistance. Educators in Thailand may need to

implement such practice as a basic characteristic for professional development.

Even though teachers are provided with a series of professional development, they might not implement the SIOP model simply because they do not see the benefits of it. As a result, during the professional development, it is also important to raise teachers' awareness of the importance of the SIOP model. Why is it important to integrate content and language? Why is the SIOP model important? In addition, since using the SIOP model requires changes in practice, which are not easy, what benefits do teachers get? In this case, policy makers may need to consider a reward policy in order to successfully enforce the SIOP policy.

Conclusion

This paper presents an alternative approach to teaching ELLs, called the SIOP model, which has been tested as an effective approach to improve learners' achievement, academic literacy, and content knowledge. With its effectiveness, teachers and educators in Thailand may need to consider the SIOP model in educating our learners to become successful.

This paper argues that a series of professional development programs, an implementation fidelity study, and a reward policy are needed to successfully enforce the SIOP model.

Note:

1. All names are pseudonyms created by the participants. By signing the informed consent, the participants understand that I will use these pseudonyms in all publications.

2. The data were from 80 hours of participant observation. It is like a collective portrait of the classroom. The portrait is a composite of the data that I created to represent the classroom discourse of how Mrs. Joy helped Carlos. Mrs. Joy is an American who does not know any Spanish, the first language of Carlos. The language of instruction was all in English.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Dr. Punwalai Kewara for her insightful reflection and intellectual discussion in an earlier draft of this manuscript. The questions proposed and the issues we discussed sparked a light into this manuscript. I owe her a big thank you.

Appendix

Components of the SIOP Model (Echevarría et al., 2008, p. 228-229)

1. Lesson Preparation

Content objectives clearly defined, displayed, and reviewed with students.

Language objectives clearly defined, displayed, and reviewed with students.

Content concepts appropriate for age and educational background level of students.

Supplementary materials used to a high degree, making the lesson clear and meaningful (e.g., computer programs, graphs, models, visuals).

Adaptation of content (e.g., text, assignment) to all levels of student proficiency.

Meaningful activities that integrate lesson concepts (e.g., surveys, letter writing, simulations, constructing models) with language practice opportunities for reading, writing, listening, and/or speaking.

2. Building Background

Concepts explicitly linked to students' background experiences.

Links explicitly made between past learning and new concepts.

Key vocabulary emphasized (e.g., introduced, written, repeated, and highlighted for students to see).

3. Comprehensible Input

Speech appropriate for students' proficiency levels.

Clear explanation of academic tasks.

A variety of techniques used to make content concepts clear.

4. Strategies

Ample opportunities provided for students to use learning strategies.

Scaffolding techniques consistently used, assisting and supporting students understanding.

A variety of questions or tasks that promote higher-order thinking skills.

5. Interaction

Frequent opportunities for interaction and discussion between teacher/student and among students, which encourage elaborated responses about lesson concepts.

Grouping configurations support language and content objectives of the lesson.

Sufficient wait time for student responses consistently provided.

Ample opportunities for students to clarify key concepts in L1 as needed with aide, peer, or L1 text.

6. Practice and Application

Hands-on materials and/or manipulatives provided for students to practice using new content knowledge.

Activities provided for students to apply content and language knowledge in the classroom.

Activities integrate all language skills.

7. Lesson Delivery

Content objectives clearly supported by lesson delivery.

Language objectives clearly supported by lesson delivery.

Students engaged approximately 90% to 100% of the period.

Pacing of the lesson appropriate to students' ability levels.

8. Review and Assessment

Comprehensive review of key vocabulary.

Comprehensive review of key content concepts.

Regular feedback provided to students on their output.

Assessment of student comprehension and learning of all lesson objectives throughout the lesson.

References

- Abadiano, H. R., & Turner, J. (2002). Sheltered-instruction: An empowerment framework for English language learners. *New England Reading Association Journal*, 38(3), 50-55.
- Alejandro, H., & Murillo, R. (2013). Adapting features from the SIOP component: Lesson delivery to English lessons in a Colombian public school, *PROFILE*, 15(1), 171-193.
- Baecher, L., Farnsworth, T., & Ediger, A. (2014). The challenges of planning language objectives in content-based ESL instruction. *Language Teaching Research*, 18(1), 118-136.
- Boyson, B. A. & Short, D. J. (2003). *Secondary school newcomer programs in the United States*. Research report. Center for Research on Education, Diversity & Excellence, University of California, Santa Cruz.
- Chen, S. (2013). Sheltered initiation language learning: Introduction and initial validation of its application in teaching Chinese as a foreign language. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 36(3), 291-303.
- Crawford, J. (2004). *Educating English learners: Language diversity in the classroom*. Los Angeles: Bilingual Education Services.
- Daniel, S. M., & Conlin, L. (2015). Shifting attention back to students within the sheltered instruction observation protocol. *TESOL Quarterly*, 49(1), 169-187.

