

Differentiated Instructional Activities, Resources, and Strategies For Inclusive Education in Language Learning

Richelle B. Salamero, LPT; Jennifer S. Rubio, PhD

Mabini Colleges, Incorporated, Daet, Camarines Norte

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRISS.2026.100801122>

Received: 12 September 2026; Accepted: 17 September 2026; Published: 25 September 2026

ABSTRACT

This study determined the differentiated instructional activities, resources, and strategies that support inclusive education in English language learning among elementary teachers in Daet South District, Schools Division of Camarines Norte, during School Year 2025-2026. It examined the current status of English language instruction, the level of integration of differentiated instruction, the relationship between the two variables, the challenges encountered by teachers, and proposed an intervention program to strengthen inclusive English language teaching. Using a quantitative descriptive-correlational research design, data were gathered from 160 elementary teachers through a survey questionnaire and analyzed using weighted mean and Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient. Findings revealed that the current status of English language instruction was very highly implemented in terms of language-oriented teaching strategies, educational materials, language learning assessment, and teacher training. Similarly, the integration of differentiated instruction across activities, resources, and strategies was assessed as very highly implemented. Results showed no significant relationship between most dimensions of English language instruction and differentiated instruction, except for educational materials and differentiated instructional strategies, which exhibited a significant but weak relationship. Teachers reported challenges in implementing differentiated instruction, particularly in content and process, which were always encountered, while challenges related to product and learning environment were often encountered. To address these concerns, the study proposed the DIFFER (Developing Inclusive and Flexible Frameworks for Enhancing Responsive) in English Instruction program to enhance differentiated instructional practices and support inclusive education. The study recommends sustaining teacher professional development, strengthening differentiated instruction practices, optimizing instructional resources, addressing curriculum content overload, and implementing the proposed intervention to improve English language learning outcomes in inclusive classrooms.

Keywords: Differentiated instruction, English, language learning, content, process, teacher training.

INTRODUCTION

Inclusive education has become a significant educational priority aimed at ensuring equitable access to quality learning opportunities for all learners regardless of their abilities, backgrounds, learning preferences, and educational needs. In language learning, particularly in English instruction, differentiated instruction is recognized as an essential approach that enables teachers to adapt instructional activities, resources, and strategies to address learner diversity effectively. Through differentiated instruction, teachers modify content, process, product, and learning environment to accommodate varying readiness levels, interests, and learning profiles among learners. Studies have emphasized that differentiated instructional practices contribute to increased learner engagement, academic achievement, and inclusivity in the classroom (Altun & Nayman, 2022; Stingo, 2024).

The Department of Education continuously promotes inclusive education through policies and frameworks that encourage the utilization of differentiated instruction in classroom teaching. DepEd Order No. 44, s. 2021, known as the Policy Guidelines for Inclusive Education, advocates flexible instructional approaches that address the diverse needs of learners. Likewise, DepEd Order No. 10, s. 2024 on the implementation of the MATATAG

Curriculum emphasizes learner-centered and differentiated teaching practices to ensure that all learners are provided with meaningful and responsive educational experiences. These policies highlight the importance of differentiated instructional activities, resources, and strategies in strengthening inclusive English language education.

Empirical studies have shown that differentiated instruction supports learner participation and promotes positive educational outcomes in inclusive classrooms. Research conducted by Zens (2021), Vakolia et al. (2025), and Subandiyah et al. (2025) revealed that differentiated activities and instructional strategies improve learner engagement, motivation, and academic performance. However, despite its recognized benefits, teachers continue to encounter challenges such as curriculum content overload, insufficient instructional materials, limited planning time, and difficulties in managing differentiated classroom processes. These challenges may affect the effective integration of differentiated instruction in English language learning environments

Despite the growing emphasis on inclusive education and differentiated instruction, limited studies have examined the current status of English language instruction and its relationship with the integration of differentiated instructional activities, resources, and strategies in elementary schools. Hence, this study aimed to determine the differentiated instructional activities, resources, and strategies for inclusive education in language learning in Daet South District, assess the current status of English language instruction, identify challenges encountered by teachers, and propose an intervention to strengthen differentiated instruction in support of inclusive English language learning.

METHODOLOGY

The study employed a quantitative descriptive-correlational research design. Data were gathered using a researcher-made questionnaire developed from relevant literature on English language instruction, differentiated instruction, and inclusive education. The instrument underwent expert validation by specialists in English education, educational management, and research to establish content validity. Revisions were made based on their recommendations regarding item clarity, relevance, and alignment with the study objectives. A pilot test was subsequently conducted among teachers outside the study area to determine the instrument's reliability and comprehensibility. Reliability was established through Cronbach's alpha, which confirmed acceptable internal consistency of the questionnaire. The instrument utilized a five-point Likert scale, and weighted means were computed to determine the levels of implementation, integration, and challenges encountered, while the Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient was used to test significant relationships between variables.

Ethical procedures were strictly observed through the acquisition of approval from the concerned authorities, informed consent from respondents, assurance of voluntary participation, and maintenance of confidentiality and anonymity of all data collected. Furthermore, to avoid conceptual overlap between the study variables, English language instruction was operationally defined as the general implementation of English teaching practices, including teaching strategies, instructional materials, assessment, and teacher training, whereas differentiated instruction referred specifically to the intentional adaptation of content, process, product, and learning environment to accommodate learners' diverse readiness levels, interests, and learning profiles in inclusive classrooms. This distinction guided the development and validation of the instrument to ensure that each indicator measured its intended construct.

The respondents were 160 elementary teachers from public elementary schools in Daet South District, Division of Camarines Norte, during School Year 2025-2026, who were directly engaged in teaching English in inclusive classroom settings. A total enumeration sampling technique was utilized to include all eligible teacher-respondents in the district. Data were gathered using a validated researcher-made survey questionnaire. The collected data were statistically treated using weighted mean to determine the implementation levels of the variables and Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient (ρ) to test the significant relationship between English language instruction and differentiated instruction.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Current Status in Instruction of English Language in Daet South District. This section presents a detailed discussion of the current status of English language instruction in Daet South District across the four dimensions: language-oriented teaching strategies, educational materials, language learning assessment, and teacher training. It highlights the extent to which these instructional components are implemented to support effective English language teaching and learning in elementary schools.

