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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the background of the study, a statement of the problem, research questions, research objectives, research hypothesis, theoretical framework, conceptual framework, scope of the study, definition of terms, and significance of the study.

Background of the Study

English language is widely regarded as an essential part of the curriculum in Thailand, and in both Government and International schools it receives specific importance in the curriculum. The schools are ultimately held accountable for the progress of the students, but there is still some struggle to achieve their vision and goals. The global number of English Language Learners (ELL) according to the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE), continues to rise and how to address their needs is of great importance if schools are to facilitate the education of the next generation, not only to meet the needs of society, but also for the students to become creative, holistic, and well balanced individuals (NCTE, 2008). Pan-Asia International School (PAIS) is an international school located in Bangkok, Thailand, with a population of nearly five-hundred students comprised of a diverse mix of nationalities from around the world. The curriculum at PAIS is modeled fundamentally on the American Common Core Standards Initiative (ACCSI, 2012), but with alterations that take into consideration the multicultural population of the school. The school offers English language classes from pre-k to grade 12, with the campus consisting of kindergarten, primary, middle, and high schools. The students
also have a choice to join the International Baccalaureate (IB, 2016) program after grade 9 and have various options to do either a partial or full diploma.

The researcher believes that the grades 6 to 9 middle and high school students are not presently using their higher order thinking skills (HOTS), or being taught in by a method of instruction that enables them to work in a creative way (Bloom, Englehart, Furst, Hill, Krathwohl, 1956). The researcher had noticed that the situation is also somewhat prevalent in some of the other programs at the school, and suggested that the introduction of a new method of instruction such as Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) could help improve students’ perceptions of the method of instruction, and as a consequence their achievement. The SIOP model was created by Jana Echevarria, MarryEllenVogt and Deborah Short in 1996, and is a framework for teaching ELL.

Most classrooms are set up with rows of chairs facing the front where it is usually the case that the teacher stands for the lesson. For the most part students are instructed as a group, and the new knowledge being taught has to be remembered in anticipation of future tests and exams. The researcher considers that if a more student-centered instruction method was used by all teachers, then the students would have more opportunity for group work and HOTS activities.

The researcher also considered that at present the curriculum is not adequately aligned either vertically or horizontally to allow for students to progress smoothly from the English as a Second Language (ESL) department into the mainstream classes, or for the these students to receive an education that enables them to be creative, and use their HOTS. To rectify this situation the SIOP model was suggested for use in a trial at the school in grades 6 to 9 English Language Arts. The researcher undertook a Classroom-Based Research project with grade 7 students, which revealed
some favorable results, with the perceptions of the students showing a positive increase towards the SIOP model after it being used as a method of instruction in their English language classes. The SIOP model has been specifically created to improve the instruction methods for teachers of ELL by ensuring a systematic framework of instruction is adhered to in the creation and implementation of lessons. The SIOP model operationalizes sheltered instruction by offering teachers a model that provides ELL access to grade-level content standards. The introduction of SIOP needs to be monitored, and its perceived efficacy assessed before being fully implemented in the middle and high school ESL and ELL curriculum.

**Statement of the Problem**

The researcher was concerned with the grades 6, 8 and 9 English Language Learner perceptions of the instruction method currently being used at the Pan-Asia International School. The researcher believed that the traditional instruction method does not maximize their potential for creativity, and the use of HOTS. The instruction methods are teacher-centered, with the content and delivery being given in such a way that students are expected to master knowledge through drill and practice, such as rote learning, and content is not placed in any specific context with little chance of student-centered activities (Johnson and Johnson 1991; and Theroux 2004). The researcher considers that the grades 6, 8 and 9 ELL perception of the traditional instruction method is not very positive, and this has an effect on the students’ achievement potential in English language study. The middle and high school students were specifically targeted for this research because the researcher had better access to these students and their teachers than the other students at PAIS. The researcher could more closely monitor the research process for these chosen grades, and worked in
conjunction with the teachers involved in the study to ensure the consistency needed for validity of the pre- and post-questionnaires.

The researcher also believed that students learn more effectively when actively engaged in the classroom, rather than just passively listening to instruction. Sticht (1997) contended that all human intellectual activities have a double nature of cognition needing both processes and content, and the intention of the researcher was to study students at PAIS. Data gathered could either supported or refute the claim that the framework of SIOP included both criteria mentioned, and positively effected students' perceptions towards the method of instruction. Processes in order to be carried out to a proficient degree need to at first have a high level of content knowledge on which the processes are fundamentally based. Furthermore, the researcher believed that the way the students perceive the method of instruction is an element of the students' achievement level. The introduction of sheltered instruction in the form of SIOP should have positive consequences for learners' perceptions, and ultimately their achievement. Other subjects may also be in the same situation as the English learners, and it would be possible, through professional development, to implement changes in other departments at the school.

For the above reasons, the researcher conducted a study on the perceptions of the grades 6, 8 and 9 ELL towards the method of instruction in English lessons at PAIS in the middle and high schools. The following research questions, objectives and hypothesis were the purpose of this study.
Research Questions

The researcher sought to find answers to the following questions:

1. What is the level of English Language Learners’ perceptions towards traditional instruction methods in middle and high school at PAIS?

2. What is the level of English Language Learners’ perceptions towards sheltered instruction methods in middle and high school at PAIS?

3. What is the difference, if any, in the English Language Learners’ perceptions towards traditional and sheltered Instruction methods in middle and high school at PAIS?

Research Objectives

For the purpose of this study, the researcher has considered the following objectives in the teaching methodology between traditional instruction and sheltered instruction:

1. To determine the level of English Language Learners’ perceptions schools towards traditional instruction methods in middle and high school at PAIS.

2. To determine the level of English Language Learners’ perceptions towards sheltered instruction methods in middle and high school at PAIS.

3. To compare if there is any significant difference in the English Language Learners’ perceptions towards traditional and sheltered instruction methods in middle and high school at PAIS.

Research Hypothesis

There is a significant difference in the English Language Learners’ perceptions towards traditional and sheltered instruction methods in middle and high school at Pan-Asia International School at a 0.05 significance level.
The researcher believed that after the students had been taught using the SIOP model of instruction, that their perceptions of the lesson would show a more positive result in the post-questionnaire. The 0.05 significance level indicates that there is only a 5% risk of concluding that a difference exists when there is no actual difference between the students perception of traditional and sheltered instruction.

**Theoretical Framework**

The sheltered instruction model and the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) model created by Echevarria, Vogt and Short (2008) was the main basis of this research. The research studied the implications of the introduction of the SIOP model at PAIS. These are the eight components of the SIOP model which are: lesson preparation, building background, comprehensible input, strategies, interaction, practice and application, lesson delivery, and review and assessment.

The SIOP model is an approach to sheltered instruction that attends to ELL needs to master academic content material. As such, it provides a framework for making academic content comprehensible to students, and developing students’ academic English language skills through content instruction. The SIOP model incorporates features of effective teaching such as cooperative learning, reading comprehension strategies, differentiated instruction, and the integration of the four language modalities of reading, writing, speaking and listening. The model also includes features specifically designed to promote the academic success of ELL. Echevarria *et al*, (2008) propose that these features include clear language objectives in content lessons, the development and application of background knowledge, and the use of scaffolding and other instructional techniques to enhance comprehension. The SIOP model was created from other theories such as Instructional Theory, O’Bannon
(2002), Content Based Instruction, Sticht (1997), and Second Language Acquisition, Krashen (1981).

**Conceptual Framework**

The study aimed to determine the ELL perceptions towards traditional and sheltered instruction methods in the eight components of the SIOP, and then investigate any differences between the two instruction methods. The researcher used questionnaires as descriptors for ELL perceptions towards traditional and sheltered instruction methods. Figure 1 shows the conceptual framework of this study as below:

*Figure 1. Conceptual Framework. PAIS, SIOP, Echevarria et al, (2008)*
Scope of the Study

This study was limited to Pan-Asia International School situated in Bangkok, Thailand and may not be generalized to other educational settings. The study was only based upon students of grades 6, 8 and 9 in the middle and high schools totaling 116 students.

The samples are based on the grades 6, 8 and 9 students only, as the students in grade 7 were involved in a previous Classroom-Based Research project by the researcher during the months of August to November 2015 at PAIS. To further this research, and to ensure that the SIOP model does indeed have a positive impact with students and teachers alike, further research is being undertaken for grade 6, 8 and 9 students, and the results analyzed in this thesis should provide information for future action.

The students are ELL taught by three teachers in the middle and high schools for eight class periods a week. They receive eight lessons a week, and the lessons consist of 50 minute periods for a total of 400 minutes per week of English instruction. The perceptions towards traditional and sheltered instruction include the eight components: lesson preparation, building background, comprehensible input, strategies, interaction, practice and application, lesson delivery, and review and assessment.

Definitions of Terms

ELL: English language learners are students that study English as a second or third language.

Middle and high schools: Grades 6, 8 and 9 English Language Learners at PAIS during year 2015/16.

PAIS: Pan-Asia International School is an international school located in Bangkok.
Perceptions: The student’s cognitive thoughts, opinions, judgments, perspectives, and beliefs about the lessons as measured by the adapted SIOP questionnaire.

Sheltered Instruction: lessons are specially designed for students to cater for their specific needs; making content comprehensible for English language learners. It can include the learning strategies, peer-supported and student-centered. Students develop grade-level content area knowledge with teachers using clear, direct and simple English, and a range of scaffolding strategies. Learning activities connect new content to students’ prior knowledge and encourages collaboration with peers.

SIOP: Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol is a model of sheltered instruction designed to make grade-level academic content understandable for English learners, with teaching and lesson preparation designed to assist with the specific needs of learners. The model was created by Jana Echevarria, MarryEllenVogt and Deborah Short in the United States at the end of the last century. The following are the features of the model:

- **Lesson Preparation**: Planning lessons that produce target specific learning goals.
- **Building Background**: Links between past learning and new learning
- **Comprehensible Input**: Speech is appropriate for students' proficiency.
- **Strategies**: Teaching methods such as scaffolding techniques and higher-order questioning tasks.
- **Interaction**: Frequent opportunities for teacher and student communication.
- **Practice and Application**: Hands-on use of content and language knowledge with integration of all language skills.
- **Lesson Delivery**: Differentiation, student engagement and lesson pacing.
• **Review and Assessment**: Evaluating the students’ achievements.

**Traditional Instruction**: The teacher is at the center of the instruction methodology.

**Significance of the Study**

The significance of the study has the potential to benefit students, and may help educators in learning about the students’ own view of the instructional methods at the school. Knowledge about students’ perceptions may also help in reviewing and improving the methods and techniques of instruction at the school. It may also be of interest to those who design curriculum for students who study any content-based subject where English is not their first Language.

The study may also provide vital and current data to educators, administrators, the school board and researchers regarding the most desired instructional methods. The school administration may know what needs to be changed, and how to plan for future professional development improvements.

This study offers ground for future researchers to develop on the topic and expand the study on a national or even international level involving sheltered instruction.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter presents a review of literature pertinent to traditional and sheltered Instruction methods. The researcher used the following materials to gain a clear understanding of the concepts related to this study. The review of literature included Instructional Methods, Traditional Teacher-centered Instruction, Student-centered Instruction, Teacher-centered v Student-centered Instruction, Second Language Acquisition, Content-Based Instruction, Sheltered Instruction, Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE), Sheltered Instruction Operation Protocol (SIOP), Higher Order Thinking Skills in SIOP, Previous Research on SIOP, Criticisms of SIOP Research, Professional Development for SIOP, and finally a Background History of Pan-Asia International School.

Instructional Methods

In education there are many different methods and theories that have been suggested down through the years. The general principles vary, and classroom management strategies tend to reflect the teacher's philosophy on instruction. Much also depends on the style that suits the individual teacher, or what is required from the school administration, and the students that are being taught.

The University of North Carolina lists 150 different methods of instruction which vary in delivery from almost completely teacher-centered to predominantly student-centered approaches (UNC, 2016). According to O’Bannon (2002) there are two main instructional approaches the first being the teacher-centered approach, where the instruction is more direct with the teacher being an authority on the subject passing on
knowledge to the students via lectures and direct instruction in front of the class. The second approach is student-centered where the teacher is still an authority on the subject, but the students take on a more equal role in the learning process, with the teacher becoming more of a facilitator to assist them with comprehension of the information (Shuell, 2001). Every method has its own advantages and disadvantages, and it is essential that the teacher uses the best method for the particular situation or group of students. It is also an advantage for a teacher to have a variety of teaching methods in order to keep lessons interesting. Shuell (1996) noted that different instructional methods lend themselves to the learners either having to do more information processing, or to do more social interacting. This depends on the objectives and goals desired by the teacher for the students, as there is not one best method.

