

## *Nepalese EFL Teachers' Perception and Practices of Differentiated Instruction*

Samikshya Bidari, Soka University, Japan

The European Conference on Education 2021  
Official Conference Proceedings

### **Abstract**

Differentiated Instruction (DI) is a pedagogical premise that provides benefits, such as meeting diverse learner needs, accommodating students with varying learning abilities (De Jesus, 2012). DI is not just for special education; it addresses every student's needs without turning classrooms into cram schools or private tutoring lessons. Therefore, in light of recent progress in Nepal's education sector, ignoring the importance of DI in the EFL classroom is extremely difficult. Previous research has paid little attention to the complexities of DI implementation in Nepal. There has been little discussion of EFL teachers' perceptions of DI in Nepal, in particular. The aim of this study was to investigate Nepalese EFL teachers' perceptions and the factors supporting and hindering the implementation of DI in their classrooms. This research provides valuable insights into the pedagogical effects of incorporating DI in a desirable manner. A qualitative case study was employed as a research design of the study. Fifteen EFL secondary level teachers teaching at private schools in Kathmandu Valley were selected for this study. The teacher participants were chosen via a systematic random sampling procedure. The data were analyzed and interpreted using a thematic approach, employing survey questionnaires, teachers' interviews, book analysis, and classroom observation as data collection instruments. The findings of this study reported differentiated Instruction was not even close to the initial stage of implementation due to large class size, syllabus constraint, time constraint, lack of teacher professional development events, and digital incompetency during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Keywords: Differentiated Instruction, COVID-19, Learners' Diversity

**iafor**

The International Academic Forum  
[www.iafor.org](http://www.iafor.org)

## **Introduction**

Moving towards progressive education, teachers have felt the urgency to deal with diversity and the needs of every individual learner (Oliver, 2016). We accept the world where each individual is different (Kurt et al., 2013; Tomlinson, 2014). Although a growing body of literature recognizes the importance of teaching strategies, Differentiated Instruction (DI) has yet to attract a considerable number of dedicated educators. Generally, teachers show themselves as novices when they meet their new set of students at the beginning of each academic year; they certainly do not carry all the answers regarding how to meet the needs of their learners. Nevertheless, they bring excitement, optimism, and determination to conduct the most effective lessons. Educators globally have expressed admiration towards the culture of Differentiated Instruction (DI) as it aims to increase learners' engagement and interaction by aligning tasks and support by providing pedagogical strategies tailored to specific needs of their learners (Tieso, 2003; Houtveen et al., 2001). To conceptualize the process of DI, teachers' understanding of each individual and how they impact the proposed knowledge in their English classroom seems crucial. This article intends to explore teachers' perspectives and practices on promoting an inclusive learning environment in the secondary EFL classroom of Nepal, addressing the learners' learning differences and how teachers address those differences. This article includes the literature review, research methodology, findings, discussions, and educational implementation.

## **Literature Review**

Differentiated Instruction (DI) is an instructional strategy that embraces each individual's learning map and dismisses traditional instructions as insufficient since it is constructed around a "one size fits all" curriculum (Loeser, 2015). Hence, the prime objective of DI is to assist teachers in unlocking the full potential of their students by designing learning opportunities that are tailored to their specific needs and interests (Santangelo et.al., 2012).

Additionally, differentiated Instruction provides teachers with various options for accomplishing their instructional goals, allowing students to reach their full potential (Tomlinson, 2005). Teacher-student relationships are formed through practical communication skills. It has to meet diverse learners' needs in terms of learning capacity, economic and social circumstances, and language diversity. To address learning differences in an EFL classroom, a teacher needs to plan lessons based on a pre-assessment. While preparing for the study, as Tomlinson (2009) strongly argued, the teacher needs to consider the variations in response to students' needs. This variation implies modification in content, process, and product (Heacox, 2002 & Tomlinson, 2006).