Language-Oriented Teaching Strategies. This section presents the data on the current status of English language instruction along language-oriented teaching strategies. The current status of English language instruction obtained an overall weighted mean of 4.60, interpreted as Very Highly Implemented. The highest weighted mean of 4.76, interpreted as Very Highly Implemented, was obtained by the indicator “Regularly utilizes English language in classroom-based teaching-learning process.” This suggests that teachers consistently use English as the primary medium of instruction, providing learners with authentic opportunities to develop their communication skills. Meanwhile, the indicator “Incorporates listening, speaking, reading, and writing tasks and skills in English instruction” obtained the lowest weighted mean of 4.21, although it remained interpreted as Very Highly Implemented. This indicates that while teachers regularly integrate the four macro skills in instruction, the extent of implementation is relatively lower compared to the other language-oriented teaching strategies. The findings were corroborated by Zens (2021), who emphasized that continuous exposure to English through classroom interactions enhances learners' language proficiency and communicative competence. Likewise, the findings support Altun et al. (2022), who asserted that the integration of listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills contributes to more effective language learning and communicative development.

Table 1: Current Status in Instruction of English Language along Language-Oriented Teaching Strategies

Indicators		Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1.	Utilizes communicative tasks to foster real life language application in English.	4.53	VHI
2.	Incorporates listening, speaking, reading and writing tasks and skills in English instruction.	4.21	VHI
3.	Regularly utilizes English language in classroom-based teaching-learning process.	4.76	VHI
4.	Applies explicit strategies in teaching English vocabulary.	4.61	VHI
5.	Teaches grammar in a context-based approach in English rather than as isolated drills.	4.73	VHI
6.	Guides students in collaborative and interactive learning tasks in English.	4.49	VHI
7.	Adapts language-related activities to match the varied language proficiency levels of learners in English.	4.75	VHI
8.	Integrates authentic educational resources in English language instruction.	4.63	VHI
9.	Encourages feedback, peer assessment and performance-oriented activities in monitoring students' progress in learning English.	4.59	VHI
10.	Utilizes digital learning materials and technological tools in teaching English language.	4.73	VHI
Overall Weighted Mean		4.60	VHI

Rating Scale: Descriptive Interpretation:

4.20 – 5.00 -Very Highly Implemented (VHI)

3.40 – 4.19 -Highly Implemented (HI)

2.60 – 3.39 - Implemented (I)

1.80 – 2.59 -Poorly Implemented (PI)

1.0 – 1.79 -Very Poorly Implemented (VPI)

Educational Materials. This section presents the data on the current status of English language instruction along educational materials. The overall weighted mean of 4.50 indicates that educational materials were Very Highly Implemented. The highest weighted mean of 4.75 was obtained by the indicator "Utilizes audio-visual materials in supporting English language instruction." This finding suggests that teachers extensively utilize multimedia resources to improve learners' understanding, engagement, and language development. On the other hand, the indicator "Ensures that teaching materials sufficiently support the development of speaking, reading, listening, and writing skills" obtained the lowest weighted mean of 4.21, although it remained Very Highly Implemented. This implies that teachers consistently provide instructional materials supporting the four macro skills, but greater emphasis is still placed on the use of audio-visual resources. The findings were supported by Sahia (2022), who concluded that the consistent utilization of audio-visual materials enhances learners' listening, speaking, and comprehension skills. Furthermore, the findings corroborate Altun and Nayman (2022), who emphasized that adequate instructional resources and teacher preparedness contribute significantly to effective English language instruction.

Table 2: Current Status in Instruction of English Language along Educational Materials

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1. Utilizes updated and curriculum-based textbooks and reading materials in teaching English.	4.37	VHI
2. Ensures that there are adequate English language resource materials like modules and worktexts accessible for classroom-based instruction.	4.71	VHI
3. Ensures that my learners have access to e-books and online learning materials integrated in English language instruction.	4.55	VHI
4. Utilizes audio-visual materials in supporting English language instruction.	4.75	VHI
5. Ensures that there is a wide range of language learning materials in English matched for diverse ability groups.	4.53	VHI
6. Uses culturally-relevant instructional materials in teaching English language.	4.34	VHI
7. Ensures that the educational materials that I use in teaching English language align with the national and curriculum standards.	4.47	VHI
8. Ensures that the teaching materials in English are sufficiently supportive of the development of speaking, reading, listening and writing skills.	4.21	VHI
9. Develops English language learning materials tailored to the diverse learning needs of my learners.	4.47	VHI
10. Ensures that the teaching-learning materials that I use in English are well-maintained and convenient to use by the learners.	4.65	VHI
Overall Weighted Mean	4.50	VHI

Rating Scale: Descriptive Interpretation:

4.20 – 5.00 - Very Highly Implemented (VHI)

3.40 – 4.19 - Highly Implemented (HI)

2.60 – 3.39 - Implemented (I)

1.80 – 2.59 - Poorly Implemented (PI)

1.0 – 1.79 -Very Poorly Implemented (VPI)

Language Learning Assessment. This section presents the data on the current status of English language instruction along language learning assessment. The overall weighted mean of 4.50 indicates that language learning assessment was Very Highly Implemented. The indicator “Ensures that technology-aided assessment materials are effectively incorporated in English language assessment strategies” obtained the highest weighted mean of 4.77, suggesting that teachers extensively integrate digital tools and online platforms in assessing learner performance. Meanwhile, the indicator “Uses English language assessment that sufficiently measures learners' listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills” obtained the lowest weighted mean of 4.25, although it remained Very Highly Implemented. This result indicates that teachers consistently conduct holistic language assessments, but technology-supported assessment practices are more evident in classroom implementation. The findings were supported by Vakolia et al. (2025), who emphasized that technology-aided assessments enhance learner engagement, facilitate differentiated evaluation, and support instructional decision-making. Similarly, the findings corroborate Ramos (2023), who found that comprehensive language assessments contribute significantly to learners' overall language proficiency and academic performance.