An overview of the teacher-centered approach will include some examples of the methods which include demonstration, direct instruction, lecture and lecture discussions. Shuell (1996) described that the teacher-centered approach includes instruction where the teacher's role is to present the information that is to be learned and to direct the learning process of students. With demonstration the teacher shows the students a process or procedure they can observe, but also can by involving them, increase their participation and be a less passive method of learning. The direct instruction method helps students learn concepts and skills with various models usually following the similar steps of introduction to the topic, review of previously learned information, the presentation of new material, next some guided practice, followed by independent practice.

The lecture method may have its detractors, but is still one of the most commonly used for reasons such as planning time, its flexibility to any content, and its
simplicity. The lecture method, however, can leave the students in a very passive role. To overcome this deficit a lecture-discussion method can be used to combine the lecture and allow the teacher to question the students (O’Bannon, 2002).

An overview of the student-centered approach should include some examples of the methods such as case studies, cooperative learning, discussions, discovery learning, graphic organizers; the Ogle (1986) created K.W.L., Know want to know chart, learning centers, role-play, scaffolding, and simulations amongst others. The student-centered approach is grounded in constructivism where the teacher is more of a facilitator for the students to construct their own understanding. Case studies involve students in somewhat complex issues in order for them to draw their own conclusions by applying their previous knowledge and skills.

Cooperative learning involves small groups of students working together toward a common goal. It requires the active participation of all the members of the group and promotes social skills as well as individual accountability. Discussions and discussion boards allow students to increase interpersonal skills and can occur in the classroom or involve online activities such as social media. An example by Theroux (2004) showed an inquiry-based method such as discovery learning that used the student’s prior knowledge and experiences to construct new understanding. Other methods can include graphic organizers, and journals or blogs.

The strategy established by Ogle (1986), K.W.L., where a chart is usually created and placed in the room somewhere visible to all the students, has been adopted into Sheltered Instruction and the SIOP model. The chart is gradually completed by the students as they fill in the information about what they already know, want to know and finally complete the chart with the new knowledge that they have acquired. The
researcher has also used other examples of the student-centered approach in the classroom, including role-play, scaffolding, problem based learning and inquiry, simulations, and storytelling with the use of traditional books or with multimedia. Petrina (in press) describes how instructional systems are complex and have interrelated components, which when we alter one component in the system at the same time changes the conditions of the other components. Every change then has in this sense a cause and effect on instruction and its outcomes.

Other instructional methods include direct instruction; indirect instruction, interactive instruction, experiential learning, and independent study. The researcher will next consider further about the teacher-centered instruction, student-centered instruction, and then later on Content Based Instruction, Sheltered Instruction, Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE), and finally Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP).

**Traditional Teacher-centered Instruction**

The following is an overview of the teacher-centered approach the researcher has observed at PAIS with some examples of the methodology employed by teachers. The researcher has encountered many methods in traditional teacher-centered instruction, including demonstration, direct instruction, lecture and lecture discussions. These methods involve the role of the teacher to direct the student's learning process by presenting the information that is to be learned with the lesson objectives being identified beforehand. The teacher is primarily responsible for guiding the students, explaining the information and then giving the students opportunity to practice what they have learned. The researcher observed, but it is not so much the case in private or international schools such as PAIS, that there is often a
tendency for some teachers to arrange their lessons, and lesson plans in a teacher-centric manner, and thus inevitably the student-centered lesson becomes just an afterthought or only paid lip-service.

In a typical traditional instruction environment, the method places the teacher firmly in control of the learning environment, with very little responsibility in the hands of the students. Novak (1998) suggested that the teacher is the ultimate decision maker, and has control over the curriculum, and the content that they need to impart to the students, thus filling any knowledge holes with the relevant information. In summary; it is the teacher that causes the learning to occur. The researcher has noticed in some classes at PAIS, all of the learning takes place in the classroom, and is hardly associated with the real-world outside, possibly making the lessons somewhat surreal and less relevant to the everyday lives of the students. Furthermore, in a traditional instruction teaching environment the lessons are sometimes arranged to be competitive in nature with individuals or groups being motivated by points earned at the expense of others. While in some aspects this sense of competitiveness can foster positive traits, and assist in learning, it does however not encompass the full spectrum of needs for students to work cooperatively, holistically, and in a manner that would be more conducive to creativity and assimilation. In the traditional instruction method of the content and delivery, students are expected to master knowledge through drill and practice, such as rote learning, and content is not placed in any specific context (Johnson and Johnson 1991; and Theroux 2004). The researcher has also observed that the seating arrangement most often seen in traditional instruction classrooms involves rows of chairs and tables all facing the front of the classroom. The teacher will be found delivering the knowledge to the students who sit facing the front of the class. This means the students have to turn in
their seats to communicate with other classmates sitting behind or to the side of them. This seating arrangement already, before the lesson has even begun, sets the compass for the direction in which the lesson will head, and plots a rather strict course, with little opportunity for variation in the destination of the passengers aboard. In order to remedy this situation, this researcher studied the perceptions of the students with regards to the administration of the SIOP model at PAIS which entailed a more student-centered method of instruction.

**Student-centered Instruction**

The student-centered approach is based on constructivism, and some examples of the methods used include case studies, cooperative learning, discussions, discovery learning, graphic organizers, the Ogle (1986) K.W.L. chart, learning centers, role-play, scaffolding, and simulations amongst others. The researcher has observed that student-centered instruction involves the teacher being the facilitator with the students constructing their own understanding. In this way groups of students work together to analyze a case of a particular problem or situation and have to come up with a solution in the case study method. Students are involved in solving complex issues with the new knowledge and skills they have learned, but usually only available to students that have already reached a high degree of proficiency in the subject being learned. Students can through discussion of the case debate their conclusions to complete the process. The work of Vygostky (1978) is pertinent here when the researcher considers how student's best learn. The Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) suggests that when teachers use cooperative learning in the classroom, the less competent students can develop with the assistance from more skillful peers, and thus assimilate new information within the ZPD. Vygotsky (1986) maintained that the lesson, therefore needs to be taxing enough to stretch the abilities of the student, but
not so difficult as to result in certain failure that will disparage their efforts, and in the end leave students feeling defeated.

Scaffolding refers to the instructional method of providing contextual support through the use of a simplified version of language, and also includes, teacher modeling, visuals and graphics, and hands-on learning with students working together in groups. According to Bradley and Bradley (2004) there are three main types of scaffolding the first of which involves simplifying the language and then the scaffolding is removed as the students proficiency increase. The second is only asking for completion not generation of language from something such as a partially finished sentence or paragraph. The third being the use of visuals where the teacher can present information and ask the students to respond using tables, charts or graphs.

A study in America by Dalton, Grisham and Proctor (2007) found that scaffolding using new technologies had proven an advantage in the classroom for ELL. The ELL students increased literacy demands being placed on them at school necessitated an important need that new technologies be focused on reading and writing environments which should help support children whose needs differ from the average language learner.

The researcher has found that especially in Thailand students are reluctant to read at school, and especially in their own leisure time reading is not a particularly top priority for many students. The researcher has implemented a Drop Everything and Read (DEAR) campaign at PAIS which has had quite some success in ensuring students' participation in reading for pleasure.
Teacher-centered vs Student-centered Instruction

With specific regards to the present-day education system in Thailand, and in order to have a balanced perspective on teaching pedagogy this researcher needed to investigate the similarities and differences between teacher and student-centered instruction methods, and any other information specific to this study. The students in grade seven at PAIS were involved in a Classroom-Based Research project by the researcher during the months of August to November 2015 at PAIS. The research was positive, but to ensure that the SIOP model does indeed have a positive impact with students and teachers alike at other levels, further research was undertaken for middle and high school students.

The National Education Act, of B.E.2542 (NEA, 1999) and the Thai Ministry of Education aimed at reforming education in Thailand, and Chapter 3 of the Act explains the three types of education in Thailand: formal, non-formal and informal. The formal education aimed to specify curricula, assessment and other factors such as evaluation. The Non-formal education was intended to have more flexibility in such aspects as management procedures, duration and assessment and evaluation. Whilst the informal education should enable learners to be more autonomous, being able to study according to factors such as their interests, potential, society and other environmental concerns such as media. Just how successful this act has been is open to debate and in the present political climate in Thailand educational reform seems to be in a constant state of flux. The researcher has taught in Thailand since 1998, a year before the NEA, and has observed in some of the classrooms around Bangkok, that there is still a predominance of teacher-centered instruction with the rote-system of learning still firmly ensconced in the heart of many lessons.
The researcher believed that the ELL perceptions of the instruction method currently being used at PAIS, which has been observed as predominantly the traditional instruction method, have an effect on their academic achievement. Students are easily bored with their ever shortening attention spans, and a more student-centered approach to instruction could help maximize their potential for creativity, and the use of HOTS.

When comparing the two methods of instruction the researcher believed that sheltered instruction is more in line with the needs of making the lessons interesting and fun, which will create an atmosphere more conducive for effectively engaging them in the classroom, rather than the students just passively listening to instruction. Indeed, the researcher believes that the way the students perceive the method of instruction is also an element of the students’ achievement level.

**Second Language Acquisition**

How a student acquires a second language is an integral part of making the right choices in the method of instruction and how to structure lessons. According to Krashen (2013) there are two main ways that ability in a language is developed, the first being through acquisition, which is subconscious, and the second through learning, which is an active conscious process. Krashen (1981) described the theory of second language acquisition (SLA) as making a major distinction between acquiring and learning a language. According to his theory acquiring a language is a natural process of the human condition. He notes that learners come to acquire a second language through language input that is comprehensible to the learner provided by daily language experiences (i.e. Listening, speaking, reading and writing) of the individual learner. Language is therefore acquired naturally and over time.
Krashen (1981) noted that comprehensible input (i.e. Communication slightly above what is known), is the central component necessary for second language acquisition to occur. In his theory of second language acquisition Krashen (1981) established five hypotheses:

1. The acquisition, learning hypothesis states the differences between subconscious and conscious learning in the ways of developing second languages.

2. The natural order hypothesis states that the order in which learners acquire language rules is not necessarily in the order that is taught in formal classes.

3. The monitor hypothesis states our conscious knowledge, edits or monitors what we as learners acquire from our subconscious knowledge, and makes corrections to any mistakes.

4. The input hypothesis states that humans acquire language only by actually understanding and comprehending messages from input that is clear, and can be comprehended in context with our prior knowledge of the world. In this way learners become more competent in stages as they progress.

5. The affective filter hypothesis states that comprehensible input not only needs to be understood, but also that the learner needs to be ready to receive the new input without any mental barriers to impede or stop the learner from making full use of the comprehensible input.

Krashen (1981) noted with regard to the filter that when it is up, the acquirer may understand what he hears or reads, but the input will not reach the LAD (language acquisition device). This occurs when the acquirer is unmotivated, lacking in self-confidence, or anxious... The filter is down when the acquirer is not concerned with the possibility of failure in language acquisition and when he considers himself to be a potential member of the group speaking the
language… the filter is lowest when the acquirer is so involved in the message that he temporarily forgets he is learning or reading another language (P.1-4).

**Content Based Instruction**

In the method of Content based instruction (CBI) the emphasis is placed more on a topic being learned as opposed to the actually learning about language. Sticht (1997) contended that human intellectual activities such as thinking, communicating and problem solving have a double nature of cognition and need both process and content. When attempting to improve learners’ cognitive abilities more than just improving their processes such as reading, writing and critical thinking is needed. To be able to carry out these processes to a certain level of ability needs at first a high level of content knowledge on which the processes are fundamentally based.

CBI has been around for quite some time, but there has been renewed interest over the past decade or so particularly in the North American continent as its use in ESL programs has shown. Davies (2003) found that the use of CBI is starting to spread to other parts of the world, and teachers are finding that it can help create new and exciting ways for their students to learn. CBI has a very important part to play in the SIOP model and is considered an integral part of Sheltered Instruction.

