PRE-SERVICE TEACHERS' AWARENESS AND BELIEFS ABOUT DIFFERENTIATED INSTRUCTION IN EFL CLASSES: IMPLICATIONS FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

Le Van Tuyen[*], Tran Kim Hong, Vo Tran Minh Hieu, Nguyen Ha Linh Phuong
Ho Chi Minh City University of Technology (HUTECH University)

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
	Differentiated instruction has been proved to help EFL students obtain high achievement in their learning. Understanding pre-service teachers' awareness
	and beliefs about differentiated instruction in an EFL context like Vietnam may bring a variety of benefits to EFL teacher education. The current study, therefore,
	aims to investigate pre-service teachers' awareness and beliefs about the benefits and challenges of differentiated instruction in EFL classes. The study was
	conducted at Ho Chi Minh City of Technology with the participation of 70 pre-service teachers. Both quantitative and qualitative data were collected through
	the employment of the questionnaire and unstructured interviews; for data analysis, "descriptive statistics" and "content analysis" were utilized. The
	findings of the study revealed that most of the pre-service teachers are much aware of differentiated instruction and hold common beliefs that differentiated
	instruction may not only bring a variety of benefits but also cause challenges to teachers and students. The study highlights the importance of awareness and
	beliefs about differentiated instruction in EFL classes and provides meaningful contributions to EFL teacher development to enhance the quality of teaching EFL
	in Vietnam in particular, and in other EFL contexts in general.

NHẬN THỨC VÀ NIỀM TIN CỦA GIÁO SINH VỀ PHƯƠNG PHÁP DẠY PHÂN HÓA TRONG CÁC LỚP TIẾNG ANH: Ý NGHĨA ĐỐI VỚI VIỆC ĐÀO TẠO GIÁO VIÊN

Lê Văn Tuyên[*], Trần Kim Hồng, Võ Trần Minh Hiếu, Nguyễn Hà Linh Phương
Trường Đại học Công nghệ Thành phố Hồ Chí Minh

THÔNG TIN BÀI BÁO	TÓM TẮT
	Phương pháp dạy học phân hóa đã được chứng minh là có thể giúp học sinh tiếng Anh đạt được kết quả cao trong học tập. Hiểu được nhận thức và niềm tin của
	giáo sinh về phương pháp dạy học phân hóa trong bối cảnh tiếng Anh là một ngoại ngữ như ở Việt Nam có thể mang lại nhiều lợi ích cho việc đào tạo giáo
	viên tiếng Anh. Do đó, mục đích của nghiên cứu là tìm hiểu nhận thức và niềm tin của giáo sinh tiếng Anh về phương pháp dạy học phân hóa áp dụng trong các
	lớp tiếng Anh. Nghiên cứu được thực hiện tại trường Đại học Công nghệ Thành phố Hồ Chí Minh với sự tham gia của 70 giáo sinh. Dữ liệu định lượng và định
	tính được thu thập thông qua việc sử dụng bảng câu hỏi và phỏng vấn không cấu trúc; phương pháp "thống kê mô tả" và "phân tích nội dung" đã được sử dụng để
	phân tích kết quả. Kết quả nghiên cứu cho thấy hầu hết các giáo sinh đều nhận thức rõ về phương pháp dạy học phân hóa và có niềm tin chung rằng phương
	pháp này không chỉ mang lại nhiều lợi ích mà còn có thể gây ra thách thức cho cả giáo viên và học sinh. Nghiên cứu nhấn mạnh tầm quan trọng của nhận thức
	và niềm tin về phương pháp giảng dạy trong các lớp học tiếng Anh và mang lại những đóng góp ý nghĩa trong việc phát triển giáo viên tiếng Anh nhằm nâng cao
	chất lượng giảng dạy tiếng Anh tại Việt Nam nói riêng và trong các ngữ cảnh khác nói chung.

---

[*] Corresponding author. *Email: lv.tuyen@hutech.edu.vn*

1. Introduction

In recent decades, language educators and researchers all over the world have paid much attention to the issue of differentiated instruction (DI). This teaching approach has gained increasing interest in all types of education, including English education with the aim of helping teachers ensure equal access to education for all learners of different learning styles, interests and background. DI is defined as a set of instructional strategies held as a way of thinking and a set of principles used in planning and conducting a teaching and learning process [1]. Tomlinson [2] has proposed four areas of differentiation: content, process, product and environment. *Content* refers to the knowledge and skills mentioned in the materials, textbook or texts used in the classroom to meet the needs of different learner groups of the class. *Process* refers to the learning activities, tasks and classroom arrangement. *Product* refers to an assignment or a task which students are required to complete (e.g., a letter, an essay, an interview, a show, a marketing plan), and *Environment* refers to the place where learning takes place, e.g., classrooms. Interesting, friendly, and supportive classrooms should be created for students. The above-mentioned areas can be differentiated along three types of differences among students, including *interests* reflecting their passions and motivation, *learning profiles* reflecting their learning styles, and cultural background, and *readiness levels* reflecting their proximity to specified knowledge understanding and skills [1].