Table 3: Current Status in Instruction of English Language along Language Learning Assessment

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1. Utilizes English language assessment tools that accurately align with curriculum standards.	4.59	VHI
2. Uses English language assessment that sufficiently measures learners listening, speaking, reading and writing skills.	4.25	VHI
3. Consistently uses formative assessment approaches to evaluate learners' progress in learning English.	4.47	VHI
4. Uses diverse assessment strategies to assess students' English language competencies.	4.65	VHI
5. Uses of English language assessment tools that are matched with authentic communication.	4.45	VHI
6. Uses of scoring rubrics and proper evaluation criteria for the performance assessment of students' English writing and speaking competencies.	4.27	VHI
7. Offers proper and constructive feedback to students after English language assessment.	4.69	VHI
8. Ensures that teachers are competent in developing valid and functional English language assessment materials.	4.50	VHI
9. Uses accurate standardized English proficiency test.	4.41	VHI
10. Ensures that the technology-aided assessment materials are effectively incorporated in English language assessment strategies.	4.77	VHI
Overall Weighted Mean	4.50	VHI

Rating Scale: Descriptive Interpretation:

4.20 – 5.00	-	Very Highly Implemented (VHI)
3.40 – 4.19	-	Highly Implemented (HI)
2.60 – 3.39	-	Implemented (I)
1.80 – 2.59	-	Poorly Implemented (PI)
1.00 – 1.79	-	Very Poorly Implemented (VPI)

a. Teacher Trainings. This section presents and discusses the findings on the current status of English language instruction along teacher training. Teacher training obtained an overall weighted mean of 4.45, interpreted as Very Highly Implemented. The highest weighted mean of 4.83 was obtained by the indicator “Participates in professional development trainings on reflective instructional practices in English.” This finding indicates that teachers actively engage in professional development activities that encourage reflection and

continuous improvement of teaching practices. On the other hand, the indicator “Participated in pre-service education program to sufficiently equip myself with the vital knowledge and competencies for practical classroom instruction” obtained the lowest weighted mean of 4.13, interpreted as Highly Implemented. This suggests that teachers recognize the value of their pre-service education but place greater emphasis on continuous professional learning opportunities. The findings were corroborated by Hatmanto and Rahmawati (2023), who emphasized that reflective professional development enhances teachers' pedagogical effectiveness and instructional competence. Likewise, the findings support Canque et al. (2021), who revealed that participation in professional development programs strengthens teachers' instructional innovation, assessment practices, and overall teaching effectiveness.

Table 4: Current Status in Instruction of English Language along Teacher Training

Indicators		Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1.	Participated in pre-service education program to sufficiently equip myself with the vital knowledge and competencies for practical classroom instruction.	4.13	HI
2.	Has access to in-service trainings and professional development programs in English.	4.59	VHI
3.	Receives adequate trainings learner-oriented strategies in teaching English.	4.81	VHI
4.	Participates in trainings in the development of appropriate English language assessment.	4.49	VHI
5.	Receives adequate trainings on technological application in English language instruction.	4.32	VHI
6.	Trained about international language utilization frameworks and system in English.	4.28	VHI
7.	Engages in trainings on the effective teaching of four macro competencies such as listening, speaking, reading and writing skills.	4.49	VHI
8.	Receives professional mentoring services and guidance to upgrade my professional competencies in teaching English language.	4.37	VHI
9.	Participates in professional development trainings on reflective instructional practices in English.	4.83	VHI
10.	Pursues higher education in line with English language teaching innovation.	4.17	HI
Overall Weighted Mean		4.45	VHI

Rating Scale: Descriptive Interpretation:

4.20 – 5.00	-	Very Highly Implemented (VHI)
3.40 – 4.19	-	Highly Implemented (HI)
2.60 – 3.39	-	Implemented (I)
1.80 – 2.59	-	Poorly Implemented (PI)
1.00 – 1.79	-	Very Poorly Implemented (VPI)

Level of Integration of Differentiated Instruction in the Inclusive Education in English Language Learning.

This section presents a detailed discussion of the level of integration of differentiated instruction in inclusive English language learning across the three dimensions: activities, resources, and strategies. It examines the extent to which teachers implement differentiated instructional practices to address the diverse needs, abilities, interests, and learning preferences of learners in inclusive English language classrooms.

Activities. This section presents the findings on the level of integration of differentiated instruction in inclusive English language learning along activities. The level of integration obtained an overall weighted mean of 4.47, interpreted as Very Highly Integrated. The highest weighted mean of 4.62, interpreted as Very Highly Integrated,

was obtained by the indicator “Allows students to practice and apply English language learning competencies in differentiated learning formats.” This suggests that teachers consistently provide learners with varied opportunities to demonstrate and develop their English language competencies according to their readiness levels, interests, and learning preferences. Conversely, the indicator “Utilizes a wide range of differentiated teaching strategies in English that provide support to diverse ability groups of learners” obtained the lowest weighted mean of 4.33, although it remained interpreted as Very Highly Integrated. This indicates that while teachers regularly employ differentiated instructional approaches, the breadth of strategies utilized may vary across classroom situations. The findings were supported by Balita and Salvador (2023), who emphasized that differentiated learning activities promote learner engagement and skill development, and by Geel et al. (2022), who highlighted the importance of adapting instructional practices to learners' diverse needs.

