

PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF ALGERIA  
MINISTRY OF HIGER EDUCATION AND SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH  
AbdElhafid Boussouf University Center - Mila



*Institute of Literature and Languages*  
*Department of Foreign Languages*  
*Branch: English*

## **Differentiated Instruction and Inclusive Education in EFL Classrooms**

The Case of Third Year EFL Students at Mila University Center

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment for the Requirements of the Master Degree in  
**Didactics of Foreign Languages**

**Presented by:**

- 1) Lokmane BENHAMMADA
- 2) Imad Eddine MEGUELLATI

**Supervisor:**

Dr. Fouad BOULKROUN

**Board of Examiners:**

Chairman: Dr. Djallal MANSOR

Supervisor: Dr. Fouad BOULKROUN

Examiner : Dr. Abderrahim BOUDERBANE

**Academic year : 2021-2022**

PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF ALGERIA  
MINISTRY OF HIGER EDUCATION AND SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH  
AbdElhafid Boussouf University Center - Mila



*Institute of Literature and Languages*  
*Department of Foreign Languages*  
*Branch: English*

**Differentiated Instruction and Inclusive Education in EFL  
Classrooms**

The Case of Third Year EFL Students at Mila University Center

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment for the Requirements of the Master Degree in  
**Didactics of Foreign Languages**

**Presented by:**

- 1) Lokmane BENHAMMADA
- 2) Imad Eddine MEGUELLATI

**Supervisor:**

Dr. Fouad BOULKROUN

**Board of Examiners:**

Chairman: Dr. Djallal MANSOR

Supervisor: Dr. Fouad BOULKROUN

Examiner : Dr. Abderrahim BOUDERBANE

**Academic year : 2021-2022**

**Dedication I**

To my parents.

To my siblings and their families.

To those who labor in the shadows to light my path.

**Lokmane**

## Dedication II

*First and foremost, I would like to praise Allah, the Almighty, the Most Gracious, and the Most Merciful, for His blessing given to me during my study and in completing this thesis. Furthermore, I dedicate my work to:*

- *My great parents, who never stop giving of themselves in countless ways to see me successful and happy.*
- *My dear sister and brother.*
- *All the members of my family without exception.*
- *All my friends who encourage and support me.*
- *Whoever supported me along my career.*

***Imad Eddine***

## Acknowledgements

None is more deserving of our gratitude and thanks than **ALLAH ALMIGHTY**, our ever-present guide and constant guardian, whose benevolence and blessings sustained us throughout this work.

Words fall short of expressing our gratitude and appreciation for **Dr. Fouad Boulkroun**, our supervisor and mentor, for his invaluable suggestions, constant support, priceless advice, and endless patience. He generously shared his immense experience and knowledge with us, and wisely guided us throughout this venture. We are forever indebted to you.

We extend our thanks to the honorable members of the jury, each in his/her name, who generously agreed to sacrifice time and effort to analyze and strengthen our humble work with their empirical observations and comments.

We also owe a debt of gratitude to all the teachers and third-year students of English at the Department of Foreign Languages at Mila University Center who contributed to the data collection process. We are grateful for their generous assistance and patience in replying to our numerous questions.

Our thanks also go to everyone who helped or accompanied us during our academic career.

### **Abstract**

The concept of inclusive education has gained currency recently, and a promising route to its implementation is said to be differentiated instruction. The underpinning purpose of the present study is to inspect the use of differentiated instruction to create inclusive EFL classrooms. Within the context of this study, four questions are raised: (1) Are teachers aware of students' diversity, and what are their attitudes towards it? (2) Do teachers differentiate their instruction to arrive at inclusive EFL classrooms, and to what extent? (3) What are the obstacles faced by teachers when implementing differentiation in the EFL classroom? (4) Have teachers received any kind of TEFL training course, and if so, how efficient is such training in developing their abilities to differentiate instruction in the EFL classroom? To reach the aims of the study and answer the research questions, a questionnaire is administered to eighty third-year students of English, and another questionnaire is administered to sixteen EFL teachers. Both samples are taken from the Department of Foreign Languages, Mila University Center. The major findings reveal that differentiated instruction is applied in the EFL classroom, yet not by all teachers, and not to a full extent. Other results are further discussed. Ultimately, the research work imparts an assortment of implications and recommendations.

**Key words:** Diversity, differentiated instruction, inclusive education, EFL classroom, training.

## **List of Abbreviations and Symbols**

**ALE:** Anglais Langue Etrangères

**DEDH:** Department of Education and Department of Health

**DI:** Differentiated instruction.

**EFA:** Education for All

**EFL:** English as a Foreign Language

**II:** Inclusion International

**MUC:** Mila University Center.

**NCSE:** National Council for Special Education

**SEN:** Special Education Needs

**UK:** United Kingdom

**UN:** United Nations

**UNESCO:** United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization

**UPIAS:** Union of Physically Impaired Against Segregation

**WHO:** World Health Organization

**%:** Percentage.

**$\alpha$  :** Cronbach's alpha score

## List of Tables

<i>Table 1.1. Strategies for differentiating content.....</i>	<i>43</i>
<i>Table 1.2. Strategies for differentiating process.....</i>	<i>45</i>
<i>Table 1.3. Strategies for differentiating product.....</i>	<i>47</i>
<i>Table 2.1. Students' age.....</i>	<i>54</i>
<i>Table 2.2. Years spent in studying English.....</i>	<i>55</i>
<i>Table 2.3. Students' proficiency level.....</i>	<i>56</i>
<i>Table 2.4. Students' choices of studying English.....</i>	<i>56</i>
<i>Table 2.5. Students' personality characteristic.....</i>	<i>57</i>
<i>Table 2.6.a. Students' preferences of studying alone.....</i>	<i>57</i>
<i>Table 2.6.b. Students' preferences of group study.....</i>	<i>58</i>
<i>Table 2.6.c. Students' preferences of cooperative learning.....</i>	<i>58</i>
<i>Table 2.6.d. Students' preferences of competitive learning.....</i>	<i>59</i>
<i>Table 2.6.e. Students' opinions about mental imagery learning.....</i>	<i>59</i>
<i>Table 2.6.f. Students' preferences of visual presentation.....</i>	<i>60</i>
<i>Table 2.6.g. Students' auditory learning style.....</i>	<i>60</i>
<i>Table 2.6.h. Students' predilections for learning through reading or writing.....</i>	<i>61</i>
<i>Table 2.6.i. Students' attitudes to learning by doing.....</i>	<i>62</i>
<i>Table 2.6.j. Students' attitudes towards learning via practical or theoretical tasks.....</i>	<i>62</i>
<i>Table 2.6.k. Students' tendency to learn through parts more than wholes.....</i>	<i>63</i>
<i>Table 2.6.l. Students' tendency to consider wholes more than parts.....</i>	<i>63</i>
<i>Table 2.7. Teachers' differentiation practices.....</i>	<i>64</i>
<i>Table 2.8. Students' opinions about the value of differentiated instruction.....</i>	<i>64</i>
<i>Table 2.9. Students' opinion about teachers' way of teaching.....</i>	<i>65</i>
<i>Table 2.10.a. Teacher's consideration of students' interests.....</i>	<i>66</i>



<i>Table 2.10.b. Teacher's consideration of students' feelings.....</i>	<b>66</b>
<i>Table 2.10.c. Teacher's consideration of students' academic achievements.....</i>	<b>67</b>
<i>Table 2.10.d. Teacher's clear explanation of grammatical rules.....</i>	<b>67</b>
<i>Table 2.10.e. Teacher's presentation of content in various ways.....</i>	<b>68</b>
<i>Table 2.10.f. Teacher's use of a range of assessment methods.....</i>	<b>68</b>
<i>Table 2.10.g. Teacher's use of a variety of grouping strategies.....</i>	<b>69</b>
<i>Table 2.10.h. Teacher's use of varying learning activities to promote different learning styles.....</i>	<b>69</b>
<i>Table 2.10.i. Teacher's creation of a learning environment where students are encouraged to get involved in the topic.....</i>	<b>70</b>
<i>Table 2.10.j. Teacher's encouragement of students' trial and error to enhance learning.....</i>	<b>70</b>
<i>Table 2.10.k. Teacher's variation of lessons' format.....</i>	<b>71</b>
<i>Table 2.10.l. Teacher's use of different presentation techniques.....</i>	<b>71</b>
<i>Table 2.10.m. Students' reception of individualized feedback.....</i>	<b>72</b>
<i>Table 2.11. Teachers' experience in TEFL / TESL.....</i>	<b>74</b>
<i>Table 2.12. Size of classes taught.....</i>	<b>75</b>
<i>Table 2.13.a. Teachers' attitudes towards students with learning difficulties.....</i>	<b>76</b>
<i>Table 2.13.b. Teachers' awareness of students' differing needs.....</i>	<b>77</b>
<i>Table 2.13.c. Teachers' perceptions about organizing support for students with needs.....</i>	<b>78</b>
<i>Table 2.13.d. Teachers' perceptions about the time allocated to students with learning difficulties.....</i>	<b>78</b>
<i>Table 2.13.e. Teachers' perception about excluding students who require extra support....</i>	<b>79</b>
<i>Table 2.13.f. Teachers' perceptions about students' self-support.....</i>	<b>80</b>
<i>Table 2.13.g. Teachers' perceptions about working with students with varying needs.....</i>	<b>81</b>

<b>Table 2.14.</b> <i>Teachers' differentiation in the EFL classroom.....</i>	<b>83</b>
<b>Table 2.15.a.</b> <i>Teachers' awareness of student interests and ability to relate them to instruction.....</i>	<b>83</b>
<b>Table 2.15.b.</b> <i>Teachers' awareness of student culture and expectations and ability to relate them to instruction.....</i>	<b>84</b>
<b>Table 2.15.c.</b> <i>Teachers' awareness of student life situations and their impact on learning...85</i>	<b>85</b>
<b>Table 2.15.d.</b> <i>Teachers' awareness of learning disabilities and how to address them.....85</i>	<b>85</b>
<b>Table 2.16.a.</b> <i>Teachers' pre-assessment of readiness to adjust the lesson.....86</i>	<b>86</b>
<b>Table 2.16.b.</b> <i>Teachers' assessment during the unit to gauge understanding.....87</i>	<b>87</b>
<b>Table 2.16.c</b> <i>Teachers' assessment at the end of the lesson to determine knowledge acquisition.....87</i>	<b>87</b>
<b>Table 2.16.d.</b> <i>Teachers determining students' learning styles.....88</i>	<b>88</b>
<b>Table 2.16.e.</b> <i>Teachers determining student interests.....88</i>	<b>88</b>
<b>Table 2.17.a.</b> <i>Ensuring that teaching objectives are reached by each student.....89</i>	<b>89</b>
<b>Table 2.17.b.</b> <i>Varying materials to adjust to students' readiness, interests, and abilities.....90</i>	<b>90</b>
<b>Table 2.17.c.</b> <i>Learner involvement in designing/selecting learning activities.....90</i>	<b>90</b>
<b>Table 2.17.d.</b> <i>Scaffolding, tiering, compacting and student choices to adjust to varying needs.....91</i>	<b>91</b>
<b>Table 2.17.e.</b> <i>Teachers articulating what they want students to know, understand and be able to do.....91</i>	<b>91</b>
<b>Table 2.17.f.</b> <i>Provision of various support mechanisms.....92</i>	<b>92</b>
<b>Table 2.18.a.</b> <i>Teachers varying pace of instruction based on different learners' needs.....93</i>	<b>93</b>
<b>Table 2.18.b.</b> <i>Teachers utilizing learner preference groups and/or learning preference centers.....93</i>	<b>93</b>
<b>Table 2.18.c.</b> <i>Grouping students for activities based on readiness, interest, and/or learning</i>	

<i>preferences.....</i>	<b>94</b>
<b><i>Table 2.18.d. Basing group composition on activity.....</i></b>	<b>95</b>
<b><i>Table 2.18.e. Teachers structuring classroom environment to support individual or group activities.....</i></b>	<b>95</b>
<b><i>Table 2.18.f. Provision of tasks that require applying knowledge and expanding understanding.....</i></b>	<b>96</b>
<b><i>Table 2.19.a. Teachers varying modes of expression in product assignment.....</i></b>	<b>97</b>
<b><i>Table 2.19.b. Giving choice for student to work alone, in pairs, or in small groups....</i></b>	<b>97</b>
<b><i>Table 2.19.c. Teachers connecting product with students' interests.....</i></b>	<b>98</b>
<b><i>Table 2.19.d. Teachers' use of a variety of assessment tasks.....</i></b>	<b>98</b>
<b><i>Table 2.20. Facing obstacles in implementing differentiation in the EFL classroom... </i></b>	<b>99</b>
<b><i>Table 2.21. The obstacles faced when implementing differentiation in the EFL classroom.....</i></b>	<b>100</b>
<b><i>Table 2.22. Teachers' TEFL training course.....</i></b>	<b>101</b>
<b><i>Table 2.23.a. Competence in teaching students with varying needs after undergoing training course.....</i></b>	<b>102</b>
<b><i>Table 2.23.b. Competence in teaching students with varying needs after training and experience.....</i></b>	<b>103</b>
<b><i>Table 2.23.c. Competence in teaching students with varying needs after extensive support from colleagues.....</i></b>	<b>103</b>
<b><i>Table 2.23.d. Competence in teaching students with varying needs after additional training.....</i></b>	<b>104</b>

## Table of Contents

Dedication .....	2
Acknowledgements .....	4
Abstract .....	5
List of Abbreviations and Symbols .....	6
List of Tables.....	7
Table of Contents .....	11

### General Introduction

1. Statement of the Problem .....	14
2. Aims of the Study.....	14
3. Significance of the Study .....	15
4. The Research Questions .....	15
5. Means of the Research .....	16
6. Structure of the Dissertation.....	16

### **Chapter One: Inclusive Education and Differentiated Instruction in the EFL Classroom**

Introduction .....	18
--------------------	----

#### **1.1. Inclusive Education in the EFL Classroom**

1.1.1. Perspectives on Disability .....	19
1.1.2. Special Education Needs .....	23
1.1.3. Understanding Inclusion.....	25
1.1.3.1. Inclusive Education.....	27
1.1.3.2. Inclusion and Integration. ....	28
1.1.3.3. Inclusion versus Exclusion. ....	29
1.1.4. Barriers to and Facilitators of Inclusive Education .....	30
1.1.4.1. School Culture. ....	30
1.1.4.2. Curriculum and Teaching Approaches. ....	31
1.1.4.3. Staff Development and Training.....	32
1.1.4.4. School Environment and Resources. ....	33
1.1.4.5. Parental Involvement and Collaboration. ....	34
1.1.4.6. Teachers' Attitude.....	34
1.1.5. Implementing Inclusive Education through Differentiated Instruction in the EFL Classroom .....	35

## **1.2. Differentiated Instruction in the EFL Classroom**

1.2.1.	Definition of Differentiated Instruction.....	36
1.2.2.	Theoretical Background of Differentiated Instruction .....	37
1.2.2.1.	Gardner’s Theory of Multiple Intelligences. ....	37
1.2.2.2.	Constructivist Theories.....	38
1.2.2.3.	Bloom’s Taxonomy. ....	38
1.2.2.4.	Sternberg’ Theory.....	39
1.2.3.	The Characteristics of Students .....	39
1.2.3.1.	Readiness. ....	40
1.2.3.2.	Interest.....	40
1.2.3.3.	Learning Profile. ....	41
1.2.4.	Elements of differentiated instruction .....	41
1.2.4.1.	Content.....	41
1.2.4.1.1.	Content Differentiation. ....	42
1.2.4.1.2.	Content Differentiation Strategies.....	42
1.2.4.2.	Process. ....	43
1.2.4.2.1.	Process Differentiation.....	44
1.2.4.2.2.	Process Differentiation Strategies.....	44
1.2.4.3.	Product.....	45
1.2.4.3.1.	Product Differentiation.....	46
1.2.4.3.2.	Product Differentiation Strategies.....	46
1.2.5.	Differentiated Instruction in English as a Foreign Language Classrooms .....	48
Conclusion.....		50

## **Chapter Two: Bridging the Gap between Differentiation and Inclusion in Mila University Center**

Introduction .....	51
2.1. Aims of the Research .....	51
2.2. The Research Questions .....	52
2.3. The Participants.....	52
2.4. Data Collection Tools.....	53
2.5. The Students’ Questionnaire .....	53
2.5.1. Description of the Students’ Questionnaire .....	53
2.5.2. Administration of the Students’ Questionnaire .....	54
2.5.3. Analysis of the Students’ Questionnaire .....	54

2.5.3.1. Background Information. ....	54
2.5.3.2. Individual Differences.....	56
2.5.3.3. Students' Perceptions of Differentiated Instruction (Teaching). ....	64
2.5.3.4. Students' Perspectives of Teachers' Inclusive Teaching Practices.....	65
2.5.4. Discussion of the Main Findings of the Students' Questionnaire.....	72
2.6. The Teachers' Questionnaire.....	73
2.6.1. Description of the Teachers' Questionnaire.....	73
2.6.2. Administration of the Teachers' Questionnaire.....	74
2.6.3. Analysis and Interpretation of the Teachers' Questionnaire.....	74
2.6.3.1. Background Information. ....	74
2.6.3.2. Teachers' Awareness of and Attitude Towards Students with Learning Difficulties and Individual Differences.....	76
2.6.3.3. Teachers' Adaptive Practices to Create Inclusive EFL Classrooms.....	83
2.6.3.4. Teachers' TEFL Training.....	101
2.6.4. Discussion of the Main Findings of the Teachers' Questionnaire.....	105
2.7. General Discussion of Students' and Teachers' Questionnaires.....	107
2.8. Implications, Limitations and Recommendations.....	108
2.8.1. Implications of the Study.....	108
2.8.2. Limitations of the Study.....	109
2.8.3. Recommendations for Pedagogy and Research.....	110
2.8.3.1. Recommendations for Students.....	110
2.8.3.2. Recommendations for Teachers.....	110
2.8.3.3. Recommendations for Educational Institutions.....	112
2.8.3.4. Recommendations for Further Research.....	114
Conclusion.....	114
<b>General Conclusion</b>	
List of References.....	117
Appendices.....	129
ملخص.....	140
Résumé.....	141

## **General Introduction**

### **1. Statement of the Problem**

In regular classrooms, students share several commonalities yet many differences (Tomlinson, 1999). They vary in terms of readiness, interest, and learning styles. These distinctions may create a challenge for the teacher. However, ignoring learners' diversity may stand in the way of a successful teaching/learning process. In other words, enacting an apt philosophy or approach to teach the components of the curriculum and assessing learners, regardless of their individual differences, may suit some of them but not all. In that vein, differentiation may solve the aforementioned issue and create an inclusive environment for achievement, since it embraces and appreciates heterogeneity. Inclusive education may seem beyond the bounds, since some of the teachers may cling to a particular style of teaching, which creates a barrier to learning and participation of all students. In other words, such practices may indeed be adequate for a specifically targeted group of learners with certain traits and abilities, but inadequate for the rest. Furthermore, even teachers who are aware of learners' diversity and disabilities, and are motivated to tackle them may encounter difficulties relating to the implementation of inclusivity through adopting differentiation within English as a Foreign Language (henceforth, EFL) classrooms. In short, the essence of the problem around which the current study revolves is investigating the use of differentiated instruction to establish inclusive EFL classrooms and address diversity as such, along with the challenges faced by the teachers.

### **2. Aims of the Study**

This study sheds light on the use of differentiated instruction to establish inclusive EFL classrooms. This research sets out to examine students' diversity along with their perception of both differentiated instruction and their teachers' inclusive teaching practices. Moreover, it investigates EFL teachers' awareness of, and attitudes towards,

students with learning difficulties. The study also explores the extent to which EFL teachers at Mila University Center (henceforth, MUC) differentiate their instruction, if at all, to address students with various needs and abilities. Finally, it aims at uncovering the challenges and obstacles that EFL teachers face when attempting to implement differentiated instruction, and revealing whether teachers' training, if any, contributes to their understanding and implementation of differentiation.

### **3. Significance of the Study**

The significance of the present research is mainly derived from its being concerned with the employment of differentiated instruction to instill inclusion in education. An inclusive classroom in which diverse students are accepted and accommodated has long seemed unattainable, yet with differentiation as a tool, such a goal is no longer beyond reach. In this vein, the study expands our understanding of the topic. The study also analyzes the obstacles that may stand in the way of differentiated instruction. By highlighting the challenges faced by instructors, the study is likely to facilitate addressing such issues, and in turn, to enhance the teaching/learning process. The study also sheds light on the role of training, which may prove instrumental to the creation of inclusive EFL classrooms.

### **4. The Research Questions**

This study seeks to answer the following questions:

1. Are teachers aware of students' diversity, and what are their attitudes towards it?
2. Do teachers differentiate their instruction to arrive at inclusive EFL classrooms, and to what extent?
3. What are the obstacles faced by teachers when implementing differentiated instruction in the EFL classroom?



4. Have teachers received any kind of TEFL training course, and if so, how efficient is such training in developing their abilities to differentiate instruction in their classroom?

## **5. Means of the Research**

This research intends to determine the status of differentiated instruction to manage diversity and create inclusivity. In order to reach the set aims and answer the research questions, the study opts for utilizing two questionnaires for both students and teachers, which help obtain the data required for the completion of this work.

The students' questionnaire is administered to third-year EFL students at the Department of Foreign Languages, Mila University Center. The sample consists of 80 students representing a target population of 211 students in total. It seeks to examine learners' diversity together with their perspectives on both adaptive instruction and their teachers' inclusive practices. Furthermore, the teachers' questionnaire is designed with the purpose of investigating whether teachers differentiate their instruction, the challenges and obstacles they face during its implementation, as well as the efficacy of the TEFL training course they have undergone, if at all. It is administered to 16 full-time EFL teachers.

## **6. Structure of the Dissertation**

This study consists of two chapters wherein the first chapter constitutes the theoretical part of the research, while the second is devoted to the practical part. The first chapter, entitled "Inclusive Education and Differentiated Instruction in the EFL Classroom", has two sections, which offer theoretical insight into both inclusive education and differentiated instruction. The first section, "Inclusive Education in the EFL Classroom", is devoted to offering an overview of disability and special education needs in order to provide a framework for understanding inclusion. Furthermore, it affords a definition of inclusive education, along with the barriers to, and facilitators of, inclusion. The first section ends by

providing a way to promote inclusivity in the EFL classroom, which is through differentiated instruction. The second section, “Differentiated Instruction in the EFL classroom”, offers an insight into differentiated instruction by accounting for the concept. Moreover, it discusses the mechanism of differentiation by clarifying the core variables of adaptation, which are the characteristics of students and curricular elements. This section concludes by demonstrating how differentiated instruction operates within EFL classes.

