

---

## ABSTRACT

This study evaluated the acceptability of Differentiated Instruction (DI) in teaching English literature to Grade 10 students in Soom Integrated School, Trinidad, Bohol during the School Year 2019-2020. It identified the academic performance of the respondents in specified learning competencies in English literature and the DI's level of acceptability as perceived by the students as well as the significant relationship between the two variables. A researcher-made questionnaire was used to complete the descriptive-inferential/correlation research method.

The study revealed that there was a significant relationship between the students' academic performance and DI's perceived level of acceptability. It is recommended that an enhanced DI learning packet be applied in teaching English literature. This includes strategies like RAFT (Role, Audience, Format, Topic), flipped classroom, cubing, tune up stations, tic-tac-toe, exit cards, journal writing and jigsaw activities.

*Keywords:* differentiated instruction, English, literature, teaching, learning packet

---

## INTRODUCTION

Students nowadays come to school with different learning profile, style, interest, level of readiness, cultural and economic background and a lot more. These variances and heterogeneity in the classroom setting pose a challenge on instruction and assessment not just to the teachers in the country but across the globe since the 'one size fits all' instruction can no longer cater to the diversity of students' needs.

To keep abreast with the existing diversity that teachers face today, educational experts proposed a model that seeks to address the needs of learners in context, that is, Differentiated Instruction (DI). This is an innovation of classroom elements such as the structure, management and most importantly the content thereby engaging the students along the process (Subban, 2006).

Tomlinson and Eidson posited that the concept of Differentiated Instruction was originally crafted as a response of teachers to meet the needs of diverse learners in the general education class. It presents the premise of modifying classroom elements to cater to the needs of the students. Furthermore, Tomlinson expounded the elements that can be modified were as follows: content, process, product, learning environment, and affect. First, the content deals with what is taught and how it is presented. Second, the process is the means by which students apply and learn the content. Third, the product or summative assessments would show what students have actually learned. Fourth, the learning environment, on the other hand, refers to how time, materials, and space are organized. Lastly, affect considers the affective or emotional needs of individuals (Rojo, 2013).

Because of the trend set by Differentiated Instruction, many researchers abroad had recently conducted studies about it in investigating its effectiveness

as a viable solution to the problems of this classroom diversity and evaluating its contribution to high quality instruction as delivered to every individual student (Park, 2017).

However, other studies also revealed that there were limited studies on DI conducted from a student's perspective (Park, 2017). Moreover, the researcher discovered that researches on DI application in English literature were scarce whether abroad or local. Several studies conducted in the international learning institutions were focused on English language and other subjects like Mathematics, Sciences and Special Education. Few Filipino studies on DI were also focused on Filipino and Mathematics subjects (Amadio, 2014; Aranda, 2016). Finally, Robinson (2017) mentioned in her study that although DI is a household name to educators and teachers; still, its concept of application is not yet solidly presented. Similarly, researchers such as Santangelo and Tomlinson, Stodolsky and Grossman reinforced Robinson's conception by saying that teachers inconsistently applied DI in the classroom (as cited in Brevik et al., 2017).

To be at par with this global educational pacing, the Philippine Congress enacted the No Filipino Child Left Behind Act of 2010 and the Republic Act No. 10533 or the Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013 which impelled the Department of Education (DepEd) and Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) alike to adapt the use of DI in the classroom through the initiation of Outcomes-based Education (OBE) and K to 12 program that focus on student-centered activities tapping the multiple intelligences and learning styles of learners. Even the competency guides and learner's materials were embedded with small group differentiated work and individualized

---

### Corresponding author:

Richel D. Quisto

Email Address: richelquisto156@gmail.com

Received: Apr. 19, 2021; Accepted: Nov. 15, 2021

---

tasks to be performed by students most especially every after a literary text.

Literature, being taught along with language provides text for reference and practice for the English language (as incorporated in the Curriculum guide and Learner's Material). Teaching literature helps in promoting students' reading comprehension and critical thinking (Rohaniyah, 2012) but this contention also presented a challenge. Although, teaching literature is engaging, it demands effective and appropriate strategies for deeper understanding of the text, real life application, connection and value-integration and sufficient time for processing. In this connection, Rohaniyah (2012) exposed that small group discussion is a technique in teaching English literature that provides a context not just between students but also between students and the teacher. San Jose and Galang (2015), however, found that despite the growing differences of students, most teachers still prefer reporting as the most common method in teaching literature and most students agree that lecture is the most effective strategy in teaching literature subjects .