Table 5: Level of Integration of Differentiated Instruction in the Inclusive Education in English Language Learning along Activities

Indicators		Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1.	Offers differentiated learning materials at diverse levels of difficulty to address the learners' English competencies.	4.53	VHI
2.	Makes use of differentiated texts, stories and multimedia materials tailored to learners' needs in learning English.	4.40	VHI
3.	Give students with preferences in selecting differentiated topics that match their interests in English language learning.	4.46	VHI
4.	Utilizes wide range of differentiated teaching strategies in English that provide support to diverse ability groups of learners.	4.33	VHI
5.	Ensures that differentiated language learning opportunities are equally offered to learners based on their academic profile.	4.49	VHI
6.	Allows students to practice and apply English language learning competencies in differentiated learning formats.	4.62	VHI
7.	Offers differentiated options for assessment activities to my learners based on their strengths and competencies.	4.43	VHI
8.	Assigns differentiated performance-based tasks in English to my learners that are matched to their diverse language competency levels.	4.54	VHI
9.	Ensures that the classroom learning environment fosters respect to varied language learning competencies of learners in English.	4.39	VHI
10.	Promotes a supportive learning atmosphere to my learners to develop their confidence and efficacy in learning English.	4.47	VHI
Overall Weighted Mean		4.47	VHI

Rating Scale: Descriptive Interpretation:

4.20 – 5.00	-	Very Highly Integrated (VHI)
3.40 – 4.19	-	Highly Integrated (HI)
2.60 – 3.39	-	Integrated (I)
1.80 – 2.59	-	Poorly Integrated (PI)
1.00 – 1.79	-	Very Poorly Integrated (VPI)

Resources. This section presents the findings on the level of integration of differentiated instruction in inclusive English language learning along resources. The overall weighted mean of 4.38 indicates that differentiated instructional resources were Very Highly Integrated. The highest weighted mean of 4.57 was obtained by the indicator “Offers differentiated English language learning materials at varied levels of complexity to adapt to diverse needs of learners.” This finding suggests that teachers consistently provide learning materials that

accommodate different proficiency levels and learning needs. On the other hand, the indicator “Uses differentiated rubrics aligned to the language competency levels of learners in English” obtained the lowest weighted mean of 4.23, although it remained Very Highly Integrated. This implies that differentiated assessment resources are utilized, but to a lesser extent than differentiated instructional materials. The findings were corroborated by Zoraloglu and Sahin (2022), who emphasized the value of adapting learning materials according to learner readiness, and by Bianco (2020), who asserted that differentiated resources promote inclusivity and equitable learning opportunities in the classroom.

Table 6: Level of Integration of Differentiated Instruction in the Inclusive Education in English Language Learning along Resources

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1. Offers differentiated English language learning materials at varied levels of complexity to adapt to diverse needs of learners.	4.57	VHI
2. Exposes students to the use of differentiated reading materials that are accessible for flexible ability groups in English.	4.31	VHI
3. Ensures that the differentiated vocabulary resource materials are presented in differentiated approach to address the language competence and readiness of the learners in English.	4.46	VHI
4. Offers differentiated activity materials and learning guides to reinforce varied learning styles in English.	4.50	VHI
5. Utilizes differentiated interactive resources like educational games and materials for role-playing in English.	4.34	VHI
6. Provides students with differentiated learning output options in English.	4.30	VHI
7. Uses differentiated rubrics aligned to the language competency levels of learners in English.	4.23	VHI
8. Assigns students in differentiated innovative project resources in English.	4.30	VHI
9. Ensures that the classroom is equipped with differentiated language learning tools in English.	4.39	VHI
10. Ensures that differentiated print-rich educational materials in English are placed in the classroom.	4.45	VHI
Overall Weighted Mean	4.38	VHI

Rating Scale: Descriptive Interpretation:

4.20 – 5.00	-	Very Highly Integrated (VHI)
3.40 – 4.19	-	Highly Integrated (HI)
2.60 – 3.39	-	Integrated (I)
1.80 – 2.59	-	Poorly Integrated (PI)
1.00 – 1.79	-	Very Poorly Integrated (VPI)

c. Strategies. This section presents the findings on the level of integration of differentiated instruction in inclusive English language learning along strategies. The overall weighted mean of 4.34, interpreted as Very Highly Integrated, indicates that teachers consistently utilize differentiated instructional strategies in English language instruction. The highest weighted mean of 4.61 was obtained by the indicator “Uses differentiated tiered performance tasks in English according to the readiness and competence levels of students.” This suggests that teachers frequently design tasks that provide appropriate challenges and support based on learners’ proficiency levels. Meanwhile, the indicators “Offers differentiated leveled texts in English to ensure accurate learning challenges to learners” and “Offers differentiated guided practice in English to students with different ability levels” both obtained the lowest weighted mean of 4.25, although they remained Very Highly Integrated. This indicates that leveled texts and guided practice are regularly used but receive comparatively less emphasis than

other differentiated strategies. The findings were supported by Yunami et al. (2024), who emphasized that differentiated learning tasks effectively address learner readiness and performance levels, and by Onyishi et al. (2020), who found that differentiated instructional strategies promote inclusivity and improve learning outcomes among diverse learners.

Table 7: Level of Integration of Differentiated Instruction in the Inclusive Education in English Language Learning along Strategies

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1. Uses differentiated tiered reading tools to match to the diverse English language competencies of students.	4.34	VHI
2. Offers differentiated leveled texts in English to ensure accurate learning challenges to learners.	4.25	VHI
3. Utilizes differentiated grouping or flexible grouping in facilitating learning activities in English.	4.32	VHI
4. Initiates differentiated learning activities in English to cater to diverse levels of students' comprehension.	4.29	VHI
5. Offers differentiated guided practice in English to students with different ability levels.	4.25	VHI
6. Uses differentiated tiered performance tasks in English according to the readiness and competence levels of students	4.61	VHI
7. Offers students with differentiated choice boards for learning assessment in English.	4.39	VHI
8. Encourages the use of differentiated alternative formats in English such as oral, written and creative learning outputs.	4.41	VHI
9. Arranges differentiated seating to support the differentiated learning preferences of students in English.	4.26	VHI
10. Sets up differentiated learning stations in English for diverse learners.	4.27	VHI
Overall Weighted Mean	4.34	VHI

Rating Scale: Descriptive Interpretation:

4.20 – 5.00	-	Very Highly Integrated (VHI)
3.40 – 4.19	-	Highly Integrated (HI)
2.60 – 3.39	-	Integrated (I)
1.80 – 2.59	-	Poorly Integrated (PI)
1.00 – 1.79	-	Very Poorly Integrated (VPI)