## **Content**

Content is an important part of the curriculum to help learners improve significant and relevant content knowledge and abilities. According to Tomilson and Imbeau (2010), content can also refer to a student's manner of accessing important content. Content diversification refers to various duties, such as supplying diverse materials concerning language skills, such as brochures, multimedia, audiotaped DVDs, and other genres, and giving students options. However, when the ministry of education has specified the textbook curriculum, changing the content is difficult; instead, changing the technique is critical. According to Tomlinson (2001), though learners learn in various learning styles, the basic skills and content they comprehend stay constant.

## **Process**

The process is another domain of differentiation in which a teacher uses different teaching methods and various learning experiences to accommodate the learners' diverse learning needs. As discussed in Tomlinson (1999), all students have the cognitive ability, learning style, and learning pace. Therefore, teachers often select appropriate teaching methods, proper tasks, and essential learning experiences by considering such individual uniqueness. While choosing the right instructional strategies, personal needs, learners' unique learning styles, modalities, and intelligence are considered. Expectations are defined by criteria and accessed through designed strategies and negotiations tailored for the student. Generally, teachers differentiate the process by adding complex or abstract tasks, ensuring their engagement in critical and creative thinking, and offering various learning methods suited to the student's needs, aspirations, and abilities. Tomlinson (1999) identified the process as teaching style, group tasks, and group discussion. In the process, students can take different roads to the same destination. Tomlinson, Brimijoin, and Narvaez (2008) discussed the features of differentiated Instruction that includes understanding students' learning styles, interests, cognitive capacities, and then instructing them in groups or pairs, or as a whole class. How students show, their understanding is the key principle of DI. Tomilson and Imbeau (2010) used the term "sense-making activities" to enhance learning; such activities can be tiered tasks, project work, group work, individual work, and whole-class work according to the level of students. As Tomlinson and Allan (2000) suggested, such activities call for students to use critical thinking skills to understand essential ideas and are focused on learning goals. However, involving students in the same work on a regular pattern may not prove long-term beneficial.

## **Product**

The third component of differentiated Instruction is differentiation in the product. Tomlinson (1999) defined the product as final assessments that give learners a different way for self-expression, activities and tasks with varying levels, and custom-designed evaluation method. Product refers to the result of the whole teaching and a learning process, which mainly depends on the program's input and process. A product may be tangible, like a report, brochure, or model; it may be verbal, dialogue, speech, or debate; or it may involve action, like a dance. In the educational process, product refers to the knowledge, behaviors, values, and skills known from curriculum and Instruction. Different types of products may have occurred from the same educational process. Some students learn the syllabus's language, but some students do not learn the delivered content as per expectation. After participation in an educational program, students learn so many things such as how to be prepared on curricular content, how to ask questions to the teachers, how to answer the asked questions in the examination, how to write the answer on the answer-sheet, how to behave with others, how to communicate with others, how to get help from other, and so on. However, all learners attending the same class and studying the same curricula cannot learn the same content to a similar extent. Such differences are especially visible in an inclusive classroom where diverse learners' study together. It means; children with a fast pace learn content, behaviors, values, and skills compared to the children with a slow learning pace within a particular time bound. The product comprises the way students show what they learn and what they can do with that learning. In other words, demonstrating what students learn and what they can do after understanding can be called a product.

## **Socio-Cultural Theory**

According to Vygotsky (1978), a teacher's job is to identify students' current level of achievement and provide them with treatment to help them learn more effectively. The doctrines of Vygotsky constitute one of the main elements in assembling the theoretical framework of this research. Vygotsky (1978) identified an important concept of the Socio-Cultural theory of human education, emphasizing knowledge as a social process. The primary theme of the socio-cultural theoretical framework is that learners create meaning and understanding. Vygotsky (1978) discovered that social and cognitive development is an inseparable aspect of human development, and learners can absorb new concepts through the ears and interact with the peers or The Knowledgeable Other (TKO). These interactions help students understand a new concept or skill by involving them in group, pair, individual, and collaborative work (Mooney, 2000). In a similar vein, Brown et al., (2015) stated that as students demonstrate progress in their learning, they continue gaining communicative competence in the target language.