Donato, Hendry, Lee, Pessoa, and Tucker (2007) found that although a sizable amount of professional literature makes a case for the possible benefits of content-based instruction, there has only been a relatively small amount of research on how it is actually appropriated, understood, and eventually put into practice by ELL teachers. Several implications for the content-based instruction model also emerged from the Donato *et al,* (2007) study that could have a bearing on the research at PAIS.
Stoller (2002) maintained that CBI can be used as a method of instruction in settings that have predominantly content-learning objectives, or predominant language-learning objectives. The two ends of the continuum or anywhere in between can be a place where CBI is utilized. The content-based instruction can be used as a framework for language along with content learning instead of just using the content as a kind of shell for language instruction.

There are different types of CBI, but this researcher is primarily concerned with the Sheltered Instruction model the goal of which is for teachers to enable their ESL or ELL students to study the same content material as regular grade English language students. Sheltered CBI is called *sheltered* because learners are given special assistance to help them understand regular classes. Stoller (2002) suggested it is also an option for two teachers to work together to give instruction in a specific subject. One of the teachers is a content specialist and the other an ESL specialist. They may teach the class together or the class time may be divided between the two of them. For example, the content specialist will give a short lecture and then the English teacher will check that the students have understood the important words by reviewing them later in another lesson.

**Sheltered Instruction**

In order to make grade level content more accessible for ELL, sheltered instruction can be used as it also promotes English language development. The sheltered instruction model combines second language acquisition strategies and content area instruction. The vocabulary and subject matter found in grade-level material can be used to teach students new concepts and skills by making the information comprehensible through language and context.
Sheltered instruction as a way to make content comprehensible for the ELL in their classrooms, has been around since the early 1980’s. Freeman and Freeman (1995) remarked on the days when the term was first used in connection with ELL. The students were considered sheltered because they studied in classes separate from the mainstream, and did not compete academically with native English speaking students. Presently the majority of ELL study alongside their English-speaking peers, and have to be accountable to the same curriculum standards. Echevarria et al., (2009) recommended that sheltered instruction presents a set of practices valuable to teachers in helping ELL learn English, and at the same time enable them to learn content material in English. An important component of effective sheltered instruction is the preparation of learning objectives for every lesson such as content objectives, and language objectives that are aligned with English language arts standards of the school. Communication of the objectives at the beginning of the lesson and as the students’ progress through the lesson is also important. Feedback to students becomes part of the ongoing process and helps with future instruction. Background knowledge entails explicitly linking student’s previous knowledge with new concepts and also the use of various learning strategies, with teachers providing plenty of opportunities for students to interact and cooperate. Within each sheltered lesson the teacher seeks to ensure that students have sufficient background knowledge to tackle new curriculum material. Instruction often means that teachers are required to modify their speech, and when necessary and possible, alter the content text so that English language learners can grasp important content concepts, facts, and questions more comfortably.
The Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English Model

Another model of sheltered instruction similar to SIOP is the Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE) model, which the researcher has previously considered for implementation as professional development at PAIS. The professional training program for SDAIE is also available online in a similar format to that of the SIOP online course, and of a similar duration and cost.

Boyle and Perogoy (2008) proposed that the need for comprehensible subject matter and input is necessary when teaching ELL due to their limited English proficiency, and there has been an increase in SDAIE in order to implement a procedural method that emphasizes this in the classroom. In California, in the United States, SDAIE has replaced the terms English as a second language (ESL), and sheltered instruction in order to more clearly differentiate the language teaching through content, and make it more accessible for the students. Freeman and Freeman, (1995) defined SDAIE as preparing the lessons with grade level content specifically for speakers of other languages other than English as their native tongue.

In his research on SDAIE for minority students, Genzuk (2010) explained the instructional strategies for SDAIE, and how the strategies emphasize the concept of comprehensive input that can be used with any curriculum, and how the method has seven main features, the first of which being tapped into prior knowledge, thus readying the student for instruction, and focusing their attention by connecting them with their own life experiences. Cooperative learning is the next feature, and ELL can feel safe to learn new skills through positive social interaction with other students. Another important feature is when written and oral words are given context or a situation so that it is easier for the student to comprehend the new information. An
example of this would be to use manipulatives such as pictures, flashcards and the like in order to model vocabulary.

It is an important strategy to reduce the amount of teacher talk in which the teacher tries to incorporate students' use of oral language as much possible into the lesson, and also that the teacher only presents what is really essential in the lesson. The promotion of a multicultural education is highly regarded in SDAIE with each student having a unique contribution to the lesson bringing individuality, and their own culture to the fore. Genzuk (2010) emphasized that as the lesson progresses, it is essential for the facilitator to check for understanding, and allow the students time to process new information with the students getting feedback not only from the teacher, but also from their peers. With this method a high priority is placed on manipulatives to ensure student participation and cooperation thus giving them a real hands-on experience with concepts taking on a tactile-kinesthetic quality to enhance long-term memory.

There are indeed many similarities between SIOP and SDAIE, but the main focus of this research was to obtain data about the student's level of perceptions towards traditional and sheltered instruction methods, and although SDAIE was not chosen for a study of possible implementation at PAIS, it was still necessary to research similar models as an alternative or comparison.

The Sheltered Instruction Operation Protocol Model

The Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP), was created in the early 1990s by Jana Echevarria, Deborah J. Short, and MaryEllen Vogt (Echevarria et al., 2004), and was intended to improve the effectiveness of sheltered instruction. In the United States of America, where the SIOP model is much more prolific than in
Thailand, educators at schools that have used SIOP have noticed that students in English Language Learner classes have benefited from teachers using SIOP strategies in the classroom. The researcher suggests that the SIOP model is much more prolific in America because that is where it originated, and also has been heavily marketed by both its creators and Pearson publishing company.

The researchers study at PAIS aimed to determine the ELL perceptions towards traditional and sheltered instruction methods in the eight components, and then investigated any differences between the two instruction methods. The researcher used questionnaires as descriptors for students' perceptions towards traditional and sheltered instruction methods. The researcher intends to address some issues concerning the perceptions of the instructional methods at PAIS with particular emphasis on the ELL in middle and high schools. The researcher attempted to show that the overall perception of the instruction methods can be improved, and how the SIOP model specifically can achieve this by being implemented by the relevant teachers at the school. The researcher had identified several ways the SIOP model will help support quality instruction in the school. The SIOP model was implemented at PAIS with the aim to bring consistency between the different grade levels of middle and high school, and help with the ESL students to better understand the mainstream curriculum in order to transition into their appropriate grade as smoothly as possible. The SIOP model has been around for more than twenty years, and has thus proved itself to some extent, but its efficacy has very little proven track record in Thailand. The researcher being circumspect would be amiss to undertake any changes without at first doing the appropriate research on the subject.

It was also essential for the researcher to know how the implementation of the SIOP model can lead to differentiated classroom instruction, and language
development for English learners. Every single student is unique, and has their own individual set of past experiences, and background knowledge that is a treasure trove to be plundered and used in the classroom to enrich their learning, and share with their classmates. After being introduced as professional development for the teachers at PAIS, the SIOP model should improve the instruction of ELL, bringing together the content of the grade-level curriculum at PAIS, while at the same time improving students English language skills. To bridge the gap between ESL students and the ELL in mainstream classes, the teacher can modify instructional practices within the framework of the SIOP model. Echevarria and Short (2004, 2005) maintained that in this way the sheltered instruction model typically used to teach ESL can also be used with ELL to add vocabulary instruction, and implement best teaching practices in a uniform manner across the curriculum. This model not only helps ESL stay current with the content of the mainstream classes while learning English, but it also benefits English language acquisition.

There was a need to understand to what extent the SIOP components and their features compare to appropriate instruction for English learners. Many of the components of the SIOP model may have already been incorporated into some aspects of teachers’ lessons. Teachers’ may know instinctively what worked well, but some components may have been missing. The researcher suggested that it is therefore important to have a comprehensive SIOP model to ensure that all the essential components are explicitly available for the teachers to understand. This researcher believed that the lesson plans, and their execution should not be any secret undertaking without the students having any knowledge as to what the teacher intends to impart. It should rather be a constant feedback loop of transparency, which nurtures the student, and thus allows for the lesson to grow and improve over time.
The first of these features is to ensure that the content and concepts are appropriate for your lesson. A teacher needs specific focus and consideration of the student’s prior knowledge, which should always be taken into account, and to make the lesson as relevant as possible to what they have experienced in their daily lives before, or that they have at least some prior understanding of the concept being taught. One example of this is to start by introducing the concept, and then ask the students to explain it in their own words to express how they understand the ideas by verbalizing them in class.

Careful consideration of the supplementary materials that will be used in the lesson is needed, as there are various manipulative and supplementary materials that the facilitator can use in class, such as worksheets, handouts and also IT equipment such as a Smart board (Echevarria et al, 2013) emphasized that this can add another dimension to the lesson with the students becoming more active, and participating with videos, images, information or even games. This can be used to enhance the student’s attention, by providing various forms of stimulation.

Echevarria, et al (2013) contended that some of the features of SIOP aim to ensure that the lesson will adapt content to ensure that your English learners can easily access the material by including the supplementary materials that aid in linking their background knowledge, and multi-media visuals or audio that can stimulate their imagination, thus motivating them to become active enquirers rather than passive observers just waiting for information to be given by the teacher.

Echevarria, et al (2006) noted that in order to make meaningful activities and not just some mixed-bag of ideas, there should be a plan to support the content, and language objectives in a lesson, for example by placing the students in pairs or groups, then giving them an assignment or project in which they all have to take some
responsibility. The project could be a PowerPoint presentation, or some form of creative activity with a presentation in front of the class to allow the students to show that they really have grasped the content and concepts in the lesson. It is often useful to read aloud what the students have written, and then follow that up with discussion amongst the other students, which can also be another useful technique.

To ensure there is an explicit link in the lesson to students' background experiences, throughout the lesson the teachers need to frequently ask the students about their background, and personal experiences in life, drawing on their differences in culture, from their own societies or other countries that they have lived in as part of their acculturation and growth. It is also good to have whole class discussions that allow for debate on a topic with maybe some search online encouraging the students to research for other information to incorporate into the lesson.

Consideration of how lessons will explicitly link new concepts with past learning usually involves the teacher asking the students what they know about a specific topic or activity, which in turn gives some ideas about the direction needed to go without losing any opportunity for ample spontaneous input. Echevarria, Richards-Tutor, Chinn, Ratteff (2011) suggested that linking new concepts with the students past experiences ensure that they are not being introduced to something totally alien to them. Keeping a journal can be a handy tool for ELL and it can be utilized in so many ways to help with brainstorming for ideas and making sure that the content is relevant and personalized for them.

Echevarria et al., (2006) described that in order to make a lesson plan that will develop and emphasize key academic vocabulary, the students can be given a new vocabulary list every week and have to write the new words in their notebooks. They can also be given worksheets with definitions of the new vocabulary and students can
compare with the definitions that they wrote for themselves in their notebooks. Students are tested on the vocabulary, spelling and definitions, and then they review, which words are problematic if any, and why there are any difficulties in meaning or spelling. The new words are then used in essay writing in the following lessons.

The first three components of SIOP are lesson preparation, building background, and comprehensible input, and can be used in a lesson in conjunction with reflection on previous lessons, and becoming self-critical about how well the lessons actually worked can become a beneficial practice indeed. Taking into account how well the students assimilated the new information, and were able to bring forward previous information to incorporate with their new knowledge can be a good barometer of how successful your techniques are in the classroom. Proper lesson preparations are a major factor in the success of any lesson, and building on background information definitely makes the input more comprehensible, and learning how to differentiate for certain students becomes a regular part of the process rather than an afterthought.

There are some important questions about integrating the features of lesson preparation, building background, and comprehensible input into lessons so as to really integrate the SIOP model into the classroom, and the teacher would certainly like to have some multi-media, and other interactive resources available to use with the smart board that link to the strategies and components to make full use of the available technology and the abundance of information available online. This in turn allows them to create connections with new information as they learn schemata or knowledge of the world, which is a student’s basis for building understanding and learning; otherwise known as their conceptual framework. (Echevarria et al, 2008)

Bloom et al, (1956) described that during a lesson there needs to be a variety of questions or tasks that promote HOTS implementation into the lesson, as creativity is
concomitant with the freedom of the student to be allowed time to ponder a given topic. As the teacher works to implement creativity in the classroom, and also get students to brainstorm, a cognitive, metacognitive, or language learning strategy the teacher could teach the students is the Buzan (2005) method of mind-mapping, because it will help the students become more creative thinkers, and to better assimilate the new knowledge with their previous knowledge.

There are at present very little research results available in Thailand with regards to the SIOP model which this researcher hopes to partly rectify with this study, but some resources are available from the United States, and the contents focus on academic attainment in U.S. schools.