Relationship between the English Language Instruction and the Level of Integration of Differentiated Instruction in Inclusive Education. Table 8 presents the computed Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficients (ρ) showing the relationship between English language instruction and the level of integration of differentiated instruction in inclusive English language learning. English language instruction was categorized into language-oriented teaching strategies, educational materials, language learning assessment, and teacher training, while the level of integration of differentiated instruction was assessed in terms of activities, resources, and strategies. Results revealed that language-oriented teaching strategies showed weak and non-significant correlations with differentiated instructional activities ($\rho = -0.055$, $p = .503$), resources ($\rho = -0.025$, $p = .760$), and strategies ($\rho = .135$, $p = .099$). Likewise, language learning assessment was not significantly correlated with differentiated activities ($\rho = .049$, $p = .549$), resources ($\rho = -.069$, $p = .400$), and strategies ($\rho = -.085$, $p = .301$). Similarly, teacher training demonstrated no significant relationship with differentiated activities ($\rho = -.130$, $p = .113$), resources ($\rho = .049$, $p = .553$), and strategies ($\rho = -.004$, $p = .960$). These findings indicate that variations in these

dimensions of English language instruction do not necessarily influence the level of integration of differentiated instruction

Notably, the only statistically significant relationship identified was between educational materials and differentiated instructional strategies ($\rho = -.185$, $p = .024$). Although the relationship was weak and negative, the result suggests that educational materials have a measurable influence on the implementation of differentiated instructional strategies. This implies that the types and nature of instructional materials available to teachers may affect how differentiated strategies are applied in the classroom.

These findings were supported by Ramirez (2019), who emphasized that the successful implementation of differentiated instruction requires deliberate adaptation of instructional methods, learning activities, and educational materials to address learners' varying needs, interests, and readiness levels. The findings further suggest that while English language instruction is generally implemented at a very high level, schools may need to strengthen the alignment between instructional practices and differentiated instruction through the provision of more learner-responsive resources and targeted professional development opportunities.

Table 8: Test for Significant Relationship between the English Language Education and the Level of Integration of Differentiated Instruction

English Language Education	Integration of Differentiated Instruction					
	Activities		Resources		Strategies	
	ρ	p-value	ρ	p-value	ρ	p-value
Language-Oriented Teaching Strategies	-.055	.503	-.025	.760	.135	.099
Educational Materials	.150	.067	-.117	.154	-.185*	.024
Language Learning Assessment	.049	.549	-.069	.400	-.085	.301
Teacher Training	-.130	.113	.049	.553	-.004	.960

*Correlation is significant @ 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Challenges Encountered by the Teachers in Employing Differentiated Instructional Activities, Resources and Strategies in Support of Inclusive Education in English Language. This section presents the findings on the challenges encountered by teachers in implementing differentiated instruction in inclusive English language learning across the areas of content, process, product, and learning environment. These challenges reflect the difficulties experienced by teachers in addressing learners' diverse needs while maintaining effective instructional delivery

Content. This section presents the challenges encountered by teachers in employing differentiated instruction along content. The challenges obtained an overall weighted mean of 4.38, interpreted as Always Encountered. The highest weighted mean of 4.89 was obtained by the indicator "Curriculum content overload that affects differentiated instruction quality in English," indicating that teachers experience difficulty balancing extensive curriculum requirements with the need to adapt instruction for diverse learners. Meanwhile, the indicator "Difficulty in designing differentiated learning assessment activities in English language" obtained the lowest weighted mean of 4.13, interpreted as Often Encountered. The findings suggest that content-related challenges remain a major concern in implementing differentiated instruction. These findings were supported by Llego (2019) and Tas and Minaz (2024), who emphasized that curriculum demands, limited resources, and insufficient planning time often hinder effective differentiation.

Table 9: Challenges Encountered by Teachers in Employing Differentiated Instruction along Content

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1. Curriculum content overload that affects differentiated instruction quality in English.	4.89	AE

2.	Insufficient inclusive language educational materials that support differentiated instruction in English.	4.67	AE
3.	Establishing balance between curriculum standards and the differentiated learning needs of the learners in English.	4.15	OE
4.	Insufficient time for differentiated instructional planning.	4.45	AE
5.	Insufficient training programs on differentiated instructional strategies.	4.30	AE
6.	Difficulties in addressing the differentiated learning needs in diversity-focused classroom.	4.21	AE
7.	Difficulty in designing differentiated learning assessment activities in English language.	4.13	OE
8.	Difficulty in ensuring fair and appropriate differentiated monitoring tools for English language learning.	4.21	AE
9.	Inadequate access of learners to inclusive educational spaces to facilitate differentiated instruction.	4.25	AE
10.	Lack of implementation on instructional localization and contextualization in support to differentiated instruction in English.	4.51	AE
Overall Weighted Mean		4.38	AE

Rating Scale: Descriptive Interpretation:

4.20 – 5.00	-	Always Encountered (AE)
3.40 – 4.19	-	Often Encountered (OE)
2.60 – 3.39	-	Sometimes Encountered (SoE)
1.80 – 2.59	-	Seldom Encountered (SeE)
1.0 – 1.79	-	Not Encountered (NE)

Process. This section presents the challenges encountered by teachers in employing differentiated instruction along process. The overall weighted mean of 4.35, interpreted as Always Encountered, indicates that teachers consistently experience challenges in managing differentiated instructional processes. The highest weighted mean of 4.60 was obtained by the indicator “Difficulties in establishing balance of time for managing flexible grouping under differentiated instruction in English,” suggesting that managing multiple learner groups requires considerable instructional time and effort. On the other hand, “Balancing instructional delivery processes for differentiated instruction in English for large classes” obtained the lowest weighted mean of 3.89, interpreted as Often Encountered. The findings imply that time management, flexible grouping, monitoring learner progress, and classroom management are common challenges in differentiated instruction. These findings support the study of Diaz (2023), which highlighted the importance of planning time, professional support, and effective classroom management in implementing differentiated instruction successfully.