## **Policy**

It is stated by the British Council (2019) that we live in challenging times with diverse societies, where their commitment to equality, diversity, and inclusion (EDI) is put to the test in a day-to-day setting. The inclusion of EDI in education is the aspect that receives the most attention. Around the world, there is a common commitment to achieving the Sustainable Development Goals, as set out by the United Nations General Assembly by 2030. In order to "ensure inclusive and equitable quality education for all and promote life learning opportunities for all," Goal 4 is highly committed to reaching out to the unreached children and being the voice for the voiceless, while also ensuring justice for children with disabilities and children from marginalized communities. Inclusion of students from a variety of backgrounds can help to create a welcoming environment for all, regardless of their age, gender, ethnicity, socio-economic background, cognitive ability, health or language needs (Douglas, 2019). It is about demonstrating the skills and awareness as an educator of how to identify and respond to the students' diverse learning differences and styles in an EFL classroom (Thiederman, 2003).

The Government of Nepal (2017) has officially declared that Nepal is a diverse country in many ways. Schools in Nepal are full of students from different social, cultural, economic and linguistic backgrounds. Hence, teaching is very challenging in such a diversified classroom and with all the political instability and policy changes that have occurred, new complications and challenges are unavoidably emerging. Teachers should always be mindful of the fact that learners from all cultures should be afforded the same opportunities as others. The School Sector Development Plan, SSDP, envisions Nepal achieving the goals of Education for All (EFA) and the Millennium Development Goals by 2016-2022.

## **Problem Statement**

While differentiation is widely acknowledged as a compelling and effective way to restructure the traditional classroom to include students with a wide range of abilities, needs, interests, and learning profiles, the philosophy lacks empirical evidence, notably in Nepal (Joshi, 2018; Bidari, 2021).

## **Purpose of the study**

To explore English language teachers' perceptions and classroom practices  
Analyze the impacts on DI implementation. The purpose is also to gain understanding of existing, appropriate differentiation techniques and to learn how teachers can improve their own practice by meeting children where they are, rather than where the textbook says they should be.

## **Research Questions**

1. What are the different perceptions of teachers regarding instructional differentiation in Nepalese EFL classroom?
2. How do teachers practice differentiated Instruction in Nepalese secondary English classrooms?

## **Research Methodology**

This research explores EFL teachers' perception, practice and understanding about differentiated instructional strategies. This research also intended to examine the possible factors that supported or challenged the teachers to promote an inclusive environment in their classroom to accommodate students with learning differences.

This qualitative study adopted the phenomenological approach because it holds the notion that participants' perspectives led to multiple realities (Ary et al., 2010, p. 50)

## **Research Participants**

Based on diversity, fifteen English teachers were selected who represented different cultural ethnic groups, language, and geographical region of the country. Systematic random selection: All the teachers preparing students for their tenth-grade national level board exam SEE (Secondary Education Examination) under the Ministry of Education. The reason behind the systematic random selection is to create a wide structure for a specific phenomenon based on the schoolteachers with different features (Yildirim et al., 2005).

## **Research Site**

Fifteen B graded private schools in Nepal were selected for this research. B-Grade school symbolizes the schools for lower socio-economic community who strive to send their children to private schools for the better education. The reason behind the selection of B-grade schools is to create a wider view for a specific phenomenon (Yildirim, 2005).

## **Instruments**

In order to provide comprehensive data from the participants of the study, three instruments were employed to provide details and complete data collection from various participants. The first tool was online survey questionnaire, this questionnaire intended to filter the participant's and only interview those participants who showed interest to talk about DI and share their ideas. The second instrument in-depth interview, where teachers were approached and reapproached to collect better data. The third instrument used to triangulate the data was classroom observation. All the selected instruments have their specific purpose that were

intertwined to extract wider possibilities to understand the interpretation of the repeated patterns and themes. Online questionnaires and semi-structured In-depth interviews were the primary data sources completed from August to October 2020. Because the participants were teaching English in English medium instruction condition, the Questionnaire was delivered in English.