- Echevarría, J. (2005). Using SIOP in science: Response to Settlage, Madsen, and Rustad. *Issues in Teacher Education*, 14(1), 59-62.
- Echevarría, J., Short, D., & Powers, K. (2006). School reform and standards-based education: A model for English language learners. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 99(4), 191-211.
- Echevarría, J., & Graves, A. (2007). *Sheltered content instruction: Teaching English language learners with diverse abilities*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Echevarría, J., Vogt, M., & Short (2008). *Making content comprehensible for English learners: The SIOP® model*. Boston, MA: Pearson Education.
- Echevarría, J., & Vogt, M. (2010). Using the SIOP model to improve literacy for English learners. *New England Reading Association Journal*, 46(1), 8-15.
- Echevarría, J., Richards-Tutor, C., Canges, R., & Francis, D. (2011). Using the SIOP model to promote the acquisition of language and science concepts with English learners. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 34(3), 334-351.
- Echevarría, J., Richards-Tutor, C., Chinn, V. P., & Ratleff, P. A. (2011). Did they get it? The role of fidelity in teaching English learners. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 54(6), 425-434.
- Francis, D. J., & Vaughn, S. (2009). Effective practices for English language learners in the middle grades: Introduction to the special issue of Journal of Research Effectiveness. *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness*, 2(4), 289-296.
- Gratt, J. E. & Holcomb, S. (2005). Meeting the needs of immigrant students with limited English ability. *Informational Education*, 35, 49-62.
- Lyster, R., & Ballinger, S. (2011). Content-based language teaching: Convergent concerns across divergent contexts. *Language Teaching Research*, 15(3), 279-288.
- Macías, A. H., Fontes, A. R. D. L., Kephart, K., & Blume, M. (2012). Sheltered instruction for English language learners: Insights and challenges. *TESOL Journal*, 4(1), 83-105.
- McIntyre, E., Kyle, D., Chen, C., Munuz, M., & Beldon, S. (2010). Teacher learning and ELL reading achievement in sheltered instruction classrooms: Linking professional development to student development. *Literacy Research and Instruction*, 49(4), 334-351.
- Nitiprateep, T. (2015). *SIOP Approach Application to Develop English Learning Achievement of Pratomsuksa III Students*. Unpublished Independent Study, Faculty of Education, Burapha University, Thailand.
- Prabjandee, D. (2014). *Portraits of successful Thai English teachers: An exploration of teaching journey*. Published doctoral dissertation, University of Northern Colorado.

- Pray, L., & Monhard, R. (2009). Sheltered instruction techniques for ELLs: Ways to adapt science inquiry lessons to meet the academic needs of English language learners. *Science and Children, 46*(7), 34-38.
- Rong, L. X. & Preissle, J. (2009). *Educating immigrant students in the 21st century*. California: Corwin Press.
- Salcedo, D. M. (2010). The SIOP Model: Transforming the experiences of college professors. *Gist Education and Learning Research Journal, 4*(1), 78-93.
- Settlage, J., Madsen, A., & Rustad, K. (2005). Inquiry science, sheltered instruction, and English language learners: Conflicting pedagogies in highly diverse classrooms. *Issues in Teacher Education, 14*(1), 39-57.
- Short, D. J. (2002). Language learning in sheltered social studies classes. *TESOL Journal, 11*(1), 18-24.
- Short, D. J., & Echevarría, J. (1999). *The sheltered instruction observation protocol: A tool for teacher researcher collaboration and professional development*. Santa Cruz, CA: Center for Research on Education, Diversity, and Excellence.
- Short, D. J. (2000). What principals should know about sheltered-instruction for English language learners. *National Association of Secondary School Principals, 84*(619), 17-27.
- Short, D. J. & Boyson, B. A. (2000). Newcomer Programs for linguistically diverse students. *NASSP Bulletin, 84*(619), 34-42.
- Short, D. J., Echevarría, J., & Richards-Tutor, C. (2011). Research on academic literacy development in sheltered instruction classrooms. *Language Teaching Research, 15*(3), 363-380.
- Short, D. J., Fidelman, C. G., & Louguit, M. (2012). Developing academic language in English language learners through sheltered instruction. *TESOL Quarterly, 46*(2), 334-361.
- Short, D. J. (2013). Training and sustaining effective teachers of sheltered instruction. *Theory into Practice, 52*(2), 118-127.
- Weisman, E. M., & Hansen, L. E. (2007). Strategies for teaching social studies to elementary level ELLs. *Education Digest: Essential Readings Condensed for Quick Review, 73*(4), 61-65.
- Whittier, E., & Robinson, M. (2007). Teaching Evolution to Non-English proficient students by using Lego robotics. *American Secondary Education, 35*(3), 19-28.
- Zarobe, Y. R., & Cenoz, J. (2015) Way forward in the twenty- first century in content-based instruction: moving towards integration, *Language, Culture and Curriculum, 28*(1), 90-96