Table 10: Challenges Encountered by Teachers in Employing Differentiated Instruction along Process

	Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1.	Insufficient time for planning and management of differentiated instruction in English.	4.15	OE
2.	Difficulty in managing differentiated instructional activities and procedures in teaching English.	4.33	AE
3.	Limited access to trainings in differentiated instructional practices in English.	4.42	AE
4.	Balancing instructional delivery processes for differentiated	3.89	OE

instruction in English for large classes.		
5. Difficulties in establishing balance of time for managing flexible grouping under differentiated instruction in English.	4.60	AE
6. Limited access to professional support from personnel in the management of differentiated instructional operations and activities in English.	4.32	AE
7. Rigorous processes in incorporating technology to support differentiated instruction in English.	4.31	AE
8. Balancing teacher-initiated roles and independent learning tasks along differentiated instruction in English.	4.53	AE
9. Integrating differentiated instructional processes in classroom management practices in English.	4.39	AE
10. Monitoring the quality and consistency of differentiated instructional processes and activities in English.	4.56	AE
Overall Weighted Mean	4.35	AE

Rating Scale: Descriptive Interpretation:

4.20 – 5.00	-	Always Encountered (AE)
3.40 – 4.19	-	Often Encountered (OE)
2.60 – 3.39	-	Sometimes Encountered (SoE)
1.80 – 2.59	-	Seldom Encountered (SeE)
1.0 – 1.79	-	-Not Encountered (NE)

Product. This section presents the challenges encountered by teachers in employing differentiated instruction along product. The overall weighted mean of 3.40, interpreted as Often Encountered, indicates that teachers regularly experience difficulties in developing differentiated learning outputs and assessment products. The highest weighted mean of 3.98 was obtained by the indicator “Difficulty in aligning differentiated learning outputs in English with curriculum standards,” suggesting that teachers struggle to ensure that varied outputs measure the same learning competencies while meeting curriculum requirements. The lowest weighted mean of 2.80 was obtained by “Difficulty in ensuring validity of differentiated assessment tools in English,” interpreted as Sometimes Encountered. The findings were corroborated by Deloso (2020) and Ramos (2023), who emphasized that balancing curriculum standards with differentiated assessment and learning outputs remains a challenge in inclusive classrooms.

Table 11: Challenges Encountered by Teachers in Employing Differentiated Instruction along Product

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1. Difficulty in producing differentiated assessment approaches in English.	3.46	OE
2. Difficulty in ensuring validity of differentiated assessment tools in English.	2.80	SoE
3. Difficulty in developing differentiated language learning outputs in English.	3.69	OE
4. Insufficient time to balance the use of differentiated formative and summative evaluation tools in English.	3.40	OE
5. Limited professional support from experts in developing differentiated alternative language assessment in English.	3.41	OE
6. Difficulty in guiding my students in developing	2.81	SoE

differentiated oral and cooperative language learning outputs in English.

7. Limited motivation towards the use of differentiated and non-traditional assessment tools in English.	3.53	OE
8. Insufficient time for assessing differentiated learning outputs in English of students.	3.35	SoE
9. Difficulty in aligning differentiated learning outputs in English with curriculum standards.	3.98	OE
10. Limited self-assessment skills of students after developing differentiated language outputs in English.	3.53	OE
Overall Weighted Mean	3.40	OE

Rating Scale: Descriptive Interpretation:

4.20 – 5.00	-	Always Encountered (AE)
3.40 – 4.19	-	Often Encountered (OE)
2.60 – 3.39	-	Sometimes Encountered (SoE)
1.80 – 2.59	-	Seldom Encountered (SeE)
1.00 – 1.79	-	Not Encountered (NE)

Learning Environment. This section presents the challenges encountered by teachers in employing differentiated instruction along the learning environment. The challenges obtained an overall weighted mean of 3.72, interpreted as Often Encountered. The highest weighted mean of 4.55 was obtained by the indicator “Difficulty in establishing classroom-based policies in managing differentiated learning materials in the classroom,” indicating that managing varied instructional materials and ensuring their appropriate use remain significant concerns among teachers. Meanwhile, “Difficulty in guiding students who are less confident and less motivated in differentiated learning” obtained the lowest weighted mean of 2.63, interpreted as Sometimes Encountered. These findings suggest that classroom management, resource organization, and learner diversity continue to influence the implementation of differentiated instruction. The findings were supported by Maming (2022) and Balita and Salvador (2023), who highlighted the importance of effective classroom management, clear routines, and learner support in sustaining inclusive and differentiated learning environments.

Table 12: Challenges Encountered by Teachers in Employing Differentiated Instruction along Learning Environment

Indicators	Weighted Mean	Interpretation
1. Inadequate educational areas to facilitate differentiated instruction in English.	3.54	OE
2. Insufficient ICTs in the classroom to support differentiated teaching of English.	4.14	OE
3. Insufficient professional support for differentiated instructional delivery in English language classroom.	4.16	OE
4. Unfavorable attitude of students towards differentiated instructional activities in English in the classroom.	4.53	AE
5. Difficulty to guide my students who are less confident and less motivated to differentiated learning of English in the classroom.	2.63	SoE
6. Excessive workload in handling differentiated classroom-based instruction in English.	3.89	OE
7. Limited time for establishing professional partnership with	3.39	SoE

fellow English teachers in line with innovation in differentiated classroom-based instruction.		
8.	Inadequate parental involvement in the conduct of differentiated educational activities in the classroom related to learning English.	3.29 SoE
9.	Cultural and language diversity of pupils which affect the delivery of differentiated classroom-based instruction in English.	3.07 SoE
10.	Difficulty in establishing classroom-based policies in managing differentiated learning materials in the classroom.	4.55 AE
Overall Weighted Mean		3.72 OE

Rating Scale: Descriptive Interpretation:

4.20 – 5.00	-	Always Encountered (AE)
3.40 – 4.19	-	Often Encountered (OE)
2.60 – 3.39	-	Sometimes Encountered (SoE)
1.80 – 2.59	-	Seldom Encountered (SeE)
1.00 – 1.79	-	Not Encountered (NE)

Proposed Intervention to Enhance the Differentiated Instructional Activities, Resources and Strategies in Support of Inclusive Education in English Language Learning. The findings of the study on the differentiated instructional activities, resources, and strategies for inclusive education in English language learning indicate the need for a targeted professional development program to strengthen teachers' capacity to implement differentiated instruction effectively. The proposed intervention, entitled D.I.F.F.E.R. (Developing Inclusive and Flexible Frameworks for Enhancing Responsive English Instruction) (see Appendix H), was specifically developed to address the major challenges encountered by teachers in implementing differentiated instruction

The basis for this intervention stems directly from the challenges reported by the respondents. Specifically, the highest-rated challenge under content was curriculum content overload that affects differentiated instruction quality in English (WM = 4.89), while difficulties in managing flexible grouping (WM = 4.60), aligning differentiated outputs with curriculum standards (WM = 3.98), and establishing classroom-based policies for managing differentiated learning materials (WM = 4.55) were also identified as major concerns. These findings suggest that teachers experience difficulties in balancing curriculum requirements with learner diversity, managing differentiated classroom processes, and developing differentiated instructional outputs and resources.