### **Data Collection**

All those participants expressing their desire to participate voluntarily were noted via survey questionnaire section. The participants were then asked to set an interview schedule with the researcher. The interview questions were framed as one of the valid tools to explore the theme and understanding of the phenomenal pattern of differentiated Instruction. The data from the interview were collected through virtual/online interviews using the zoom to make it convenient for the participant due to COVID-19, some participants preferred to send answers in a written form as the bandwidth service was not strong for video or even a call, it was not effective and also very costly. The researcher was also searching for participants who had been practicing the concept of differentiated Instruction to some extent. Semi-structured interviews provided better room for participants to open up express their perceptions and materialize their actions and feelings. Interviews are more flexible, which allows the participants to add on new possible issues that researchers may not have perceived yet during their study. The classroom observation was conducted online due to the COVID-19 global pandemic-2 zoom online sessions from one of the schools and three messenger group classrooms from other schools were observed in detail.

### **Data Analysis**

Data analysis is a crucial step in research. First of all, the analyzing process started by digitally transcribing interviews. The researcher then organized the data, and coded teachers name as T1, etc. After organizing, the researcher located redundant data and dismissed them as unnecessary to reach the core meaning out of the remaining data. The process relied on content analysis by repeatedly reading through all of the data in order to generate a general relevant theme or sense of information, according to the common characteristics (Cohen et al., 2007). The content analysis in this research was developed through the deductive approach. The use of the deductive approach was used to harmonize with the concept of the study and its relevancy to research objectives (Saldana, 2013). In this research, the theme building process was followed by four phases of the thematic analysis process as described in Braun et al., (2006). In the first phase, the researcher became familiarized themselves with the data by reading it several times. While reading, everything relevant and important was being noted down and also, whatever ideas or thoughts that emerge after reading was noted down. In the second phase, data were carefully coded by identifying meaningful chunks. All that looked relevant was coded. In the third phase, several categories were created and then merged together with open codes. In the fourth or the final phase, categories were merged into the construction of themes to induce what the theme meant to the participants. To elicit the intended hands- on data, researcher had established a good rapport with the selected teachers' participants.

### **Result**

**RQ 1.** What are the different perceptions of teachers regarding instructional differentiation in Nepalese EFL classroom?

Several themes emerged from the data collected from survey questionnaire and the in-depth interview, the most common issue raised in response to the first question about teachers' perceptions of DI was surprising. Twelve teachers reported they were aware of differentiated Instruction, one replied partially, and the other three said they were not aware of it. From the teachers' interview, the answer was interesting regarding the Nepalese EFL teachers' perception on DI, the recurring confusion was apparent amongst the Nepalese EFL teachers of the term differentiated Instruction. The teachers who have had completed their university graduation with education background were aware about the term, but all had their own interpretation about DI. For instance, when requested to describe differentiated Instruction to the best of their knowledge, they quickly began to clarify the question. Some teachers felt it was more used in special needs education only, while others explained it was used only for the classroom with disadvantageous learners. The differentiation variables of choice and interest were used interchangeably throughout the lessons observed and interview responses.

**RQ.2.** How do teachers practice differentiated Instruction in Nepalese secondary English classrooms?

This question was answered using questionnaire survey and interviews with teachers. Everyone had a chance to speak during the interview, including the fifteen teachers. Due to COVID, some respondents chose to recall physical classrooms while ignoring online classrooms. They preferred to talk about their recent online sessions and differentiated instruction experiences. To bring in new ideas from the internet and attending various webinar series, T7 and T13 were excited to use ICT in their EFL classrooms. Adding games, a digital white board, grading via excel, and more were suggested. T9 complained that educational technology squandered class time. He claimed it was impossible to differentiate Instruction while students were using the same software at the same time. 12 more teachers shared their teaching memories. They mentioned teaching content, assignments, and assessments.