The second chapter, entitled “Bridging the Gap between Differentiation and Inclusion in Mila University Center”, is devised to provide a description of the practical part of the current research. The chapter sets out by providing a reminder of the research questions and the aims of the study. The research methodology is then explained in detail through the description and analysis of both the students’ and the teachers’ questionnaires. The chapter allocates a great deal of attention to the analysis and interpretation of the main findings as well as the potential implications. Towards the end, the chapter concludes with delineating the limitations of the study as well as contributing some recommendations for pedagogy and research.

## **Chapter One: Inclusive Education and Differentiated Instruction in the EFL Classroom**

### **Introduction**

Students have abundant differences, such as interest, culture, gender, and background experience. These differences have motivated the shift in pedagogical practices from a traditional teacher-centered approach, which pays little attention to learners' varying needs, to a student-centered approach, which attempts to accommodate to diversity (Kamarulzaman et al., 2018; Tomlinson & Imbeau, 2010). As such, the inclusion of diverse learners has become a necessity. Differentiated instruction is a student-centered approach that provides an instructional planning framework for addressing student diversity (Tomlinson & McTighe, 2006). Teachers adjust curricular elements (content, process, product) according to learners' traits (readiness, interest, learning profile), thereby meeting the needs of the students and creating an inclusive classroom. In the spirit of the foregoing account, this chapter discusses a variety of concepts pertaining to both inclusive education and differentiated instruction.

The chapter is made up of two sections. The first section, entitled "Inclusive Education in the EFL Classroom", begins with presenting a plethora of perspectives on disability and Special Education Needs. Afterwards, it attempts to introduce the concept of inclusion in its broad sense as well as in relation to the educational context. Later on, various factors which either facilitate or hinder the implementation of inclusive education are discussed, such as curriculum, teachers' attitude and training, as well as school culture and environment. Finally, the section briefly discusses the role that differentiated instruction plays either in the success or failure of inclusive education in the EFL classroom.

Moving forward, the second section, entitled "Differentiated Instruction in the EFL Classroom", aims to clarify the concept of differentiated instruction as a teaching approach. To begin with, it sets out to introduce the concept of differentiated instruction by offering

some clear definitions, along with exploring the theoretical roots of it. Then, it attempts to explain both the characteristics of the students and the elements of the curriculum; it also throws light on the mechanism of differentiation between the two by providing strategies. Finally, it ends up by examining the use of differentiated instruction in English as a foreign language (EFL) classes.

## **1.1. Inclusive Education in the EFL Classroom**

### ***1.1.1. Perspectives on Disability***

Prior to diving into the subject of inclusion, it is only fitting to tackle the major perspectives on disability and elaborate further on learning difficulties. Throughout the 20<sup>th</sup> century and the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup>, disability has been viewed from numerous perspectives and assigned a plethora of varying delineations (Hodkinson & Vickerman, 2009). Such views are labelled by researchers as models which primarily serve to describe people's understanding of, and attitudes towards, disability (Priestley, 2003). Ainscow (1998) describes the various perspectives on disability in an educational framework as "alternative ways of looking at the phenomena of educational difficulty based on different sets of assumptions that lead to different explanations, different frames of reference and different kinds of questions to be addressed" (p. 8). On this account, Ainscow (1998) associates disability in education with the learning difficulties that students might encounter. It is worthy to mention that the overwhelming bulk of perspectives on disability attribute the core issue of the matter either to the individual or to the society in which he/she resides. In that vein, Dyson (1997) raises the following question: "how far should children's difficulties in learning be seen as innate within the child, and how far should it be seen as the product of traditional forms of schooling?" (p. 152). The field of learning difficulties is largely dominated by two major perspectives on disability, namely, the medical/psychological model and the social model.

The medical/psychological model perceives disability from a diagnostic standpoint. According to Swain et al. (2003), the medical model provides a framework for the understanding, measurement, occurrence, planning, and justification of disability. Put differently, the aforementioned perspective regards disability as a disease which must be examined and treated medically. Skidmore (2004) elaborates on the previous idea by stating that the medical model “conceptualizes difficulties in learning as arising from deficits in the neurological or psychological make-up of the child, analogous to an illness or medical condition” (p.20). On that basis, the model deems the individual’s pathology as the main source of disability and promotes the role of professionals, specialists, and physicians in providing the necessary treatment (Hodkinson & Vickerman, 2009). The overarching principles of this model are asserted in the definitions provided by the World Health Organisation (WHO, 1980):

- Impairment: any loss or abnormality of psychological, physiological or anatomical structure or function.
- Disability: any restriction or lack, resulting from an impairment of ability to perform any activity in the manner or within the range considered normal for a human being.
- Handicap: a disadvantage for a given individual, resulting from an impairment or disability, that prevents the fulfilment of a role that is normal depending on age, sex, social and cultural factors for that individual.

In concurrence with the medical model, these definitions affirm the idea that disability is the outcome of impairment solely, and utilize the word “handicap” to further support the individual argument.

The model, however, is heavily criticized for excessively emphasizing the role of clinical intervention and medical treatment in reducing impairment, while entirely

disregarding the voices and rights of disabled people (Oliver, 1996). In other words, it restricts disabled people to confined and controlled settings, such as special centers, which deprive them from a life similar to their non-disabled peers (Gomez & McKee, 2020). Moreover, the psychological implications on disabled people can be disastrous as many of them can experience rejection and marginalization. Furthermore, by perceiving learning difficulties as mere deficits which require nothing more than medical attention, the model undervalues the role that pedagogy and curriculum can play in dealing with disability (Skidmore, 2004). Consequently, research investigating special needs education is diverted from asking questions such as, 'why do schools fail to accommodate learners' needs?' for decades. As such, criticism of the medical model questions whether it offers the sole solution for dealing with impairment, or if it is only part of a much larger picture.

As a reaction to the medical model, the Union of Physically Impaired Against Segregation (UPIAS), an organization established and managed by disabled people, is accredited with introducing a new definition to the concept of disability in 1970 (Thomas, 2002). Instead of describing disability as an inevitable outcome of impairment which is only handled through medical intervention, the UPIAS delineates the term from a social perspective by calling for an end to discrimination and stigmatization against disabled people and advocating for social justice. In an excerpt from the 'Fundamental Principles of Disability' publication, the UPIAS states:

In our view, it is the society which disables physically impaired people. Disability is something imposed on top of our impairments by the way we are unnecessarily isolated and excluded from full participation in society. Disabled people are therefore an oppressed group in society. (UPIAS, 1976, as cited in Oliver, 2009, p.42)

This gives rise to the social model, which rejects the traditional notion of disability and absolves the individual from the blame. Alternatively, the social model holds the environment and society responsible for failing to accommodate the needs of impaired people (Oliver,

1996). In an educational setting, for instance, the social model necessitates the reorganization of schools and teaching methods to meet the varying needs of learners (Norwich, 1990).

The emergence of the social model and the pressure its core ideas exert force the WHO to refine its preliminary statements (Thomas, 2002). For instance, the term ‘disability’ is replaced by ‘disablement’, and its overall meaning is broadened to include various dimensions such as, body functions and structures, physical activities as well as social participation. The social model also influences a change in the Index for Inclusion which replaces the term “students with Special Education Needs” with students who “face barriers to play, learning and participation” (Booth & Ainscow, 2011, p.41). The aforementioned changes signal a shift towards recognizing the human rights of people with disability and seek to eliminate social and physical barriers which hinder their participation in different areas of life (Hodkinson & Vickerman, 2009).

Notwithstanding its influential ideas, the social model is criticized for severely downgrading the importance of medical treatment and intervention in dealing with impairment (Morris, 1991). According to Humphrey (1994), the social model “avoids mention of pain, medication or ill health” (p.66). In that vein, the overt attempt to attribute disability to society’s failure to accommodate impaired people largely lead to overlooking the significance of medical treatment (Mittler, 2000). Even though society bears part of the responsibility for dealing with disability, medical attention remains largely relevant as it may indeed resolve, or at least alleviate, a multitude of cases.

Accordingly, the social view of disability is by no means capable of singlehandedly producing a society that is free from any obstacles (Abberley, 1996). Disability indeed persists to hinder individuals from performing a plethora of tasks even when society exerts the best of efforts to eliminate any societal or physical barriers. On that account, the optimal

solution is not the polarization, but rather the amalgamation of both the medical and the social views into a complementary perspective, which not only promotes the removal of social barriers to disability, but also values the importance of medical measures (Norwich & Kelly, 2005).

### ***1.1.2. Special Education Needs***

The term Special Education Needs (henceforth, SEN) is first introduced in the Warnock Report in 1978 to describe and classify groups of children who require additional educational support (Norwich, 1999). Although the term SEN is relatively recent, the concept behind it is by no means new. According to Atkinson et al. (1997), history is overladen with cases in which children with special educational needs are transferred into separate learning environments where they receive targeted care and support. Be that as it may, the explicit introduction of SEN constitutes a move in the right direction towards boosting learning opportunities and expanding the circle of support to include all learners regardless of their needs or disabilities.

Learners with SEN are defined and classified differently according to the country and culture in which they reside. In the United Kingdom, the Education Act of 1996 describes learners with SEN as those suffering from “a learning difficulty which calls for special educational provision to be made for” (p. 178). In Ireland, the Special Educational Needs act of 2004 describes disability as:

a restriction in the capacity of the person to participate in and benefit from education on account of an enduring physical, sensory, mental health or learning disability, or any other condition which results in a person learning differently from a person without that condition. (NCSE, p.6)

What can be construed as a mutual point amongst the majority of SEN definitions regardless of their cultural or social background is their recognition of a phenomenon that was overlooked for decades.



According to the Special Educational Needs and Disabilities Code of Practice in the United Kingdom (henceforth, UK), there are four different categories of learners with SEN, known as “broad areas of need” (Department for Education & Department of Health, 2014, p.97). These categories are: communication and interaction; cognition and learning; social, emotional and mental health; as well as sensory and physical needs. The first category, communication and interaction, includes learners who have needs pertaining to their speech, communication and language. Such needs could arise from their inability to comprehend speech and produce proper utterances as well as their ignorance of the social rules of communication. The first category also includes learners who suffer from Autism Spectrum Disorder (otherwise labelled as Asperger’s Syndrome). The second category, cognition and learning, incorporates learners who experience varying degrees of learning difficulties (moderate, severe, profound, and specific). While moderate learning difficulties may only require medium support, severe and profound learning difficulties necessitate immense support in all areas of the curriculum. As for specific difficulties, they cover a wide range of learning aspects and can emanate from a variety of conditions, such as dyslexia, dyscalculia and dyspraxia. The third category consists of individuals who suffer from social and emotional issues, which manifest in disruptive behaviors as well as mental difficulties, such as anxiety, depression, or even attention deficit disorder. The last category, sensory and physical needs, comprises individuals with disabilities which obstruct their use of educational facilities. Some of these sensory or physical abilities include visual impairment, hearing impairment, multi-sensory impairments (a combination of visual and hearing disabilities). Learners who belong to the last category require attention from specialists and institution members alike to accommodate their needs and facilitate learning for them. It is worthy to mention that learners may fit in one or more of these four categories as some of them, for

instance, can suffer from both emotional issues, such as anxiety as well as some physical disability.

Even though these categorizations constitute valuable tools for teachers and educational institutions alike to identify and address learners' needs and disabilities, they receive heavy criticism for a multitude of reasons. According to Corbett (1996), the categorizations delineated by SEN are discriminatory and represent a form of prejudice against specific groups of learners. Tassoni (2003) also claims that SEN classifications contribute to developing erroneous stereotypes of students with disability. For instance, they may be perceived as having lower capabilities than their peers and consequently expected to perform worse and achieve less. Be that as it may, Norwich and Kelly (2005) maintain that the use of SEN classifications, such as the one previously discussed is by no means optional. To tackle learning difficulties and help learners, the difficulties themselves must be labelled and students must be categorized accordingly.

### ***1.1.3. Understanding Inclusion***

In spite of having a multitude of definitions, no specific delineation has been agreed on regarding the concept of inclusion. According to Mitchell (2005), previously presented definitions of inclusion demarcate the concept from a variety of social and cultural perspectives according to the country and society from which they emanate. Having said that, a broad conceptualization can be presented as to what inclusion generally refers to. As stated in the Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary, the word inclusion refers to "the fact or policy of providing equal opportunities and resources for people who might otherwise not get them, for example people who are disabled or belong to minority groups" (Hornby, 2004, p.785). Another definition from Forest and Pearpoint (1992) provides a more detailed view of the concept by stating that:

Inclusion means inclusion! It means affiliation, combination, comprisal, enclosure, involvement, surrounding. It means WITH... Inclusion means BEING WITH one another and caring for one another. It means inviting parents, students and community members to be part of a new culture, a new reality. Inclusion means joining with new and exciting educational concepts (cooperative education, adult education, whole language, computer technology, critical thinking). Inclusion means inviting those who have been left out (in any way) to come in, and asking them to help design new systems that encourage every person to participate to the fullness of their capacity - as partners and as members. (p.1)

As is evident from the previous quotation, Forest and Pearpoint (1992) define inclusion in terms of a number of social values, the likes of empathy towards, and acceptance of, diverse and rejected members of the community. They also emphasize what practical actions inclusion entails, such as providing assistance and creating a better environment that accommodates precluded people. Forest and Pearpoint (1992) also highlight the role that society and culture play in realizing inclusion via promoting a sense of togetherness rather than division.

The aforementioned principles are also shown to be instrumental when inaugurating inclusion to an educational setting. According to Sebba and Ainscow (1996), inclusion constitutes the process through which educational institutions respond to individual learners' differences, diversity, and needs by restructuring their organization, ideologies, and policies. In the same vein, Ainscow (2005) defines inclusion from an educational standpoint as a process which is mainly concerned with the detection and elimination of barriers that hinder the academic involvement, participation, and success of marginalized groups of learners. Mitchell (2005) describes inclusion in education as the entitlement to a full membership in academic institutions as well as to the individualized support, services and measures that such establishments provide. What is evident from the previous delineations is that inclusion goes beyond celebrating diversity and accepting heterogeneity to include well-informed measures which instill valid change at the academic as well as the societal levels.

### **1.1.3.1. Inclusive Education**

Much controversy surrounds the concept of inclusive education as it can be defined from a multitude of perspectives. According to UNESCO (2005), inclusive education is defined as:

a process of addressing and responding to the diversity of needs of all learners through increasing participation in learning, cultures and communities, and reducing exclusion within and from education. It involves changes and modifications in content, approaches, structures and strategies, with a common vision which covers all children of the appropriate age range and a conviction that it is the responsibility of the regular system to educate all children. (p. 13)

The previously-cited definition emphasizes the idea that inclusive education responds to learners' diversity and needs through increasing incorporation rather than marginalization. Moreover, the definition details the various ways in which inclusive education modifies the pre-existing educational system including content, approaches, strategies, and structures to accommodate all learners of varying needs. It is worth mentioning that the initial understanding of inclusive education has undergone change over time. At first, inclusive education is perceived to serve disabled learners only, yet the concept broadens to tackle diversity in general, be that in race, social class, ethnicity, gender, or disabilities (Mittler, 2005).

One of the most heated arguments concerning inclusive education pertains to the institutions in which learning takes place and to how inclusive they truly are (Ellis et al, 2008). Organizations such as Education for All (EFA) and Inclusion International (II), which promote full inclusion, suggest that any form of special schools that separate learners with SEN from their non-disabled peers should face permanent closure. This idea stems from numerous human rights principles which argue that mainstream school is a fundamental right to all learners, regardless of their special needs and disabilities.

The human rights argument, however, is in itself a counter argument for other scholars who affirm that it is inhumane to close special schools and deprive disabled learners from an

environment that is specifically designed to accommodate their needs (Warnock, 2005). Farrell (2000) calls for what he describes as ‘educational inclusion’ instead of ‘mainstream inclusion’:

This concept is not dependent on where the education takes place and is to some degree related to the idea of a curriculum entitlement for all [...] ‘Educational inclusion’ applies to all venues and enhances the aims of ‘inclusion in the community’ as a reinforcement of statutory, full-time education through appropriate placements, and gives parents the opportunity to express preferences for the education of their children which are not constrained by the belief that mainstream placements are necessarily the most appropriate. (p.38)

Herein, Farrell (2000) affirms that any decision about which educational setting is better for learners with disability should be based on the appropriateness of that institution to accommodate their needs instead of the human rights policy of mainstream education, which may propel them into a learning environment that is not equipped to support them. In concurrence with this viewpoint, Hornby (1999) raises the following question: “is it more important for a child to be educated in the local school, or to be educated well?” (p. 153). Hornby (1999) argues that, unlike responsible inclusion, full/radical inclusion does not take into account the fact that mainstream institutions struggle to appropriately accommodate learners’ needs. As a resolution to the aforementioned debate, Hornby (1999) calls for a moderate version of responsible inclusion in which mainstream educational institutions adopt a multitude of provisions to accommodate the vast array of learners’ needs.

### **1.1.3.2. Inclusion and Integration.**

Upon perceiving the terms ‘inclusion’ and ‘integration’, one might assume that the two terms are synonymous, and while this proves to be the case in a multitude of contexts, their terminology in education implies some differences. The term ‘integration’ appears in the 1978 Warnock Report of de-segregation practices in the UK to denote a plethora of arrangements made for students with SEN in mainstream educational institutions (Thomas et al, 1998). Integration herein by no means indicates altering the educational system as whole to

accommodate learners' needs (Mittler, 2000). Instead, it means that educational institutions adopt and adapt learners to a pre-existing and preset environment. According to Vislie (2003), the main difference between integration and inclusion is that the former is:

being linked to system reforms [...] integration did not have much focus on teaching and learning or on classroom processes. Integration policies took mostly for granted that reforms at the system level would have an effect on teaching and learning as classroom practice. (p. 20)

On the other hand, inclusion entails profound system reforms of schools' educational policy, working curriculum, assessment techniques, as well as other measures (Walker, 1995). Put simply, inclusion denotes adapting the educational system to learners' special needs, while integration purports adapting learners to the educational system.

The linguistic shift from 'integration' to 'inclusion' is acknowledged by UNESCO in 1994 at the World Conference on Special Needs Education in Salamanca, Spain. The reason behind such a change constitutes an attempt to minimize discrimination in educational settings, provide learning opportunities, and improve the effectiveness of education (Vislie, 2003). The conference statement affirms children's right to education and acknowledges their differences, be that in character, interest, ability, or learning needs (UNESCO, 1994). Moreover, it emphasizes the importance of adopting an inclusive orientation to create a discrimination-free environment that is modelled in every sense to accommodate all learners.

### **1.1.3.3. Inclusion versus Exclusion.**

Inclusion as a concept is largely perceived in opposition to exclusion. According to Booth (1999), inclusion incorporates two interrelated dimensions or processes: "It is the process of increasing the participation of learners in and reducing their exclusion from the curricula, cultures and communities of neighbourhood mainstream centers of learning" (p. 164). Booth maintains that inclusion is realized by identifying exclusive measures against

groups of learners and countering them. As such, the two concepts are exclusive of one another, and the presence of one would instinctively denote the absence of the other.

#### ***1.1.4. Barriers to and Facilitators of Inclusive Education***

From a practical standpoint, the successful implementation of inclusive education depends upon a multitude of factors, such as school culture, curriculum and teaching approach, staff development and training, school environment and resources, parental involvement and collaboration, as well as teachers' attitude.

##### **1.1.4.1. School Culture.**

One of the most influential factors in the success or failure of inclusive education is school culture. According to Eredics (2018), school culture constitutes “the collective norms, attitudes, ideals and behaviours that characterize a school and are demonstrated by school leadership, teachers, students and the larger community” (p. 16). On that account, it can be construed that school culture is mainly related to the guiding beliefs, principles, and rules which govern the organization and operation of an educational community. As such, inclusion can by no means be achieved if an educational institution does not value diversity and perceive it as an asset rather than a disadvantage (Ainscow et al, 2013). If such values are upheld, however, the school environment will be affable to diversity. An astoundingly effective tool for instilling such values and culture is raising people's awareness of learners' differences and needs (Braunsteiner & Mariano-Lapidus, 2014). Consequently, learners and teachers alike can be more accepting and tolerant of previously neglected and excluded groups.

Research investigating the influence of school culture emphasizes the importance of leadership in developing an inclusive culture and instigating the necessary reforms to instill the change in educational institutions (Harris, 1992; Hargreaves & Hopkins, 2005). Upon analyzing a multitude of research findings about school culture, Hunt and Goetz (1997)

identify two crucial factors in promoting an inclusive culture in educational settings. The factors are: (a) having a morally-driven commitment to children, and (b) having a consensus among the institutional staff about a set of values and rules which implement and strengthen the inclusive culture. Zoller et al. (1999) also emphasized similar factors, such as the role that an inclusive leader can play in promoting an inclusive culture, managing staff and professional training, as well as strengthening the bonds between learners' parents and the society in general.

#### **1.1.4.2. Curriculum and Teaching Approaches.**

It cannot be denied that curriculum constitutes a critical factor in the success or failure of inclusive education. According to UNESCO (2004), curriculum denotes “what is learned and what is taught; how it is delivered; how it is assessed; and the resources used” (p. 13). As such, what the word curriculum stands for extends far beyond the content taught to learners and how academic progress is measured alone. It goes so far as to include how the content is delivered through a plethora of teaching approaches and methods (Redmond et al., 1988). Furthermore, curricula reflect the cultural norms of the society in which they are used. It is believed that the nature of the curriculum determines whether it is inclusive or integrative (see section 1.1.3.2). Overall, integration necessitates students with SEN to fit in the pre-existing mainstream school and curriculum, while inclusion means that educational curricula require modification to adapt to learners' needs.

Having said that, curricula in the majority of cases are inflexible, which makes them unsuitable for learners with special needs and abilities (Moodley, 2002). An inflexible and demanding curriculum by no means takes into account the diversity which exists within the classroom, given its “one-size-fits-all” ideology. As such, it constitutes an enormous barrier to the successful implementation of inclusive education. Jackson et al. (2001) details two categories of barriers which prevent learners and teachers alike from accessing the general



curriculum: Practical issues and philosophical differences. Practical issues include curriculum standards and availability in which teachers' focus on improving learners' achievements decreases the opportunity and time to adapt instruction for students with SEN. Moreover, the practical issues also comprise increased practitioner responsibilities as well as the lack of time, resources, skills, and training. The philosophical differences pertain to how inclusion is interpreted differently from one teacher to another leading to different practices, and the eventual absence of any individualized practice within the classroom. Moreover, teachers and students may perceive curriculum adaptation to accommodate learners with SEN as unwarranted.