The strategic focus of the intervention is to strengthen teachers' competencies in implementing differentiated instruction within inclusive English language classrooms. Through seminar-workshops, collaborative learning activities, and instructional material development sessions, the program is designed to enhance teachers' knowledge and skills in differentiated instructional planning, resource development, classroom management, assessment design, and learner support. The intervention emphasizes practical and learner-centered approaches that enable teachers to respond effectively to learners' varying readiness levels, interests, and learning profiles

Specifically, the D.I.F.F.E.R. Program aims to:(1) strengthen teachers' competencies in implementing differentiated instructional activities in English,(2) enhance the development and utilization of differentiated instructional resources,(3) improve teachers' skills in managing flexible grouping and differentiated classroom processes,(4) develop differentiated assessment tools and learner outputs aligned with curriculum standards, and (5) promote collaboration among teachers in creating inclusive and learner-centered instructional materials.

This proposed intervention is further supported by DepEd Order No. 44, s. 2021 on Inclusive Education and DepEd Order No. 10, s. 2024 on the MATATAG Curriculum, both of which advocate learner-centered, flexible,

and inclusive instructional practices that address the diverse needs of learners. By institutionalizing the D.I.F.F.E.R. Program through INSET activities, schools can provide sustained professional support that will help teachers overcome identified challenges and strengthen the implementation of differentiated instruction in English language learning. Ultimately, the program is expected to enhance instructional effectiveness, improve learner engagement, and promote equitable and inclusive educational opportunities for all learners.

CONCLUSIONS

The study concluded that English language instruction in Daet South District was implemented at a very high level, reflecting the consistent application of language-oriented teaching strategies, educational materials, assessment practices, and teacher training initiatives. Likewise, differentiated instruction was highly integrated in inclusive English language learning through the implementation of differentiated activities, resources, and instructional strategies that address learners' diverse needs, readiness levels, and learning preferences. The findings further revealed that there was generally no significant relationship between English language instruction and the level of integration of differentiated instruction, except for the significant relationship between educational materials and differentiated instructional strategies, highlighting the important role of instructional resources in supporting differentiated practices. Despite the high level of implementation and integration, teachers encountered challenges related to curriculum content overload, management of differentiated processes, alignment of differentiated outputs with curriculum standards, and classroom management concerns. To address these challenges and further strengthen differentiated instruction in inclusive English language classrooms, the D.I.F.F.E.R. (Developing Inclusive and Flexible Frameworks for Enhancing Responsive English Instruction) in English Instruction Program was proposed as a targeted intervention focused on capacity building, resource development, instructional innovation, and professional collaboration.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations focus on sustaining the quality of English language instruction, strengthening differentiated instruction practices, and improving support for inclusive education. School heads are advised to continuously sustain professional development programs, instructional monitoring, and mentoring initiatives that enhance teachers' competencies in English language instruction and differentiated teaching practices. They should also institutionalize support mechanisms that provide teachers with adequate instructional resources, learner-responsive materials, and opportunities for professional growth.

Teachers, on their part, are encouraged to strengthen the integration of differentiated instruction by utilizing varied instructional activities, resources, and strategies that address learners' diverse needs, abilities, and learning preferences. They should also enhance the alignment between language-oriented teaching and differentiated instruction through the development and utilization of differentiated educational materials and assessments. Furthermore, teachers and school leaders should collaboratively address curriculum content overload by prioritizing essential competencies and streamlining instructional content to facilitate more effective differentiation.

Finally, Public Schools District Supervisors, school heads, and education experts should implement the proposed D.I.F.F.E.R. (Developing Inclusive and Flexible Frameworks for Enhancing Responsive English Instruction) in English Instruction Program as a continuing professional development initiative to strengthen differentiated instructional activities, resources, and strategies in inclusive English language learning. Regular monitoring and evaluation should be conducted to ensure the sustainability and effectiveness of the intervention. Future researchers are likewise encouraged to conduct related or expanded studies on collaborative support systems, professional learning communities, and other innovative approaches that may further enhance differentiated instruction and inclusive English language education, using qualitative, quantitative, or mixed-method research designs.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The researcher extends heartfelt gratitude, first and foremost, to the Almighty God for His wisdom, guidance, strength, and countless blessings throughout the completion of this study. Deep appreciation is extended to Jennifer S. Rubio, PhD, the research adviser, for her invaluable guidance, patience, encouragement, and unwavering support throughout the conduct of the study. The researcher is likewise thankful to Sonia S. Carbonell, PhD, Dean of the Graduate School, for her continuous support and encouragement. Sincere gratitude is also conveyed to the esteemed Thesis Committee members, Anicia S. Madarang, EdD, Analyn D. Ramos, EdD, and Daryl I. Qunito, PhD, for their expert insights, constructive suggestions, and valuable feedback that strengthened the quality of this research. Special thanks are also extended to Jamila M. Macapundag, MAEd, MLL, for her assistance and support throughout the research process. The researcher also expresses sincere appreciation to the school administrators and teachers of Daet South District, Division of Camarines Norte, for their generous participation, cooperation, and valuable contributions as respondents, which made this study possible. Finally, the researcher is deeply grateful to her family for their unwavering love, understanding, moral support, encouragement, and sacrifices throughout this academic journey. Their constant inspiration served as a source of strength and motivation in accomplishing this study.