However, not every teacher participant said they do differentiated Instruction every day. T1 replied that he divides students into groups, trying to understand their multiple intelligences, learning pace, motivation, and rapport. Timing, rapport, needs, and motivation are all important to T2, but time constraints prevent him from addressing them all. Learner's learning style by knowing their background, family, culture, and customs, T3 responded. A group of students with similar learning styles aided T4. He also divides students by proficiency and interests, according to T5. Also, T6 mentioned responding to students' learning styles by talking to them and knowing their learning needs. In addition to their family and cultural background, previous learning strategies, and goals and objectives are checked. These assessments helped him respond to students with various learning styles. T7 said he made groups with similar norms and learning interests. T8 said she tried to approach students as they expected them. As a researcher, T9 expressed his desire to see his students use collaborative and cooperative learning strategies. T13 suggested introducing the subject and grouping students based on learning styles to make learning enjoyable. T14 said the students' results couldn't be equal because they had different learning strengths. They didn't use any special planning or techniques. It was T14 who said he was aware of the differences but chose to ignore them. Their strategy choices were also influenced by the content's task and demand. It varies from lecture-style to project-based learning. T4 said his strategy was based on task-based learning, content-based learning, and project-based learning, as well as the lesson's nature. T5 said he used the lesson to choose his strategy. Grammar exemplification, literature comprehension. It depends on the situation and how students learn,

said T6. T7 chose their strategy based on the chapter's content and the students' needs and interests. Instead, they checked students' facial expressions and performance during classwork and homework assignments, then let them write as much as they needed, according to their learning paces and requirements. Selective teaching was mentioned by teachers. Theoretically, T3 and T8 agree that while selective teaching may help students meet assessment criteria, it cannot improve real-world outcomes. For each month, T11 reported that they had to report on their classmates' issues. The teacher could then adjust their lesson based on the reports from each of the leaders. T12 reported analyzing needs by reading their faces. T12 smiled and said he sometimes felt more like a psychiatrist than their English professor. Lack of time and student numbers were the main issues reported by T14. Time, class size, and syllabus all contributed to T15's inability to analyze their students' needs.

However, in the classroom using Messenger, there were too few participants for any grouping to be observed. As a result of COVID-19, the teacher claimed they could no longer use cooperative learning strategies. Less than the traditional Teacher Fronted Approach, it appears that teachers are already using the Student Talk Approach (STA) to address students' needs and interests (TFA). In addition, teachers paid close attention to students' needs and learning styles by observing their facial expressions and behavior in class and homework assignments. Some teachers mentioned selective teaching. Third, while selective teaching can help students meet assessment criteria, it does not guarantee better results in real-life situations.

## **Findings**

The fifteen teachers selected for the interview for this study had a unique perspective on DI. To protect participants' privacy, they were referred to as T1, T2, T3, etc. The participants responded to interview questions about their perspectives and classroom practices with differentiated Instruction. The data analysis revealed common themes in the participants' statements. The primary two themes, cooperative language learning and good teacher-student rapport, were classified as supporting DI. Developing language learning skills and differentiated Instruction in a classroom are perceived by teachers as important factors in overall teaching and learning performance. Five other significant themes or issues were discovered as impediments to DI's process. As revealed in the interviews, the COVID-19 era is hindered by large class sizes, a lack of in-service professional development programs, and technological challenges in remote teaching.

## **Factors Supporting DI**

11 out of 13 teachers believed DI helped them cater to their students' needs and interests. As T1 stated, *“I try to group students based on their learning pace, intelligence, and interests. From there, I try to ensure that the stronger ones help the weaker ones and that the students are free to approach me at any time if they have not understood my lesson or if I am too fast or too slow”*.

Following Vygotsky's (1978) socio-cultural learning theory, students should learn from The Knowledgeable Other (TKO). The lines also confirm Cooperative Learning's worldwide and cross-curricular success (Johnson et al., 2009).