#### **1.1.4.3. Staff Development and Training.**

An increasing body of research considers staff development and training to be essential for the successful implementation of inclusive education (Moodley, 2002; Lipsky & Gartner, 1998; Dickens-Smith, 1995). According to O'Brien (2001), a training course must consider an array of issues related to inclusive education, such as classroom pedagogy, the psychology of learning, the socio-economic factors which affect learners' achievement, as well as the cultural and ethical values pertaining to SEN. A multitude of studies investigating staff development reveal that the lack of training constitutes a major barrier to inclusive education (Winter, 2006). For instance, a study conducted by Leyser et al. (1994) compares instructional performance between two groups of teachers. One group receives extensive training in special needs education while the other receives none. The results show that teachers who received training are capable of implementing the principles of inclusive education, whereas the other group fall short of the task. In accordance with that, Moodley (2002) maintains that staff development and training contribute in improving teachers' instructional skills, raising their confidence, and creating a positive attitude towards learners with SEN.

#### **1.1.4.4. School Environment and Resources.**

There is a widespread agreement among researchers regarding the influence of school environment and available resources on inclusive education (Koutrouba et al., 2006). School environment does not only refer to the physical setting but to the socio-cultural environment in which learning takes place, whereas resources denote the materials which facilitate the learning process and make it possible for learners with SEN (United Nations (UN), 2007). According to Okongo et al. (2015, p.133), educational environments “are not disability friendly and the facilities within the community are inaccessible.” There are various ways in which the educational environment can be inaccessible to learners with SEN, leading to their exclusion (Ruhama, 2020). For instance, the physical structure may present an obstacle when it does not take into account learners’ needs and disabilities. Furthermore, if classrooms are physically undersized, the effectiveness of inclusion decreases. UNESCO (2005) suggests making numerous improvements to render institutional environments accessible for all learners. Some of these improvements include building ramps to facilitate mobility, increasing classroom size, structuring classrooms to accommodate group work, and creating display areas to exhibit learners’ work.

Regarding resources, it is believed that providing learning materials which are suitable to students with varying needs and abilities greatly contributes to inclusive education (Okongo et al., 2015; Moodley, 2002). These materials can be in the form of hearing aids, visual aids, Information Technologies (ITs), wheelchairs, crutches, as well as positioning devices to facilitate communication and movement. It is worthy to mention that neither institutional environment nor the absence of learning materials should be taken as sufficient excuses to entirely abandon the implementation of inclusive practices. According to Moodley (2002), the available resources, however scarce they may be, can be properly managed to ensure the execution of inclusive practices.

#### **1.1.4.5. Parental Involvement and Collaboration.**

It is strongly argued that parental involvement characterizes an essential part of their children's academic performance and greatly contributes to the success of inclusive education (Christenson & Sheridan, 2001). In a mixed method study, Bennett et al. (1997) investigate the influence of parents' involvement on the success of inclusive education among disabled children. The results suggest that parents' involvement at home positively contributes to their children's academic progress. As such, parents assume a role which resembles that of the teacher to some extent as they adopt a number of attitudes and practices which help implement inclusive education (Adams et al, 2016). Nevertheless, such a contribution results in strain between parents and teachers over the role that each party plays in learners' academic development. To ease this tension, Norwich (2002) suggests a parent-partnership in which both parents and teachers work collaboratively towards the educational success of children with SEN. To realize such partnership, Mittler (2000) suggests that institutional staff in general and teachers in particular should undergo a special training which provides them with the necessary knowledge and expertise to collaborate with parents. Furthermore, Friend and Cook (2007) outline a number of factors which contribute to the successful collaboration between parents and teachers, such as making collaboration voluntary, sharing resources, conjoint decision-making, mutual respect, as well as setting plans and formal programs. In concurrence with Braley (2012), if teachers and parents are to operate as separate agents, collaboration collapses and inclusive education fails.

#### **1.1.4.6. Teachers' Attitude.**

It is widely believed that teachers' attitude plays an instrumental role in inclusive education. According to O'Brien (2001), "the inside of a teacher's head is the key resource for inclusion because the starting point for inclusive learning begins when teachers reflect upon how they create educational reality" (p.42). The nature of teachers' attitude can constitute the

borderline between inclusion and exclusion. By way of illustration, when teachers believe that learners with SEN are no responsibility of theirs, they tend to implement an exclusive instruction instead of an inclusive one (Tilstone & Rose, 2003). As such, teachers' attitude can either be a barrier to, or a facilitator of, inclusive education. Some of the most influential factor on teachers' attitude are experience, institutional support, as well as training. For instance, Forlin et al. (1996) maintains that teachers with more instructional experience tend to exhibit a positive attitude towards learners with SEN, while Avramidis et al. (2000) stress the importance of teachers' training in creating a positive attitude towards learners with SEN.

#### ***1.1.5. Implementing Inclusive Education through Differentiated Instruction in the EFL***

##### ***Classroom***

It is strongly believed that differentiated instruction constitutes one, if not the most essential, tool to achieve inclusive education. According to Strogilos (2018), differentiation involves "responding effectively to the differences that exist among learners in the classroom" (p.3). That is to say, it mainly relates to the instructional practices implemented inside the classroom in order to accommodate students' learning difficulties and differences and ensure the best learning experience for all. In this sense, differentiated instruction primarily seeks to include groups of learners, who are otherwise excluded by classical measures of teaching. As Tomlinson (2003) argues, differentiated instruction acts in opposition to the "one-size-fits-all" teaching approach and incites teachers to "proactively plan varied approaches to what students need to learn, how they will learn it, and/or how they will show what they have learned" (p. 151). The second section delves deeper into differentiated instruction and provides ample details on how its practices are implemented to achieve inclusive education in the EFL classroom.

## **1.2. Differentiated Instruction in the EFL Classroom**

### ***1.2.1. Definition of Differentiated Instruction***

Differentiated Instruction refers to a systematic approach to map out curriculum and instruction for academically varied students. It is a way of thinking regarding the classroom with the dual objective of fulfilling each student's educational needs and optimizing each learner's learning potential (Tomlinson & Strickland, 2005). For many educators, differentiated instruction provides a framework for tackling student diversity as a crucial element of instructional planning (Tomlinson & McTighe, 2006).

A common definition of differentiated instruction is established by Tomlinson. She explains:

Differentiated Instruction is a teachers' response to learner's needs guided by general principles of differentiation, such as respectful tasks, flexible grouping and ongoing assessment and adjustment. Teachers can differentiate content, process, and product according to student's readiness, interests and learning profile (1999, p.15).

This definition clarifies the core variables of differentiation which are curricular elements (content, process, products) and learner's characteristics (readiness, interest, learning profile) that the teacher modifies and adapts to address the needs of his heterogeneous classroom and therefore create an inclusive classroom.

Differentiated instruction is a philosophy about teaching and learning. Actually, it is a set of principles, yet many teachers misperceive it as a set of instructional strategies to be employed in the classroom (Tomlinson & Imbeau, 2010). In the classroom context, the teacher differentiates instruction when he proactively designs and utilizes a different approach to content, process, and product to address student various needs in terms of readiness, interest and learning profile (Tomlinson, 2017). In other words, the teacher may modify one or more of the curriculum elements based on one or more of the learner's characteristics. However, teachers are not supposed to adapt all components in all possible ways. For effective differentiation, teachers should only modify curriculum elements, if they are

convinced that such adaptation will increase students' grasp of concepts and ideas or if the student needs that adjustment for academic growth (Tomlinson, 1999).

Researchers differ in the conceptualization of differentiated instruction. For instance, according to Levy (2008), differentiated instruction (DI) is a set of strategies that will aid teachers to meet each student's current level as well as push them forward to their extreme potential on their learning trail. Kojak (2008) and Atiya (2009) view it as an instructional system (as cited in Al-Shaboul et al., 2021), whereas Tomlinson and Imbeau (2010) describe it as a way of thinking (philosophy). Notwithstanding these differences in views, they all agree on the same goal, which is aiding all students to learn by taking into consideration their diversity in the teaching/learning process. It is important to note that the framework of the current study is based on Tomlinson's perspective of differentiation which is a way of thinking i.e. it is a set of principles.

### ***1.2.2. Theoretical Background of Differentiated Instruction***

Differentiated instruction is rooted in a variety of theories and researches including: Gardner's theory of multiple intelligences, Constructivist theories, Bloom's taxonomy, and Sternberg' theory (Kojak, 2008; Subban,2006; Tomlinson & Strickland, 2005; Woolcott et al., 2021).

#### **1.2.2.1. Gardner's Theory of Multiple Intelligences.**

Gardner (1999) distinguishes seven main types of intelligence: linguistic-verbal, logical-mathematical, musical, spatial, bodily-kinesthetic, interpersonal, and intrapersonal. Furthermore, he has added spiritual as the eighth intelligence (Gardner, 1999; Tirri et al., 2008, as cited in Winarti et al., 2019). Multiple intelligences are a way of differentiation that helps the teacher to determine not only the various thinking types of learners but also their preferences in instruction and what they enjoy through practices such as interest inventory (Beam, 2009). For instance, learning profile differentiation can be approached via

investigating and expressing through multiple modes of intelligence (Tomlinson, 1999). The teacher needs to provide a variety of paths for students to show what they understand and can do, based on their needs in terms of readiness, interest, and learning profile (Tomlinson et al. 2008).

#### **1.2.2.2. Constructivist Theories.**

Differentiated instruction is influenced by two main constructivist theories, which are cognitive and social constructivism (Woolcott et al., 2021). The former is introduced by Piaget (1953) and the latter by Vygotsky (1962). Cognitive constructivism, according to Piaget, is concerned with how the individual constructs knowledge about the world through the two processes of assimilation and accommodation. Assimilation is when the new knowledge fits into the previous schemas, and accommodation is when the new knowledge needs to be adjusted in order to fit. During the process of accommodation, teachers need to facilitate the process. As for, social constructivism, according to Vygotsky, it is centered on learners' social interactions and their personal critical thinking processes. Vygotsky's main theory is the zone of proximal development (ZPD). In ZPD, a student can learn new concepts with the assistance of the teacher. Both constructivism theories require an interactive environment for learning (as cited in Kalina & Powell, 2009). Differentiated instruction is a student-centered approach that uses a variety of classroom management including individual work, group work, or whole class work. It acknowledges that new knowledge must be constructed on prior knowledge in which the teacher proactively prepares the lesson to meet the needs of the students in terms of readiness, interest and learning profile (Tomlinson, 2017). Thus, they are the basic principles to create a constructivist learning environment.

#### **1.2.2.3. Bloom's Taxonomy.**

Bloom's taxonomy includes six classifications of cognitive skills that vary from lower-order abilities that require less mental processing to higher-order skills that demand deeper

cognitive processing. These classifications are knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation. However, in the revised version, they are renamed respectively, remember, understand, apply, analyze, evaluate, and create (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001; Blanco et al., 2014, as cited in Adams, 2015). According to Tomlinson & Strickland (2005), students vary in terms of readiness, interest and learning profile, so it is necessary to vary content in response to students' diversity; readiness refers to the actual level of a student's knowledge, understanding, and skills related to a given learning sequence. As Tomlinson & McTighe put it: "Attending to student readiness allows for academic growth" (2006, p.19). Bloom's taxonomy enables teachers to reflect on the cognitive skills that their students can reach. Therefore, they vary instruction to meet the learner's readiness (Kojak, 2008). Moreover, Bloom's taxonomy allows teachers to classify activities and questions by level of complexity; thus, a variety of high-order thinking challenges are provided for learners (PDST, n.d.). Besides, higher levels of thinking strengthen the content, thereby ensuring that learners who require more time than their peers to develop their content knowledge are provided such time. Providing more time for learners who need it while offering an adequate challenge for all is a way to differentiate instruction.

#### **1.2.2.4. Sternberg' Theory.**

Learning profiles are shaped by Sternberg's triarchic intelligence theory (1988, 1997). Sternberg indicates three intelligence modes: Analytic, creative, and practical. Learning profile differentiation is one form of differentiation that is based on intelligence orientation, in which teachers permit students to work in their favorite mode (as cited in Tomlinson & Strickland, 2005).

#### **1.2.3. *The Characteristics of Students***

There are three students' characteristics according to which teachers can adapt their curriculum and instruction (Tomlinson & Strickland, 2005).



### **1.2.3.1. Readiness.**

Tomlinson defines it as “a student’s entry point relative to a particular understanding or skill” (1999, p.11). In other words, it refers to the actual level of a student's knowledge, understanding, and skill regarding a given learning sequence (Tomlinson & Strickland, 2005). Tomlinson and Strickland emphasize the distinction between the term readiness and ability. Readiness, actually, reflects what the learner currently knows, understands and can do in terms of what the teacher is planning to teach at the moment. Moreover, it is difficult to optimize a learners' learning potential without knowing their learning gaps or if they have already covered the material at hand (i.e. they have dealt with it before). The objective of differentiation according to readiness is to make the material challenging for the students and then support them with the assistance they need to progress. Students with a low readiness may require more support and opportunities for practice and more structured activities (Tomlinson, 1999). However, students with high readiness may need less practice and more complex activities. Differentiation in terms of readiness does not mean compromising curriculum, but adapting the teaching strategies to make the curriculum suitably challenging for the learners (Tomlinson & Strickland, 2005).

### **1.2.3.2. Interest.**

Tomlinson & Imbeau refer to interest as, “[t] hat which engages the attention, curiosity, and involvement of a student” (2010, p.16). To put it another way, it denotes what the student likes to learn about, do and reflect on (Tomlinson & Strickland, 2005). The term could also be used to consider new possibilities that a learner might encounter which would be a source of future passions (Tomlinson & Moon, 2013). There are five goals of differentiation according to interest: (1) it enables students to establish a connection between their learning desires and school; (2) it shows the interrelatedness of all learning; (3) it aids learners to develop their autonomy and competency; (4) it enables the learners to utilize

familiar concepts to understand ambiguous ones; and (5) it bolsters their success (Tomlinson, 2017). Moreover, a clever teacher links content to his students' interest to have their attention, since it is a great motivator for learning (Tomlinson & Strickland, 2005).

### **1.2.3.3. Learning Profile.**

Tomlinson & Imbeau define it as “[a] preference for taking in, exploring, or expressing content” (2010, p.16). In a different way, it refers to styles through which we learn best as individuals (Tomlinson, 2017). Tomlinson has investigated learning profiles and noted four factors that influence how individuals learn or process ideas, namely learning style, intelligence modes, gender, and culture. Learning style preferences refer to environmental or personal aspects that may influence the learning process. Intelligence modes correlate to the kinds of brain-based tendencies people have for learning. It is based on the theories of Howard Gardner and Robert Sternberg (see section 1.2.2.1 and 1.2.2.4 for more details). Gender modes refer to the learning differences based on gender. Culture shapes humans' ways of thinking and, therefore, it affects how they learn as well. All aspects are crucial for identifying a student's learning profile. Furthermore, the objective of differentiation learning profile is to help students to learn in their ideal way of learning along with providing ways in which they can learn efficiently (Tomlinson & Strickland, 2005).

### **1.2.4. *Elements of differentiated instruction***

Content, process, and product are the curricular elements that teachers can modify to address the learners' diversity (Tomlinson, 1999).

#### **1.2.4.1. Content.**

Content refers to what we teach, what we want students to learn, and the mechanism through which it is accomplished, as well. (Levy, 2008; Tomlinson, 1999, 2017). In other words, it refers to what students should master and be able to perform as a result of a segment of study (Tomlinson & Strickland, 2005). Students vary in terms of readiness, interest and

learning profile, so it is necessary to adapt content in response to student diversity. According to Tomlinson, there are two ways to view content differentiation: either by “adapting what we teach or want students to learn” or “adapting how we give students access to what we teach or want them to learn” (2017, p.124).

#### ***1.2.4.1.1. Content Differentiation.***

Content can be modified to meet the students’ needs in terms of readiness, interest, and learning profile (Tomlinson, 2001, 2017). Firstly, according to readiness, differentiation refers to the process of fitting the material or knowledge you are asking students to learn to their current reading and understanding competency; for instance, it is inappropriate to ask a learner who barely understands English to read independently from a book. Secondly, differentiating content according to interest involves integrating ideas and tools that build or extend student interest into the course. For example, teachers help students to find novels that feed their curiosity about serial killers. Thirdly, according to learning profile, differentiation is by ensuring that learners access ideas and materials in their favorite way of learning. To illustrate, some learners may like to learn through images, so incorporating pictures in the lesson is a way of differentiation.

#### ***1.2.4.1.2. Content Differentiation Strategies.***

The following table includes strategies that teachers can use in order to differentiate content according to students’ characteristics in terms of readiness, interest, and learning profile. The first section is devoted to strategies that teachers can employ to adapt content to students’ readiness. Furthermore, the second section contains techniques to aid teachers in planning content differentiation according to interest. The last section includes strategies that teachers can utilize to adapt content to address students’ learning profiles.

*Table 1.1. Strategies for differentiating content (Adapted from Tomlinson & Strickland, 2005, p. 9).*

<b>Student Characteristics</b>	<b>Teacher Strategies</b>
<b>Readiness</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide supplementary materials at varied reading levels.</li> <li>• Use small-group instruction for advanced students or for reteaching students having difficulty.</li> <li>• Demonstrate ideas or skills in addition to talking about them.</li> <li>• Use audiotaped and videotaped material to supplement and support explanations and lessons.</li> <li>• Use texts with key portions highlighted.</li> <li>• Use reading partners to support understanding of text or supplementary materials.</li> </ul>
<b>Interest</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide materials to encourage further exploration of topics of interest.</li> <li>• Use student questions and topics to guide lessons and materials selection.</li> <li>• Use examples and illustrations based on student' interests.</li> </ul>
<b>Learning Profile</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Present material for different learning styles.</li> <li>• Use applications, examples, and illustrations for a wide range of intelligences.</li> <li>• Use applications, examples, and illustrations for both genders and for a range of cultures and communities.</li> <li>• Teach with whole-to-part and part-to-whole approaches.</li> </ul>

#### **1.2.4.2. Process.**

Process refers to the activities designed for students that trigger their key skills to make sense of the content (Tomlinson, 1999; Tomlinson & Imbeau, 2010). According to Tomlinson (2017), the term “Process” is usually used to refer to “activity”. However, she notes that it is suitable to use the term sense-making activity since it reminds us that activity is just a tool and needs to be goal-oriented. Furthermore, an effective activity is mainly a sense-

making process that leads the students to progress from their current knowledge to a complex one. Levy (2008) emphasizes the use of activities that address learners' diversity in terms of learning styles, abilities and interests. Good differentiated activities are ones that involve students' higher thinking abilities, keep their interest alive and require them to use their key skills, understanding, and knowledge (Tomlinson, 2017). Moreover, they also provide more than one way for students to make sense of content, i.e. it is differentiated.

#### ***1.2.4.2.1. Process Differentiation.***

Process can be adapted in response to learners' readiness, interest, and learning profile (Tomlinson, 2001, 2017). Differentiating process in response to students' readiness means fitting the difficulty of activity, material and assistance provided to a student's current competency in terms of knowledge, understanding, and skill. For instance, when asking students to write something, the teacher can provide them with three different versions of directions of which each matching a current skill of a learner. Moreover, adapting process to students' interest means providing learners with choices of which aspects of the subject they want to work on or supporting them by linking their interest to a process goal. Last, differentiating process in response to students' learning profile means motivating the learners to process ideas via their preferred way of learning. An example of this is choosing to work on a task in groups or individually.

#### ***1.2.4.2.2. Process Differentiation Strategies.***

The table below lists strategies for teachers that can be employed to differentiate "process" in terms of students' readiness, interest, and learning profiles. The first part encompasses strategies that teachers can use to adapt "process" to students' readiness. Moreover, the second part is devoted to techniques that teachers can utilize to modify "process" according to students' interests. The last part includes strategies designed to help teachers plan process differentiation in terms of students' learning profiles.

*Table 1.2. Strategies for differentiating process (Adapted from Tomlinson & Strickland, 2005, p.10).*

<b>Students' Characteristics</b>	<b>Teacher strategies</b>
<b>Readiness</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use tiered activities (activities at different levels of difficulty, but focused on the same key learning goals).</li> <li>• Make task directions more detailed and specific for some learners and more open for others.</li> <li>• Provide resource materials at varied levels of readability and sophistication.</li> <li>• Provide small-group discussions at varied levels of complexity and focused on a variety of skills.</li> <li>• Provide materials in the primary language of second language learners. Provide readiness-based homework assignments.</li> </ul>
<b>Interest</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use interest-based work groups and discussion groups.</li> <li>• Use both like-interest and mixed-interest work groups.</li> <li>• Allow students to specialize in aspects of a topic that they find interesting and to share their findings with others.</li> <li>• Design tasks that require multiple interests for successful completion.</li> <li>• Encourage students to design or participate in the design of some tasks.</li> </ul>
<b>Learning Profile</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allow multiple options for how students express learning.</li> <li>• Encourage students to work together or independently.</li> <li>• Balance competitive, collegial, and independent work arrangements.</li> <li>• Develop activities that seek multiple perspectives on topics and issues.</li> </ul>

#### **1.2.4.3. Product.**

Product is a way for students to demonstrate and extend their proficiency with the knowledge, understanding and skills they have learned, usually at the end of a units of study, a marking period or even a semester (Levy, 2008; Tomlinson, 1999, 2017). It is summative in nature; thus, it is used to assess if a student has learned what is taught (Levy, 2008; Tomlinson, 2017). Product tasks invite students to work on broader concepts and need more

time for completion than performance tasks; also, they are typically more open in terms of promoting students' interest (Tomlinson, 2017). Performance tasks refer to tasks that allow students to demonstrate their proficiency, similar to product tasks, yet they differ in the aforementioned points. Moreover, product assignments ought to have definite, challenging, and defined standards for success, based on both academic expectations and individual needs (Tomlinson & Strickland, 2005). Product, according to Levy, "it must reflect student learning styles and abilities" (2008, p.162).

#### ***1.2.4.3.1. Product Differentiation.***

Product, similar to content and process, can be differentiated according to students' readiness, interest, and learning profile (Tomlinson, 2001). According to Levy (2008), the practices through which students demonstrate their knowledge should vary in response to their differences in abilities, learning styles, and interest. To start with, readiness assignment adaptation is applied by extending and challenging a student's current level and considering the complexity of the materials and resources. Moreover, teachers implement product assignment differentiation in response to learners' interest by taking into consideration their area of interest when applying the required knowledge, understanding and skills. Finally, product assignment differentiation according to students' learning profile is put into practice via providing a variety of ways to approach the assignment to meet their different learning modes.

#### **1.2.4.3.2. Product Differentiation Strategies**

To differentiate "product" according to students' traits, teachers can use the strategies listed in the table below. The first section encompasses strategies that teachers can utilize to adjust "product" to learners' readiness. Moreover, the second section lists techniques for teachers that can be employed to modify "product" in terms of students' interests. The last section contains strategies that help teachers to plan product differentiation according to

students' learning profiles. Thereby, these strategies provide framework for teachers to create their own philosophy of differentiating.