Thus, these findings of the scarcity of DI researches done on English literature and the challenge of using DI in the teaching of English literature that caters to students' needs motivate the researcher to further investigate the DI implementation in teaching English 10 literature topics in Soom Integrated School and on how this innovation had affected the students (Waid, 2016). This study could fill in the existing gap of scholarly researches by adding a specific study about the evaluation of the acceptability of implemented DI based on students' perceptions and academic performances in English literature. Relatively, this study supported the teachers in using more appropriate and relevant strategies to differentiate the content, process, learning environment and product in the English literature class.

The present study drew on the tenets of the implemented laws in the country and some theories abroad. The No Filipino Child Left Behind Act of 2010 and the Republic Act No. 10533 or the Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013 are implemented in the country to make sure that every child's way of learning, interest, learning styles, need and background are considered and attended to in the classroom setting.

Also, theories of Differentiated Instruction or Differentiation, Multiple Intelligence (MI)), and Learning Style Theories like Visual, Auditory Kinesthetic and Tactile (VAKT) served as anchors and foundations in the birth of this study.

The Philippine educational system's basic curriculum was revisited and enhanced through The No Filipino Child Left Behind Act of 2010 and the Republic Act No. 10533 or the Enhanced Basic Education Act of 2013 to adhere to its vision and mission in providing quality, equitable, culture-based education that facilitates the learning of every Filipino. With these innovations in the educational system, the Department of Education was demanded to develop its curriculum according to the standards and principles. Few of these curriculum enhancements paralleled the tenets of Differentiation: learner-centered, inclusive, constructivist, inquiry-based, collaborative, integrative, and relative to social context. Content and performance standards, together with the

learning competencies were cascaded to the Teacher's Manual and Learner's Materials through these guidelines and thereby providing some DI-based activities and task into the learners (Republic Act No. 10533, 2013).

Learning Style Theories play a big role in the profiling of students in the preparation of Differentiated Instruction. These theories are premised on the ideas and principles that the student actively constructs knowledge based on prior knowledge or experience. Instruction is then based on the development of the students. It focuses on the student's readiness, interest and learning style. According to Gholami and Bagheri, among the learning style theories, VAKT Theory has gained a popular ground among educators (as cited in Charles, 2017). This theory which stands for Visual, Auditory, Kinesthetic and Tactile uses the main sensory receivers as bases or as medium on how learners process information to acquire new knowledge and skill. VAKT learning style employs practical assessment that includes asking individual learners to identify the way in which he or she learns. This theory is based on how learners learn and on what interests them the most while learning.

Worthy to mention next is Gardner's (1980s) Theory of Multiple Intelligences (MI) (as cited in Subban, 2006). This theory contended that no two individuals learn in the same way. He postulated eight intelligences that were relatively independent but were interacting cognitive capacities. The intelligences are verbal-linguistic, logical-mathematical, musical, spatial, bodily-kinesthetic, naturalistic, interpersonal, and intrapersonal and a tentative ninth one, moral intelligence. The multiple intelligences are primary tools for learning, problem-solving, and creating opportunities for all students by enriching the classroom through multiple techniques and assessment forms, develops students and brings out their strengths.

Differentiated Instruction as the prime pillar of this study highlights on the internal differentiation which focuses on the modification of content of curriculum, method of delivery and other variation to address the differences of the learners in an inclusive classroom setting. Tomlinson further expounded that DI is guided by the principle of quality curriculum, continual assessment and flexible grouping (as cited in Rasheed & Wahid, 2018).

Differentiated Instruction, according to Tomlinson, is student-centered and is used to reach and engage students based on their diverse interests, strengths, and weaknesses, and how they learn best. Furthermore, the theory is expounded with consideration on the students' differences in their readiness to learn, interest, learning styles, experiences, cultural background and life circumstances (as cited in Rojo, 2013 ; Lyles & Wu, 2016 ).