The researcher believed that Gagné’s Nine Events of Instruction have similarities to the components of the SIOP model. The nine events are: Gain attention of the students, inform the students of the objectives, stimulate prior learning, present the content, provide learning guidance, elicit practice, provide feedback, assess performance and enhance retention and transfer to the job. The first and second events as to first gain the attention of the students and inform the students of the objectives, which the researcher relates to the SIOP component of lesson planning and having clearly defined objectives displayed. The third event to stimulate the recall of prior learning is similar to the component of building background, and the need to connect students’ personal experiences. Comprehensible input in SIOP relates to event four, where the teacher can then proceed to present the new content using strategies to ensure more effective and efficient instruction. The content can be chunked and organized to ensure meaningful input. The Strategies component correlates with event five of providing guidance where the teacher facilitates the lesson, and provides learning guidance, advising the students of any strategies to
assist in learning content or available resources. The interaction and practice and application components of SIOP can be compared to event six and seven as there is a need to elicit performance, the students need to practice what they have learned which ensures that through active participation the students process the new information, thus internalizing any new skills, and knowledge, and in turn confirm the proper understanding of these concepts. The components of lesson delivery, and review and application, can be compared to the final events described by Briggs et al, (1992) of assessing the students performance and enhancing retention, where the students provide feedback to assess and facilitate learning, such as confirmatory feedback, corrective and remedial feedback, informative feedback and analytical feedback.

Higher Order Thinking Skills in SIOP

One reason for the introduction of SIOP at PAIS, is to ensure that students are able to systematically be encouraged as part of the lesson to consistently use what Bloom et al, (1956) suggested are their Higher Order Thinking Skills (HOTS), and not just be passive learners operating on the less demanding level of Lower Order Thinking Skills (LOTS).

Bloom et al, (1956) considered the highest of these thinking skills to be creativity. The educational reform concepts surrounding the student-centered teaching methods are based on learning taxonomies such as Blooms Taxonomy, in which skills involving analysis, evaluation and synthesis are involves. These skills can create new knowledge which is considered to be of a higher order of thinking, and as such need another set of learning and teaching skill sets. These skill sets develop critical thinking and problem solving not just the retention of facts and concepts. According to Bloom et al, (1956) the higher order thinking skills as opposed to lower order
thinking skills, maybe at first more troublesome to facilitate or learn, but in the long run are invaluable and transposable to real-life situations that students will encounter in the future. The researcher believes that there is more opportunity to use these skills in a Sheltered Instruction based classroom environment.

**Previous Research on SIOP**

Much of the previous research on the SIOP model has been undertaken in the United States starting in the early 1990's. In 1996, the Center for Research on Education, Diversity and Excellence (CREDE) funded by the U.S. Department of Education, researched sheltered instruction and developed an explicit model of sheltered instruction which was given the title SIOP. The SIOP model was used to train teachers, and also to conduct field experiments which could evaluate the effects of sheltered instruction. The preliminary study in 1997 had favorable results which validated the SIOP model as a reliable measure for sheltered instruction (Echevarria et al, 2004, p. 16).

The research claims a solid and growing research base that shows how the SIOP model positively impacts student achievement, but this researcher is not yet convinced of such claims. The national research which CREDE (2016) has carried out was on students whose teachers had been trained in the SIOP model. The research claims that the SIOP model performed significantly better in standardized state academic writing assessment when compared to a group of students similar in skill level whose teachers had not been trained in the SIOP model.

In one such study the California Standards Test for English Language Arts (CST-ELA) and California English Language Development Test (CELDT) scores were collected for students in grades 6, 7, and 8 in 2007/08, 2008/09 and 2009/10.
address teacher outcomes; a teacher survey was administered at the same times. The SIOP was used to rate classroom observations of teachers in 2007, 2008, 2009 and 2010 (QTEL, 2012).

No studies of SIOP fall within the scope of the ELL review protocol that meets What Works Clearinghouse (WWC) evidence standards. This means that presently WWC is not able to draw any conclusions based on previous research either on the effectiveness or ineffectiveness of the SIOP model in the case of ELL. The Institute of Education Sciences, (IES), report for WWC goes on to recommend further research for the SIOP model, and also gives a description of the SIOP instructional strategies that are a framework for the planning lesson design and delivery of SIOP (Institute of Education Sciences, 2013).

**Criticisms of SIOP Research**

Some of the research that has been conducted by Krashen is not very favorable towards the SIOP model. Krashen (2013) noted that only a limited amount of studies have been done involving SIOP trained teachers which have been compared to the performance of regular classes taught by non SIOP trained teachers. He also asserts that the comparison groups are not very well defined in any of the research, and it is not really evident what is actually causing the changes in outcomes. This Krashen (2013) contended, is probably due to the two conflicting hypotheses that form the basis of the SIOP model, and which eventually make the comparisons not theoretically useful.

In the International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching, Krashen (2013) again did not give a particularly positive review of the SIOP Model, and considers it a mixed-bag. Krashen then explains that there are at present two very different hypotheses in the field of language education about how language is acquired, and
how in his opinion the SIOP model just ignores the contradictions, bundles them into one system, and accepts both hypotheses as valid.

Krashen (2013) remained critical of the studies undertaken by some researchers, and disputes parts of the validity of their studies. Krashen asserted that so much information is missing from the research, such as information about the students and measures of mean and standard deviations. This makes it difficult to find valid results as it is not clear which features were actually responsible for the results. The SIOP model is described as a rubric or checklist of features that teachers need to follow whilst instructing ELL. Krashen (2013) informed that the SIOP model is constructed from two contradictory theories of language acquisition, namely the skill-building hypothesis and the comprehension hypothesis.

The skill-building hypothesis entails the students needing to firstly consciously learn the skills of grammar, vocabulary, and spelling, and only after these skills have been acquired can they make use of them in everyday real life situations. In this way, then, skill-building needs to have conscious learning in a feedback loop of output and correction.

With the comprehension hypothesis, however, it is claimed that students acquire language and literacy only when the message is understood, for example when they understand what they hear or read. For the comprehension hypothesis then, language acquisition occurs subconsciously, not when we produce it in speech or written form, but rather when we are not conscious that it is happening. So language acquisition can happen when having a conversation or watching a movie, and then be stored subconsciously in our minds. In summary, then according to the skill-building hypothesis, we first learn grammar and vocabulary, but can only use them after they
are made automatic, and for the comprehension hypothesis our knowledge comes as a
result of getting comprehensible input and then grammar and vocabulary emerge.

Krashen (2013) went on to explain that the bulk of evidence points to the verdict
that the comprehension hypothesis is correct, with most of our skills in language and
literacy coming from what we hear and read. Comprehensible input can be delivered
through the use of sheltered subject matter instruction, in which case students study
subject matter made comprehensible in the second language. The main importance is
placed on subject matter rather than the language, thus the students are tested on
subject matter and not language. In the SIOP model, both the skill-building and
comprehension hypothesis are given the same status of importance in second
language development which inevitably causes problems, and raises the question
whether SIOP really does embody a validated theory of second language acquisition.
Crawford and Reyes (2015) challenged that the SIOP model is a behaviorist
framework that has been attempted to be validated through flawed research, and then
even more nefariously marketed cleverly to the education profession. These issues
they purported have come to define, and even diminish Sheltered Instruction for ELL.

There is still much research needed to validate the efficacy of the SIOP Model,
educators and researchers alike should be inspired to conduct further studies to negate
the perceived inadequacies of some of the previous research work undertaken by the
previous research.

Professional Development for SIOP

The researcher’s main incentive for choosing this line of research is with the
intention that it could be put to immediate use at Pan-Asia International School, and is
of use to other researchers interested in this area as the basis for justification for professional development, and not be just purely for academic purposes. The data analyzed here will have an immediate effect on the professional development at PAIS with more training being initiated if the results prove favorable towards SIOP. Met (1999) described the need for content mastery to be a high priority especially in the needs of ELL to precipitate their improvements in language proficiency, and keep up with the demands of the mainstream curriculum.

This study will be used to oversee in the future the implementation of SIOP into grades 6 to 9, and may even precede school-wide introduction of the model, so it is important to carefully review the data gathered in this study.

The perceptions of the ELL in middle and high school towards the SIOP model is only part of the necessary research, though, as it does not prove the efficacy of SIOP. Further study is needed to assess that the students have not only positively responded to the questionnaire, but have actually shown an improvement in their academic achievement.

Professional development for individual teachers, and for PAIS as a whole, is very important as new teaching methodologies are needed to keep in sync with society’s ever changing landscape. The end results of education, after all, is to produce well rounded students who can contribute to society’s future, and not just reproduce generic facsimiles of past generations. The researcher is optimistic about the findings so far towards the SIOP model, and other researchers also seem positive towards the potential for SIOP to improve teaching and hence learning. The stakeholders responsible for professional development have also noticed positive changes. Reed (2008) noted that many teachers responded positively to SIOP training, finding that
after teachers had implemented the model, there was an increase in student scores with regards to reading, but not that statistically significant an improvement.

The days of the teacher being the main focus-point in the classroom are maybe coming to an end. At present, Thailand and its education system are still somewhat of an anachronism, hanging on to a pedagogy that is a long way behind other countries, and with only a glimmer of hope of any reformation in the near future. The researcher believes that student-centered instruction should be propagated in any contemporary school that wishes to educate holistic, creative thinkers that will shape mankind’s future for the better.

**Background History of Pan-Asia International School**

In the year 2004, Pan-Asia International School (PAIS) was established in its current location on Chalermprakiat Road to the southeast of Bangkok in Pravet district. The school is located in a quiet bucolic suburb, which is convenient for both local students in the area or from other parts of Bangkok to attend. The school also alternatively offers the option of dormitories adjacent to the school, and the Next-G fitness gym for exercise and sports is very convenient. Since its inception, the school has progressively expanded buildings, facilities, and educational options with the recent addition of a new Apple equipped computer laboratory, artificial-turf football fields, and even a small petting zoo.

At PAIS students are offered to learn Arabic, Chinese, Turkish, Thai, and English languages with the majority of the lessons being conducted in the latter. Presently the school offers the International Baccalaureate (I.B.) program for high school students or optionally a standard diploma for those students not in the I.B. Program. (International Baccalaureate, 2016) The middle and high school has a totally separate
building from the primary school, with the middle school students being distributed from grade 6 to 8, and high school students being distributed from grade 9 to 12.

The curriculum at PAIS is modeled fundamentally on the American Common Core but with alterations that take into consideration the multicultural population of the school (Common Core States Initiative, 2012). The majority of the students are English Language Learners with a mixed spectrum of proficiency in English language skills, and PAIS provides the opportunity for students in need of specially designed instruction to attend English as a Second Language (ESL) classes before being introduced into the regular mainstream classes. These language proficiency factors have been taken into account by the researcher, and as the same students are involved in both the pre-and post-questionnaires, the researcher considered that the SIOP model would have had the same impact on the students whatever their language proficiency at the beginning of the study.

The school is multicultural and includes more than forty different nationalities, but with a predominantly Muslim population. Their religious needs are catered for with a nearby mosque, and a class schedule that allows for the Muslim students to attend prayer throughout the day. Many students come from Thailand with approximately half of the school population being Thai nationals. Other nationalities predominant at PAIS are Indian, Pakistani and Turkish. The rest of the students come from countries such as America, UK, Myanmar, Philippines, Korea, Palestine, Syria, Jordan and Yemen. Many of the students then come from cultures that do not have English as their native language which is an important factor when considering instruction.

The researcher is presently a teacher at PAIS for ESL and middle school students. The researcher observed a possible need for a model of instruction that can achieve curriculum alignment both horizontally and vertically, but still allow the teacher
freedom to incorporate the necessary content for the specific needs of the students and the school's philosophy. Before undertaking a middle and high school-wide professional development program, the researcher first undertook a Classroom-Based Research project with grade 7 students which revealed some favorable results. To further this research, and to ensure that the SIOP model does indeed have a positive impact with students and teachers alike, further research is being undertaken for grade 6, 8 and 9 students, and the results analyzed in this thesis should provide information for future action.

In summary, then, the researcher has a positive outlook towards this study, the new knowledge and data it has produced, and eventually any prospective professional development that will result from the research at PAIS. Hopefully this research can also be of use to other researchers interested in this area of education, and precipitate the move towards Sheltered Instruction and other more up to date methods, not just for the sake of change, but for the actual benefit of the students themselves which should be the end result in any educator’s aspirations.
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the research design, population, instrument, validity and reliability of the instrument, collection of data, data analysis and summary of the research process.