*“To make learning fun, I divide the students into groups of similar learning styles.*

*According to Wertsch (1985), the emphasis on human interaction is restructured to create a cooperative learning environment where learners are engaged in group, pair, and individual task-based learning activities. Examples of project work include group, peer, and individual. This study emphasizes grouping and pairing students."*

Likewise, T14 mentioned, *"I encourage equal participation from all students."*

In this setting, Vygotsky (1978) advised teachers to form collaborative learning communities. Ahmed (2017) discusses how to best apply Vygotskyan's theory through group work. In this type of group work, students can work individually or in pairs. All participants used these techniques to differentiate when teaching language skills.

Students today have a wide range of academic abilities, learning styles, and intelligences. Teachers face a huge challenge teaching in such a diverse environment. Motivation must be used to assess their level of interest. Teachers are expected to reach all learners, slow to fast, in order to successfully complete teaching and learning activities.

T12 also had unique motivational experiences. *"I think giving good grades and marks serves as a tool to motivate my students. Some of my students could write well while others couldn't. Those who were good wrote well and got good grades. My students' grades improved dramatically when they produced strange sentence structures with lots of other errors. So, I gave them high marks even though their writing skills differed. When slow learners saw good grades, they became more motivated to learn. Their faces were beaming."*

According to T12, slow and fast learners are intrinsically motivated, contrary to Lei (2010). While T14 had a unique approach to motivating students. He said he always gave students personal attention. Slow or fast learners, they need personal attention to feel cared for and supported. They felt safe in learning because the teacher is the center for them.

T14's statement opposes traditional teaching methods that focused less on individual learners. T14, however, focused on individual students, implying that individual attention is required for balanced differentiated Instruction. And, as Tillemaand (2002) puts it, such practice is the model of desirable pedagogical behavior. Most of the teachers reported their understanding about inclusive education was to integrate factors such as gender, ethnicity, academic ability as well as personality. Teachers reported that students were busy forming their own groups even before teacher took their time to study about the needs of their learners. T1 replied that he tried to create a conducive environment by creating a fun-filled environment by being funny using jokes, creating drama or role-plays, making stories, and explaining slowly and giving group work.

## **Factors Supporting Differentiated Instruction**

### **Rapport between Teacher and Students**

Rapport building were classified as supporting factors in this study on DI for the learners' benefits. The teachers' belief about students' ability to achieve created the positive impact as stated in Bidari (2021). In the same line perception regarding developing language learning skills and the effectiveness of differentiated Instruction in a classroom and their reasons for having played roles in overall teaching and learning performance. Similarly, five other significant themes or issues were discovered, classified as factors hindering DI's process.

## **Factors Hindering the Implementation of Differentiated Instruction (DI)**

Differentiated Instruction assumes that all students, regardless of their differences, should be addressed. However, DI was found to be impractical. Many studies, both qualitative and quantitative, show that teachers' knowledge of DI (Chien, 2015; Lunsford, 2017; Mariyam Shareefa, 2019) and teaching and learning methodology is lacking (Suprayogi; 2017, Merawi; 2018). This study found several barriers to implementing DI in the classroom.

### **Time Constraints**

Teachers find it difficult or impossible to implement DI because lesson planning and preparation takes time. T6: Enforcing DI and finishing the annual plan at the same time is impossible. Most of the time, high achievers get bored or low achievers can't keep up. According to Tomlinson (1999), not all Instruction is differentiated, and it is impossible to teach each student a unique lesson. Instead, it focuses on content that is relevant to each learner's pace and needs. In this context, T12 stated that there is no set method to follow because it depends on the lesson and the students' interest and desire to learn. Moreover, one method or technique does not address all needs.

### **Large Class Size**

The class size determines the success or failure of teaching. It's difficult for teachers to address a large class. T1 responded, "My class has 40-50 students, so it's difficult to address different types of students in the time allotted." Similarly, 11 out of 15 respondents agreed to the same. The responses suggest that secondary EFL teachers in Kathmandu Valley have been unable to implement DI due to class size. T12 added, "I enjoy teaching students with diverse interests and needs." I strive to reach every student. T14 also claimed that time is a barrier in the teaching process, as well as the number of students in my classroom; their arguments are in line with the small class size, which is genuinely conducive to teach as expected. From the above examples, large classes hinder DI implementation. As a result, students should be divided into small groups of no more than 30. The size of the class determines the success and failure of teaching. When it comes to a large class, it is very challenging for the teachers to address all the students.