For over two decades language educators and researchers have conducted studies to investigate the implementation of DI used in teaching English skills or knowledge, e.g., English vocabulary [3], reading comprehension [4], assessing English learning [5], the impact of DI on English listening performance [6] and English-speaking skills [7], and effects of DI on students' achievements [8]. Regarding beliefs about DI, it can be found that most of the studies have focused on in-service teachers' beliefs about DI instead of pre-service teachers (PTs), e.g., teachers' beliefs about DI in mixed ability classrooms [9], teachers' beliefs and practices in DI [10], or teachers' beliefs and attitudes towards DI [11]. Very few studies have been found to investigate issues in DI with the participation of PTs [12].

In the Vietnamese context, in the last decade, Vietnam's general education system has also focused on the employment of DI in the implementation of subjects or courses from primary schools to tertiary institutions as stated in the draft of the new general education program by Ministry of Education and Training of Vietnam (MoET) in 2015 [13]. DI is considered one of the basic orientations of Vietnam's general education innovation to develop the country's education system according to a competency-based approach [14]. It is evident that DI implementation and research on DI are still at an early stage in Vietnam. Consequently, it is hard to find any studies on PTs' beliefs about DI used in EFL classes in the Vietnamese context. The present study seeks to fill the research gap in this area, aiming to investigate PTs' awareness of ID and their beliefs about the benefits and challenges of ID in EFL teaching and learning. The study attempted to address two research questions as follows:

1-To what extent are the pre-service teachers aware of differentiated instruction?

2-What are the pre-service teachers' beliefs about differentiated instruction in term of its benefits and challenges in EFL classes?

The research findings are expected to inform EFL teacher trainers and educators of the value and significance of investigating and understanding PTs' beliefs about DI to shed light on the field of EFL teacher training and development.

2. Research methodology

2.1. Research site and participants

The current study was conducted at Ho Chi Minh City University of Technology (HUTECH University), a private multidisciplinary university located in Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam. Outcome-based education (OBE) is widely employed for all the courses, including English courses

at the university. "English language" is one of over 60 disciplines trained at the university. The students who enroll in the Faculty of English Language (FoEL) can choose "Teaching English as a foreign language (TEFL)" as a sub-major. The TEFL-majored students are required to complete 4 compulsory courses on TEFL. At the request of the program, DI is introduced to the TEFL-majored students so that they will be able to apply it after graduation.

Convenience sampling was employed for the current study, i.e., two classes with 70 four-year TEFL students of Cohort 2020 at FoEL were invited to participate in the study. The number of female students was 51 (72.9%), while that of males was 19 (27.1%). Their ages range from 21-23 (82.9%) to 24-26 (11.4%) and 27-over (5.7%). All of them took part in this study after they had completed the four TEFL courses and eight-week teaching practicum. The participants are referred to as "pre-service teachers" (PTs) in this study.

2.2. Research instruments

The current study employed a mixed methods research design using two research instruments, i.e., the questionnaire and semi-structured interview for collecting both quantitative and qualitative data. The questionnaire consists of three parts with 48 items. Part 1 (5 items) asks about the participants' demographic information. Part 2 (22 items) asks about the PTs' awareness of DI, using 5-point Likert scale, including "not at all aware, slightly aware, somewhat aware, moderately aware, and extremely aware". Part 3 (21 items) asks about the PTs' beliefs about the benefits (11 items) and challenges (10 items) of DI in EFL classrooms, using "strongly disagree, disagree, undecided, agree, and strongly agree" scale. The Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of the questionnaire items is very good, including: awareness of DI (22 items) = 0.883, beliefs about benefits of DI (11 items) = 0.869, and beliefs about challenges of DI (10 items) = 0.762.

The second instrument was the unstructured interview consisting of six open-ended questions used to collect qualitative data to gain a deeper understanding of the participants' awareness and beliefs about DI to support quantitative data.