Research Design

The purpose of this study was to determine the perceptions of the ELL of grades 6, 8, and 9 towards the traditional and sheltered instruction methods, and investigate whether there is any difference in the student’s perceptions towards the two methods in English Language study. The researcher employed a quantitative-comparative design to investigate the perceptions of the students to fulfill the purpose of this study. A questionnaire was used to determine the students’ perceptions towards traditional and sheltered instruction methods in the eight components of lesson preparation, building background, comprehensible input, strategies, interaction, practice and application, lesson delivery and finally review and assessment.

Population

Pan-Asia International School is a private school located on Chalermprakiat Road, Prawet district in Bangkok. This researcher studied the grades 6, 8 and 9 middle and high school English Language Learners, a total of 116 male and female students from many countries around the world. Grade 6 contained 20 male and 22 female students, grade 8 contained 19 male and 20 female students, and finally grade 9 contained 16
male and 19 female students. A total of 55 male students and 61 female students received the questionnaire. The students were all linguistically advanced enough to understand and complete the questionnaire.

Sample

The sample consisted of students from grades 6, 8 and 9 in the middle and high school currently studying English Language at Pan-Asia International School in the academic year 2015-16, for a total of 116 students. The sheltered instruction method was introduced in grade 7 Middle School at Pan-Asia International School during a Classroom-Based Research project (CBR) by the researcher as a precursor to this thesis, and hence rendered grade 7 as exempt from this study. The research was conducted in the second semester during the months of March to June 2016. The table below shows the sample details.

Table 1
The Number of Students for this Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade six</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade eight</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade nine</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Instrument

The researcher used an adapted Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) questionnaire which is a validated survey instrument developed by Echevarria, Short and Vogt (2000; 2004; 2008). The survey questionnaire consisted of 30 items that measure the eight different components of the sheltered instruction model, namely lesson preparation, building background, comprehensible input, strategies, interaction, practice and application, lesson delivery, review and assessment.

(See Appendix B)

The researcher adapted the questionnaire by simplifying the wording of the 30 features in the questionnaire. This meant that the students could better comprehend the concepts relating to the lesson, and enabled the researcher to gather information about the student’s perceptions towards the SIOP model. The questionnaire was comprised of 30 items, and was designed with a five point Likert-type scale for measuring students’ perceptions on how well the lesson was developed and implemented by the teacher. The questionnaire was explained clearly to the students before being administered. The research design was quantitative-comparative research, and the phenomenon in this study was based on the perceptions of the students. The table below shows the five-point Likert-type scale.

Table 2

Five-Point Likert-type Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly Evident</th>
<th>Less Evident</th>
<th>Somewhat Evident</th>
<th>Hardly Evident</th>
<th>Not Evident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 points</td>
<td>3 points</td>
<td>2 points</td>
<td>1 point</td>
<td>0 points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table below shows the breakdown of the research instrument.

Table 3

*Breakdown of the Research Instrument*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>SIOP Components</th>
<th>Item Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lesson Preparation</td>
<td>1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Building Background</td>
<td>7-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Comprehensible Input</td>
<td>10-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Strategies</td>
<td>13-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>16-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Practice and Application</td>
<td>20-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lesson Delivery</td>
<td>23-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Review and Assessment</td>
<td>27-30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The students completed the questionnaire by putting an ‘X’ in the appropriate box for each item. The researcher then computed the mean scores of the Likert-type scale for each component and feature based on the respondents’ data. The highest mean scores showed any student positivity to instruction methods. Table 4 below shows the details about the scale and interpretation of the student perception.

Table 4

*Interpretation and Scale of Students’ Perceptions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evident Level</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly Evident</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.51 - 4.00</td>
<td>Very Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Evident</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.51 - 3.50</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Evident</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.51 - 2.50</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardly Evident</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.51 - 1.50</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Evident</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00 - 0.50</td>
<td>Very Negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Validity of the SIOP Questionnaire

In order to validate and find the reliability of the SIOP model the researcher has studied previous research to judge, and review the effectiveness of the data. The SIOP questionnaire has been validated by its creators in past research, and is used by educators on a daily basis. The makers of the model have also validated the SIOP Questionnaire by carrying out studies in the U.S.A.

In one such study the California Standards Test for English Language Arts (CST-ELA) and California English Language Development Test (CELDT) scores were collected from students in grades 6, 7, and 8 in 2007/08, 2008/09 and 2009/10. To address teacher outcomes; a teacher survey was administered at the same times. The SIOP questionnaire was used to rate classroom observations of teachers in 2007, 2008, 2009 and 2010 (QTEL, 2012).

The SIOP model has been proposed as a measure of teacher performance designed to rate teachers on their delivery of instruction to English language learners in K-12 settings. The creators of SIOP also claim that it measures effectively the eight components that make up the SIOP model. The eight components created by Echevarria et al. (2008) are: lesson preparation, building background, comprehensible input, strategies, interaction, practice and application, lesson delivery, and review and assessment.

Although throughout their literature, which is published by Pearson in the United States, the authors claimed that the SIOP model has been validated in various research studies, it has proven very difficult for the researcher to find any actual solid evidence of this validation. Most of the previous research has been conducted either by the authors themselves, studies that are affiliated in some way with the Pearson Company, or studies that could possibly have a vested interest in any positive review of SIOP.
During the years 1983 and 2012, a total of 32 studies of SIOP for ELL were published or released. Only seven studies were in the scope of the ELL review protocol, but did not meet the U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Sciences, *What Works Clearinghouse* (WWC) evidence standards. (U.S. Department of Education, 2013)

There is a comprehensive list of all the evidence standards in the WWC Procedures and Standards Handbook with the current version 3.0 being available online. This has to be mentioned here as a serious limitation in this research study, and has also previously been discussed in Chapter 3 of this thesis. The researcher did however find a Cronbach’s alpha for reliability. The 30 -item SIOP questionnaire demonstrated a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.94 in the Institute of Education Sciences, Quality Teaching of English Learners study. (QTEL, 2012)

Table 5

*Details of the Reliability in Previous Studies*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous study</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QTEL</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This study</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this study, the researcher gathered information on the level of perceptions of ELL in grades 6, 8 and 9 towards the traditional and sheltered instruction method, at PAIS. The researcher then computed the scores using the Likert-type scale, finding the mean and standard deviation for the two methods of instruction based on the questionnaire replies. The data gathered may assist in future choices at the school regarding further professional development, and curriculum planning.
Collection of Data

The researcher obtained permission from Pan-Asia International School to conduct research from March 21st to June 3rd 2016. The SIOP questionnaire was administered to the grades 6, 8 and 9 ELL with a pre- and post- questionnaire being administered; thereafter the data were collected by the researcher and then analyzed. The pre-questionnaire was given on March 21st 2016, and then the post-questionnaire was administered on Jun 3rd 2016. The 116 questionnaires were received and the respondents’ valid return rate was 100%.

The procedure for administrating the questionnaire and collecting the data was in the steps as follows:

1. Firstly, all the students in grades 6, 8 and 9 were given a pre-questionnaire about their perceptions towards the traditional instruction method being used in the English Language Arts lesson.

2. Secondly, the students in grades 6, 8 and 9 were taught using the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol method during their English Language Arts lessons for a time period of approximately ten weeks.

3. Next, all the students in grades 6, 8 and 9 were given a post-questionnaire about their perceptions towards the sheltered instruction method being used in the English Language Arts lesson.

4. Finally, the data collected from the pre- and post-questionnaires were analyzed by the researcher in relationship to the stated objectives of the study by comparing the corresponding items in the instrument.

The teachers in this study used the traditional instruction methods that they usually employ to teach their lessons. The researcher acknowledges that a limitation of this
study is that some aspects of instruction may vary in certain respects, but the researcher has observed that during the research period traditional teacher-centered instruction was used in the pre-questionnaire time period. In sheltered instruction the teachers in this study all used the same SIOP model as a framework for their lesson plans and the way that they taught, which entailed the use of the following features created by Echevarria, Short and Vogt (2008) namely; lesson preparation, building background, comprehensible input, strategies, interaction, practice and application, lesson delivery, review and assessment.

Data Analysis

The following statistical methods were used for the objectives of this study.

For objective 1, mean and standard deviation were used to measure the perceptions of the English Language Learners towards the traditional instruction method.

For objective 2, after the sheltered instruction method was used to teach the English language learners class, mean and standard deviation were used to measure the perceptions of the English Language Learners towards the sheltered instruction method.

For objective 3, a two-tailed dependent sample t-test was used to analyze the sample data collected between the two methods of traditional and sheltered instruction.
### Summary of the Research Process

**Table 6**

**Summary of the Research Process**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Objective</th>
<th>Source of Data</th>
<th>Data Collection Method or Research Instrument</th>
<th>Data Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To determine the level of English Language Learners’ perceptions towards traditional instruction methods in middle and high school at PAIS.</td>
<td>Students of Grades 6, 8, and 9 English Language Learners in Pan-Asia International School</td>
<td>SIOP Questionnaires</td>
<td>Mean and Standard Deviations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 6 = 42 students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. To determine the level of English Language Learners’ perceptions towards sheltered instruction methods in middle and high school at PAIS.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIOP Questionnaires</td>
<td>Mean and Standard Deviations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 8 = 39 students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To compare if there is any significant difference in the English Language Learners’ perceptions towards traditional and sheltered instruction methods in middle and high school at PAIS.</td>
<td></td>
<td>SIOP Questionnaires</td>
<td>t-test (Two-tailed dependent samples)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grade 9 = 35 students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total = 116 students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH FINDINGS

This chapter presents the research findings, according to the research objectives:

1. To determine the level of English Language Learners’ perceptions schools towards traditional instruction methods in middle and high school at PAIS.

2. To determine the level of English Language Learners’ perceptions towards sheltered instruction methods in middle and high school at PAIS.

3. To compare if there is any significant difference in the English Language Learners’ perceptions towards traditional and sheltered instruction methods in middle and high school at PAIS.

Research Findings of Research Objective 1

Research objective 1 was to determine the level of English Language Learners’ perceptions towards the traditional instruction method. The researcher presents here the students’ perceptions towards the traditional instruction method according to the eight components in tables 7 to 14. The summary table shown in table 15.

1. Students’ perceptions towards the traditional instruction method in the component of lesson preparation. Table 7 shows the mean and standard deviation of the students’ perceptions towards the traditional-instruction method in the component of lesson preparation. The total mean score of lesson preparation was 2.88, which, according to the interpretation key was positive. According to the table, items 2 and 3 received the highest mean score of 3.20, which, according to the interpretation key was positive and item 4 got the lowest mean score of 2.53, which according to the interpretation key was positive.
Table 7

Students’ Perceptions towards Lesson Preparation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Content objectives are clearly explained and reviewed.</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Language objectives are clearly explained, displayed and reviewed.</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Content concepts are appropriate for the age of the students.</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Supplementary used often to make the lesson clear and meaningful.</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Content made clear for all levels of skill.</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Meaningful activities that include lesson concepts, with language practice for reading, writing, listening and speaking.</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Students’ perceptions towards the traditional instruction method in the component of building background. Table 8 shows the mean and standard deviation of the students’ perceptions towards the traditional instruction method in the area of building background. The total mean score of building background was 2.68, which, according to the interpretation key was positive. According to the table, item 8 received the highest mean score of 2.74 which, according to the interpretation key was positive, and item 7 got the lowest mean score of 2.61 which was also positive.

Table 8

Students’ Perceptions towards Building Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Concepts linked clearly to students’ background experiences.</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Links clearly made between past learning and new concepts.</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Key vocabulary made clear and repeated in lessons.</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Students’ perceptions towards the traditional instruction method in the component of comprehensible input. Table 9 shows the mean and standard deviation of the students’ perceptions towards the traditional instruction method in the component of comprehensible input. The total mean score of comprehensible input was 2.97, which, according to the interpretation key was positive. According to the table, item 11 received the highest mean score of 3.29 which, according to the interpretation key was positive, and item 12 got the lowest mean score of 2.40 which according to the interpretation key was neutral.