### **Technological Challenges in Remote Teaching During Covid-19**

From teacher T7's response, it seems evident that there has been a digital divide between and among students and the teachers. It is very challenging for the teachers to teach the students to resolve their technical difficulties. Also, teachers themselves have technological challenges as they are not digitally supported either by the government or school administration.

### **Insufficient Preservice Training on Differentiated Instruction**

The teachers are the actual practitioners of differentiated Instruction in the classroom. Nepalese English teachers are not practicing much DI in their classrooms. (Khanal, Nadif & Bidari, 2021) reported the similar instance as the demotivating factor of teachers' motivation in teaching; in this study, a similar case was prevalent; implementing it in the real classroom setting seemed to be an obstacle.

## **Digital Divide**

The research examined that there has been a digital divide between and among students and the teachers due to which it is very challenging for the teachers to teach the students resolving their technical difficulties and teachers themselves do have technological challenges as they are not digitally supported neither by the government nor by the school administration as mentioned in (Bidari, 2021) Moreover, it was found that most Nepalese English teachers were utterly unknown about differentiated Instruction.

## **Conclusion**

The results indicated that the perceptions and the practice of differentiated Instruction did not match in Nepal. The complexities of DI implementation in Nepal have received scant research. Particularly in Nepal, nothing has been said about EFL teachers' views on DI. To find out how Nepalese EFL teachers perceive DI and what elements help or impede its adoption in their classrooms. This study focused on the beneficial pedagogical effects of adopting DI. The study used a qualitative case study research design. This survey included 15 EFL secondary teachers from Kathmandu Valley private schools. The teacher participants were picked at random. The data were collected via survey surveys, teacher interviews, book analysis, and classroom observation. Because of class size, syllabus, time, lack of teacher professional development, and digital incompetence, this study indicated differentiated Instruction was not even close to being implemented.

## References

- Ahmed, M., Hussain, I., Farooq, R. A., & Ahmed, S. (2011). Regional differentials in students' preferences regarding the theory of multiple intelligences at elementary level. *Academic Research International*, 1(2), 327–331. Retrieved from [http://www.savap.org.pk/journals/ARInt./Vol.1\(2\)/2011\(1.2-35\).pdf](http://www.savap.org.pk/journals/ARInt./Vol.1(2)/2011(1.2-35).pdf)
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., Sorensen C. & Razavieh A. (2010). *Introduction to research in education*. CA: Nelson Education LTD.
- Bidari, S. (2021) A qualitative study Nepalese EFL teachers' perception on differentiated Instruction. An unpublished MA dissertation, Soka University: Japan.
- Bidari, S. (2021) Engaging learners in online classroom: A case study from Nepal. *Journal of World Englishes and Educational Practices*, 3(7),01-06.  
<http://doi.org/10.32996/jweep2021.3.7.1>
- Bidari, S. (2021) Beliefs about language learning inventory: A brief review *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation*, 4(7), 221-224.  
<https://doi.org/10.32996/ijllt.2021.4.7.22>
- Braun, S., Kurt, K., and Mukharjee, J. (2006). *Corpus technology and language pedagogy: New resources, New Tools, New Methods [ads]*. English Corpus Linguistics-3.
- British Council, (2019). *Creating an inclusive school environment*. London: UK
- Brown, H.D., & Lee, H. (2015). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. (4<sup>th</sup> ed.) NY: Pearson Education Press.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education*. London: Routledge.
- Douglas (2019). *Creating an inclusive school environment*. London: UK
- Faber, J. M., Glas, C. A. W., & Visscher, A. J. (2018). Differentiated Instruction in a data-based decision-making context. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 29(1).  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09243453.2017.1366342>
- Gregory, G. H., & Chapman, C. (2007). *Differentiated instructional strategies: One size doesn't fit all* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). California, USA: Corwin Press.
- Johnson, K. E. (2009). Trends in second language teacher education. In Richards, J. C., & Burns, A. (Eds.) *The Cambridge guide to second language teacher education* (pp. 20-29). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Joshi, D. N. (2018) *Teacher perception on differentiated Instruction and its influences on instructional practice*. An unpublished M.Phil. dissertation, Kathmandu University: Nepal.