**Table 1.3. Strategies for differentiating product** (Tomlinson & Strickland, 2005, p. 22).

<b>Student' Characteristics</b>	<b>Teacher strategies</b>
<b>Readiness</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide access to bookmarked Internet sites at different levels of complexity.</li> <li>• Lead optional, in-class, small-group discussions on various facets of product development (e.g., asking good research questions, using the Internet to find information, conducting interviews, citing references, editing, etc.).</li> <li>• Use similar-readiness critique groups during product development (especially for advanced learners).</li> <li>• Use mixed-readiness critique groups or teacher-led critique groups during product development (particularly for students who need extra support and guidance)</li> <li>• Develop rubrics or other benchmarks for success based on both grade level expectations and individual student learning needs.</li> </ul>
<b>Interest</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Encourage students to demonstrate key knowledge, understanding, and skills in related topics of special interest.</li> <li>• Help students find mentors to guide product development or choice of products.</li> <li>• Allow students to use a range of media or formats to express their knowledge, understanding, and skill.</li> <li>• Provide opportunities for students to develop independent inquiries with appropriate teacher or mentor guidance.</li> </ul>
<b>Learning Profile</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Encourage students to work independently or with partner(s) on product development.</li> <li>• Teach students how to use a wide range of product formats.</li> <li>• Provide visual, auditory, and kinesthetic product options.</li> <li>• Provide analytic, creative, and practical product options.</li> <li>• Ensure connections between product assignments and a range of student cultures/communities.</li> </ul>



### ***1.2.5. Differentiated Instruction in English as a Foreign Language Classrooms***

English as a foreign language (EFL) classes are diverse in their composition; thus, teachers need to cater students' diversity (Reckermann, 2020). Differentiated instruction is an instructional approach that addresses learners' diversity by adapting content, process, and product according to learners' readiness, interest, and learning profile (see section 1.2.1 and 1.2.4). The following section will demonstrate how DI operates within EFL classrooms, the strategies employed and challenges faced by teachers to address the needs of the learners based on examples from EFL classes.

A study conducted in Ecuador creates a framework that guides teachers to differentiate instruction in the language learning classrooms at the high school level (Ortega et al., 2018). The research includes theoretical considerations and the practical application of DI. To use DI in language classrooms, teachers need first to use an inventory or a questionnaire about learning styles at the beginning of the year to place learners into groups along with formative assessment to identify students' proficiency levels in order to differentiate instruction. First, to differentiate content, teachers can provide students with choices and remain flexible to meet their needs; also, they can use the learning centers approach, in which students can both read and listen to a story. This approach consists of a classroom, which includes a set of materials or activities directed at teaching, strengthening, or extending a given notion or skill (Theisen, 2002, as cited in Ortega et al., 2018). In learning centers, students experience abundant opportunities to read and listen to content and practice the skills needed for writing by moving between centers that interest them and taking notes to be discussed later in groups via the ticket-out strategy, in which they write a summary between two to four sentences about the content of the last passage they have worked on. Second, process differentiating can be implemented by using pair work based on the different learning styles to expand students' learning experiences they have in the learning centers. Furthermore, the pairing of students is

based on their preferred learning center. The pairs are required later on to write notes about their learning centers' experiences to write a summary and discuss it with the whole class. These activities help teachers in their formative assessment of students' needs by adapting their teaching to address those needs. Third, to differentiate the product, students may be offered multiple ways to write a summary based on Bloom's Taxonomy and Gardner's Multiple Intelligences, such as creating a song, acting out a role-play, or making a collage.

The strategies and the methods employed by teachers mainly depend on learners' characteristics and the teacher's philosophy of differentiation. According to a survey that investigates DI in relation to advanced students in Swedish primary education, EFL teachers differentiate content through the use of web-based materials, supplementary material, an additional textbook, and more advanced materials for a common task (Loberg, 2020). At a military institution in Taiwan, Hung and Chao (2020) employ three-tiered tasks and heterogeneous grouping tasks based on students' proficiency levels to differentiate instruction in EFL classroom. Moreover, in Taiwan, the questionnaire used by Chien (2021) to analyze elementary school English teachers' perceptions of and design for differentiated reading instruction reveal that the most used practices by teachers are station teaching, Question-Answer-Relationship, and tiered assignments. Question-Answer-Relationship is an instructional strategy for reading that includes four types of questions, namely (1) right there questions have a single response that can be found in one place in the reading text, (2) think and search questions have answers that are available in various parts of a text, (3) author and you questions demand readers to read between the lines and draw conclusions, and (4) on your own questions are linked to students' experiences and feelings about a subject (Raphael, 1982, as cited in Chien 2021). Furthermore, in higher education, Jørgensen and Brogaard (2021) examine the use of DI according to students' readiness; they provide tested tools for assessing readiness in higher education that teachers can use to adapt their instruction: a

survey questionnaire and rubrics. Furthermore, they offer ideas to differentiate instruction through the two cases they have studied, such as planning lecture themes and varying the levels of student activities to match their readiness.

EFL teachers encounter several obstacles when putting DI into practice, namely time limitation, class size, insufficient training, many different needs, and remote teaching challenges during covid19 (Bidari, 2021; Loberg, 2020). Nonetheless, the use of DI in EFL classrooms has proved its efficiency in teaching many language areas, such as grammar, listening comprehension skills, and creative thinking skills (see AlShareef, 2015; Boulkroun, 2020).

## **Conclusion**

Inclusion presupposes a multitude of values such as tolerance, acceptance, understanding, and support. These values, however, are often absent in educational institutions, leading to the exclusion of learners with special needs and disabilities. Differentiated instruction presents a solution to the aforementioned predicament as it is a philosophy of teaching that is mainly based on addressing learners' differences and catering for their readiness, interest, and learning profile. As an instructional approach in a mixed-ability classroom, it has proved its effectiveness (see section 1.2.5). However, high-quality curriculum is a crucial element for the success of instruction; and the more powerful the curriculum, the more offered opportunities in the classroom for the teacher, and the students (Tomlinson & McTighe, 2006). Moreover, it is considered the other half of instruction besides the approach; thus, the teachers need to consider both curriculum and instruction for an effective teaching/learning process.

## **Chapter Two: Bridging the Gap between Differentiation and Inclusion in Mila University Center**

### **Introduction**

In contrast to the previous chapter in which a literature review of inclusive education and differentiated instruction was introduced, the present chapter constitutes the practical part of this research. This chapter begins with a restatement of various elements of the present research, such as the aims of the study, the research questions, the participants under investigation, as well as the instruments employed to accumulate the necessary. Furthermore, the chapter includes the description, analysis and discussion of both the students' and the teachers' questionnaires. The chapter also includes a comparison between the main findings from both questionnaires as well as the implications and limitations of the study. Finally, the chapter provides numerous recommendations and suggestions for pedagogy and research based on the analysis and interpretation of the findings.

### **2.1. Aims of the Research**

The present study seeks to investigate the use of differentiated instruction to create inclusive EFL classrooms. It sets out to explore the extent to which EFL teachers differentiate instruction to handle diverse classrooms in which students with varying abilities and needs assemble. Moreover, it aims at unveiling the challenges and obstacles that teachers face when attempting to apply differentiated instruction. The study also seeks to gauge students' diversity, and then attempts to unveil EFL teachers' awareness of, and attitudes towards, students with learning difficulties. Finally, an attempt is made to reveal whether EFL teachers' training, if any, contributes to their understanding and implementation of differentiation.

## **2.2. The Research Questions**

For reminder purposes, a number of research questions are raised:

1. Are teachers aware of students' diversity, and what are their attitudes towards it?
2. Do teachers differentiate their instruction to arrive at inclusive EFL classrooms, and to what extent?
3. What are the obstacles faced by teachers when implementing differentiated instruction in the EFL classroom?
4. Have teachers received any kind of TEFL training course, and if so, how efficient is such training in developing their abilities to differentiate instruction in their classroom?

## **2.3. The Participants**

The current research is conducted at Mila University Center, Institute of Letters and Languages, Department of Foreign Languages during the academic year '2021/2022'. Two sets of participants fall under examination within this inquiry. The first group includes 80 third-year students of English, selected from a parent population of 211 students. Third-year students are opted for due to their familiarity with EFL teaching and learning, which makes them more suitable to identify teachers' instructional practices than their first or second year counterparts. Moreover, unlike novice students who largely exhibit a variety of common needs and deficiencies, third-year students are more likely to show a greater percentage of diversity, which qualifies them to be the ideal sample for this research.

Concerning the second group of informants, the present study incorporates a total of 16 full-time EFL teachers, who hold permanent instructional jobs at Mila University Center. The rationale behind opting for full-time teachers is that they are usually enrolled in a number of formal training courses suggested by the Algerian Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research. As such, their feedback about the efficiency of formal training courses, if any, can prove to be contributory to our current investigation. Besides, involving part-time teachers in the present study would make a number of questionnaire items irrelevant.

## **2.4. Data Collection Tools**

In pursuit of the aforementioned aims, the present research employs two questionnaires as data collection tools. The questionnaires are administered to both students and teachers so as to gather the necessary data for this investigation.

## **2.5. The Students' Questionnaire**

### ***2.5.1. Description of the Students' Questionnaire***

The students' questionnaire aims to explore EFL classrooms' diversity at Mila University Center, along with students' perceptions of both differentiated instruction and teachers' inclusive practices. The questionnaire is divided into four main parts: (1) background information, (2) individual differences, (3) students' perceptions of differentiated instruction, and (4) students' perspectives of their teachers' inclusive teaching practices. It includes open-ended questions, close-ended questions, multiple choice questions, as well as ranking-scale questions.

The first part is devoted to gathering background information about the participants. It is composed of two questions, namely age, and years of experience in learning the English language.

The objective of the second part is to investigate EFL classes' diversity. It is made up of four main questions, the fourth of which sub-divides into a number of rating-scale sub-questions. The first three questions seek to explore learners' proficiency level, interest, and personality traits. The last set of questions are an adapted version of Abdollahimohammad and Ja'afar's (2014) learning styles questionnaire, which is a valid and reliable scale (Cronbach's alpha  $\alpha=0.70$ ). It includes 12 statements that examine students learning preferences. These statements can be responded to by students using a four-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Agree, 4 = Strongly agree).

The third part aims at exploring students' perceptions of differentiated instruction. It consists of three questions that seek to determine whether teachers vary their instruction along with students' opinions about both differentiated instruction and their teachers' current approach.

The last section is concerned with students' perspectives of teachers' inclusive teaching practices. It is a rating-scale adapted from an attitude scale to inclusion designed for students to assess their teachers' actual inclusive practices by Schwab, Sharma, and Hoffmann (2019). It consists of 13 items that aim to measure teachers' inclusive practices. These items can be answered by students using a three-point Likert scale (1 = Not at all, 2 = Somewhat true, 3= Completely true). The scale is highly reliable as Cronbach's alpha score is  $\alpha = 0,87$ .

### ***2.5.2. Administration of the Students' Questionnaire***

In order to gather the necessary data, the students' questionnaire was administered using a variety of ways. The participants provided answers on hard copies, Google Forms, as well as emails during a time period of nearly four weeks.

### ***2.5.3. Analysis of the Students' Questionnaire***

#### **2.5.3.1. Background Information.**

#### **Q1. Age:**

***Table 2.1. Students' age***

<b>Age</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>20</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>51.25%</b>
<b>21</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>21.25%</b>
<b>22</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>17.5%</b>
<b>23</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6.25%</b>
<b>25</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2.5%</b>
<b>27</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.25%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100%</b>

To gather personal data about the participants' background, we asked them about their age. It should be informative to note that demographic information constitutes in no way a variable in the present study, but it was thought that it would quench the curiosity of the interested reader. This study is conducted on third-year students. Roughly more than half of the informants (51.25 %) are 20 years old, 21.25% of them are 21 years of age, 17.5% are 22, and 6.25% are 23. The remainder constitute 2.50% being 25 years old, and 1.25% being 27.

**Q2. How many years have you been studying English?**

*Table 2.2. Years spent in studying English*

<b>Study years</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>10</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>78.75%</b>
<b>11</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>11.25%</b>
<b>12</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6.25%</b>
<b>13</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2.50%</b>
<b>15</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.25%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100%</b>

This question investigates the number of years the participants have spent studying English. As demonstrated in Table 2.2, since they are third-year students, most respondents (78.75%) have been learning English for ten years. However, nine of the participants (11.25%) have been studying it for eleven years, and five of them (6.25%) have spent twelve years. The reminder are two respondents (2.50%) with thirteen years, and only one for fifteen years long.



### 2.5.3.2. Individual Differences.

#### Q3. What is your proficiency level in English?

*Table 2.3. Students' proficiency level*

Option	Number	Percentage
Average	66	82.50%
High	11	13.75%
Low	3	3.75%
Total	80	100%

This question aims to examine learners' proficiency level in English to show students' diversity in terms of proficiency. We can notice from the results in Table 2.3 that 82.50 % of learners have an average level, and eleven students (13.75%) have a rather high proficiency level; however, 3.75% (three students) consider their level as low. Thus, this indicates diversity in students' proficiency levels, which EFL teachers need to embrace when teaching.

#### Q4. Was studying English your choice?

*Table 2.4. Students' choices of studying English*

Option	Number	Percentage
Yes	72	90%
No	8	10%
Total	80	100%

This question seeks to find out whether or not students are interested in learning English. As presented in the table, most respondents (90 %) chose to study English, while 8 students (10%) did not. Thereby, the results suggest that the majority of the students are interested and motivated to learn English.

**Q5. Are you extrovert or introvert?***Table 2.5. Students' personality characteristic*

<b>Option</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Extrovert</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>57.5%</b>
<b>Introvert</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>42.5%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100%</b>

The purpose of this question is to examine students' personality traits. The findings shown in the above table indicate that forty-six students (57.50%) are extroverts, while thirty-four (42.50%) are rather introverts. These results reveal differences in students' personalities; thus, the targeted EFL classes are diverse in their composition.

**Q6.** This question consists of twelve rating-scale items examine students' preferences for learning.

**Q6.a. Most of the time, I prefer to study alone.**

*Table 2.6.a. Students' preferences of studying alone*

<b>Option</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8.75%</b>
<b>Disagree</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>20%</b>
<b>Agree</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>36.25%</b>
<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>35%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100%</b>

The statement aforementioned seeks to find out whether or not students prefer to study individually. As presented in Table 2.6.a, 29 students (36.25%) agree with the idea of studying alone, and 28 of them (35%) strongly agree. However, (20%) out of 80 students

disagree in that they do not prefer to study alone, and seven (8.75%) of them strongly disagree.

**Q6.b. Most of the time, I prefer to study with other students.**

*Table 2.6.b. Students' preferences of group study*

<b>Option</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>15%</b>
<b>Disagree</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>33.75%</b>
<b>Agree</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>42.50%</b>
<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8.75%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100%</b>

The second rating-scale statement aims at determining whether or not students prefer to study with others. As shown in the above table, 34 students (42.50%) agree with the above statement, and 7 students (8.75%) strongly agree. Nonetheless, 27 students, representing a percentage of 33.75%, disagree with the idea of group study, while 12 (15%) of them disagree strongly.

**Q6.c. Most of the time, I prefer cooperative learning.**

*Table 2.6.c. Students' preferences of cooperative learning*

<b>Option</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5%</b>
<b>Disagree</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>30%</b>
<b>Agree</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>58.75%</b>
<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6.25%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100%</b>

This statement investigates whether students prefer to cooperate with their peers in the learning process. The findings presented in the above table indicate that 47 students (58.75%) agree that they prefer cooperative learning, and 5 learners (6.25%) strongly agree with that.

Contrariwise, 24 students, who constitute 30% of the whole sample, disagree with the preference of cooperative learning, and 4 students (5%) disagree totally.

**Q6.d. Most of the time, I prefer competitive learning**

*Table 2.6.d. Students' preferences of competitive learning*

<b>Option</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6.25%</b>
<b>Disagree</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>30%</b>
<b>Agree</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>46.25%</b>
<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>17.50%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100%</b>

The statement above seeks to determine if students prefer to compete with their peers in the learning process. As demonstrated in Table 2.6.d, 37 students (46.25%) show their agreement with preferring competitive learning, and 14 students, who represent 17.50% of the whole sample, indicate their strong agreement. However, 24 out of 80 students (30%) disagree with the aforementioned statement, and 5 of them (6.25%) strongly disagree.

**Q6.e. Most of the time, I create a mental picture of what I study.**

*Table 2.6.e. Students' opinions about mental imagery learning*

<b>Option</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>Disagree</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>12.50%</b>
<b>Agree</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>55%</b>
<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>32.50%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100%</b>

The fifth statement aims at examining whether students like to learn via mental imagery or not. The results in Table 2.6.e denote that the most of the participants either agree

(55%) or strongly agree (32.50%) with the concept of mental imagery learning. Conversely, only 10 respondents (12.50%) disagree.

**Q6.f. Most of the time, I learn better when someone presents information in a pictorial (e.g., picture, flowchart) way.**

*Table 2.6.f. Students' preferences of visual presentation*

Option	Number	Percentage
Strongly disagree	3	3.75%
Disagree	7	8.75%
Agree	43	53.75%
Strongly agree	27	33.75%
<b>Total</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100%</b>

The objective of this statement is to investigate students' attitudes towards learning through visual aids. The table above indicates that most of the students either agree (53.75%) or strongly agree (33.75%) with learning through pictorial aids. This makes up an overwhelming majority when added up together. Nonetheless, 10 students either disagree, representing 8.75%, or strongly disagree (3.75%) with the aforementioned statement.

**Q6.g. Most of the time, I learn better when someone introduces information in an auditory (e.g., records, audio-books, tapes) way.**

*Table 2.6.g. Students' auditory learning style*

Option	Number	Percentage
Strongly disagree	3	3.75%
Disagree	28	35%
Agree	31	38.75%
Strongly agree	18	22.5%
<b>Total</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100%</b>

This statement aims to examine whether students like to study via auditory tools. As demonstrated in Table 2.6.g, 31 participants (38.8%) express agreement in terms of tending to learn through auditory aids, and 18 students (22.5%) strongly agree with this. On the contrary, 28 respondents (35%) disagree, and 3 students (3.75%) strongly disagree.

**Q6.h. Most of the time, I learn better when I read or write information (e.g., reading texts, rephrasing).**

*Table 2.6.h. Students' predilections for learning through reading or writing*

<b>Option</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>12.50%</b>
<b>Disagree</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>7.50%</b>
<b>Agree</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>41.50%</b>
<b>Strongly agree</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>38.75%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100%</b>

This statement investigates if students learn better via reading or writing. The results shown in the above table indicate that most of the participants either agree (41.50%) or strongly agree (38.75%) with preferring to learn through reading or writing. Again, added up together, they constitute an overwhelming majority favoring such a tendency to learn. However, 10 students disagree with such a tendency and 6 of the respondents express their total disagreement with it. Notwithstanding their importance, this remains a tiny minority even when added up together.

**Q6.i. Most of the time, I learn better when I am involved in a task.**

*Table 2.6.i. Students' attitudes to learning by doing*

<b>Option</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3.75%</b>
<b>disagree</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>15%</b>
<b>Agree</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>55%</b>
<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>26.25%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100%</b>

The ninth rating-scale statement aims at finding out whether students prefer to learn by doing. As presented in Table 2.6.i, most of the students express their agreement with the present statement either by agreeing (55%) or strongly agreeing (26.25%). Nevertheless, 12 respondents (15%) disagree with having a tendency to learn by doing. Furthermore, 3 participants, representing 3.75% of the sample, completely disagree.

**Q6.j. Most of the time, I learn practical tasks better than theoretical ones.**

*Table 2.6.j. Students' attitudes towards learning via practical or theoretical tasks*

<b>Option</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8.75%</b>
<b>disagree</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>11.25%</b>
<b>Agree</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>53.75%</b>
<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>26.25%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100%</b>

The statement above seeks to determine if students prefer to acquire knowledge through practical tasks or theoretical ones. The data indicate that the most of the informants either agree (53.75%) or strongly agree (26.25%) with favoring practical tasks over

theoretical ones. As opposed to them, 9 out of 80 students (11.25%) disagree with the present statement, and 7 respondents (8.75%) completely disagree with it.

**Q6.k. Most of the time, I consider the details of a subject more than its whole.**

*Table 2.6.k. Students' tendency to learn through parts more than wholes*

<b>Option</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5%</b>
<b>disagree</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>30%</b>
<b>Agree</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>49.50%</b>
<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>17.50%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100%</b>

The objective of this statement is to examine whether students like to learn via part-to-whole strategy. As denoted in Table 2.6.k, 38 participants (49.50%) agree with the notion of learning by considering details more than the whole, and 14 students (17.50%) strongly agree with that. conversely, 24 participants, representing 30 % of the sample, disagree with the statement presented to them, and 4 students strongly disagree.

**Q6.l. Most of the time, I consider the whole of a subject more than its details.**

*Table 2.6.l. students' tendency to consider wholes more than parts*

<b>Option</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>15%</b>
<b>disagree</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>51.25%</b>
<b>Agree</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>26.25%</b>
<b>Strongly Agree</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7.50%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100%</b>



The last rating-scale aims at determining if students prefer to study with a whole-to-part strategy. The results show that most participants either disagree (51.25%) or strongly disagree (15%). However, 26.25% of the respondents agree with the said statement, and 7.50% strongly agree.

### 2.5.3.3. Students' Perceptions of Differentiated Instruction (Teaching).

#### Q7. Does your teacher present the lessons in varied ways?

*Table 2.7. Teachers differentiation practices*

Option	Number	Percentage
Yes	41	51.25%
No	39	48.75%
<b>Total</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100%</b>

This question aims to find out whether or not teachers differentiate their instruction. As shown in Table 2.7, thirty-nine students (48.75%) maintain that their teachers do not vary instruction; however, forty-one respondents (51.25%) oppose that by reporting that their teachers actually do. These findings indicate that over half of EFL teachers vary their ways of teaching, yet a significant proportion of other teachers do not, at least from the students' perspective.

#### Q8. Do you find it a good way of teaching when the teacher varies strategies to present the content of the lesson, grouping and assessment, and types of activities?

*Table 2.8. Students' opinions about the value of differentiated instruction*

Option	Number	Percentage
Yes	78	97.50%
No	2	2.50%
<b>Total</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100%</b>

The objective of this question is to see if students like it when teachers differentiate their instruction. The findings presented in the above table reveal that almost all students (97.50%) like the idea of teachers varying their strategies to present the lesson. In justification, they stated three reasons for which they like teachers varying their strategies: (1) for a better understanding of the lesson, (2) to meet and cover their needs, (3) and to avoid boredom. In opposition, two students (2.50%) out of 80 do not like teachers to vary their strategies. Moreover, only one of them explain further by a comment saying that “I like when the teacher keep an only way of teaching”.