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Speech appropriate for students' ability levels.</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Clear explanations of academic tasks.</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Variety of techniques to make the content, concepts clear for students.</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Students’ perceptions towards the traditional instruction method in the component of strategies. Table 10 shows the mean and standard deviation of the students’ perceptions towards the traditional instruction method in the component of strategies. The total mean score of strategies was 2.59, which, according to the interpretation key was positive. According to the table, item 15 received the highest mean score of 2.92 which, according to the interpretation key was positive, and item 13 got the lowest mean score of 2.40 which according to the interpretation key was neutral.
Table 10

Students’ Perceptions towards Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. Many opportunities for students to use learning strategies.</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Step by step approach to support student understanding.</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Many questions asked to promote higher-order thinking skills.</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Students’ perceptions towards the traditional instruction method in the component of interaction. Table 11 shows the mean and standard deviation of the students’ perceptions towards the traditional instruction method in the component of interaction. The total mean score of Interaction was 2.90, which, according to the interpretation key was positive. According to the table, items 19 received the highest mean score of 3.16 which, according to the interpretation key was positive, and item 17 got the lowest mean score of 2.34 which according to the interpretation key was neutral.

Table 11

Students’ Perceptions towards Interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. Many opportunities for interaction and discussion among students and teacher.</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Grouping the students for activities when needed.</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Enough time given to answer teachers’ questions.</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Enough opportunity to clarify concepts with their teacher and friends.</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Students’ perceptions towards the traditional instruction method in component of practice and application. Table 12 shows the mean and standard deviation of the students’ perceptions towards the traditional instruction method in the component of practice and application. The total mean score of practice and application was 2.27, which, according to the interpretation key was neutral. According to the table, item 22 received the highest mean score of 2.97, which, according to the interpretation key was positive, and item 20 got the lowest mean score of 1.53, which according to the interpretation key was neutral.

Table 12

*Students’ Perceptions towards Practice and Application*

| Item                                                              | M     | SD   | Interpretation
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|------|----------------
| 20. Hands-on activities to practice using new knowledge.          | 1.53  | 1.27 | Neutral        |
| 21. Activities provided for students to practice their knowledge in the classroom. | 2.31  | 1.0  | Neutral        |
| 22. Activities include reading, writing, listening and speaking skills. | 2.97  | .94  | Positive       |
| Total                                                            | 2.27  | 1.07 | Neutral        |

7. Students’ perceptions towards the traditional instruction method in the component of lesson delivery. Table 13 shows the mean and standard deviation of the students’ perceptions towards the traditional instruction method in the component of lesson delivery. The total mean score of lesson delivery was 3.00, which, according to the interpretation key was positive. According to the table, item 23 received the highest mean score of 3.14, which, according to the interpretation key was positive, and item 25 got the lowest mean score of 2.88, which according to the interpretation key was positive.
Table 13

Students’ Perceptions towards Lesson Delivery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23. Content objectives clearly supported by the lesson delivery.</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Language objectives clearly supported by the lesson delivery.</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Students engaged approximately 90% of the time.</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Pacing of the lesson good for the students’ ability levels.</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Students’ Perceptions towards the traditional instruction method in the component of review and assessment. Table 14 shows the mean and standard deviation of the students’ perceptions towards the traditional instruction method in the component of review and assessment. The total mean score of review and assessment was 2.67, which, according to the interpretation key was positive. According to the table, item 30 received the highest mean score of 3.08, which, according to the interpretation key was positive, and item 27 got the lowest mean score of 2.00, which according to the interpretation key was neutral.

Table 14

Students Perceptions towards Review and Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27. Regular review of key vocabulary.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Regular review of content concepts.</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Regular feedback on output (e.g. Language, content work)</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Assessment of understanding, and regular feedback from students’ throughout the lesson.</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. The Summary of students’ perceptions towards the traditional instruction method.
Table 15 shows a summary of the mean and standard deviation of the students’ perceptions towards the traditional instruction method. The total mean score of traditional instruction was 3.18, which, according to the interpretation key was positive. According to the table, item 3 received the highest mean score of 3.35, which, according to the interpretation key was positive, and item 6 got the lowest mean score of 2.27, which according to the interpretation key was neutral.

Table 15

Summary of Students’ Perceptions towards Traditional Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students’ Perception</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lesson Preparation</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Building Background</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Comprehensible Input</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Strategies</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Interaction</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Practice and Application</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Lesson Delivery</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Review and Assessment</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Findings of Research Objective 2

Research objective 2 was to determine the level of English Language Learners’ perceptions towards the sheltered instruction method. The researcher presents here the students’ perceptions towards the sheltered instruction method according to the eight components in tables 16 to 23. The summary table is shown in table 24.
1. Students’ perceptions towards the sheltered instruction method in the component of lesson preparation. Table 16 shows the mean and standard deviation of the students’ perceptions towards the sheltered instruction method in the component of lesson preparation. The total mean score of lesson preparation was 3.28, which, according to the interpretation key was positive. According to the table, items 1 and 2 received the highest mean score of 3.48, which, according to the interpretation key was positive, and item 6 got the lowest mean score of 3.00, which according to the interpretation key was positive.

Table 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students’ Perceptions towards Lesson Preparation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Content objectives are clearly explained and reviewed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Language objectives are clearly explained, displayed and reviewed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Content concepts are appropriate for the age of the students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Supplementary used often to make the lesson clear and meaningful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Content made clear for all levels of skill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Meaningful activities that include lesson concepts with language practice for reading, writing, listening and speaking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Students’ perceptions towards the sheltered instruction method in the component of building background. Table 17 shows the mean and standard deviation of the students’ perceptions towards the sheltered instruction method in the area of building background. The total mean score of building background was 3.04, which, according to the interpretation key was positive. According to the table, item 8 received the highest mean score of 3.14, which, according to the interpretation key was positive,
and item 7 got the lowest mean score of 2.90, which according to the interpretation key was positive.

Table 17

*Students’ Perceptions towards Building Background*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Concepts linked clearly to students’ background experiences.</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Links clearly made between past learning and new concepts.</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Key vocabulary made clear and repeated in lessons.</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Students’ perceptions towards the sheltered instruction method in the component of comprehensible input. Table 18 shows the mean and standard deviation of the students’ perceptions towards the sheltered instruction method in the component of comprehensible input. The total mean score of comprehensible input was 3.24, which, according to the interpretation key was positive. According to the table, item 11 received the highest mean score of 3.41, which, according to the interpretation key was positive, and item 12 got the lowest mean score of 2.96, which according to the interpretation key was positive.

Table 18

*Students’ Perceptions towards Comprehensible Input*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Speech appropriates for students’ ability levels.</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Clear explanations of academic tasks.</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Variety of techniques to make the content, concepts clear for students.</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Students’ perceptions towards the sheltered instruction method in the component of strategies. Table 19 shows the mean and standard deviation of the students’ perceptions towards the sheltered instruction method in the component of strategies. The total mean score of strategies was 3.01, which, according to the interpretation key was positive. According to the table, item 15 received the highest mean score of 3.25, which, according to the interpretation key was positive, and item 13 got the lowest mean score of 2.72, which, according to the interpretation key was positive.

Table 19

Students’ Perceptions towards Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. Many opportunities for students to use learning strategies.</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Step by step approach to support student understanding.</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Many questions asked to promote higher-order thinking skills.</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.01</strong></td>
<td><strong>.88</strong></td>
<td><strong>Positive</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Students’ perceptions towards the sheltered instruction method in the component of interaction. Table 20 shows the mean and standard deviation of the students’ perceptions towards the sheltered instruction method in the component of interaction. The total mean score of interaction was 3.14, which, according to the interpretation key was positive. According to the table, items 18 and 19 received the highest mean score of 3.29, which, according to the interpretation key was positive, and item 17 got the lowest mean score of 2.88, which according to the interpretation key was positive.
Table 20

Students’ Perceptions towards Interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16. Many opportunities for interaction and discussion among students and teacher.</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Grouping the students for activities when needed.</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Enough time given to answer teachers’ questions.</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Enough opportunity to clarify concepts with their teacher and friends.</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Students’ perceptions towards the sheltered instruction method in the component of practice and application. Table 21 shows the mean and standard deviation of the students’ perceptions towards the sheltered instruction method in the component of practice and application. The total mean score of Practice and Application was 2.94, which, according to the interpretation key was positive. According to the table, item 20 received the highest mean score of 3.09, which, according to the interpretation key was positive, and item 21 got the lowest mean score of 2.66, which according to the interpretation key was positive.

Table 21

Students’ Perceptions towards Practice and Application

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20. Hands-on activities to practice using new knowledge.</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Activities provided for students to practice their knowledge in the classroom.</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Activities include reading, writing, listening and speaking skills.</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Students’ perceptions towards the sheltered instruction method in the component of lesson delivery. Table 22 shows the mean and standard deviation of the students’ perceptions towards the sheltered instruction method in the component of lesson delivery. The total mean score of lesson delivery was 3.18, which, according to the interpretation key was positive. According to the table, item 24 received the highest mean score of 3.28, which, according to the interpretation key was positive, and item 25 got the lowest mean score of 3.09, which, according to the interpretation key was positive.

Table 22

Students’ Perceptions towards Lesson Delivery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23. Content objectives clearly supported by the lesson delivery.</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Language objectives clearly supported by the lesson delivery.</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Students engaged approximately 90% of the time.</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Pacing of the lesson good for the students’ ability levels.</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Students’ perceptions towards the sheltered instruction method in the component of review and assessment. Table 23 shows the mean and standard deviation of the students’ perceptions towards the sheltered instruction method in the component of review and assessment. The total mean score of review and assessment was 3.12, which, according to the interpretation key was positive. According to the table, item 29 received the highest mean score of 3.39, which, according to the interpretation key was positive, and item 27 got the lowest mean score 2.74, which according to the interpretation key was positive.
Table 23

Students’ Perceptions towards Review and Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27. Regular review of key vocabulary.</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Regular review of content concepts.</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Regular feedback on output. (e.g. Language, content work)</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Assessment of understanding, and regular feedback from students’ throughout the lesson.</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. The summary of students’ perceptions towards the sheltered instruction method.

Table 24 shows a summary of the mean and standard deviation of the students’ perceptions towards the sheltered instruction method. The total mean score of sheltered instruction was 3.16, which, according to the interpretation key was positive. According to the table, item 1 received the highest mean score of 3.28, which, according to the interpretation key was positive, and item 6 got the lowest mean score of 2.94, which according to the interpretation key was positive.
Table 24

Summary of Students’ Perceptions towards Sheltered Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students’ Perception</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lesson Preparation</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Building Background</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Comprehensible Input</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Strategies</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Interaction</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Practice and Application</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Lesson Delivery</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Review and Assessment</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Findings of Research Objective 3

Research objective 3 was to compare if there is a significant difference in the perceptions of English Language Learners in middle and high school at Pan-Asia International School towards traditional and sheltered instruction methods at a 0.05 significance level.

1. Students’ perceptions towards the traditional compared to the sheltered instruction method. Table 25 shows a summary of the mean and standard deviation of the students’ perceptions towards the traditional and sheltered instruction methods. The total mean score of traditional instruction was 2.75, compared with sheltered instruction which was 3.12. According to the table the total standard deviation for traditional instruction was .90, and for sheltered instruction it was .78.
Table 25

*The t-test Dependent Sample Results*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Sig.(2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Instruction</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheltered Instruction</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>-6.932</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In conclusion then, the data from the questionnaire shows that the respondents as a whole showed an overall positive perception towards traditional and sheltered instruction. The study showed a significant difference in the English Language Learner perceptions towards traditional and sheltered instruction methods in middle and high schools at Pan-Asia International School at a 0.05 significance level.
CHAPTER V

FINDINGS, CONCLUSION, DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter presents a summary of how the study was conducted, and what instruments were used to gather the data, as well as the study findings, conclusions, discussion, and recommendations for future research.

Summary of the Study

In this study, the researcher examined students’ perceptions towards traditional and sheltered instruction model to find if there were any perceived differences between the two. The sample for this study was comprised of 116 students enrolled at Pan-Asia International School in middle and high school (Grades 6, 8 and 9), in the Academic year 2015/16, and the research conducted between March 21st and June 3rd 2016. The researcher used an adapted SIOP questionnaire as the instrument for collecting data from the students about their perceptions towards the two models. The researcher distributed a total of 116 questionnaires to the targeted population. The 116 questionnaires were received and the respondents’ valid return rate was 100%.

The study was based on the following research objectives:

1. To determine the level of English Language Learners’ perceptions towards traditional instruction methods in middle and high school at PAIS.

2. To determine the level of English Language Learners’ perceptions towards sheltered instruction methods in middle and high school at PAIS.