This research was anchored on the abovementioned theories since it capitalized on the use of different strategies that primarily involve and engage students in their learning which caters to their intelligences, learning styles, preferences and interests and tailors to their cognitive and academic level and readiness. Hence, this study basically assumed that using the strategy of differentiated tasks and activities in literature, students' collaboration and engagement in the class is improved; thus positively affecting their academic performance.

With the advent of DI in educational systems worldwide, a repertoire of studies had been conducted relative to its effectiveness as a strategy of teaching in general. Thus, the researcher had categorized these resources into sub-themes: Secondary Teachers and Administrators as Participants, Elements of Differentiated Instruction, Students' and Teachers' Perception on and Understanding of DI, Groupings and other DI Styles, Effectiveness of DI through Changes in Behavior, Academic Performances, and Drawbacks of DI.

These studies are all connected with this study since they all investigated on the effectiveness of the Differentiated Instruction in an inclusive classroom. There are positive results such as increase in the academic performance of students, attitude/motivation to school, self-confidence and reading comprehension skills. However, there were also limitations noted by other findings.

While it is true that many studies are related to this curr

ent endeavor, this study looked into a wider scope of differentiation from big groupings to small groups and even in individual task assigned to students in order to tailor fit instruction to students' needs. The variable of students' academic performances in literature class played a pivotal role and the designing of an enhanced DI learning guides as an output presented sufficient substance for this paper.

This research evaluated the acceptability of Differentiated Instruction (DI) in teaching English literature to Grade 10 students in Soom Integrated School, Trinidad, Bohol for the School Year 2019-2020 as basis for the crafted enhanced DI-based learning packets.

Specifically, this study answered the following questions:

1. After using DI, what is the students' academic performance in the following third quarter competencies in English 10 Literature:

- 1.1. explaining how the elements specific to a genre contribute to the theme of a particular literary selection;
- 1.2. explaining the literary devices used;
- 1.3. expressing appreciation for sensory images used; and
- 1.4. determining key ideas, tone, and purposes of the author?

2. What is the respondents' perceived level of acceptability of DI in terms of the following elements:

- 2.1. process;
- 2.2. learning environment; and
- 2.3. product?

3. Is there a significant relationship between the students'

academic performance and their perception?

4. Based on the findings, what enhanced DI Learning Packets can be crafted?

## METHODOLOGY

This research used the descriptive-inferential/correlation. It was quantitative in nature since the students' academic performances in the learning competencies in English 10 literature were collected manually and analyzed in terms of the frequency of students getting the grades based of the scale and descriptive category designated by the teacher.

Also, the respondents are asked to fill-out the researcher-made survey questionnaires about their perception of the DI utilized by the teacher after reading a literary text as prescribed in the Teacher's Guide and Learner's Manual. Similarly, the ratings that the students gave in each DI element were also collected and analyzed by using the Mean and the Standard Deviation measurements and were given descriptions on their acceptability.

Finally, the two variables were statistically treated using the Data Analysis feature in Microsoft Excel.

### Research Environment

This research was conducted at Soom Integrated School, Soom, Trinidad, Bohol. The school is founded last June 2010 as is the smallest complete secondary school in the District of Trinidad. It has 389 enrolled students.

### Research Participants

The participants of this research who answered the survey questionnaire were 79 Grade 10 students of Soom Integrated School in the school year 2019-2020. They were chosen using non-probability sampling which is the convenience sampling. Since the researcher is handling English 10, all Grade 10 students were included in the study as participants.

The instrument used in the study was a researcher-made tool to collect the perception level of students of the Differentiated Instruction containing the elements of DI. It had been pilot tested to another grade level in the same school to check the students' understanding of the items and the face validity of the material. The survey was further categorized into the the elements of differentiation, namely: process, learning environment/ affect, and product.

### Data-gathering Procedure

The collection of data followed certain steps. First, the researcher wrote a formal letter asking for permission from the Office of the Principal to conduct a study in Soom

Table 1. Distribution of sample student respondents

STUDENTS	n	%
Grade 7-12	389	100
Grade 10	79	20.31

N=389

Integrated School. Second, another letter was sent to the pilot testing respondents and actual research participants.