**Q9. Are you satisfied with your teachers’ way of teaching?**

*Table 2.9. Students’ opinion about teachers’ way of teaching*

<b>Option</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Yes</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>46.25%</b>
<b>No</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>53.75%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100%</b>

The question at hand is set to figure out whether students are satisfied with the way teachers teach. As denoted in Table 2.9, 43 students out of 80, representing 53.75 percent, state that they are not satisfied with the teaching style used by their teachers. However, the rest, 37 students (46.25%), are rather content with it.

**2.5.3.4. Students’ Perspectives of Teachers’ Inclusive Teaching Practices.**

**Q10.** The present question seeks to probe students’ standpoints regarding teachers’ inclusive practices within the EFL classroom. This inquiry is made up of thirteen sub-questions, three-point in scale, which inspect the implementation of differentiated practices from various aspects such as, lessons’ content, process, product, assessment, and students’ interests.

**Q10.a. During the lesson, my teacher takes into account my interests.***Table 2.10.a. Teacher's consideration of students' interests*

<b>Option</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Not at all</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>31.25%</b>
<b>Somewhat true</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>60%</b>
<b>Completely true</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8.75%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100%</b>

As the data show, more than half the respondents (60%), i.e. 48 students, consider it somewhat true that teachers take their interests into account during the lesson. In utter contrast, 25 participants (31.25%) maintain that teachers totally disregard their varying interests, while only a residual percentage of 8.75% of informants deem teachers' consideration of students' interests completely true.

**Q10. b. During the lesson, my teacher takes into account my feelings.***Table 2.10.b. Teacher's consideration of students' feelings*

<b>Option</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Not at all</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>67.5%</b>
<b>Somewhat true</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>27.5%</b>
<b>Completely true</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100%</b>

As exhibited in the table, most of the respondents (67.5%), i.e. 54 students, completely refute teachers' consideration of their feelings during the lesson, while 27.5% of them (22 students) partially corroborate that teachers take their feelings into account. Dissimilarly, only 4 students (5%) state that teachers' consideration of their feelings is completely true.

**Q10.c. During the lesson, my teacher takes into account my academic achievement.***Table 2.10.c. Teacher's consideration of students' academic achievements*

<b>Option</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Not at all</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>35%</b>
<b>Somewhat true</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>45%</b>
<b>Completely true</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>20%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100%</b>

By looking at the data from this item, 36 students (45%) indicate that it is somewhat true that teachers take into account their academic achievements during the lesson. In contrast, 28 students, constituting 35% of the respondents, claim that the said statement is not at all valid. The remaining 16 informants (20%), however, affirm that the aforesaid assertion is completely true.

**Q10.d. During the lesson, my teacher clearly explains the grammatical rules.***Table 2.10.d. Teacher's clear explanation of grammatical rules*

<b>Option</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Not at all</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>10%</b>
<b>Somewhat true</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>41.25%</b>
<b>Completely true</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>48.75%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based on the data obtained from this question, 39 students (48.75%) completely confirm that teachers provide a clear explanation of grammatical rule during the lesson, while 33 students (41.25%) assert that the statement is only somewhat true. In stark contrast, the remaining 8 students (10%) irrefutably deny any comprehensible explanation of grammatical rules by the teachers.

**Q10.e. During the lesson, my teacher presents the content in a variety of ways (texts, videos, pictures, etc.).**

*Table 2.10.e. Teacher's presentation of content in various ways*

<b>Option</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Not at all</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>46.25%</b>
<b>Somewhat true</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>36.25%</b>
<b>Completely true</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>17.5%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100%</b>

The data indicate that the highest percentage of the participants (46.25%), i.e. 37 students, fully refute the assertion that teachers present content in a variety of ways during the lesson, while a proximate portion of 36.25% (29 students) maintain that such is only partially true. Only 17.5% of the respondents (14 students) completely corroborate that teachers present content in a multiplicity of modes.

**Q10.f. During the lesson, my teacher uses a range of assessment methods.**

*Table 2.10.f. Teacher's use of a range of assessment methods*

<b>Option</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Not at all</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>28.75%</b>
<b>Somewhat true</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>60%</b>
<b>Completely true</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>11.25%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100%</b>

As the table shows, 60 % of the participants (48 students) state that teachers' use of a range of assessment methods is only somewhat true, while a smaller portion of 28.75% (23 students) entirely deny any diversification of assessment methods on the part of teachers

during lessons. Contrarily, only a residual number of 11.25% of informants (9 students), completely confirm teachers' use of such a practice.

**Q10.g. During the lesson, my teacher uses a variety of grouping strategies.**

*Table 2.10.g. Teacher's use of a variety of grouping strategies*

<b>Option</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Not at all</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>30%</b>
<b>Somewhat true</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>55%</b>
<b>Completely true</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>15%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100%</b>

By taking a glance at the results in the Table 2.10.g, 55% of the participants (44 students) declare that teachers' use of a variety of grouping strategies is only partially true, while 30% of the informants (24 students) strictly deny any implementation of such a practice. Contrariwise, the remainder of the respondents (12 students), forming 15%, completely confirm the utilization of various grouping strategies by teachers during lessons.

**Q10.h. During the lesson, my teacher varies learning activities to promote different learning styles.**

*Table 2.10.h. Teacher's use of varying learning activities to promote different learning styles*

<b>Option</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Not at all</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>38.75%</b>
<b>Somewhat true</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>36.25%</b>
<b>Completely true</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>25%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100%</b>

As evident from the results, the highest percentage of the participants (38.75%), i.e. 31 students, entirely disavow teachers' use of varying learning activities to promote different learning styles. A portion of 36.25% of informants (29 students) declare that teachers' use of

such practice is only somewhat true, and only 20 students (25%) fully substantiate teachers' implementation of varying learning strategies at the aim of promoting different learning styles.

**Q10.i. During the lesson, my teacher creates a learning environment where I am encouraged to get involved in the topic.**

*Table 2.10.i. Teacher's creation of a learning environment where students are encouraged to get involved in the topic*

<b>Option</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Not at all</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>33.75%</b>
<b>Somewhat true</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>38.75%</b>
<b>Completely true</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>27.5%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100%</b>

The data from the table show that 31 students (38.75%) declare that teachers creation of a learning environment where students are encouraged to participate is only partially true, while 27 students (33.75%) totally deny the application of such a practice. The smallest percentage (27.5%), constituting 22 students, completely validate teachers' exertions.

**Q10.j. During the lesson, my teacher encourages me to take risks and make mistakes to enhance my leaning by trial and error.**

*Table 2.10.j Teacher's encouragement of students' trial and error to enhance learning*

<b>Option</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Not at all</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>25%</b>
<b>Somewhat true</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>43.75%</b>
<b>Completely true</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>31.25%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100%</b>

Statistical results from this item reveal that 35 students (43.75%) only partially confirm that teachers encourage them to take risks and make mistakes to enhance their

leaning by trial and error. Coming second, 31.25% of the respondents (25 students) completely substantiate teachers' incitement of trial and error to enhance their learning, whereas, in absolute contrast, 20 participants (25%) absolutely deny any such practices on the teachers' part.

**Q10.k. During the lesson, my teacher varies the format of his lessons (e.g. lecture, free work, etc.).**

*Table 2.10.k. Teacher's variation of lessons' format*

Option	Number	Percentage
Not at all	23	28.75%
Somewhat true	38	47.5%
Completely true	19	23.75%
<b>Total</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100%</b>

The data from the table unveil that the highest portion of the participants (47.5%), i.e. 38 students, state that teachers' variation of lesson format is only somewhat true. Additionally, 23 students (28.75%) unequivocally affirm that no such a practice is implemented by teachers during lessons. The remaining 19 students (23.75%), however, completely corroborate that teachers indeed vary their lesson format.

**Q10.l. During the lesson, my teacher uses different presentation techniques (e.g. white board, flipchart, power point presentation).**

*Table 2.10.l. Teacher's use of different presentation techniques*

Option	Number	Percentage
Not at all	24	30%
Somewhat true	36	45%
Completely true	20	25%
<b>Total</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100%</b>



Upon analysis, 36 students (45%) affirm that teachers' use of different presentation techniques during lessons is only somewhat true, whereas 24 students (30%) do not at all confirm teachers' implementation of such practice. Coming last, 20 students (25%) completely corroborate teachers' use of different presentation techniques.

**Q10.m. During the lesson, I get individualized feedback.**

*Table 2.10.m. Students' reception of individualized feedback.*

<b>Option</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Not at all</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>21.25%</b>
<b>Somewhat true</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>53.75%</b>
<b>Completely true</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>25%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100%</b>

Statistical analysis reveals that more than half the participants (53.75%), comprising 43 students, partially confirm receiving individualized feedback during the lesson. Moreover, 20 students (25%) completely substantiate teachers' provision of personalized feedback. Conversely, 17 students (21.25%) fully deny the reception of such feedback.

**2.5.4. Discussion of the Main Findings of the Students' Questionnaire**

Upon analyzing the students' questionnaire, the findings reveal that EFL classrooms are diverse in their composition. Students differ in terms of interest, proficiency level, mode and style of learning, as well as personality characteristic. The findings from the present questionnaire prove to be crucial in investigating teachers' use of differentiated instruction within the EFL classroom. Students state that almost half of their teachers do not differentiate their instruction. Additionally, half of the students are not satisfied with their teachers' instructional style. To shed more light on teachers' use of differentiation, students were asked about their teachers' inclusive practices through thirteen rating-scale statements. In most statements, the majority of the students affirm that their teachers only partially differentiate their instruction, and often fail to implement its numerous practices on a regular basis.

## **2.6. The Teachers' Questionnaire**

### ***2.6.1. Description of the Teachers' Questionnaire***

The teachers' questionnaire primarily aims at investigating whether or not EFL teachers at Mila University Center differentiate instruction to arrive at an inclusive classroom. The questionnaire is made up of different types of questions, ranging from multiple choice questions to open-ended ones. It consists of twelve questions, distributed over four sections.

The first section is made up of two background information questions. The first question is concerned with teachers' experience in teaching English as a foreign or second language (henceforth, TEFL/TESL). The second question inquires about the usual size of classrooms in which they conduct their instruction.

The second section inspects teachers' awareness of, and attitude towards, students with learning difficulties and individual differences, and it comprises two questions. The first question represents the core of this section. It displays a table consisting of seven sub-questions, which probe various aspects of teachers' attitude towards, and awareness of, students with varying needs. The second question invites teachers to make comments about supporting students with learning difficulties. Whereas the latter is an open-ended question, the former is rather scaled.

The third section, which constitutes the main section of the questionnaire, is concerned with teachers' adaptive practices to create inclusive EFL classrooms. The section includes three major questions. The first question inspects whether or not teachers differentiate their instruction to create inclusive classrooms. The second question is only answered by those who opt for 'yes' in the first question. It is made up of five parts: Student interest, assessment, content, process, and product. Each part contains a number of sub-questions. The various parts of the second question seek to unveil the frequency of teachers' implementation of various differentiation practices within the EFL classroom. The third question aims at

investigating if teachers at MUC encounter any obstacles when attempting to differentiate instruction, if at all. A sub-question detailing numerous obstacles is inserted. Only teachers who acknowledged facing any obstacles when differentiating are concerned here.

The fourth section is concerned with teachers' TEFL training, and it consists of five questions. The first question investigates whether or not the participants received any TEFL training course upon starting teaching at MUC, while the second question inquires about teachers' prior TEFL training courses, if any. Those who confirm having undergone TEFL training are invited to answer the third question. This is made up of four sub-questions which seek to probe the extent to which the training course was successful and efficient in developing teachers' competence to instruct learners with a wide range of needs. The fourth and fifth questions offer teachers the chance to provide any comments, suggestions, or recommendations about their training course as well as the topic in general.

### ***2.6.2. Administration of the Teachers' Questionnaire***

The questionnaire was administered through a variety of means. Data was mainly gathered from teachers using hard copies, Google forms, and emails on a span of approximately four weeks.

### ***2.6.3. Analysis and Interpretation of the Teachers' Questionnaire***

#### **2.6.3.1. Background Information.**

**Q1. How long have you been teaching English as a foreign or second language?**

***Table 2.11. Teachers' experience in TEFL / TESL***

<b>Option</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>1 to 4 years</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>25%</b>
<b>5 to 9 years</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>12.5%</b>
<b>10 or more years</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>62.5%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>100%</b>

Table 2.11 shows participants' experience in teaching English as a foreign or second language. A whopping 62.5% of the respondents indicate having 10 or more years of experience, while 25% have undergone 1 to 4 years of teaching. Lastly, only 12.5% proclaim having an experience of 5 to 9 years. The elevated percentage of highly experienced teachers in the present study contributes to the authenticity and reliability of the ongoing investigation.

**Q2. How many students do you usually have in your largest class at this institution?**

*Table 2.12. Size of classes taught*

<b>Option</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>1 to 15 students</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>15 to 30 students</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>50%</b>
<b>30 or more students</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>50%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>100%</b>

Table 2.12 includes teachers' estimation of the overall number of students in their EFL classroom at MUC. The respondents opt equally for having *15 to 30 students* and *30 or more students* in their classrooms (50% for each option). The aforementioned estimations can be explained in light of the recent precautionary measures which limited the number of students in classrooms in order to combat the spread of the Coronavirus pandemic within educational institutions. Classroom size prior to the outbreak of the pandemic usually exceeded 30 students, and on certain occasions, the number mounted to even 40 or more. Such elevated numbers indubitably complicated teachers' duties, yet the recent measures, although unintended for educational purposes, may prove to be a blessing in disguise.

### 2.6.3.2. Teachers' Awareness of and Attitude Towards Students with Learning Difficulties and Individual Differences.

**Q3.** Using a plethora of sub-questions, the present item seeks to disclose teachers' attitude towards, perception about, and awareness of students with learning difficulties. The sub-questions inquire about teachers' instructional responsibilities, time management, and treatment of students with varying needs.

**Q3.a.** Teaching students who have 'learning difficulties' should not be part of an EFL teacher's job.

*Table 2.13.a. Teachers' attitudes towards students with learning difficulties*

Option	Number	Percentage
I strongly disagree	7	43.75%
I disagree	4	25%
I agree	4	25%
I strongly agree	1	6.25%
<b>Total</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>100%</b>

The present question seeks to gauge teachers' attitude towards students with learning difficulties, and whether or not they should be part of their instructional duties. As Table 2.13.a shows, 43.75% of the respondents strongly disagree with excluding students with learning difficulties from EFL teachers' job, while 25% just disagree. Contrariwise, an important proportion of the participants (25%) agree with minimizing teachers' duties to include only students with no learning difficulties, and 6.25% of them go so far as to strongly agree with such an exclusionary measure.

Although the majority of the respondents (i.e. 68.75%) oppose disregarding students with learning difficulties, 31.25% out of the total exhibit an exclusive attitude. Comparatively, this proportion might not appear worrying, yet it is the absence of unanimity regarding

teachers' most undisputable responsibility towards students with learning difficulties that makes any discord alarming. The failure of some teachers to identify their instructional duties could be attributed to their lack of awareness and knowledge about what instruction essentially entails.

**Q3.b. EFL teachers should expect their students to have differing needs, and it is the teachers' job to accommodate in class.**

*Table 2.13.b. Teachers' awareness of students' differing needs*

<b>Option</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>I strongly disagree</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6.25%</b>
<b>I disagree</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>12.5%</b>
<b>I agree</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>43.75%</b>
<b>I strongly agree</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>37.5%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>100%</b>

This question aims at determining the extent to which teachers are aware of students' differing needs. A considerable proportion of the respondents either agree (43.75%), or strongly agree (37.5%) that teachers should expect their students to have differing needs. On the other hand, only 12.5 % of the participants disagree, and an even smaller percentage of them (6.25%) strongly disagree. Given that a large proportion of participants in the present study possess a considerable experience in EFL teaching, it is expected that the majority are aware that learners normally have differing needs.

**Q3.c. It is the responsibility of the teacher to organize any support needed for students with differing needs.**

*Table 2.13.c Teachers' perceptions about organizing support for students with needs*

Option	Number	Percentage
I strongly disagree	1	6.25%
I disagree	6	37.5%
I agree	6	37.5%
I strongly agree	3	18.75%
Total	16	100%

Table 2.13.c shows teachers' perceptions about organizing support for students with differing needs. The results herein are polarizing as an equal percentage of participants (37.5%) either agree or disagree that teachers are responsible for organizing support for learners, and while 18.75% of the respondents strongly agree with the aforementioned statement, no overwhelming majority is established. These indecisive results could be attributed to a number of factors, such as lack of awareness of one's instructional duties, lack of knowledge and/or practice to provide such support, or reluctance to instill change to one's usual instructional routine.

**Q3.d. Students who have 'learning difficulties' unfairly take teacher time away from the other learners in the class.**

*Table 2.13.d. Teachers' perceptions about the time allocated to students with learning difficulties*

Option	Number	Percentage
I strongly disagree	3	18.75%
I disagree	5	31.25%
I agree	5	31.25%
I strongly agree	3	18.75%
Total	16	100%

This question seeks to determine teachers' perceptions about the time allocated to students with learning difficulties. Similar to the previous question, the results are also polarizing as 31.25% of participants either agree or disagree that students with learning difficulties unfairly take teacher time from other learners in class. The data are also polarizing in the second percentage as 18.75% of the participants either strongly agree or strongly disagree.

Teachers' polar opposite perceptions about time management could be influenced by a number of factors, such as classroom size and the amount of time given to present the lesson. Such factors could lead teachers to prioritize a group of learners over others. Be that as it may, some teachers may prefer to intentionally disregard students with learning difficulties even when instructional conditions are ideal.

**Q3.e. It is a form of cheating if students receive extra support; if they are unable to study independently at the required level, they should not be accepted onto the course.**

*Table 2.13.e. Teachers' perception about excluding students who require extra support*

<b>Option</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>I strongly disagree</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>43.75%</b>
<b>I disagree</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>25%</b>
<b>I agree</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>18.75%</b>
<b>I strongly agree</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>12.5%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>100%</b>

Table 2.13.e presents teachers' perceptions about excluding students who require extra support. A relatively important proportion of the participants either strongly disagree (43.75%) or disagree (25%) with the idea of excluding students who require extra support on account of their inability to study independently. It is worth noting that if both percentages are taken together, an overwhelming majority (68.75%) of the participants stand against



excluding students who require extra support. To push further, although the percentages of participants who either agree (18.75%) or strongly agree (12.5%) with the exclusionary view are statistically minor, they still constitute 5 out of 16 teachers, translating into 31.25%.

**Q3.f. Students should organize their own support if they need it.**

*Table 2.13.f. Teachers' perceptions about students' self-support*

<b>Option</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>I strongly disagree</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6.25%</b>
<b>I disagree</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>12.5%</b>
<b>I agree</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>56.25%</b>
<b>I strongly agree</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>25%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>100%</b>

This question is meant to gauge teachers' perceptions about students' organization of self-support in case they require it. The highest percentage of the participants (56.25%) agrees that students should organize their own support if the need arises, while 25% of the respondents strongly agree. On the other hand, 12.5% of the participants disagree, whereas only 6.25% strongly disagree.

Although results from this question might present teachers as inconsiderate of learners' needs, the same findings, if viewed from a teacher' perspective, may appear largely sensical. Teachers are, in no way, capable of organizing support for every learner separately even if extensive efforts are made. As such, teachers insist that students should indeed attempt to support themselves if possible. Be that as it may, such limitation should, in no way, absolve teachers from providing learners with the support that they seriously require.

**Q3.g. Working with students who have a wide range of needs is what makes English language teaching particularly rewarding.**

*Table 2.13.g. Teachers' perceptions about working with students with varying needs*

<b>Option</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>I strongly disagree</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>I disagree</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>31.25%</b>
<b>I agree</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>43.75%</b>
<b>I strongly agree</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>25%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>100%</b>

This item presents teachers' perceptions about working with students with varying needs. The major percentage of the participants (43.75%) agree that teaching learners with a wide range of needs makes English language teaching rewarding, while a proximate percentage of the respondents (31.25%) disagree. The remaining participants deem teaching English to students with special needs largely gratifying (25% of participants strongly agree). If the latter percentage is added up to those who just "agree", an overwhelming majority (68.75%) would be obtained.

Although teachers' attitudes towards, and awareness of, students with learning difficulties is positive in many sub-questions, results are largely polarizing. The findings exhibit discrepancy as some teachers constantly show extremely negative attitudes towards learners with varying needs. By way of illustration, a considerable number of the participants (5 out of 16) continuously opt for drastic measures against students with differing needs, such as denying them support or even entirely excluding them from the EFL classroom. Such exclusive measures constitute a hindrance to the creation of an inclusive EFL classroom.

**Q4. Do you have any other comments to add about supporting students with ‘learning difficulties’?**

This item invites teachers to make comments and contribute ideas about supporting students with learning difficulties. By and large, comments are plentiful, ranging from ones which emphasize the importance of teachers’ role, to others calling for a conjoint effort among teachers, students and educational institutions. A participant affirms that teachers should properly select the activities which are suitable to learners’ skills, abilities and needs, whereas others insist upon the importance of teachers’ instructional competence, psychopedagogical abilities as well as relationship with learners. One respondent stresses both teachers’ and learners’ roles by declaring that students “should be taught how to reflect upon what distinguishes them, exploit it in class and develop self reliance.” Put differently, teachers should encourage learners to explore their specific characteristics, needs, as well as points of strength and weakness so as to harness them for self-development, instead of fully relying on instructors. A few participants hold that educational institutions bear part of the responsibility. They affirm that institutional support in the form of equipped and appropriate facilities are essential in the successful teaching of students with learning disabilities. Contrary to the aforementioned comments, which mostly call for the accommodation of students with learning difficulties, a teacher exhibits an extremely negative attitude by commenting as follows: “Those students should be separated and put alone. They should have a specific syllabus and program. In my opinion, a test should be done to divide students and classify them. Then, teachers should teach them based on their needs.” Calling for the exclusion of students with learning difficulties indubitably hinders any efforts to establish an inclusive EFL classroom. As such, teachers should be trained, not only to teach in an inclusive way, but also to think in one.

### 2.6.3.3. Teachers' Adaptive Practices to Create Inclusive EFL Classrooms.

#### Q5. Do you differentiate your instruction to create inclusive EFL classrooms?

*Table 2.14. Teachers' differentiation in the EFL classroom*

Option	Number	Percentage
Yes	13	81.25%
No	3	18.75%
Total	16	100%

This item aspires to determine whether or not teachers differentiate their instruction. The majority of the participants (81.25%) affirm their use of differentiation in the EFL classroom, while the remaining informants (18.75%) deny any implementation of such a practice.