3. To compare if there is any significant difference in the English Language Learners’ perceptions towards traditional and sheltered instruction methods in middle and high school at PAIS.
There was one hypothesis: There is a significant difference in the English Language Learner perceptions towards traditional and sheltered instruction methods in middle and high school at Pan-Asia International School at a 0.05 significance level.

This study was a quantitative-comparative study based on a questionnaire used to investigate the students’ perceptions towards traditional and sheltered instructional methods in grades 6, 8 and 9 middle and high school students. The questionnaire was also used to compare the students’ perceptions between the traditional and sheltered instruction models.

Findings

The following findings were observed in the research study:

1. The data from the questionnaire shows that the respondents as a whole, grade 6, 8 and 9 middle and high school students, showed an overall positive perception towards traditional instruction. There is need for further research in the future, with a study on the perceptions comparing the different grade levels, and it is also important to mention that this is limitation of this researchers study. The total mean score of traditional instruction was 3.18, which, according to the interpretation key was positive. The component of lesson delivery received the highest mean score of 3.00 and a standard deviation of .93, which showed a positive perception. The component of practice and application showed a neutral perception with a mean of 2.27 and standard deviation of 1.07.

2. The data from the questionnaire shows that the respondents as a whole, grade 6, 8 and 9 middle and high school students, showed an overall positive perception towards sheltered instruction. The total mean score of sheltered instruction was 3.16, which was positive. The component of lesson delivery received the highest mean
score of 3.28 and a standard deviation of .73, which showed a positive perception. The component of practice and application showed a positive perception with a mean of 2.94 and standard deviation of .80.

3. The study showed a significant difference in the English Language Learner perceptions towards traditional and sheltered instruction methods in middle and high schools at Pan-Asia International School at a 0.05 significance level. The mean and standard deviation of the students’ perceptions towards the traditional and sheltered instruction methods showed that the total mean score of traditional instruction was 2.75, compared with sheltered instruction which was 3.12. According to the table the total standard deviation for traditional instruction was .90, and for sheltered instruction it was .78.

**Conclusion**

From the findings the following conclusions were drawn.

1. The grades 6, 8 and 9 middle and high school students’ perceptions towards traditional instruction were positive.

2. The grades 6, 8 and 9 middle and high school students’ perceptions towards sheltered instruction were positive.

3. There was a significant difference between grades 6, 8 and 9 middle and high school students’ perceptions towards traditional instruction compared to sheltered instruction with students' perceptions more positive towards sheltered instruction.

4. The students’ perceptions in the comparison most significantly differed between traditional and sheltered instruction in the components of strategies, and of practice and application.
Discussion

The results of this study determined that the level of the ELL in middle and high schools perceptions towards the traditional instruction method was overall positive. Met (1999) maintained that a primary aim of ESL was to quickly gain academic proficiency in content-based instruction with a model that matches language to meaning. In this way the learner can gain control over the content more easily especially in programs that have integrated language and content for older learners. In traditional instruction this was not so much the case, and here resulted in some features that the students perceived as neutral, for example, in the component comprehensible input the lowest mean score showed that they perceived a lack of variety of techniques to make the content concepts clear. The same result was seen for the component strategies where the lowest mean score which according to the interpretation key was neutral. This showed that students perceived that there were not many opportunities for students to use learning strategies. Accordingly, in the component of interaction, the lowest mean score, which, according to the interpretation key was neutral, showed that students perceived that the grouping of students for activities when needed was not adequate. Genzuk (2010) recommended that as the lesson progresses, it is essential for the facilitator to check for understanding. The research also suggested that allowing the students time to process new information, getting feedback not only from the teacher, but also from their peers is an important part of the interactive process that could be lacking in traditional instruction at PAIS. This method places a high priority on manipulatives thus ensuring student participation, cooperation, and allowing them a real hands-on experience linking concepts with activities undertaken in the classroom. This also linked to the results of the study, which showed the students' perceptions to be more
neutral to traditional instruction in the component of practice and application, where the total mean score was neutral overall. Both, hands-on activities to practice using new knowledge, and activities provided for students to practice their knowledge in the classroom provided a neutral result. Student’s perceptions towards the component review and assessment resulted in the lowest mean score which according to the interpretation key was again neutral. This indicated that student perceived a lack of regular review of key vocabulary.

In summary of students’ perceptions towards the traditional instruction method of the component 6 of practice and application was neutral, with all other components results being positive according to the interpretation key.

The results of this study demonstrated that the level of ELL perceptions in middle and high schools towards sheltered instruction methods was positive. Students’ perceptions towards the component comprehensible input was positive with the highest mean score, which according to the interpretation key was positive, and the lowest mean score for the variety of techniques to make the content concepts clear for students, but according to the interpretation key was still positive. The contention that Sticht (1997) made, that all human intellectual activities such as thinking, communicating and problem solving have a double nature of cognition needing both processes and content, seems to be well founded, and the findings of the research study at PAIS supported this claim as the framework of SIOP includes both criteria mentioned. Processes in order to be carried out to a proficient degree need to at first have a high level of content knowledge on which the processes are fundamentally based.

The component of strategies received the highest mean score, which, according to the interpretation key was positive for students’ perceptions of there being many
questions asked to promote higher-order thinking skills. The lowest mean score, which, according to the interpretation key was still positive for students’ perceptions of having many opportunities to use learning strategies. In a study by Dalton et al (2007), they found that scaffolding using new technologies had proven advantage in the classroom for ELL. The strategy used to increase the use of new technologies specifically focused on reading and writing environments, which they attested should help support children whose needs differ from the average language learner. ESL students in Thailand, the researcher has noticed, are more likely to be engaged with reading if technology and the use of multimedia are involved.

Students’ perceptions towards the component of interaction showed the highest mean score, which according to the interpretation key was positive. Both enough time given to answer teachers’ questions and having enough opportunity to clarify concepts with their teacher and friends was perceived as positive here then. Although the lowest mean score was for grouping the students for activities when needed, it was still positive according to the interpretation key. Theroux (2004) recommended an inquiry based method such as discovery learning using method such as graphic organizers, and journals or blogs. These methods can use the student’s prior knowledge and experiences to construct new understanding and quite easilbe used in not only individual work but in groupwork using social media. The total mean score of the component review and assessment according to the interpretation key was positive. The highest mean score, showing that the students’ perception of getting regular feedback on the output such as language and content work was positive. Component review and assessment got the lowest mean score, which, according to the interpretation key was again still positive for students’ perceptions towards receiving a regular review of key vocabulary.
This study’s data determined that there was a significant difference in the English Language Learners’ in middle and high school perceptions towards traditional compared with sheltered Instruction methods at a 0.05 significance level. The total mean score of traditional instruction was lower, compared with sheltered instruction which was significantly higher. According to the table the total standard deviation for traditional instruction was wider, and for sheltered instruction it was slightly narrower. As the sig. was found to be .00 which is smaller than .05, it was thus concluded that there is a significant difference between student’s perceptions when comparing between the two models. Crawford and Reyes (2015) challenged that one model of instruction such as SIOP could not possibly be of great benefit to all types of learners, and question the contradictory theories that it is based on can work together. Here though, at least in learners’ perceptions, the SIOP model had a positive effect. The difference in students’ perception towards traditional and sheltered Instruction was most noticeable in the component of practice and application with a higher, more positive perception towards sheltered instruction changing from neutral to positive. In the component of comprehensible input, a variety of techniques to make the content concepts clear for students’ perceptions, changed from neutral to positive with sheltered instruction. Scully (2016) argued that problems with the SIOP model as a framework for instruction mean that much of the previous results are based on flawed research. Not only this, but also Scully asserts that SIOP is driven by clever marketing by the creators and the publishing company, with an outcome of this is that sheltered instruction for ELL has been diminished in the minds of some educators. The researcher also noticed there was a change in the students’ perceptions towards the component strategies, with students’ perceiving having many opportunities for students to use learning strategies. Petrina (in press) described how altering one
component of instruction had an effect on all the other components and hence the actual process of instruction changes too. Altering strategies can have a big effect on the learning system and they should be malleable enough that when problems and issues arise the system can be altered and in this way a feedback link established. For the component strategies the perceptions again changed from neutral to positive for this component item. Another component, which got the lowest mean score for grouping the students for activities when needed under traditional instruction, received a more positive mean score with sheltered instruction, which according to the interpretation key was positive. Scully (2016) further remarked that SIOP does have the potential to help instruction, and give teachers greater choice whilst working with ELL, but only when it is used as one part of instruction, and not as a rigid framework.

In summary, then practice and application showed the most difference in comparison between the two models, whilst strategies showed the widest spread with a larger significant deviation. The overall perception of the student’s towards sheltered instruction was positive.

The study showed perceptions of the ELL in middle and high school towards the sheltered instruction model is positive, but this researcher realized that this does not prove in any way the efficacy of the SIOP model. There is a need for further study to assess whether, along with the students’ perceived preference for SIOP by positively responding to the questionnaire, that they have actually shown a corresponding improvement in their academic achievement to match. With this in mind the researcher intends to study the academic achievement of the students between SIOP and non-SIOP. Donato et al, (2007) suggested that more research is needed to find out just content based models such as SIOP are actually appropriated, understood, and
eventually put into practice by ELL teachers. This study was limited by time constraints as the researcher considered that there would not be enough data gathered to show any conclusive evidence of academic achievement being affected by the SIOP model in such a short time frame. A study undertaken by the Institute of Education Sciences (IES), was a much larger and more in-depth than this researcher undertook, the Evaluation of Quality Teaching for English Learners (QTEL, 2012) study was over a four year time frame, but still did not manage to find conclusive evidence of the efficacy of the SIOP model to a sufficient standard to confirm the link between sheltered instruction and students’ academic achievement.

**Recommendations**

Based on the results of this study the following recommendations are offered:

**Recommendations for Teachers:**

Teachers at Pan-Asia International School should be offered to take professional development in the SIOP model. The implementation and features of the SIOP model should lead to more student-centered instruction, improved differentiated lessons and better language development for English learners.

**Recommendations for Administrators:**

This study shows a positive result in perceptions towards the SIOP model for the students, and this researcher is optimistic about the findings so far towards the SIOP model of other researchers which also seem positive towards the potential for SIOP to improve teaching and hence learning for ELL. The stakeholders at PAIS responsible for professional development have also noticed positive changes with the SIOP model trial. The SIOP model can be given firstly as professional development for middle and high school teachers at PAIS, and eventually be implemented in the other departments
at the school. It is hoped that further implementation of SIOP at our school will bring more consistency between the different grade levels of ELL in middle and high school, and will also help administrators with the ESL students to better understand the mainstream curriculum in order to transition into their appropriate grade as smoothly as possible.

**Recommendations for Future Research:**

This study provides implications for future research with regards to SIOP in Thailand. These future studies are needed to better understand the use of the SIOP model. According to the results of this study the respondents preferred the sheltered instruction model, but the researcher recommends further study at PAIS, and a larger survey including more questionnaires covering other grades. This research along with further research on the students’ academic achievement under sheltered instruction would be beneficial to future research in Thailand and internationally.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX A
The following lesson plans were adapted and developed by PAIS teachers from lesson plans created for the SIOP model available online as examples.

**SIOP Lesson Plan**

**Part I: Lesson Introduction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Population</th>
<th>Pan-Asia International School, Bangkok, Thailand. Class of 18 students, 8 males, 10 females.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade Level</td>
<td>Grade 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Area</td>
<td>English Language Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of Textbook</td>
<td>Theme: Story Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson Rationale</td>
<td>English Language Arts studies with technology content. These students are developing writing skills in their classroom. In my one-week unit of instruction these students will learn the elements of a story, the process of story writing, and how to use Microsoft PowerPoint to write and present a story. I chose my objectives and standards for this unit based on ESLRs’ and Common Core standards. This unit will support the development of story writing skills.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ELD Standards:**

Students will be able to- (SIOP process-to-performance continuum)

1. Recognize setting and characters (Day 1). Explore.
2. Discuss the plot of their story (Day 2). Discuss in small groups.
3. Write a short story (Day 3). Draft.
4. Recognize spelling and grammar errors with spell check (Day 4). Edit.
5. Present their short story to the class (Day 5). Oral presentation.

**Common Core Standards:** Grade 6, English Language Arts

Production & Distribution of Writing

5. With guidance and support from peers and adults, develop and strengthen writing as needed by planning, revising, and editing.
6. With guidance and support from adults, use technology to produce and publish writing.
SIOP Lesson Plan #1

Standards:
Grade 6, ELA: Production & Distribution of Writing- 3.5, with guidance and support from peers and adults, develop and strengthen writing as needed by planning, revising, and editing.