REFERENCES

1. Altun S., Nayman H. (2022). Differentiated Instruction: A Study on Teachers' Experiences and Opinions. Researchgate.net/publication/361532494-differentiated-instruction-a-study-on-teachers-experiences-and-opinions
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/361532494_Differentiated_Instruction_A_Study_on_Teachers%27_Experiences_and_Opinions
2. Balita A. B., and Salvador N. T. (2023). Differentiated Instruction and Higher Order Thinking Skills of Grade 12 Students in Understanding Culture. Ijams.bbp.<https://net/wp-content/uploads/2023/07-1-ijams-june-2023-425-451.pdf>
3. Bianco J. J. (2020). The Use of Differentiated Instruction by Teachers of the Columbia Union Seventh Day Adventists. Digitalcommons.andrews. <http://edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3002&context=dissertations>
4. Canque M.S., Trinidad G. A., Cortes M. J.P. (2021). Differentiated Instruction through Tiered Activities in Teaching Geometry to the Junior High School Students. Turcomat <https://org.index.php/turkomat/article/view/9358/72>
5. Deloso, M. (2020). Culturally-Founded Developmentally-Appropriate Practices in Teaching. Educators' Paper. Pp 42-44. C & E Publishing Inc. Quezon City, Metro Manila <https://www.cebookshop.com/educators-paper-2020>
7. Geel M. V., Keuning T., Safar I. (2022). How Teachers Develop Skills for Implementing Differentiated Instruction. Sciencedirect. <http://com/science/article/pii/S2667320722000069>
8. Hatmanto E. D., and Rahmawati F. (2023). Unleashing the Potential: Exploring Attitudes and Overcoming Challenges in Implementing Differentiated Instruction in the Philippines' English Language Classrooms. Researchgate.<https://net/publication/373930472-unleashing-the-potential-exploring-the-attitudes-and-overcoming-challenges-implementing-differentiated-instruction-the-philippines-english-language-classrooms>
9. Maming, D. P. (2022). Differentiated Instruction Employed by the SHS English Teachers: Basis for Modifying or Crafting Innovative Differentiated Strategies in the Classroom. https://depedbinan.com/media/research_research/ijmrd/maming-2022.pdf
10. Onyishi, C. N., Sefotho M. N. (2020). Teachers' Perspectives on the Use of Differentiated Instruction in Inclusive Classrooms: Implications for Teacher <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1277890.pdf>
11. Ramirez, R. (2019). Implementation of Developmentally-Appropriate Practice in Basic Education System. The Learners' Magazine. pp 12- 15. Summit Media Philippines. Pioneer Street, Mandaluyong City. <https://files.e/fulltext/EJ1277890.pdf>

12. Ramos, A. L. (2023). Competence of Teachers in Using Differentiated Instruction in Teaching English: Self-Assessment <https://ijmrap.com/wpcontent/upload/2023/03/ijmrap-v5n9-p44-y23.pdf>
13. Stingo J. (2024). The Effects of Differentiated Instruction and Individualized Instruction on Special Education Students. Researchgate.<http://net/publication/38039260-the-effects-of-differentiated-instruction-and-individualized-instruction-on-special-education> [http://net/publication/38039260-the-effects-of-differentiated-instruction-Subandiyah H., Nasrullah R., Ramadhan R., Supratno H. \(2025\). The Impact of Differentiated Instruction on Student Engagement and Achievement in Indonesian Language Learning.Tandfonline. <http://com/doi/full/10.1080/23331186x2025.2516378>](http://net/publication/38039260-the-effects-of-differentiated-instruction-Subandiyah H., Nasrullah R., Ramadhan R., Supratno H. (2025). The Impact of Differentiated Instruction on Student Engagement and Achievement in Indonesian Language Learning.Tandfonline. http://com/doi/full/10.1080/23331186x2025.2516378)
14. Tas H., and Minaz M. B. (2024). The Effects of Learning Style-Based Differentiated Instructional Activities in the Social Studies Course. Journals.sagepub.<http://com/doi/10.1177/21582440241249290>
15. Vakolia Z., ShyKitika H., Potiuk S., Kazmirchuk N., Liubchenko K. (2025). The
16. Impact of Differentiated Instruction on the Academic Performance of Students with Special Educational Needs. Journals.sapienzaeditorial. <http://com/index.php/SIIS/article/view/e25045>
17. Yunami N., Mustadi A., Mumpuniarti M., Ishrtiwi I., Hidayat R. (2024). Different Instruction Science Learning for Intellectually Disabled Pupils at an Inclusive Primary School: A Case Study. tused. <http://org/index.php/tused/article/view/2664>
18. Zens A. (2021). The Impact of Differentiated Learning Activities on Student Engagement and Motivation in the English Language Arts Classroom. Red.mnstate.<http://edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1645&context=thesis&fbclid=IWAR1EB09>
19. Zoraloglu, S., and Sahin A. E. (2022). Teachers' Competencies for Differentiated Instruction Approach. Dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/2247935 <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/2247935>
20. DepEd Order No. 10, s. 2024 Policy Guidelines on the Implementation of the Matatag Curriculum https://www.deped.gov.ph/wpcontent/uploads/DO_s2024_010.pdf
21. DepEd Order No. 42, s. 2016 Policy Guidelines on Daily Lesson Preparation for The K to 12 Basic Education Program <https://www.deped.gov.ph/2016/06/17/do-42-s-2016-policy-guidelines-on-daily-lesson-preparation-for-the-k-to-12-basic-education-program/>
22. DepEd Order No. 44, s. 2021 Policy Guidelines for Inclusive Educationhttps://www.deped.gov.ph/wpcontent/uploads/2021/11/DO_s2021_044.pdf
23. Diaz N. D. (2023). Diversity of Learners Final.
24. Scribd.<http://com/document/648102948/diversity-of-learners-final> Llego, A.B (2019). teacher capacity building for Grades 1–3 literacy instruction <https://sps.wfu.edu/articles/what-is-Literacy-instruction/>