**Q6.** The present question is specifically directed to participants who opted for 'yes' in Q5, i.e., respondents who affirmed their use of differentiated instruction in the EFL classroom. This item is made up of a multitude of sub-questions distributed over five parts: Student interest, assessment, content, product, and process. Each of the previous parts gauges teachers' classroom practices in a specific aspect of differentiated instruction.

#### Q6.1. Student Interest

##### Q6.1.a. I know individual student interests and can relate them to instruction.

*Table 2.15.a. Teachers' awareness of student interests and ability to relate them to instruction*

Option	Number	Percentage
Hardly ever/ never do this	1	7.69%
Sometimes/ do on a few occasions	6	46.15%
Frequently do this	3	23.08%
Do intentionally and often	3	23.08%
Total	13	100%

As evident from Table 2.15.a, the highest percent of the participants (46.15%), i.e. six out of thirteen, are aware of student interests and able to employ them in instruction only on a few occasions. Coming second, an equal percentage of teachers (23.08%) declare that they are either frequently, or intentionally and often aware of, and able to utilize student interests in their instruction.

**Q6.1.b. I know individual student culture and expectations and can relate them to instruction.**

*Table 2.15.b. Teachers' awareness of student culture and expectations and ability to relate them to instruction.*

<b>Option</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Hardly ever/ never do this</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7.69%</b>
<b>Sometimes/ do on a few occasions</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>38.46%</b>
<b>Frequently do this</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>46.15%</b>
<b>Do intentionally and often</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7.69%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100%</b>

As the result in the upper table shows, 46.15% of the respondents (six teachers) are frequently aware of learners' culture and expectations, and capable of making use of such knowledge to improve instruction. A proximate percentage of the informants (38.46%), i.e. five teachers, implement the aforementioned practice only sometimes.

**Q6.1.c. I know individual student life situations, and how they might impact their learning.**

*Table 2.15.c. Teachers' awareness of student life situations and their impact on learning*

<b>Option</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Hardly ever/ never do this</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>23.08%</b>
<b>Sometimes/ do on a few occasions</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>61.54%</b>
<b>Frequently do this</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7.69%</b>
<b>Do intentionally and often</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7.69%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100%</b>

The results indicate that the overwhelming proportion of the respondents (61.54%) are knowledgeable about students' life situations and their impact on learning only on a few occasions, while 23.08% of them declare that they are never aware of any life situations learners experience, nor of their impact on learning. The data, herein, exposes the massive interactional gap between teachers and learners.

**Q6.1.d. I am aware of students' learning disabilities, and I know how to address them in lessons so as not to impair their learning.**

*Table 2.15.d. Teachers' awareness of learning disabilities and how to address them*

<b>Option</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Hardly ever/ never do this</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7.69%</b>
<b>Sometimes/ do on a few occasions</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>23.08%</b>
<b>Frequently do this</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>38.46%</b>
<b>Do intentionally and often</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>30.77%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100%</b>

The data show that the highest portion of the participants are either frequently (38.46%), or intentionally and often (30.77%) knowledgeable about students' learning disabilities and how to address them in the classroom so as to avoid any difficulties in learning. Contrariwise, three informants, constituting 23.08%, declare that they only apply this strategy on a few occasions.

## **Q6.2. Assessment**

### **Q6.2.a. I pre-assess readiness to adjust the lesson.**

*Table 2.16.a. Teachers' pre-assessment of readiness to adjust the lesson*

<b>Option</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Hardly ever/ never do this</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>15.38%</b>
<b>Sometimes/ do on a few occasions</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>61.54%</b>
<b>Frequently do this</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>23.08%</b>
<b>Do intentionally and often</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100%</b>

Results from this item show that most of the informants (61.54%) pre-assess readiness to adjust instruction only on a few occasions, while 23.08% of them maintain that they frequently implement such a practice. Besides, 15.38% affirm that they hardly ever pre-assess readiness, whereas none (0%) enacts it intentionally and often.

The near-total absence of frequent pre-assessment results in teachers' lack of knowledge about learners' prior experiences, skills and needs, which in turn is likely to lead to poor instructional planning. While experienced teachers are said to be capable of pre-assessing students' readiness and plan lessons accordingly, a great many beginners might lack the appropriate training and expertise to do so.

**Q6.2.b. I assess during the unit to gauge understanding.***Table 2.16.b. Teachers' assessment during the unit to gauge understanding*

<b>Option</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Hardly ever/ never do this</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7.69%</b>
<b>Sometimes/ do on a few occasions</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>23.08%</b>
<b>Frequently do this</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>53.85%</b>
<b>Do intentionally and often</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>15.38%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100%</b>

Upon taking a glance at the data, the highest percentage of the respondents (53.85%) confirm their frequent assessment of learners during units to gauge their understanding, while three teachers, constituting 23.08%, affirm that they enact this practice sometimes. A proportion of 15.38% of the informants declare they intentionally often use the aforementioned strategy, while the remaining 7.69% hardly implement it.

**Q6.2.c. I assess at the end of the lesson to determine knowledge acquisition.***Table 2.16.c Teachers' assessment at the end of the lesson to determine knowledge acquisition*

<b>Option</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Hardly ever/ never do this</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>Sometimes/ do on a few occasions</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7.69%</b>
<b>Frequently do this</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>46.15%</b>
<b>Do intentionally and often</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>46.15%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100%</b>



Results from this question reveal that 46.15% of the participants frequently assess learners at the end of the lesson to determine their knowledge acquisition, and an equal proportion admit they do it often and intentionally. The remaining 7.69%, representing one participant, affirm applying the aforesaid practice only sometimes.

#### **Q6.2.d. I determine students' learning styles.**

*Table 2.16.d. Teachers determining students' learning styles*

<b>Option</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Hardly ever/ never do this</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>15.38%</b>
<b>Sometimes/ do on a few occasions</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7.69%</b>
<b>Frequently do this</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>53.85%</b>
<b>Do intentionally and often</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>23.08%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100%</b>

As evident from the upper table, most of the participants (53.85%) maintain that they frequently determine students' learning styles, while three respondents, i.e. 23.08%, affirm that they intentionally and often do it. The remaining informants either never seek to ascertain their students' learning styles (15.38%), or apply it only on a few occasions (7.69%).

#### **Q6.2.e. I determine student interests.**

*Table 2.16.e. Teachers determining student interests*

<b>Option</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Hardly ever/ never do this</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>23.08%</b>
<b>Sometimes/ do on a few occasions</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>15.38%</b>
<b>Frequently do this</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>38.46%</b>
<b>Do intentionally and often</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>23.08%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100%</b>

Findings from this question reveal that 38.46% of the respondents frequently determine learners' interests, whereas an equal percentage of teachers (23.08%) either intentionally and often detect their students' interests, or never attempt it altogether. Contrariwise, the residual participants (15.38%) apply the aforementioned practice only sometimes.

### **Q6.3. Content**

#### **Q7.3.a. I teach up by ensuring that each student reaches the objectives.**

*Table 2.17.a. Ensuring that teaching objectives are reached by each student*

<b>Option</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Hardly ever/ never do this</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>Sometimes/ do on a few occasions</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>30.77%</b>
<b>Frequently do this</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>53.85%</b>
<b>Do intentionally and often</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>15.38%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100%</b>

Based on the results, more than half the participants (53.85%) maintain that they frequently teach up by ensuring that each student reaches the instructional objectives, while 30.77% employ such a practice only sometimes. The rest of the informants who constitute 15.38% affirm that they intentionally and often ensure that each learner achieves the lesson's objectives.

**Q6.3.b. Materials are varied to adjust to students' readiness, interests, and abilities.**

*Table 2.17.b. Varying materials to adjust to students' readiness, interests, and abilities*

<b>Option</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Hardly ever/ never do this</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7.69%</b>
<b>Sometimes/ do on a few occasions</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>15.38%</b>
<b>Frequently do this</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>53.85%</b>
<b>Do intentionally and often</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>23.08%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100%</b>

As the results exhibit, the highest portion of the informants (53.85%) frequently vary their materials so as to adjust to learners' readiness, interests, and abilities, whereas three informants, making 23.08% of the participants, affirm they often and intentionally use such an instructional strategy. The remaining participants either enact this practice sometimes (15.38%), or never (7.69%).

**Q6.3.c. Learners play a role in designing/selecting learning activities.**

*Table 2.17.c. Learner involvement in designing/selecting learning activities*

<b>Option</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Hardly ever/ never do this</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7.69%</b>
<b>Sometimes/ do on a few occasions</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>46.15%</b>
<b>Frequently do this</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>38.46%</b>
<b>Do intentionally and often</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7.69%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100%</b>

The data reveal that the highest portion of the participants (46.15%) only sometimes allow learners to play a role in designing/selecting learning strategies, whereas 38.46% frequently permit this practice. As evident from the results, a number of teachers might be

reluctant to bestow upon learners such an authority. One might well conjecture that some learners are likely to end up designing a flawed activity which does not fulfil the objectives of the lesson or selecting an inappropriate one.

**Q6.3.d. I adjust to diverse learner needs with scaffolding, tiering, compacting, and student choices in learning activities.**

*Table 2.17.d. Scaffolding, tiering, compacting and student choices to adjust to varying needs*

Option	Number	Percentage
Hardly ever/ never do this	1	7.69%
Sometimes/ do on a few occasions	5	38.46%
Frequently do this	6	46.15%
Do intentionally and often	1	7.69%
<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100%</b>

The results show that the largest portion of respondents (46.15%) state that they frequently utilize differentiated strategies such as scaffolding, tiering, compacting and considering student choices to adjust to learners' diverse and varying needs, while 38.46% of them affirm that they only employ such practices on a few occasions.

**Q6.3.e. I clearly articulate what I want students to know, understand and be able to do.**

*Table 2.17.e. Teachers articulating what they want students to know, understand and be able to do*

Option	Number	Percentage
Hardly ever/ never do this	0	0%
Sometimes/ do on a few occasions	1	7.69%
Frequently do this	4	30.77%
Do intentionally and often	8	61.54%
<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100%</b>

The results show that a considerable proportion of the respondents (61.54%) intentionally and often articulate in a comprehensible way what they want learners to know, understand and be able to do. A smaller but important percentage of the participants (30.77%) maintain that they frequently enact such a strategy. When added up, the two proportions give a better picture in favor of such a practice. Only one participant (7.69%) affirms using the aforementioned practice only sometimes. This, we content, is not quite bad.

**Q6.3.f. I provide a variety of support mechanisms (organizers, study guides, etc.).**

*Table 2.17.f. Provision of various support mechanisms*

<b>Option</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Hardly ever/ never do this</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>Sometimes/ do on a few occasions</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>15.38%</b>
<b>Frequently do this</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>61.54%</b>
<b>Do intentionally and often</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>23.08%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100%</b>

Given the data, 61.54% of the informants frequently provide learners with a variety of support mechanisms, and 23.08% of them do so often and intentionally. The remaining informants (15.38%) provide similar support only on a few occasions.

#### Q6.4. Process

##### Q6.4.a. Pace of instruction varies based on varying learner needs.

*Table 2.18.a. Teachers varying pace of instruction based on different learners' needs*

Option	Number	Percentage
Hardly ever/ never do this	0	0%
Sometimes/ do on a few occasions	2	15.38%
Frequently do this	8	61.54%
Do intentionally and often	3	23.08%
<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100%</b>

As the results show, most informants (61.54%) frequently vary the pace of instruction according to students' diverse needs. The second highest portion of the respondents (23.08%) declare that they intentionally and often exert the aforesaid differentiated strategy. Two participants (15.38%) state that they vary instructional pace based on learners' needs only sometimes.

##### Q6.4.b. I use learner preference groups and/or learning preference centers.

*Table 2.18.b. Teachers utilizing learner preference groups and/or learning preference centers*

Option	Number	Percentage
Hardly ever/ never do this	2	15.38%
Sometimes/ do on a few occasions	2	15.38%
Frequently do this	8	61.54%
Do intentionally and often	1	7.69
<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100%</b>

As the results indicate, a vast proportion (61.54%), i.e. 8 teachers, utilize learner preference groups and/or learning preference centers to differentiate their instruction and respond to varying learners' needs. A considerable percentage of the participants (36.7%) is equally divided between those who never use this practice, and others who only apply it sometimes.

**Q6.4.c. I group students for learning activities based on readiness, interests and/or learning preferences.**

*Table 2.18.c. Grouping students for activities based on readiness, interest, and/or learning preferences*

<b>Option</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Hardly ever/ never do this</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>Sometimes/ do on a few occasions</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7.69%</b>
<b>Frequently do this</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>76.92%</b>
<b>Do intentionally and often</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>15.38%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100%</b>

The results reveal that a substantial majority of the respondents (76.92%) frequently group students for learning activities in accordance with their readiness, interest, and/or learning preferences. Coming second, two participants (15.38%) state that they often and intentionally enact such practice, whilst one informant (7.69%) employs the aforementioned strategy only sometimes.

**Q6.4.d. Group composition changes based on activity.***Table 2.18.d. Basing group composition on activity*

<b>Option</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Hardly ever/ never do this</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>23.08%</b>
<b>Sometimes/ do on a few occasions</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>23.08%</b>
<b>Frequently do this</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>38.46%</b>
<b>Do intentionally and often</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>15.38%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100%</b>

As shown in the table, five respondents (38.46%) state that they frequently change group composition based on the nature of the activity. A portion of 46.16% never change group composition, and an equal proportion apply this practice only sometimes. The residual informants (15.38%) often and intentionally enact this strategy.

**Q6.4.e. Classroom environment is structured to support a variety of activities including group or individual work.***Table 2.18.e. Teachers structuring classroom environment to support individual or group activities*

<b>Option</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Hardly ever/ never do this</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7.69%</b>
<b>Sometimes/ do on a few occasions</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>23.08%</b>
<b>Frequently do this</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>53.85%</b>
<b>Do intentionally and often</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>15.38%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100%</b>



Findings from this item indicate that more than half the participants (53.85%) declare that they frequently structure classroom environment to support a variety of individual and group activities. Coming second, three participants (23.08%) affirm that they apply the aforesaid practice only sometimes, while only two teachers (15.38%) often and intentionally utilize it. Lastly, one participant (7.69%) outright denies any structuring of classroom environment.

**Q6.4.f. I provide tasks that require students to apply knowledge and extend understanding.**

*Table 2.18.f. Provision of tasks that require applying knowledge and expanding understanding*

<b>Option</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Hardly ever/ never do this</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>Sometimes/ do on a few occasions</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7.69%</b>
<b>Frequently do this</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>53.85%</b>
<b>Do intentionally and often</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>38.46%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100%</b>

The above table reveals on the whole the participants either frequently (53.85%), or often and intentionally (38.46%) provide tasks that require learners to apply the knowledge that they receive and expand their understanding of the subject matter.

## Q6.5. Product

### Q6.5.a. Product assignments with multiple modes of expression.

*Table 2.19.a. Teachers varying modes of expression in product assignment*

Option	Number	Percentage
Hardly ever/ never do this	0	0%
Sometimes/ do on a few occasions	4	30.77%
Frequently do this	8	61.54%
Do intentionally and often	1	7.69%
<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100%</b>

As shown in the table, 61.54% of the participants state that they frequently provide multiple modes of expression in product assignment in order to allow learners of varying abilities and needs to communicate their understanding, while a smaller percentage of respondents (30.77%) provide various modes of expressions on a few occasions.

### Q6.5.b. Student choice to work alone, in pairs or small group.

*Table 2.19.b. Giving choice for student to work alone, in pairs, or in small groups*

Option	Number	Percentage
Hardly ever/ never do this	1	7.69%
Sometimes/ do on a few occasions	1	7.69%
Frequently do this	8	61.54%
Do intentionally and often	3	23.08%
<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100%</b>

As the findings indicate, eight informants (61.54%) state that they frequently give students choice to either work alone, in pairs, or small groups, while three respondents (23.08%) often and intentionally apply this practice.

**Q6.5.c. Product connects with student interest.**

*Table 2.19.c. Teachers connecting product with students' interests*

<b>Option</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Hardly ever/ never do this</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>Sometimes/ do on a few occasions</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>23.08%</b>
<b>Frequently do this</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>46.16%</b>
<b>Do intentionally and often</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>30.77%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100%</b>

As the numbers indicate, 46.16% of the respondents frequently connect product components to student interest, 30.77% of them do it often and intentionally, while 23.08% maintain that they use this practice sometimes only.

**Q6.5.d. I use a variety of assessment tasks.**

*Table 2.19.d. Teachers' use of a variety of assessment tasks*

<b>Option</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Hardly ever/ never do this</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>Sometimes/ do on a few occasions</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>15.38%</b>
<b>Frequently do this</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>61.54%</b>
<b>Do intentionally and often</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>23.08%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100%</b>

The data reveal that an important proportion of teachers (61.54%) frequently utilize a variety of assessment tasks, while 23.08% of them use this practice often and intentionally. A lesser percentage (15.38%), i.e. 2 teachers, declare that they use various assessment tasks but on a few occasions.

**Q7. Do you encounter any obstacles in implementing differentiation within the EFL classroom?**

*Table 2.20. Facing obstacles in implementing differentiation in the EFL classroom*

<b>Option</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Yes</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>87.5%</b>
<b>No</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>12.5%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>100%</b>

As evidenced by the results in the table, the overwhelming majority (87.5%) confirm that they do indeed face obstacles when attempting to implement differentiated instruction in the EFL classroom, while only two teachers (12.5%) opt for 'no'. Such results are to be expected given the enormous challenges that naturally emerge when dealing with learners with a plethora of needs.

**Q7.a. If yes, what do these obstacles pertain to? (You can tick one or more boxes).**

*Table 2.21. The obstacles faced when implementing differentiation in the EFL classroom*

<b>Option</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>a-Teachers' training</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7.14%</b>
<b>b-Classroom size</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>c-Institutional support</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>d-Time shortage</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>14.29%</b>
<b>e-Others</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>b+c</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7.14%</b>
<b>c+d</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7.14%</b>
<b>d+e</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7.14%</b>
<b>a+b+d</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7.14%</b>
<b>b+c+d</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7.14%</b>
<b>b+d+e</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>14.29%</b>
<b>a+b+c+d</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>21.43%</b>
<b>a+b+c+d+e</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7.14%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>100%</b>

The present question is devised for participants who previously recognized facing obstacles when attempting to implement differentiation within the EFL classroom i.e. the fourteen teachers who opted for 'yes' in the previous question. The findings indicate that the highest portion of respondents (21.43%) opt for "a+b+c+d"; that is, the obstacles that teachers encounter herein are teachers' training, classroom size, institutional support, and time shortage. The second highest percentage (14.29%) is commonly shared by two groups of respondents: The ones who opt only for "d" (time shortage), and those who agree on "b+d+e" (classroom size, time shortage, and others). As for the remaining percentages, the participants opt equally (7.14%) for "a" (teachers' training), "b+c" (classroom size and institutional

support), “c+d” (institutional support and time shortage), “d+e” (time shortage and others), “a+b+d” (teachers’ training, classroom size, and time shortage), “b+c+d” (classroom size, institutional support, and time shortage), and “a+b+c+d+e” (teachers’ training, classroom size, institutional support, time shortage, and others). Upon giving participants the chance to elicit any other obstacles, a teacher claims that students’ lack of motivation and downright laziness constitute a major roadblock to differentiation, whereas a different respondent maintains that the content of lessons in its entirety presents a hindrance. One teacher denotes in particular the unavailability of a ready-made differentiated curriculum, and calls for its preparation to facilitate the implementation of differentiated instruction in the EFL classroom.

#### **2.6.3.4. Teachers’ TEFL Training.**

##### **Q8. Did you receive any TEFL training course?**

*Table 2.22. Teachers' TEFL training course*

<b>Option</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Yes</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>68.75%</b>
<b>No</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>31.25%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>100%</b>

Data from the above table show that the majority of the respondents (68.75%), i.e. eleven teachers, received a TEFL training course, whereas five informants (31.25%) underwent no such training.

##### **Q9. If this was not your first training course, what did you receive before?**

Only two out of sixteen participants received prior training, and in both cases, the course took place while they were teachers in the secondary school level. The Algerian Ministry of Education insists on a number of training courses, on the practical level, for

teachers at the primary, middle, and secondary levels in order to enhance their instructional performance.

**Q10.** This item is answered only by respondents who opted for 'yes' in the eighth question, i.e. teachers who underwent a TEFL training course. The present inquiry, using a number of sub-questions, seeks to probe teachers' perceptions about the efficiency of their TEFL training course in developing their competence in teaching students with a wide range of needs.

**Q10.a. After finishing my TEFL training course, whatsoever, I was competent in teaching students with a wide range of needs.**

*Table 2.23.a. Competence in teaching students with varying needs after undergoing training course*

<b>Option</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>I strongly disagree</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>
<b>I disagree</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>27.27%</b>
<b>I agree</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>54.55%</b>
<b>I strongly agree</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>18.18%</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100%</b>

As the data show, over half the respondents (54.55%) agree that they became competent in teaching students with a wide range of needs after undergoing the training course, while three participants (27.27%) disagree with the aforementioned statement. The residual informants strongly agree with developing competence in teaching learners with varying needs upon finishing the training course. This adds up to 72.73% of the participants who answered positively.

**Q10.b. After finishing my training course, whatsoever, I needed to gain some experience in the classroom before becoming competent in teaching students with a wide range of needs.**

*Table 2.23.b. Competence in teaching students with varying needs after training and experience*

Option	Number	Percentage
I strongly disagree	2	18.18%
I disagree	0	0%
I agree	4	36.36%
I strongly agree	5	45.45%
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100%</b>

The results from the present question reveal that most of the participants either strongly agree (45.45%) or only agree (36.36%) that they needed to gain some experience in teaching after the training course to be capable of instructing learners with varying needs. Again, they constitute an overwhelming majority who happen to have benefited from training and experience. The remaining two informants (18.18%) strongly disagree with the previous assertion.

**Q10.c. After finishing my training course, whatsoever, I needed a lot of support from my colleagues in order to be competent in teaching students with a wide range of needs.**

*Table 2.23.c. Competence in teaching students with varying needs after extensive support from colleagues*

Option	Number	Percentage
I strongly disagree	2	18.18%
I disagree	5	45.45%
I agree	1	9.09%
I strongly agree	3	27.27%
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100%</b>



Upon observing the upper table, the highest portion of the respondents (45.45%) disagree that they require extensive support from their colleagues after training to develop competence in teaching learners with varying needs; opposingly, 27.27% of the participants strongly agree with the aforesaid statement. The results from this item are slightly polarizing as no overwhelming majority is established. Such polarity can be explained by novice teachers' need for support from more experienced colleagues even after undergoing training.