The researcher-made survey on the Level of Perceived Acceptability of the DI was pilot tested to selected Grade 9 students of the same school to determine whether the items were comprehensible to the respondents and to prove what the form purports to measure.

Then, the implementation of DI-based instructional plan constructed by the teacher following some prescribed activities in the Teacher’s Guide and Learner’s Manual followed. The grades of the students during the evaluation performance based on the specified competencies taught were collected. These grades ranged from 0 to 100 per cent and were measured using rubrics for differentiated activities. The data gathered were analyzed using the weighted average of students falling into the descriptive categories prepared by the teacher such as excellent, very good, good and lastly, poor.

Then the students answered the researcher-made survey questionnaire on their perception of their experience with DI. They rated the elements and the sub elements as 5 being most acceptable and 1 as least acceptable. The data collected were treated using the mean and the standard deviation. Subsequently, the results were also given descriptions according to their acceptability. Finally, a significant difference between the grades of the students in the literature competencies and their perception of DI was extracted using the data analysis feature in Microsoft excel.

**Treatment of the Data**

To determine the significant relationship between the respondents’ perceived level of acceptability of DI and their academic performance in English Literature the Pearson Product-Moment Coefficient of Correlation was used. The students’ grades for each performance of the desired learning competency were collected as well as the students’ perceived level rating for each element of DI. The data were then analyzed and compared using the statistical feature on Microsoft excel.

**Scoring Procedure**

In terms of the survey questionnaire for the students’ perceptions on the level of acceptability of DI, each response had an equivalent one point. Each element

has statements that will be assessed by students using the 5 point scale of frequency/ quality: 5 - most acceptable 4 – highly acceptable, 3 – acceptable, 2 - less acceptable and 1 – least acceptable. Each scale has the same designated point for scoring.

In terms of the students’ academic performance per competency, the researcher used rubrics based on the specific activity or performance assigned to a group of students or an individual student. The rubrics were teacher-made ones deemed best to measure the performances. For the first learning competency which was explaining how the elements specific to a genre contribute to the theme of a particular literary selection, the class was divided into four heterogeneous groups. Each group had a different element to analyze and report at the end of the session. The presentation of output was based on their preferred mode of delivery decided by the group as long as the criteria in the rubric are met. See Appendix A for the rubric.

The second learning competency in English 10 Literature was explaining the literary devices used. The class was divided into two big groups. The group had the same output—to come up with an illustration of a tree with leaves having samples of figurative statements (2 samples per figure of speech). Each member had a specific role to do like: book/ note scanners, messengers, writers, illustrators, board designers, proof readers, mentors, reporters (to explain the literary devices used in the sentences). See Appendix B for the rubric of group activity.

The third learning competency was expressing appreciation for sensory images used. The students were asked to choose a talent or an intelligence they preferred for the performance of expressing appreciation for sensory images. They were limited to Visual (Poster), Verbal (Talk Show), Kinesthetic (Dance Interpretation) and Musical (Jazz Chant). See Appendix C for the rubric of Small Group Differentiated Work (SGDW): MI-Based Activity.

Lastly, the fourth learning competency was determining tone, mood, technique, and purpose of the author. The students were asked to choose a specific text to analyze its tone, mood, technique and purpose in an essay form. See Appendix D for the individual text analysis.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

This section presents the data gathered from

Table 2. Students’ academic performance in small group differentiated works (SGDW): explaining how the elements specific to a genre contribute to the theme of a particular literary selection.

Descriptions	Weighted Ave.
Excellent (95-100)	2.5
Very Good (90-94)	19.25
Good (80-89)	38.75
Poor (below 80)	18.50
Total	79

Table 3. Students' academic performance in big grouping( board work) activity: explaining the literary devices used.

Descriptions	Weighted Ave.
Excellent ( 95-100)	8.50
Very Good (90-94)	17.50
Good (80-89)	36.50
Poor (below 80)	16.50
Total	79

Table 4. Students' academic performance in small group differentiated work (SGDW) MI-based activity: expressing appreciation for sensory images used.