- Kamarulzaman, M. H., Azman, H., & Zahidi, A. M. (2018). Research trend in the practice of differentiated Instruction. *Journal of Social Sciences Research*, 4(12). <https://doi.org/10.32861/jssr.412.648.668>
- Khanal, L. P., Bidari, S., & Nadif, B. (2021). Teachers' (De)Motivation During COVID-19 Pandemic: A Case Study from Nepal. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature, and Translation*, 4(6), 82-88. <https://doi.org/10.32996/ijllt.2021.4.6.10>
- Klem, A. M., and Connell, J.P. (2004). Relationships matter: Linking teacher support to student engagement and achievement. *Journal of School Health*, 74(7), 262-273. Doi: 10.1111/j.1746-1561.2004.tb08283.x.
- Kurt, S. (2012). Examining teachers' use of computer-based technologies: A case study. *Education and Information technologies*, 1-14. Doi: 10.1007/s10639-012-9199-7
- Lei, X. (2010). Communicative teacher talk in the English classroom. *English Language Teaching*, 2(1), 75-79.
- Loeser, John W. (2015). *Differentiated Instruction. Research Starters: Education* (Online Edition).
- Oliver, M., and Barnes, C. (2016). *The new politics of disablement*. Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke
- Rosenberg (2020) *Embrace the differences, learner preferences and strategies*. NELTA International Virtual Conference.
- Saldana, J. (2013). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (3<sup>rd</sup> Ed.). SAGE, Los Angeles, CA.
- Santangelo, T., & Tomlinson, C. A. (2012). Teacher educators' perceptions and use of differentiated instruction practices: An exploratory investigation. *Action in Teacher Education*, 34(4), 309–327. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01626620.2012.717032>.
- Shareefa, M., & Moosa, V. (2020). The Most-cited Educational Research Publications on Differentiated Instruction: A bibliometric analysis. *European Journal of Educational Research*, 9(1). <https://doi.org/10.12973/eu-jer.9.1.331>
- Smale-Jacobse, A. E., Meijer, A., Helms-Lorenz, M., & Maulana, R. (2019). Differentiated Instruction in Secondary Education: A Systematic Review of Research Evidence. *Frontiers in Psychology* (Vol. 10). <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02366>
- The Government of Nepal (2017). Inclusive education policy for disabled people in Nepal. Ministry of Education, Kathmandu.
- Tomlinson, C. A. (1999). *The differentiated classroom: Responding to the needs of all learners*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Tomlinson, C. A. (2006). *Differentiated instructions for academic diversity*. U.S.A: J.M.

- Tomlinson, C. A., & Imbeau, M. B. (2010). *Leading and managing a differentiated classroom*. Alexandria, Virginia: ASCD.
- Tieso, C. L. (2003). Patterns of overexcitabilities in identified gifted students and their parents. *The Gifted Child Quarterly*, 51(1), 11-22. DOI: org/10.1177/0016986206296657
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Wertsch, J., and Vygotsky, L. S. (1985). *The Social formation of mind* [1<sup>st</sup> Ed.]. Cambridge Harvard University press.
- Yavuz, A. C. (2020). The effects of differentiated Instruction on Turkish students' l2 achievement, and student and teacher perceptions. *Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 6(2). <https://doi.org/10.32601/ejal.776002>
- Yildirim, O., Acar, A. C., and Bull, S. (2014). Relationship between teachers' perceived leadership style, students; learning style, and academic achievement: A study on high school students. *Educational Psychology*, 28(1), 72– 81.

**Contact email:** samikshya\_phele21@kusoed.edu.np