**Q10.d. After finishing my training course, whatsoever, I needed more formal training, before becoming competent in teaching students with a wide range of needs.**

*Table 2.23.d. Competence in teaching students with varying needs after additional training*

Option	Number	Percentage
I strongly disagree	1	9.09%
I disagree	2	18.18%
I agree	5	45.45%
I strongly agree	3	27.27%
<b>Total</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100%</b>

The above table reveals that an important proportion of the participants either agree (45.45%), or strongly agree (27.27%) that competence in teaching students with a wide range of needs require additional formal training. A smaller portion of the informants (18.18%) disagree with the aforesaid assertion, while one respondent (9.09%) strongly disagrees.

**Q11. What other comments would you like to make about your training course?**

When asked to make comments about their training, numerous teachers indicate that the TEFL training course that they received was by no means sufficient or directed towards developing their abilities to handle learners with varying needs and learning difficulties. One teacher states: “Unfortunately in my teaching training course, we have not dealt with how to deal with students with different needs.” Other respondents maintain that for teachers to

create an inclusive EFL classroom, their training should be psychologically-oriented, more so than it is competency-based. Despite differences of opinion, the majority of teachers assert the importance of continuous training in developing their competence in managing and instructing learners with diverse needs. In that vein, they call for enacting more specifically designed training courses to enhance the quality of teaching at MUC.

**Q12: Do you have any suggestions or recommendations about the topic?**

This question aims at giving teachers the opportunity to provide any suggestions or recommendations about the topic. The majority of comments emphasize the important role that teachers' instructional competence, expertise and training play in differentiating instruction and accommodating learners' varying needs. One participant, however, maintains that promoting inclusive values and principles, such as fairness, equity, and having a sense of empathy towards students with learning difficulties within educational environments constitutes the basis upon which other instructional practices stand.

***2.6.4. Discussion of the Main Findings of the Teachers' Questionnaire***

Upon perceiving the results from the teachers' questionnaire, numerous vital findings are unveiled. In relation to teachers' awareness of, and attitude towards, students with learning difficulties, the majority of tutors affirm their consciousness of the learners' varying needs and proclaim an empathetic and supportive stance. Having said that, results in this particular point spark controversy due to the recurring absence of congruence among teachers regarding some of their most instrumental duties towards learners. It goes without saying that teachers' responsibility exceeds that of merely voicing knowledge with no regard to how such knowledge is conveyed and perceived, or to how factors such as students' individual differences, needs, and learning difficulties may disrupt instruction. In contrast, part of the teachers not only fail to recognize the inevitable presence of different learning difficulties and needs among learners within the EFL classroom, but they also exhibit a fairly exclusive

attitude. Admittedly, the number of teachers who show indifference and negative attitude towards students with learning difficulties is smaller in comparison with those who do not, yet it is not numerical superiority that reflects the calamitous outcomes of such exclusive perspectives. Put simply, even one teacher's failure may propagate to affect tens, if not hundreds of learners over time. It is worth noting that some teachers' exclusive viewpoints indicate the absence of an inclusive culture within Mila University Center, which accounts for such radical perspectives.

Key findings are also unveiled regarding teachers' use of differentiated instruction to create EFL inclusive classrooms. The greater part of instructors claimed implementing differentiated practices. To corroborate their claim, these teachers are faced with extensive inquiries about various aspects of differentiation. Since only teachers who supposedly differentiate their instruction are asked, one might expect their answers to fully match their claim. This, however, is by no means the case. De facto, findings reveal that although all the participants maintain their use of differentiated instruction, not all actually do, judging from their answers. Numerous instructors affirm their scarce and infrequent use of differentiated strategies such as, pre-assessment, scaffolding, tiering, and compacting to adjust to learners' readiness, interests, and abilities. Some teachers' false claims of differentiation might emanate from their unawareness of what differentiated instruction truly entails, their inability to implement its core practices, or other factors. The overwhelming majority of teachers confirm having faced obstacles when attempting to differentiate instruction. These obstacles primarily include the lack of teachers' training and expertise, crowded classrooms, the absence of institutional support, time shortage, as well as the unavailability of a ready-made differentiated curriculum.

The greater part of teachers indicate having received TEFL training courses. When asked about the efficacy of such training courses in teaching instructors how to differentiate,

many teachers emphasized the need for gaining additional experience subsequent to their training. In other words, they maintain that although training is important to grasp the major concepts of differentiated instruction, practical experience is as essential in dealing with students' learning difficulties and varying needs. Other teachers stress the necessity for continuous and targeted training, instead of the limited and broad courses that they had. That is to say, the initial TEFL training courses provided by the Algerian Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research are neither sufficient nor specifically designed to develop teachers' ability to differentiate their instruction and create inclusive classrooms.

## **2.7. General Discussion of Students' and Teachers' Questionnaires**

Upon comparing the main results from the students' and the teachers' questionnaires, a number of findings unravel. It is evident from the students' questionnaire that learners exhibit great diversity in terms of readiness, interest, learning styles, as well as learning disabilities. Given the data from the teachers' questionnaire, such diversity is either completely unknown to, or negatively perceived by, a considerable number of teachers. Moreover, results from the students' questionnaire indicate that many teachers do not implement any differentiated practices within the EFL classroom. This finding is very much in keeping with the results from the teachers' questionnaire, which also denotes that a considerable number of teachers seldom or never differentiate their instruction in the EFL setting.

Prior to imparting a number of implications and recommendations, it is only fitting to provide answers to the research questions raised in the present study. In regard of the question about teachers' awareness of, and attitudes towards, students with varying needs, it is evident that teachers are largely conscious of learners' diversity, and they retain a positive and supportive view about it. Nonetheless, an important portion of teachers exhibit an exclusive attitude, which may be a cause for alarm. Apropos the question about the use of differentiation, the greater part of participants confirm their implementation of differentiated

practices to establish inclusive classrooms. Having said that, a proportion of teachers who claim to be differentiating instruction fail to apply a number of important differentiation strategies. As such, differentiation is not implemented to a full extent in the present context. As an answer to the research question about the obstacles encountered when differentiating, the results show that issues, such as classroom size, time shortage, the lack of institutional support, the lack of training, as well as the absence of a ready-made differentiation curriculum impede teachers from employing differentiated practices in the EFL classroom. With regard to the question about the efficiency of training, if any, in developing instructors' abilities to differentiate, most teachers confirm receiving TEFL training courses, yet they concurrently maintain the *general* nature of such training as it was by no means *specifically* designed to improve their capabilities in *differentiation*. In the same vein, they affirm the need for gaining additional experience, benefitting from the support of more seasoned colleagues, and attending continuous and targeted training.

## **2.8. Implications, Limitations and Recommendations**

### **2.8.1. Implications of the Study**

Taking into account the findings from both the students' and the teachers' questionnaires, the present research brings about some significant implications.

In spite of many teachers' initial proclamations that they indeed differentiate instruction within the EFL classroom, their claims are later rebuffed. Upon conducting a thorough inquiry into teachers' use of a multitude of differentiated strategies, both students and teachers affirm most tutors' failure to implement the aforementioned practices on a regular basis, if at all. This is significant in the sense that teachers carry an inaccurate picture of what differentiated instruction represents. As such, some teachers' fragmented knowledge about differentiation constitutes an issue that needs to be resolved before attempting to implement any differentiated practices.

As the data from the teachers' questionnaire indicate, numerous teachers exhibit a fairly exclusive attitude towards learners with a wide range of needs. Similar to fragmented knowledge, negative attitudes towards students with learning difficulties renders any attempts at differentiating instruction futile. As such, the path between differentiation and inclusion is by no means a one way ticket, but rather a circle; to differentiate for inclusion requires, before all else, being inclusive.

### ***2.8.2. Limitations of the Study***

It goes without saying that no research is unburdened with obstacles. The process of scientific investigation often includes numerous barriers which researcher usually attempt to overcome. Upon carrying out the present study, a number of obstacles are encountered on various levels. Concerning data collection, difficulty arised in collecting information using the traditional approach as both learners and teachers alike are not physically available on a weekly basis at MUC. In consequence, it was thought wise to administer both questionnaires online using Google Forms and email addresses. With all its benefits, online distribution comes with various disadvantages as some learners and teachers do not have internet access. Furthermore, even those who have internet access may encounter obstacles in grasping some aspect of the questionnaire, and badly enough, the researcher cannot provide the necessary explanation.

It cannot be stressed enough how concise the time period was allotted to the conduct and completion of this study. Time shortage has proven every bit detrimental for research as it is harmful for teachers who seek to implement differentiated instruction. Originally, the teachers' questionnaire was intended to be an interview, but due to teachers' unavailability and the lack of time, it was formulated in its present form. Undoubtedly, given the time, a teachers' interview can be vastly more informative. Finally, any mention of the Coronavirus after years of its emergence may seem unwarranted, yet the domino effect

triggered by its initial and subsequent outbreaks continues to impact institutional schedules and contributes to the lack of time to conduct a more comprehensive study.

### ***2.8.3. Recommendations for Pedagogy and Research***

Based on the present findings, this section provides a collection of suggestions and recommendations for students, teachers, educational institutions, as well as further research. The recommendations are drawn as follows.

#### **2.8.3.1. Recommendations for Students.**

When discussing differentiated instruction, one might presume that the responsibility largely falls upon the teachers' shoulders, and while that is partially true, students also play an important role. Teachers are usually required to determine learners' interests, readiness, learning styles, needs so as to adjust for instruction, yet learners can contribute in this process. Students are required to embark on a journey of self-discovery in which they recognize what characterizes them and exploit it to their own benefit. Being aware of their own individual characteristics may even allow learners to provide teachers with feedback about the type of activities and tasks that better suit their needs, which in turn facilitate differentiation for teachers. In accordance with the concept of self-reliance, students should attempt to organize their own support whenever they can. As teachers cannot be omnipresent, students' self-support may constitute an essential factor into their academic success.

#### **2.8.3.2. Recommendations for Teachers.**

- It is so essential that EFL teachers at Mila University Center get acquainted with learners' diversity and learning difficulties so as to be able to accommodate to their educational needs and make teaching successful.

- Teachers are also required to develop a positive attitude towards learners with a wide range of needs. Put differently, teachers should be more willing to accept and accommodate to learners' varying needs, instead of adopting an exclusive attitude.
- They need to expand their knowledge about, and practice of, differentiated instruction. They should be essentially aware of what it stands for, what it entails, and how to implement it in the EFL classroom.
- In that vein, teachers should utilize an array of assessment strategies. They should conduct a pre-assessment in which they measure students' readiness and plan for upcoming lessons. Moreover, teachers should also gauge learners' understanding during lessons, and assess their knowledge and acquisition at the end of a course using a variety of assessment tasks.
- Teachers are required to identify students' interests, learning styles, culture, expectations, life situations, as well as learning disabilities in order to relate such knowledge to their instruction and make differentiation successful.
- They are required to utilize varying materials according to learners' readiness, interests, and abilities.
- Teachers are advised to adjust for diverse learners using a number of differentiated practices such as scaffolding, tiering, and compacting in learning activities.
- They are recommended to allow learners to voice their opinion about which learning activities they prefer.
- It will undoubtedly be good for students if teachers adjust instructional pace according to their needs.



- Teachers are required to group learners based on their readiness, interests, and abilities. In the same vein, teachers should also consider grouping students based on the type of activities and how suitable these activities are to learners' needs.
- They should give students the choice to work alone, in pairs or in small groups given that some learners may prefer to study alone, while others may prefer collaboration instead.
- Teachers are required to encourage students to explore their own characteristics and needs in order to develop their self-reliance.
- It would be wise if they provide product assignments with varying modes of expression so as to accommodate learners with diverse abilities and needs.
- It is recommended that they regularly enrol in TEFL formal training courses to enhance their knowledge as well as competence in implementing differentiated instruction.

### **2.8.3.3. Recommendations for Educational Institutions.**

As differentiated instruction exceeds being the responsibility of solely teachers, educational institutions play a crucial role in the success or failure of its implementation. As such, a number of recommendations are provided for such institutions.

- Educational institutions are required, before all else, to promote an inclusive culture in which students with varying needs, abilities, and learning difficulties are accepted and supported. Endorsing an inclusive ideology raises teachers' awareness of learners' disabilities and points their attitudinal compass in a positive direction. Moreover, as classroom environments reflect institutional ones, creating an inclusive institutional setting paves the way for the establishment of an inclusive classroom.

- Institutions should supply teachers with the necessary materials and support to properly implement differentiated instruction. As diverse learners require diverse means and materials, institutions should furnish teachers with equipment that they may necessitate.
- As previously discussed, EFL teachers maintain the importance of TEFL training courses in expanding their erudition and developing their competence in instruction. TEFL training courses, as teachers repeatedly asserted, are scarce, theoretical in nature, and in no way targeted at improving teachers' abilities to differentiate instruction. In that sense, educational institutions should organize continuous TEFL training courses which are designed, not only to provide a theoretical framework about differentiated instruction, but also to practically prepare teachers to implement differentiation in EFL classrooms.
- The presence or absence of a ready-made differentiated curriculum draws the line between integration and inclusion. As earlier discussed, integration entails remodelling learners to previously established educational systems with no regard to their varying needs. As such, learners may be taught using a curriculum which is not intentionally designed to accommodate to their differences.
- Although this suggestion may appear as overindulgent, institutions should take into account the establishment of learning preference centers. These centers provide teachers with crucial information about students' learning preferences, abilities, and needs, which facilitates the implementation of differentiated instruction and the creation of inclusive EFL classrooms
- Institutions should minimize the number of students in EFL classrooms to allow teachers the chance to work individually on each student.
- They are required, to the extent possible, to expand teaching hours given that the present schedule does not permit teachers to work at ease and attempt to differentiate instruction.

#### **2.8.3.4. Recommendations for Further Research.**

The present research primarily seeks to investigate the use of differentiated instruction to establish inclusive EFL classrooms. Although the study is exploratory in nature, it paves the way for more profound investigations of the same issue at Mila University Center. Future studies probing inclusive education as a by-product of differentiated instruction can be conducted based on a larger sample, which will undoubtedly yield more representative, reliable, and insightful findings. Given enough time, future research can prove more informative if the investigation is made experimental. In other words, an experimental approach permits insight into the effect of differentiation on inclusion. An immediate observation of teachers' practices as well as the outcomes of implementing differentiated instruction within the EFL classroom would as well be equally informative.

#### **Conclusion**

This chapter is concerned with the practical part of the present study, which mainly deals with inclusive education as an outcome of differentiated instruction. The analysis and comparison of students' and teachers' questionnaires reveal that although differentiated instruction is present in the EFL classroom at Mila University Center, it is not applied to a full extent. The chapter stipulates the reasons behind such a finding, and presents differentiated instruction as an invaluable tool to handle learners with varying needs and establish an inclusive EFL classroom.

### **General Conclusion**

Throughout this work, it was repeatedly stated that the implementation of differentiated instruction with the purpose of achieving inclusive education constitutes the central focus around which the present research revolves. The study sought to unveil the extent to which EFL teachers differentiate instruction, if at all, so as to promote inclusive classrooms. Furthermore, the study aimed at gauging students' diversity as well as teachers' awareness of, and attitudes towards, it. Moreover, it endeavoured to determine the efficiency of TEFL training courses, if any, in developing teachers' skill of differentiation.

In pursuit of the aforementioned research aims, two questionnaires were administered. One questionnaire was administered to eighty third-year students, while another was administered to sixteen EFL teachers. Both students' and teachers' samples were taken from the Department of Foreign Languages, Mila University Center.

The main findings obtained from this study unveiled that most teachers are aware of students' diversity, and have a positive attitude towards it. Having said that, an important portion of teachers exhibited highly exclusive views. The analysis of the data also revealed that the proportion of teachers who differentiate instruction exceeded that of those who do not; nonetheless, differentiation remains underused given that a number of important differentiation practices are largely discarded even by those who claim to differentiate. The findings disclosed a number of obstacles to the implementation of instructional differentiated, such as classroom size, the lack of time, the absence of institutional support, the lack of training courses, as well as the absence of specifically designed differentiation curricula. The results also showed that most teachers received a TEFL training course. Nevertheless, they stressed that the training was not specifically designed to improve their competence to differentiate instruction. Teachers also emphasized the need for further experience, support, as well as specifically designed and continuous training to differentiate instruction.

Towards the end, it is essential to note that the present investigation is small in scale. Consequently, it can be subject to discussion and critique. Furthermore, the research is exploratory in nature, and as such, an experimental approach would indubitably yield more significant and reliable findings. Nonetheless, this study may serve to draw attention to this particular area of study and open the door for future researchers to probe this topic in more extensive ways.

### List of References

- Abberley, P. (1996). Work, utopia and impairment. In L. Barton (Ed.), *Disability and society: Emerging issues and insights* (pp. 1-79). Routledge.
- Abdollahimohammad, A., & Ja'afar, R. (2014). Learning style scales: A valid and reliable questionnaire. *Journal Of Educational Evaluation For Health Professions*, 11, 22. <https://doi.org/10.3352/jeehp.2014.11.22>
- Adams, N. (2015). Bloom's taxonomy of cognitive learning objectives. *Journal Of The Medical Library Association: JMLA*, 103(3), 152-153. <https://doi.org/10.3163/1536-5050.103.3.010>
- Adams, D., Harris, A., & Jones, M. S. (2016). Teacher-Parent Collaboration for an Inclusive Classroom: Success for Every Child. *The Malaysian Online Journal of Educational Science*, 4(3), 58-71.
- Ainscow, M. (1998). Would it work in theory? Arguments for practitioner research and theorising. In C. Clark, A. Dyson, & A. Millward (Eds.), *Theorising Special Education* (pp. 7-20). Psychology Press.
- Ainscow, M. (2005). Developing inclusive education systems: what are the levers for change?. *Journal of educational change*, 6(2), 109-124.
- Ainscow, M., Dyson, A., Weiner, S., & CfBT Education Trust (United Kingdom). (2013). *From exclusion to inclusion: Ways of responding in schools to students with special educational needs*. CfBT Education Trust.
- Al-Shaboul, Y., Al-Azaizeh, M., & Al-Dosari, N. (2021). Differentiated instruction between application and constraints: Teachers' Perspective. *European Journal of Educational Research*, 10(1), 127-143. <https://doi.org/10.12973/eu-jer.10.1.127>

- AlShareef, D. (2015). The effectiveness of differentiated instruction in developing EFL listening comprehension skills and creative thinking among third secondary students. *Journal of Scientific Research In Education*, 16636-605, (الجزء الخامس).
- Atkinson, D., Jackson, M., & Walmsley, J. (1997). *Forgotten lives: Exploring the history of learning disability*. BILD publications.
- Avramidis, E., Bayliss, P., & Burden, R. (2000). Student teachers' attitudes towards the inclusion of children with special educational needs in the ordinary school. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 16(3), 277-293.
- Beam, A. P. (2009). Standards-based differentiation: Identifying the concept of multiple intelligence for use with students with disabilities. *Teaching Exceptional Children Plus*, 5(4), n4.
- Bennett, T., Deluca, D., & Bruns, D. (1997). Putting inclusion into practice: Perspectives of teachers and parents. *Exceptional Children*, 64(1), 115-131.
- Bidari, S. (2021). Nepalese EFL teachers' perception and practices of differentiated instruction. *ECE Official Conference Proceedings*. <https://doi.org/10.22492/issn.2188-1162.2021.41>
- Booth, T. (1999). Viewing inclusion from a distance: Gaining perspective from comparative study. *Support for Learning*, 14(4), 164-168.
- Booth, T., & Ainscow, M. (2011). *Index for inclusion: Developing learning and participation in schools*. Center for Studies on Inclusive Education.

- Boulkroun, F. (2020). Short-term and long-term effects of differentiated grammar instruction: A quasi-experimental study. *Journal of Arabic Language Sciences and Literature*, 12(2), 2100-2124
- Braley, C. (2012). *Parent-teacher partnerships in special education* [Honors degree dissertation]. Rhode Island College.
- Braunsteiner, M. L., & Mariano-Lapidus, S. (2014). A perspective of inclusion: Challenges for the future. *Global Education Review*, 1(1).
- Chien, C. W. (2021). Analysis of elementary school english teachers' perceptions of and design for differentiated reading instruction. *Journal of English Learner Education*, 12(1), 5.
- Christenson, S. L., & Sheridan, S. M. (Eds.). (2001). *Schools and families: Creating essential connections for learning*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Corbett, J. (1996). *Bad-mouthing: The language of special needs*. Falmer Press.
- Department for Education and Department of Health (DEDH). (2014). *Special Educational Needs and Disability Code of Practice: 0 to 25 Years*. Her Majesty's Stationary Office.
- Dickens-Smith, M. (1995). *The effect of inclusion training on teacher attitude towards inclusion*. Chicago Public Schools.
- Dyson, A. (1997). Social and educational disadvantage: reconnecting special needs education. *British Journal of Special Education*, 24(4), 152-157.
- Education Act (1996) London: The Stationery Office. Available at: [http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1996/56/pdfs/ukpga\\_19960056\\_en.pdf](http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1996/56/pdfs/ukpga_19960056_en.pdf)



- Ellis, S., Graham, M. L., Tod, J., & NASUWT (Trade union). (2008). *Special educational needs and inclusion: Reflection and renewal*. National Association of Schoolmasters and Union of Women Teachers.
- Eredics, N. (2018). *Inclusion in action: Practical strategies to modify your curriculum*. Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co.
- Farrell, M. (2000). Educational inclusion and raising standards. *British journal of special education*, 27(1), 35-38.
- Forest, M., & Pearpoint, J. (1992). Inclusion! The bigger picture. *Network*, 2(1), 1-5.
- Forlin, C., Hattie, J., & Douglas, G. (1996). Inclusion: Is it stressful for teachers?. *Journal of Intellectual and Developmental Disability*, 21(3), 199-217.
- Friend, M., & Cook, L. (2007). *Interactions: Collaboration skills for school professionals* (5th ed.). Pearson Education Inc.
- Gomez, A. S., & McKee, A. (2020). When special education and disability studies intertwine: Addressing educational inequities through processes and programming. *Frontiers in Education*, 5. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2020.587045>
- Hargreaves, D., & Hopkins, D. (2005) *The empowered school: The management and practice of development planning*. Cromwell Press.
- Harris, E. L. (1992). A Principal and the Evolution of a School Culture: A Case Study. *Planning and Changing*, 23(1), 29-44.
- Hodkinson, A., & Vickerman, P. (2009). *Key Issues in special educational needs and inclusion*. Sage Publications.
- Hornby, G. (1999). Inclusion or delusion: can one size fit all?. *Support for learning*, 14(4), 152-157.