Descriptions	Weighted Ave.
Excellent ( 95-100)	11.67
Very Good (90-94)	21.33
Good (80-89)	32
Poor (below 80)	14
Total	79

the academic performance of the respondents in the English literature lessons as well as from the conduct of survey questionnaires on the respondents' perception on Differentiated Instruction's level of acceptability of Soom Integrated School. Along with the consolidation of statistics, this part also showcases the analysis and interpretation of the results.

#### Academic performance of respondents in English literature according to learning competencies

Table 2 shows the frequency of students attaining a specific score per criteria in Small Group Differentiated Works (SGDW). Here, the students are divided into four heterogeneous groups. Each group has a different element to analyse and report at the end of the session. The presentation of output is based on their preferred mode of delivery as long as the criteria in the rubric are met.

Students get the highest weighted average of 38.75 under the description of Good. This comprises the students' performance in the criteria of content, delivery, creativity and cooperation in the group. This is seconded by 19.25 of Very Good and closely followed by 18.50 weighted average of Poor. This further implies that the students' performance in the differentiated activity fell into the good level of student achievement. According to Moyer (2011), grouping students according to their interest allow for an effective learning environment and showed academic growth.

Table 3 presents the frequency of students getting a specific range of scores in the big group performance

with the criteria of content and role delivery. This result implies that the students once again performed in an average level based on the range set by the teacher in the rubric. The changes of seating arrangement which enables the students to roam around freely, interact with members and complete the task as a group provide a conducive place for students thus affecting their performance (Wannarka and Ruhl, 2008).

The third performance was another SGDW of the assigned learning competency. The activity was prescribed in the same English 10 Learner's Material but modified by the teacher in terms of grouping and specific task to be done by the learners. The activity tapped four intelligences of students. Each group was to follow the instructions set by the teacher for a specific performance according to the talent or intelligence.

Table 4 shows that 32 per cent of the students performed good in the DI-based activity. This result has a favorable inclination towards better scores of students in the said activity. The incorporation on students' intelligences enhances the students' engagement in the class and boosting their creativity in the presentation of output (Gardner as cited in Subban, 2006). Additionally, the small group activity led by able peers and facilitated by the teacher helped in the increased motivation and performance in the class (Vygotsky in Waid, 2016 and Subban, 2006).

Table 5 illustrates the frequency of students getting the range of scores determined by the teacher. The lesser number of students getting the Excellent grade in the

Table 5. Students' academic performance in individualized text analysis activity: determining tone, mood, technique, and purpose of the author.

Descriptions	Weighted Ave.
Excellent (95-100)	5
Very Good (90-94)	28.33
Good (80-89)	21.33
Poor (below 80)	24.33
Total	79

Table 6. Students' perception on the acceptability of differentiated instruction: process.

DI Element: Process The teacher...	Mean	Std. Dev.	Description
A.1. divides the class into different groups/assigns tasks according to talents, gender, interest, and learning styles.	3.84	1.2717	Highly Acceptable
A.2. assigns tasks based on student's choice.	3.49	1.1421	Highly Acceptable
A.3. uses varied and engaging activities in class.	3.73	0.9426	Highly Acceptable
A.4. varies the time for students to complete their task.	3.95	0.9213	Highly Acceptable
A.5. monitors individual or group progress on the task given by moving around and attending to the students' needs.	3.87	1.1308	Highly Acceptable
Average	3.78		Highly Acceptable

Legend:

- (4.21 - 5.00 Most Acceptable
- 3.41 - 4.20 Highly Acceptable
- 2.61 - 3.40 Acceptable
- 1.81 - 2.60 Less Acceptable
- 1.00 - 1.80 Least Acceptable

criterion of content gives approximately with the number of honor students. This is parallel with Kaweera, Yawiloeng and Tachon's (2019) which states that high proficient students particularly favor individual activity, specifically in writing.

On the other hand, the dominance of Very Good in the weighted average among other levels illustrates a favorable impact brought about by Differentiated Instruction to the students' performance in class as studied by educators (Leonardo et al, 2015; Aranda & Zamora, 2016; Kiley, 2011).

#### Students' Perceptions on the Level of Acceptability of Differentiated Instruction.

This part comprises the presentation of DI's perceived level of acceptability by the students according

to the elements of Differentiated Instruction.