Grade 6, ELA: Production & Distribution of Writing- 3.6, with guidance and support from adults, use technology to produce and publish writing.

Theme: Story Writing

Lesson Topic: Setting & Characters, Prewriting

Objectives:

Content: Today students will determine the setting and choose the characters for their story.

Language: Students will be able to recognize setting and characters.

Learning Strategies: KWL Chart & Think, Pair, Share

Key Vocabulary: setting & characters
Technology Vocabulary- PowerPoint, slides, normal view, insert, Clip Art, resize

Materials:
Laptops, Microsoft PowerPoint, KWL chart, Teacher PowerPoint for lesson presentation

Motivation:
(Building Background)
KWL: What do you already know about writing stories? What do you want to know?

Presentation:
1. Visual presentation of language and content objectives in teacher’s presentation.
2. New key vocabulary and a review of technology vocabulary will also be presented in the teacher’s PowerPoint with visuals to improve comprehensibility.
3. Think, Pair Share strategy to encourage student interaction & feedback. Wait time given.
Practice/Application:

1. Following Think, Pair, Share where students interacted and discussed their choice for story setting and characters, students will prewrite in Microsoft PowerPoint.
2. Students will open a new PowerPoint presentation.
3. Students will search Clip Art to find the setting they want for their short story.
4. Students will resize Clip Art for their story setting.
5. Students will insert their chosen Clip Art characters onto their story setting.
6. After students finish, they will find a partner and identify the setting and characters they have chosen for their short story.
7. The teacher provides feedback to all students as she supports their learning activities.

Review/Assessment:

1. The teacher will review the objectives and vocabulary in the teacher PowerPoint.
2. Students will complete an exit ticket where they will recognize story setting and characters.

Extension: Students ready for challenge work may complete the below webquest:

http://webquests215.wikispaces.com/Short+Story+Elements

The above webquest challenges students to further explore the elements of a story.
SIOP Lesson Plan #2

Standards: Grade 6, ELA: Production & Distribution of Writing- 3.5, with guidance and support from peers and adults, develop and strengthen writing as needed by planning, revising, and editing.

Grade 6, ELA: Production & Distribution of Writing- 3.6, with guidance and support from adults, use technology to produce and publish writing.

Theme: Story Writing

Lesson Topic: Plot, Drafting

Objectives:

Content: Today students will create a storyboard in order to draft the plot of their story.

Language: Students will discuss their story plot.

Learning Strategies:

Chunk and Chew- to keep students chunking new information, the teacher pauses every 10 minutes during input to give students time to talk with a partner or small group about what they just learned.

Review and Roam- At the end of the lesson, the teacher gives students a reflection question (What is plot? What is the plot of your story?). Students think silently, then stand and roam the classroom, looking at their classmate’s PowerPoint plots and discussing their ideas with whomever they choose.

Key Vocabulary: plot, storyboard, drafting

Technology Vocabulary: duplicate slide, text box,

Materials:

Laptops, student PowerPoints with setting and characters, Teacher PowerPoint presentation, storyboard prewriting worksheets, directions handouts (and modified directions handouts)

Motivation:

1. Revisit KWL chart and add additional “Know” and “Want to Know”
2. Allow students to volunteer to share their setting and characters briefly with the class.
3. Show students a sample of a finished short story PowerPoint to motivate.
Presentation:
1. Present Language & content objectives, along with key vocabulary & technology vocabulary in teacher PowerPoint with appropriate visuals and educational video clips to improve comprehensibility.
2. Chunk and Chew- Pause every ten minutes during presentation to give students time to talk with a partner or small group about what they just learned.
3. Revisit objectives and review directions for completing prewriting story board with handout
   a. A special handout with additional visuals, simplified language, and scaffolding is prepared for English limited students and SPED students.
   b. Students will give feedback as they are led to discuss how they will meet the objectives in the practice activity

Practice/Application:
1. Students will use their handout to complete the storyboard/prewriting for the plot of their story.
2. Students will share and discuss their storyboard with a partner.
3. Students will insert a textbox on their setting/character PowerPoint slide.
4. Students will duplicate the slide to create additional story pages.
5. Students will begin drafting their short story as they type into the text boxes of their PowerPoint slides.
6. The teacher will check in with students to ensure all students comprehend and have accommodations or reteaching as is needed. The teacher will provide feedback as students draft their stories.

Review/Assessment:
1. The teacher will lead students to review key vocabulary and technology vocabulary in a visual PowerPoint presentation.
2. The teacher will revisit the KWL chart to fill in, “What we have learned.” (assessment).
3. The teacher will lead a class discussion, soliciting feedback from students on how the class has met the objectives through their practice activity. Ample wait time will be given during teacher questioning. Teacher questioning will stimulate higher level thinking as the teacher asks students a variety of question types.
4. Review and Roam- At the end of this lesson, the teacher gives students reflection questions: What is plot? What is the plot of your story? These questions will be posted on the board at the end of the teacher’s PowerPoint presentation. Students think silently, then stand and roam the classroom, looking at their classmate’s PowerPoint plots and discussing their ideas with whomever they choose.
5. The teacher will assess student short story PowerPoints to determine next steps for future lessons, and to plan for reteaching or target small groups to scaffold ELL students.
Extension:
Brief written response-

How does the setting affect the plot of your story?

How do the characters affect the plot of your story?

Reference-Learning strategies were taken from the fourth edition of *Making Content Comprehensible for English Learners: The SIOP Model*. This empirically validated book was written by Jana Echevarria, MaryEllen Vogt, & Deborah J. Short.

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

- **Adaptation of content** to all levels of student proficiency

- **Meaningful activities** that integrate lesson concepts with language practice opportunities for reading, writing, listening, and/or speaking

**Building Background**

- **Concepts explicitly linked** to students’ background experiences

- **Links explicitly made** between past learning and new concepts

- **Key vocabulary** emphasized

**Comprehensible Input**

- **Speech** appropriate for students’ proficiency levels

- **Clear explanation** of academic tasks

- **A variety of techniques** used to make content concepts clear

**Strategies**

- Ample opportunities provided for students to use **learning strategies**

- **Scaffolding techniques** consistently used, assisting and supporting student understanding

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

**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

Practice & 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 (i.e., reading, writing, listening, and speaking)

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

Review & 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 (MCC4, pp. 294–296)
Creating Language Objectives (SIOP)

Language Objectives:

- Promote student academic language growth.
- Include the use of either receptive (listening and reading) and/or productive language skills (speaking and writing)
- Connect clearly with the lesson topic or lesson activities

**Essential Question:** Which of the four domains will the students use to accomplish the content objective?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key vocabulary</strong> refers to the technical terms, concept words, and other words needed to discuss, read, or write about the topic of a lesson</td>
<td>Students will be able to define the terms . . . orally and in writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language Functions</strong> refer to the ways students use language in the lesson.</td>
<td>Students will be able to formulate questions and generate hypotheses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language Skills</strong> are the reading, writing, listening, and speaking skills students need to learn.</td>
<td>Students will read and determine a main idea. Students will write an explanation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grammar or Language Structures</strong> can be taught when they are prevalent in the written or spoken discourse of the class.</td>
<td>Students will use adverbs when drafting their report. Students will recognize imperative sentences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Lesson Tasks** involve identifying language that is embedded in a single lesson and turning it into explicit instruction in language. Students will be able to read and summarize a text passage with peers and then teach the main information to another student.

**Language Learning Strategies** may include corrective strategies (reread confusing text), self-monitoring strategies (make and confirm predictions), pre-reading strategies (relate to personal experience), or language practice strategies (repeat or rehearse phrases, visualize). Students will be able to confirm their responses to text questions with a peer. Students will be able to represent data graphically.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Listening</th>
<th>Speaking</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>act</td>
<td>agree/disagree</td>
<td>discover</td>
<td>ask and answer questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arrange</td>
<td>answer/ask</td>
<td>distinguish</td>
<td>brainstorm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distinguish</td>
<td>converse</td>
<td>explore</td>
<td>classify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duplicate</td>
<td>debate</td>
<td>find</td>
<td>collect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>categorize</td>
<td>define</td>
<td>find specific</td>
<td>compare/contrast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>choose</td>
<td>describe</td>
<td>info</td>
<td>create</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>copy</td>
<td>discuss</td>
<td>identify</td>
<td>describe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>follow</td>
<td>explain</td>
<td>infer</td>
<td>edit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>directions</td>
<td>express</td>
<td>interpret</td>
<td>evaluate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>identify</td>
<td>give</td>
<td>locate</td>
<td>explain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indicate</td>
<td>instructions</td>
<td>make</td>
<td>illustrate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>label</td>
<td>identify</td>
<td>connections</td>
<td>journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>listen</td>
<td>name</td>
<td>match</td>
<td>label</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>match</td>
<td>predict</td>
<td>preview</td>
<td>list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>order</td>
<td>pronounce</td>
<td>predict</td>
<td>order/organize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>point</td>
<td>rehearse</td>
<td>read</td>
<td>record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recognize</td>
<td>repeat</td>
<td>read aloud</td>
<td>revise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role play</td>
<td>rephrase</td>
<td>skim</td>
<td>state &amp; justify opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>show</td>
<td>respond</td>
<td></td>
<td>summarize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sort</td>
<td>restate</td>
<td></td>
<td>support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tell</td>
<td>share</td>
<td></td>
<td>write/take notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>summarize</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Language objectives can be **process** oriented: explore, listen to, recognize, discuss, express, practice OR **performance** oriented: define, write, paraphrase, argue, complete, read and respond

### 3 Parts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Function</th>
<th>Action verb appropriate for an ELP level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Content related to what is taught at grade level w/ standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Scaffold necessary for the ELL to demonstrate understanding through language</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example: Make predictions from illustrated text using personal experiences.

*Adapted from Making Content Comprehensible for English Language Learners by Echevaria, Short and Vogt*
Name ____________________________ Date ____________________________

**KWL Chart**

Before you begin your research, list details in the first two columns. Fill in the last column after completing your research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>What I Know</th>
<th>What I Want to Know</th>
<th>What I Learned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### ADAPTED SIOP QUESTIONNAIRE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson Preparation</th>
<th>Highly Evident</th>
<th>Mostly Evident</th>
<th>Somewhat Evident</th>
<th>Rarely Evident</th>
<th>Not Evident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Content objectives are clearly explained, displayed and reviewed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Language objectives are clearly explained, displayed and reviewed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Content concepts are appropriate for the age of the students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Supplementary used often to make the lesson clear and meaningful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Content made for all students levels of skill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Meaningful activities that include lesson concepts with language practice for reading, writing, listening and speaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building Background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Concepts linked clearly to students background experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Links clearly made between past learning and new concepts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Key vocabulary made clear and repeated in the lessons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensible Input</td>
<td>Highly Evident</td>
<td>Mostly Evident</td>
<td>Somewhat Evident</td>
<td>Rarely Evident</td>
<td>Not Evident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Speech appropriate for students ability levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Clear explanations of academic tasks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Variety of techniques to make the content concepts clear for students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Strategies                                                                          |                |                |                  |                |             |
| 13. Many opportunities for students to use learning strategies                      |                |                |                  |                |             |
| 14. Step by step approach to support student understanding                           |                |                |                  |                |             |
| 15. Many questions asked to promote higher-order thinking skills                    |                |                |                  |                |             |

<p>| Interaction                                                                         |                |                |                  |                |             |
| 16. Many opportunities for interaction and discussion among students and teachers   |                |                |                  |                |             |
| 17. Grouping the students for activities when needed                                |                |                |                  |                |             |
| 18. Enough time given to answer teachers' questions                                  |                |                |                  |                |             |
| 19. Enough opportunity to clarify concepts with their teacher and friends           |                |                |                  |                |             |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice and Application</th>
<th>Highly Evident</th>
<th>Mostly Evident</th>
<th>Somewhat Evident</th>
<th>Rarely Evident</th>
<th>Never Evident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20. Hands-on activities to practice using new knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Activities provided for students to practice their knowledge in the classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Activities include reading, writing, listening and speaking skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson Delivery</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23. Content objectives clearly supported by the lesson delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Language objectives clearly supported by the lesson delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Students engaged approximately 90% in the lesson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Pacing of the lessons good for the student ability levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review and Assessment</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27. Regular review of key vocabulary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Regular review of content concepts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Regular feedback on output (eg. language, content, work)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Assessment of understanding, and regular feedback from students throughout the lesson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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