- Hornby, A. M. (2004). *Oxford advanced learner's dictionary of current English*. Oxford University Press.
- Humphrey, R. (1994). Thought on disability arts. *Arts Magazine*, 4(1), 66–67.
- Hung, Y., & Chao, S. (2020). Practicing tiered and heterogeneous grouping tasks in differentiated EFL classrooms at a military institution in Taiwan. *Asia Pacific Journal Of Education*, 41(3), 405-423. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02188791.2020.1859989>
- Hunt, P., & Goetz, L. (1997). Research on inclusive educational programs, practices, and outcomes for students with severe disabilities. *The Journal of Special Education*, 31(1), 3-29.
- Jackson, R., Harper, K., & Jackson, J. (2001). *Effective teaching practices and the barriers limiting their use in accessing the curriculum: A review of recent literature*. Center for Applied Special Technology.
- Jørgensen, M. T., & Brogaard, L. (2021). Using differentiated teaching to address academic diversity in higher education: Empirical evidence from two cases. *Learning and Teaching*, 14(2), 87-110. <https://doi.org/10.3167/latiss.2021.140206>
- Kalina, C., & Powell, K. C. (2009). Cognitive and social constructivism: Developing tools for an effective classroom. *Education*, 130(2), 241-250.
- Kamarulzaman, M. H., Azman, H., & Zahidi, A. M. (2018). Research trend in the practice of differentiated Instruction. *The Journal of Social Sciences Research*, 4(12), 648-668.
- Kojak, K. (2008). *Diversification of teaching in the classroom: teacher's guide to improving teaching and learning methods in schools in the Arab world* (1st ed.). UNESCO Regional Office.

- Kupchyk, L., & Litvinchuk, A. (2020). Differentiated instruction in English learning, teaching, and assessment in non-language universities. *Advanced Education*, 7(15), 89-96.
- Koutrouba, K., Vamvakari, M., & Steliou, M. (2006). Factors correlated with teachers' attitudes towards the inclusion of students with special educational needs in Cyprus. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 21(4), 381-394.
- Levy, H. (2008). Meeting the needs of all students through differentiated instruction: Helping every child reach and exceed standards. *The Clearing House: A Journal Of Educational Strategies, Issues And Ideas*, 81(4), 161-164.  
<https://doi.org/10.3200/tchs.81.4.161-164>
- Leyser, Y., Kapperman, G., & Keller, R. (1994). Teacher attitudes toward mainstreaming: a cross-cultural study in six nations. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 9(1), 1-15.
- Lipsky, D., & Gartner, A. (1998). Factors for successful inclusion: learning from the past, looking toward the future. In Vitello, S. and Mithaug, D. (Eds.), *Inclusive schooling. National and international perspectives* (pp. 98-112). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Loberg, A. (2020). Differentiated instruction in the EFL Classroom : Accommodation for advanced students in Swedish Primary Education (Dissertation). Retrieved from <http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:hig:diva-32449>
- Mitchell, D. (2005). *Contextualizing inclusive education: Evaluating old and new international perspectives*. Routledge.
- Mittler, P. (2000). *Working towards inclusive education*. Routledge.

- Mittler, P. (2005). The global context of inclusive education: The role of the United. In D. Mitchell (Ed.), *Contextualizing inclusive education: Evaluating old and new international perspectives* (pp. 38-52). Routledge.
- Moodley, P. (2002). Building a culturally capable workforce—an educational approach to delivering equitable mental health services. *Psychiatric Bulletin*, 26(2), 63-65.
- Morris, J. (1991). *Pride against prejudice*. Womens Press Ltd.
- National Council for Special Education (NCSE). (2004). *Education for persons with special educational needs act*. The Stationery Office Dublin. Available at: <https://www.irishstatutebook.ie/eli/2004/act/30/enacted/en/pdf>
- Norwich, B. (1990). *Reappraising special needs education*. Cassell.
- Norwich, B. (1999). The connotation of special education labels for professionals in the field. *British Journal of Special Education*, 26(4), 179-183.
- Norwich, B., & Kelly, N. (2005). *Moderate learning difficulties and the future of inclusion*. Psychology Press.
- O'Brien, T. (2001). *Enabling inclusion: Blue skies—Dark clouds*. Stationery Office.
- Okongo, R. B., Ngao, G., Rop, N. K., & Wesonga, J. N. (2015). Effect of availability of teaching and learning resources on the implementation of inclusive education in pre-school centers in Nyamira North Sub-County, Nyamira County, Kenya. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6(35), 132-141.
- Oliver, M. (1996). *Understanding disability: From theory to practice*. Macmillan International Higher Education.

- Oliver, M. (2009). The Social model in context. In R. Michalko & T. Titchkosky (Eds.), *Rethinking Normalcy: A Disability Studies Reader* (pp. 19-30). Canadian Scholars' Press.
- Ortega, D., Cabrera, J., & Benalcázar, J. (2018). Differentiating instruction in the language learning classroom: Theoretical considerations and practical applications. *Journal Of Language Teaching And Research*, 9(6), 1220. <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.0906.11>
- PDST, Differentiation in action!, Dublin, n.d.  
[https://www.pdst.ie/sites/default/files/Session%20%20-%20Differentiation%20Resource%20\\_0\\_0.pdf](https://www.pdst.ie/sites/default/files/Session%20%20-%20Differentiation%20Resource%20_0_0.pdf)
- Priestley, M. (2003). *Disability: A life course approach*. Polity Press.
- Reckermann, J. (2020). Dealing with diversity in english children's books in the heterogeneous EFL classroom. *PraxisForschungLehrer\* innenBildung. Zeitschrift für Schul-und Professionsentwicklung.*, 2(4), 134-157.
- Redmond, P., Evans, P., Ireson, J., & Wedell, K. (1988). Comparing the curriculum development process in special (MLD) schools: A systematic qualitative approach. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 3(3), 147-160.
- Rouse, M., & Florian, L. (1997). Inclusive education in the market-place. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 1(4), 323-336.
- Ruhama, A. (2020). School environment and inclusive educational settings: Policy implications and mitigation strategies emerging from the South West Region of Cameroon. *International Journal of Trend in Scientific Research and Development*, 2(3), 1078-1089.

- Sebba, J., & Ainscow, M. (1996). International developments in inclusive schooling: mapping the issues. *Cambridge Journal of education*, 26(1), 5-18.
- Skidmore, D. (2004). *Inclusion: The dynamic of school development*. McGraw-Hill Education.
- Subban, P. (2006). Differentiated instruction: A research basis. *International education journal*, 7(7), 935-947.
- Strogilos, V. (2018). The value of differentiated instruction in the inclusion of students with special needs/ disabilities in mainstream schools. In A. G. Abdullah, J. Foley, I. G. N. A. Suryaputra, & A. Hellman (Eds.), *SHS Web of Conferences* (Vol. 42, p. 3). EDP Sciences. <https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/20184200003>
- Swain, J., French, S., & Cameron, C. (2003). *Controversial issues in a disabling society*. McGraw-Hill Education.
- Schwab, S., Sharma, U., & Hoffmann, L. (2019). How inclusive are the teaching practices of my German, Maths and English teachers? – psychometric properties of a newly developed scale to assess personalisation and differentiation in teaching practices. *International Journal Of Inclusive Education*, 26(1), 61-76. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603116.2019.1629121>
- Tassoni, P. (2003). *Supporting special needs: Understanding inclusion in the early years*. Heinemann Educational.
- Thomas, G., Walker, D., & Webb, J. (1998). *The making of the inclusive school*. Routledge.
- Thomas, C. (2002). Disability theory: Key ideas, issues and thinkers. In C. Barnes, L. Barton, & M. Oliver (Eds.), *Disability Studies Today* (pp. 9-57). Polity.

- Tilstone, C., & Rose, R. (2003) *Strategies to promote inclusive practice*. RoutledgeFalmer.
- Tomlison, C. A. (1999). *The differentiated classroom: Responding to the needs of all learners*. Association of Supervision and Classroom Development.
- Tomlinson, C. A. (2001). *How to differentiate instruction in mixed-ability classrooms*. ASCD.
- Tomlinson, C. A. (2003). Differentiating instruction for academic diversity. In J. M. Cooper (ed.) *Classroom teaching skills*, pp.149-180. Houghton Mifflin.
- Tomlinson, C. A., & McTighe, J. (2006). *Integrating differentiated instruction & understanding by design*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Tomlinson, C. A., Brimijoin, K., & Narvaez, L. (2008). *The differentiated school: Making revolutionary changes in teaching and learning*. ASCD.
- Tomlinson, C. A., & Imbeau, M. B. (2010). *Leading and managing a differentiated classroom*. Ascd.
- Tomlinson, C. A., & Moon, T. R. (2013). *Assessment and student success in a differentiated classroom*. Ascd.
- Tomlinson, C. (2017). *How to differentiate instruction in academically diverse classrooms*. ASCD.
- UNESCO. (1994). *The Salamanca statement and framework for action on special needs education*. Document produced at the world conference on Special Needs Education, 7-10 June, 1994 Salamanca, Spain. UNESCO.
- UNESCO. (2004). *Investing in the future: Financing the expansion of educational opportunity in Latin America and the Caribbean*. UNESCO Institute for Statistics.

- UNESCO. (2005). *Guideline for Inclusion: Ensuring access to education for all*. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.
- Union of the Physically Impaired Against Segregation (UPIAS). (1976). *The Union of the Physically Impaired Against Segregation and the Disability Alliance discuss fundamental principles of disability: Being a summary of the discussion held on 22nd November, 1975 and containing commentaries from each organisation*. Union of the Physically Impaired Against Segregation.
- United Nations (UN). (2007). Convention on the rights of persons with disabilities. *European Journal of Health Law*, 14(3), 281-298.
- Vislie, L. (2003). From integration to inclusion: focusing global trends and changes in the western European societies. *European journal of special needs education*, 18(1), 17-35.
- Walker, D. (1995). *Postmodernity, Inclusion and Partnership* [unpublished MED dissertation]. Milton Keynes: Open University.
- Warnock, M. (1978). *Report of the Committee of Enquiry into the Education of Handicapped Children and Young People*. Her Majesty's Stationary Office.
- Warnock, M. (2005). *Special educational needs: A new look*. Philosophy of Education Society of Great Britain.
- Winarti, A., Yuanita, L., & Nur, M. (2019). The effectiveness of multiple intelligences based teaching strategy in enhancing the multiple intelligences and science process skills of junior High School students. *Journal Of Technology And Science Education*, 9(2), 122. <https://doi.org/10.3926/jotse.404>



- Winter, E. C. (2006). Preparing new teachers for inclusive schools and classrooms. *Support for Learning, 21*(2), 85-91.
- Woolcott, G., Marks, A., & Markopoulos, C. (2021). Differentiating Instruction: Development of a practice framework for and with secondary mathematics classroom teachers. *International Electronic Journal Of Mathematics Education, 16*(3), em0657. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iejme/11198>
- World Health Organization (WHO). (1980). *International classification of impairments, disabilities, and handicaps*. WHO Publications Centre.
- Zollers, N. J., Ramanathan, A. K., & Yu, M. (1999). The relationship between school culture and inclusion: How an inclusive culture supports inclusive education. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 12*(2), 157-174.

## Appendices

### Appendix A

#### The Students' Questionnaire

Dear student,

We kindly invite you to support our work by filling in this questionnaire which is an essential part of the research study we are conducting on the use of differentiated instruction in inclusive EFL classes. We would like to inform you that your answers will be processed anonymously with the utmost confidentiality.

#### **Section One: Background information**

1- Age:

2- How many years have you been studying English?

.....  
 .....

#### **Section Two: Individual Differences**

3- What is your proficiency level in English?

High

Average

low

4- Was studying English your choice?

Yes

No

5- Are you:

Extrovert?  or Introvert?

6- This table is designed to find out your preferred way of learning. There are no wrong or right answers. Tick according to your preference. (1- strongly disagree; 2- disagree; 3- agree; 4- strongly agree)

Most of the time, I ...	1 strongly disagree	2 disagree	3 agree	4 strongly agree
<b>A</b> ...prefer to study alone.				
<b>B</b> ...prefer to study with other students.				
<b>C</b> ...prefer cooperative learning.				
<b>D</b> ...prefer competitive learning.				
<b>E</b> ...create a mental picture of what I study.				
<b>F</b> ...learn better when someone presents information in a pictorial (e.g., picture, flowchart) way.				
<b>G</b> ...learn better when someone introduces information in an auditory (e.g., records, audio-books, tapes) way.				
<b>H</b> ...learn better when I read or write information				
<b>I</b> ...learn better when I am involved in a task.				
<b>J</b> ...learn practical tasks better than theoretical				
<b>K</b> ...consider the details of a subject more than its whole.				
<b>L</b> ...consider the whole of a subject more than its details.				

### Section Three: Students' Perceptions of Differentiated Instruction (Teaching)

7- Does your teacher present the lessons in varied ways? Yes  No

8- Do you find it a good way of teaching when the teacher vary strategies to present the content of the lesson, grouping and assessment, and types of activities?

Yes  No

Justify.....

.....

9- Are you satisfied with your teachers' way of teaching?

Yes  No

### Section Four: Students' Perspectives of Teachers' Inclusive Teaching Practices

10- This list of practices can be used by teachers in the classroom. Tick according to your own learning experience.

During the lesson ...	Not at all	Somewhat true	Completely true
<b>A</b> -...my teacher takes into account my interests.			
<b>B</b> -...my teacher takes into account my feelings.			
<b>C</b> -...my teacher takes into account my academic achievement			
<b>D</b> -...my teacher clearly explains the grammatical rules.			
<b>E</b> -...my teacher presents the content in a variety of ways (texts, videos, pictures, etc.).			
<b>F</b> -...my teacher uses a range of assessment methods.			
<b>G</b> -...my teacher uses a variety of grouping strategies.			

<b>H</b> ...my teacher varies learning activities to promote different learning styles.			
<b>I</b> ...my teacher creates a learning environment where I am encouraged to get involved in the topic.			
<b>J</b> ...my teacher encourages me to take risks and make mistakes to enhance my learning by trial and error.			
<b>K</b> ...my teacher varies the format of his lessons (e.g. lecture, free work, etc.).			
<b>L</b> ...my teacher uses different presentation techniques (e.g. white board, flipchart, power point presentation).			
<b>M</b> ...I get individualized feedback.			

## Appendix B

### The Teachers' Questionnaire

Dear teacher,

You are kindly invited to yield a portion of your precious time to respond to this questionnaire, which aims to investigate teachers' perceptions and attitudes towards diversity in the EFL classroom. The questionnaire also seeks to inspect teachers' use, if any, of differentiated instruction strategies in an effort to surmount the diversity barrier and create inclusivity within the EFL classroom. Your collaboration will be of great value to this research.

Thank you, in advance, for your cooperation.

#### Section One: Background Information

**1. How long have you been teaching English as a foreign or second language?**

..... year (s)

**2. How many students do you usually have in your largest class at this institution?**

a. 1-15

b. 15-30

c. 30 or more

#### Section Two: Teachers' Awareness of and Attitude Towards Students with Learning Difficulties and Individual Differences

**3. For each statement (a – g) below, please circle one number on each line, indicating how well it fits with your views:**

		I strongly disagree	I disagree	I agree	I strongly agree
A	Teaching students who have 'learning difficulties' should not be part of an EFL teacher's job.	1	2	3	4
B	I think that EFL teachers should expect their students to have differing needs, and it is the teachers' job to accommodate in class.	1	2	3	4
C	It is the responsibility of the teacher to organize any support needed for students with varying needs.	1	2	3	4
D	Students who have 'learning difficulties' unfairly take teacher time away from the other learners in the class.	1	2	3	4
E	It is a form of cheating if students receive extra support; if they are unable to study independently at the required level, they should not be accepted onto the course.	1	2	3	4
F	Students should organize their own support if they need it.	1	2	3	4
G	Working with students who have a wide range of needs is what makes English language teaching particularly rewarding.	1	2	3	4

**4. Do you have any other comments to add about supporting students with ‘learning difficulties’?**

.....

.....

.....

.....

### Section Three: Teachers’ Adaptive Practices to Create Inclusive EFL Classrooms

**5. Do you differentiate your instruction to create inclusive EFL classrooms?**

a. Yes

b. No

**6. If yes, please answer the following items by circling the letter in the right column to indicate the level of use.**

- (1) hardly ever/ never do this
- (2) sometimes/ do on a few occasions
- (3) frequently do this
- (4) do intentionally and often

- **Student Interest**

I know individual student interests and can relate them to instruction.	1 2 3 4
I know individual student culture and expectations and can relate them to instruction.	1 2 3 4
I know individual student life situations, and how they might impact their learning.	1 2 3 4
I am aware of students’ learning disabilities, and I know how to address them in lessons so as not to impair their learning.	1 2 3 4



- **Assessment**

I pre-assess readiness to adjust the lesson.	1 2 3 4
I assess during the unit to gauge understanding.	1 2 3 4
I assess at the end of the lesson to determine knowledge acquisition.	1 2 3 4
I determine students' learning styles	1 2 3 4
I determine student interests	1 2 3 4

- **Content**

I teach up by ensuring that each student reaches the objectives.	1 2 3 4
Materials are varied to adjust to students' readiness, interests, and abilities.	1 2 3 4
Learners play a role in designing/selecting learning activities.	1 2 3 4
I adjust to diverse learner needs with scaffolding, tiering, compacting, and student choices in learning activities.	1 2 3 4
I clearly articulate what I want students to know, understand and be able to do.	1 2 3 4
I provide a variety of support mechanisms (organizers, study guides, etc.).	1 2 3 4

- **Process**

Pace of instruction varies based on varying learner needs.	1 2 3 4
I use learner preference groups and/or learning preference centers.	1 2 3 4
I group students for learning activities based on readiness, interests and/or learning preferences.	1 2 3 4
Group composition changes based on activity.	1 2 3 4
Classroom environment is structured to support a variety of activities including group or individual work.	1 2 3 4
I provide tasks that require students to apply and extend understanding.	1 2 3 4

- **Product**

Product assignments with multiple modes of expression.	1 2 3 4
Student choice to work alone, in pairs or small group.	1 2 3 4
Product connects with student interest.	1 2 3 4
I use a variety of assessment tasks.	1 2 3 4

**7. Do you encounter any obstacles in implementing differentiation within the EFL classroom?**

a. Yes

b. No

- If yes, what do these obstacles pertain to? (You can tick one or more boxes).

a. Teachers' training

b. Classroom size

c. Institutional support

d. Time shortage

e. Other:.....

.....

.....

.....

#### Section Four: Teachers' TEFL Training

**8. Did you receive any TEFL training course?**

a. Yes

b. No

**9. If this was not your first training course, what did you receive before?**

.....

.....

.....

.....

**10. If you received training, please read each of the statements below (a – d). For each, circle only one number on each line, indicating how well it fits with your views:**

	After finishing my initial training course, whatsoever,...	I strongly disagree	I disagree	I agree	I strongly agree
A	...I was competent in teaching students with a wide range of needs.	1	2	3	4
B	... I needed to gain some experience in the classroom before becoming competent in teaching students with a wide range of needs.	1	2	3	4
C	... I needed a lot of support from my colleagues in order to be competent in teaching students with a wide range of needs.	1	2	3	4
D	...I needed more formal training, before becoming competent in teaching students with a wide range of needs.	1	2	3	4

**11. What other comments would you like to make about your initial training course?**

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

**12. Do you have any suggestions or recommendations about the topic?**

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

## ملخص

اكتسب مفهوم التعليم الشامل رواجًا مؤخرًا ويقال إن الطريق الواعد لتنفيذه هو باستعمال التدريس المتمايز. الغرض الأساسي من هذه الدراسة هو فحص استخدام التعليم المتمايز لإنشاء فصول دراسية شاملة للغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية. في سياق هذه الدراسة ، تم طرح أربعة أسئلة: (1) هل المعلمون على دراية بتنوع الطلاب ، وما هي مواقفهم تجاهه؟ (2) هل يستخدم الأساتذة التعليم المتمايز للوصول إلى فصول دراسية شاملة لتعليم اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية ، وإلى أي مدى؟ (3) ما هي المعوقات التي يواجهها المعلمون عند تطبيق التعليم المتمايز في قسم اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية؟ (4) هل تلقى المعلمون أي نوع من دورات تدريبية لتدريس اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية ، وإذا كان الأمر كذلك ، ما مدى فعالية هذا التدريب في تطوير قدراتهم على استخدام التدريس المتمايز في الفصل الدراسي لتعليم اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية؟ للوصول إلى أهداف الدراسة والإجابة على أسئلة البحث ، تم تقديم استبيان إلى ثمانين من طلاب السنة الثالثة للغة الإنجليزية ، واستبيان آخر يتم إجراؤه على ستة عشر استاذًا من معلمي اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية. تم أخذ العينات من قسم اللغات الأجنبية ، المركز الجامعي ميلة. تظهر النتائج الرئيسية أن التعليم المتباين يتم تطبيقه في حجرة الدراسة للغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية ، ولكن ليس من قبل جميع المعلمين ، وليس إلى حد كامل. يقوم البحث أيضا بمناقشة النتائج الأخرى. في نهاية المطاف ، يضيفي العمل البحثي مجموعة متنوعة من الآثار والتوصيات.

**الكلمات المفتاحية:** تنوع ، تدريس متمايز ، تعليم شامل ، فصول تعليم اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية ، تدريب.

## Résumé

Le concept d'éducation inclusive a récemment gagné du terrain et une voie prometteuse pour sa mise en œuvre serait l'enseignement différencié. L'objectif sous-jacent de la présente étude est d'inspecter l'utilisation de l'enseignement différencié pour créer des classes d'anglais langue étrangère inclusives. Dans le contexte de cette étude, quatre questions sont soulevées : (1) Les enseignants sont-ils conscients de la diversité des élèves, et quelles sont leurs attitudes à son égard ? (2) Les enseignants différencient-ils leur enseignement pour parvenir à des classes inclusives, et dans quelle mesure ? (3) Quels sont les obstacles rencontrés par les enseignants lors de la mise en œuvre de la différenciation ? (4) Les enseignants ont-ils suivi une formation à l'enseignement de l'anglais langue étrangère, et si oui, dans quelle mesure cette formation est-elle efficace pour développer leurs capacités à différencier l'enseignement dans la classe? Pour atteindre les objectifs de l'étude et répondre aux questions de recherche, un questionnaire est administré à quatre-vingts étudiants de troisième année d'anglais, et un autre questionnaire est administré à seize enseignants d'anglais. Les deux échantillons proviennent du département des langues étrangères du Centre Universitaire de Mila. Les principaux résultats révèlent que l'enseignement différencié est appliqué dans les classes d'anglais, mais pas par tous les enseignants, et pas dans toute son ampleur. D'autres résultats sont discutés plus en détail. Enfin, le travail de recherche donne lieu à un ensemble d'implications et de recommandations.

**Mots clés :** Diversité, enseignement différencié, éducation inclusive, classe ALE, formation.