Table 6 presents the respondents' perception on the teacher's differentiation in the process in terms of dividing the class into small groups according to talents, gender, interests and learning styles as Highly Acceptable based on the average mean of 3.78. This result signifies favorable inclinations of students towards the way the teacher implements DI in the literature classes. The respondents find the activities engaging and student-friendly. Thus, they are more motivated to participate and perform better in the task assigned to them. Tomlinson (in Waid, 2016) contends that small groups are beneficial to students.

Table 7 shows the highest mean of 4.32, categorized as Most Acceptable was given to the teachers' respect to students' differences. It was followed by 3 items

Table 7. Students' perceptions on the acceptability of differentiated instruction: environment.

DI Element: Affect/Environment The teacher....	Mean	Std. Dev.	Description
B.1. changes the arrangements of seats according to class activity.	3.91	1.0401	Highly Acceptable
B.2. encourages the students to make decisions and choose options.	4.09	0.9547	Highly Acceptable
B.3. varies his/her reward system and positive reinforcements to students.	3.09	0.9310	Acceptable
B.4. shows high respect to students' differences in class.	4.32	0.9680	Most Acceptable
B.5. engages the students to the lesson through her facial expressions, tone, gestures and etc.	4.01	0.9941	Highly Acceptable
Average	3.88		Highly Acceptable

Table 8. Students' perception on the acceptability of differentiated instruction: product.

Learning Competencies: Product The teacher....	Mean	Std. Dev.	Description
C.1.uses criteria or rubrics in rating products or performances.	4.32	1.0023	Most Acceptable
C.2. allows the students to choose their medium of presentation of the same skill.	3.78	0.8868	Highly Acceptable
C.3. assigns students same product or performance but different level of difficulty.	3.49	0.9563	Highly Acceptable
C.4. asks students to do different products or performance according to intelligence/learning styles.	3.53	1.1190	Highly Acceptable
C.5. allows for other students to rate their classmates performance through rubrics.	3.81	1.0751	Highly Acceptable
Average	3.79		Highly Acceptable

with Highly Acceptable in the teacher's modification of the classroom through seating arrangements, encouragements to students' decision-making and choices in their learning and engaging students through facial expression, tones, gestures and other non-verbal modes of communication with the mean 3.91, 4.09 and 4.01, respectively. In terms of the reward systems and positive reinforcements employed by the teachers, the respondents said that it is Acceptable with the mean of 3.09. As a whole, the respondents rated the teacher's implementation of DI as Highly Acceptable in terms of Environment or Affect.

This only means that with the use of DI in the English literature classes, students feel motivated and are satisfied with the learning outcomes (Cox as cited in Gentry, Sallie & Sanders, 2013). Also, innovations in the classroom setting such as the physical arrangement, and reward systems are critical in providing an environment which is conducive to learning.

Table 8 shows that the teacher's use of rubrics and criteria has the Most Acceptable description with the mean

of 4.32. Joseph et al. (2013) specify that differentiating the product should demand allowing certain options for students to demonstrate what they have learned and gaining freedom on how to showcase their strengths and skills; creativity and critical mind set. In terms of choices for output presentation, Bailey and Williams-Black maintained that such freedom added to the self-satisfaction of students and confidence that they can finish the task they had opted (as cited in Joseph et al., 2013).

#### Significant Relationship between the Students' Academic Performance in English Literature Class and Perception of DI's Level of Acceptability

Table 9 displays the statistical treatment of the data gathered from the respondents' academic performance and their scores from the survey questionnaire on their perception regarding the DI's acceptability in the English literature lessons. The data presented means that there is a weak relationship between performance and perception as indicated by the r-value of 0.2597. The coefficient of determination described the accountability

Table 9. Significant Relationship

Regression Statistics				
R	0.25965			
Coef of Determination	0.06742			
Adjusted R Square	0.05531			
Standard Error	6.01792			
Observations	79			
	Coef	Std Error	t Stat	P-value
Intercept	74.5574	4.4364	16.8058	1.76 x 10 <sup>-27</sup>
Perception	2.72579	1.1553	2.3594	0.0208*

of the perception in predicting performance only at 6.7%. The other 93.3% accounts for other predictors of performance but were not included in the study. Although the relationship was weak, it was significant. Moreover, the P-value is 0.0208 is lesser than the standard level of 0.05. Hence, this result signifies that the null hypothesis is rejected. Thus, there was a significant relationship between the students' academic performance and perception on the acceptability of Differentiated Instruction in English Literature classes.

The research likewise confirms to many researches that revealed that instructional interventions tapping on the individuality of students and tailoring to the learning needs, learning styles, interests, backgrounds and preferences of every student can lead to a statistically significant difference in academic performance (Dunn et al. as cited in Koeze 2007; Valiandes; Dosch and Zidon as cited in Aranda and Zamora, 2016).

## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This research evaluated the acceptability of Differentiated Instruction (DI) in teaching English literature to Grade 10 students in Soom Integrated School, Trinidad, Bohol for the School Year 2019-2020 as basis for the crafted enhanced DI-based learning packets.

Based on the findings, it is concluded that Differentiated Instruction is proven to be effective in English Literature classes as shown in the students' good academic performance and highly acceptable perception towards DI.

Since the students' academic performances in the English 10 literature learning competencies were generally categorized as average, English teachers are challenged to maximize better results in students' performance in literature class by tapping the students' individuality using the principles of Learning Styles, Multiple Intelligences and Differentiated Instruction. However, they shall not restrict differentiation with one or two strategies and of using the same all throughout their teaching of literature topics or following in to-to what is provided by the book but they may always consider and reconsider students' interests, styles, background and preferences. They may adopt the enhanced DI learning packets using strategies such RAFT Technique, cubing, tune-up stations, tic-tac-toe, flipped classroom, jig-saw activities, exit cards, and journal writing to add fun and engage the learners in the literature class.

Lastly, this study may serve as a benchmark for future DI researchers focusing on the administrators' or teachers' perspective.

## REFERENCES

- Abella, M., Jung, E.J., & Taylor, M. (2011). Students' perceptions of classroom instructional environments in the context of 'universal design for learning. *Learning Environ Research*, 14, 171–185. Doi: 10.1007/s10984-011-9090-2
- Almonte, L., Flandez, L., Hermosa, A.L., Lagustan, N., Mangaluz, L., Miranda, E., Mendoza, P.A., Palomar, L., Barradas-Soriano, G.A. & Villanueva, K. (2015). Celebrating diversity through world literature: English 10 learner's material." Department of Education.
- Amadio, R. (2014). Differentiated instruction in secondary mathematics. (Master's thesis, University of Wisconsin-Superior). Retrieved from <https://minds.wisconsin.edu/bitstream/handle/1793/69647/Thesis%20FINAL.pdf?sequence=1>
- Aranda, M.R., & Zamora, J. (2016). Using differentiated instruction in improving the academic performance of students in Filipino language. (Master's thesis, National University). Retrieved from [national-u.edu.ph/up-content/uploads/2016/08/JSTAR-4\\_Aranda.pdf](http://national-u.edu.ph/up-content/uploads/2016/08/JSTAR-4_Aranda.pdf)
- Bhattacharya, V. (2016). Applying differentiated instruction strategies to meet the educational need of students with disabilities at the high school level. Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No.10633751)
- Brevik, L., Gunnulfsen, A., & Renzulli, J. (2017). Student teachers' practice and experience with differentiated instruction for students with higher learning potential. *Teaching and Teacher Education*. Doi:10.1016/j.tate.2017.12.003
- Burkett, J.A. (2013). Teacher perception on differentiated instruction and its influence on instructional practice. (Master's thesis, University of Central Oklahoma). Retrieved from <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/215277469>
- Charles, L. (2017). Differentiated instruction, teachers' perception, and lower third students' achievement: A



- qualitative study. Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 10288345)
- D' Angelo, F. (2009). Differentiating instruction: effects on reading in the urban schools. VDM Verlag. Retrieved from abebooks.com
- Gentry, R, Sallie, A. & Sanders, C. ( 2013). Differentiated instructional strategies to accommodate students with varying needs and learning styles. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED545458)
- Joseph, S., Thomas, M., Simonette, G., & Ramsook, L. (2013). The impact of differentiated instruction in a teacher education setting: Successes and challenges. *International Journal of Higher Education*. 2(3),28-40. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v2n3p28>
- Kaweera, C., Yawiloeng, R., & Tachon, K. (2019). Individual, pair and group writing activity: a case study of undergraduate efl student writing. *Canadian Center of Science and Education*, 1-13. Doi: 10.5539/elt.v12n10p1
- Kiley, D. (2011). Differentiated instruction in the secondary classroom: Analysis of the level of implementation and factors that influence practice. (Doctoral Dissertations, Western Michigan University). Retrieved from <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/dissertations/427>
- Koeze, P.A. (2007). Differentiated instruction: the effect on student achievement in an elementary school. (Master's thesis and Doctoral dissertation, Eastern Michigan University). Retrieved from <https://commons.emich.edu/theses/31>
- Leonardo, R., Nivera, G., & Reyes, A. (2015). Effects of differentiated instruction on college students' achievement in and attitude towards trigonometry. *The Normal Lights*, 9(1), 119-132. Retrieved from [po.pnuresearchportal.org](http://po.pnuresearchportal.org)
- Lyles, C. & Wu, E. (2016). Teachers' responses on differentiating instruction and measuring progress of gifted students in the regular classroom. *Gifted Education Press Quarterly*, 20(3), 21-32. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/311825773>
- No Filipino Child Left Behind Act of 2010, 15th Cong. (enacted). Retrieved from [senate.gov.ph/lisdata/7497](http://senate.gov.ph/lisdata/7497)
- Park, Z. (2017). Middle school student perception and understanding of differentiated instruction: a phenomenological study. (Doctoral dissertation, Liberty University, Lynchburg, VA.). Retrieved from [digitalcommons.liberty.edu/doctoral/1635/](http://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/doctoral/1635/)
- Republic Act No. 10533.(2013)(enacted)Retrieved from [www.officialgazette.gov.ph](http://www.officialgazette.gov.ph)
- Rohaniyah, J. (2012). Technique in teaching literature. OKARA, 1. Doi: 10.19105/ojbs.v6i1.419. Retrieved from <https://www.semanticscholar.org>
- Robinson, L., Maldonado, N. & Whaley, J. (2017). perceptions about implementation of differentiated instruction." Annual Mid-South Educational Research (MSERA) Conference, Tennessee. PDF. 2017.
- Rojo, P. (2013). Studying the effects of differentiated instruction in the science classroom. (Master's thesis, Montana State University). Retrieved from [scholarworks.montana.edu/xmlui/bitstream/handle/1/2825/RojoP0813.pdf;sequence=1](http://scholarworks.montana.edu/xmlui/bitstream/handle/1/2825/RojoP0813.pdf;sequence=1)
- San Jose, A., & Galang, J. (2015). Teaching strategies in teaching literature: students in focus. *International Journal on Education and Research*, 3(4), 41-47. Retrieved from <http://academia.edu>
- Solberg, M.T. (2017). Teachers' Approaches To Differentiated Instruction In Group Lessons In Lower Secondary School. (Master's thesis, University of Oslo). Retrieved from <http://www.duo.uio.no>
- Subban, P. (2006). Differentiated instruction: a research basis. *International Education Journal*, 7(7), 935-947. Retrieved from <http://iej.com.au>
- Tshering & Phu-ampai, S. (2018). Effects of using rubrics on the learning achievement of students in educational assessment and evaluation. *Research Gate*. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/331703168>
- Tomlinson, C.A. (2000). Differentiation of instruction in the elementary grades." *ERIC Digest*. Retrieved from [www.ericdigests.org/2001-2/elementary.html](http://www.ericdigests.org/2001-2/elementary.html)
- Van Geel, M., Keuning, T., Frèrejean, J., Dolmans, D., Merriënboer, J. & Visscher, A. (2018). Capturing the complexity of differentiated instruction. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 30 (1), 51-67. Doi.org/10.1080/09243453.2018.1539013
- Waid, N. (2016). Social Studies Teachers' Use Of Differentiated Instruction to Help Struggling Learners." 2016. Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 10096872)
- Wannarka, R. & Ruhl, K. (2008). Seating arrangement that promote positive academic and behavioral outcomes: A review of empirical research. *ResearchGate*, 23(2), 89-93. Doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9604.2008.00375