2.3. Procedures for data collection and analysis

Data of the study were collected in August 2024, just after the students finished their "teaching practicum". 76 PTs from two TEFL classes completed the questionnaire within 20 minutes. Due to the irrelevant responses of six questionnaire copies, 70 copies (92%) were relevant, so the final number of participants was 70. For the interviews, 10 participants volunteered to join the interviews. Each individual interview took about 10-15 minutes. To ensure that all interview data were accurate and comprehensive, every interview was conducted in Vietnamese and meticulously recorded. In addition, an interview sheet was used for each participant; the researcher also took particularized notes throughout the interview procedure.

Regarding data analysis, through SPSS software, descriptive statistics was employed to analyze the quantitative data. Mean (M) and standard deviation (SD) were calculated. Mean scores for awareness of DI and beliefs about the benefits and challenges of DI were interpreted as follows: For both research questions, based on the calculated interval coefficient for four intervals in five points (5-1= 4), intervals with the range of 0.80 (4/5) were arranged. The following criteria in the Likert scale were used to interpret the data, a) for research question 1: not at all aware (M=1.00 - 1.80); slightly aware (M=1.81-2.60); somewhat aware (M=2.61-3.40); moderately aware (M = 3.41- 4.20); and extremely aware (M= 4.21-5.00), and for research question 2: strongly disagree (M=1.00-1.80); disagree (M=1.81-2.60); undecided (M=2.61-3.40); agree (M=3.41-4.20); strongly agree (M=4.21-5.00). Meanwhile, content analysis was employed for analyzing data collected from the interviews. The interviewees were coded as PT1, PT2, PT3… and PT10.

3. Results and discussion

3.1. Results

3.1.1. Awareness of differentiated instruction

This section displays the data collected for addressing research question 1. It has been revealed that almost all PTs were extremely aware of ID in terms of ways of differentiating instruction (13 items) and students' characteristics (9 items) with M= 4.26 and 4.21 and SD = 0.568 and 0.795 respectively (Table 1).

Table 1. *Descriptive Statistics of PTs' Awareness of DI*

No	Categories	N	M	SD
1	PTs' awareness of ways of differentiating instruction	70	4.26	0.568
2	PTs' awareness of characteristics of students	70	4.21	0.795

Ways of differentiating instruction

The data collected from the questionnaire clearly reflect the PTs' awareness of the ways of DI. More specifically, PTs were extremely aware that teachers need to differentiate instruction in 4 ways, including a) through content, b) process, c) product, and d) learning environment to respond to the student characteristics of a) readiness, b) interest, and c) learning profile (item 1) with M = 4.26 and SD = 0.652. They understood that **content** refers to what students need to learn, e.g., the major concepts, principles, and skills (item 2) with M = 4.23 and SD = 0.618, students learn the same concepts or skills but in different ways (item 5) with M= 4.21 and SD = 0.797, and are given access to the same content in one unit or class session (item 3) with M= 3.76 and SD = 0.970. Particularly, they were extremely aware that teachers should adjust the degree of complexity using diverse instructional processes to teach the content (item 4) with M= 4.41 and SD = 0.577. The data also revealed that almost all PTs were aware that "**process**" refers to ways in which the content is taught (item 6) with M = 3.99 and SD = 0.807, flexible grouping should be used to meet students' readiness levels, interest, and learning profiles (item 7) with M=423 and SD = 0.854. More interestingly, nearly all of them affirmed that teachers need to employ a range of instructional strategies (item 8) with M= 4.50 and SD = 0.608. Regarding **product**, the data showed that the PTs were extremely aware that products refer to concepts and skills (item 9) with M= 4.40 and SD = 0.668, different products such as a written report, an oral presentation, a group discussion on key concepts, a short story, or an essay can be made by students based on their own readiness levels, interests, and learning preferences (items 10, 11) with M= 4.46 and 4.46; SD = 0.630 and 0.716 respectively. Finally, regarding **learning environment**, almost all participants were extremely aware that teachers should employ classroom management techniques that support a safe and supportive learning environment and flexible pacing to allow students with different abilities to master the key concepts (items 12, 13) with M = 4.50 and 4.49; SD = 0.608 and 0.697 respectively.

Characteristics of students

Regarding the extent of awareness of the characteristics of students in EFL classes in terms of **readiness** levels, **interests** and **learning profiles**, data collected from the questionnaire showed that nearly all the PTs were extremely aware of those characteristics. They understood that DI is a teaching approach that enables to meet the needs of every student (item 14) with M = 4.31 and SD = 0.826, and that teachers need to know the varying readiness levels, interests, and learning profiles of each student (item 15) with M = 4.41 and SD = 0.670. Moreover, to address readiness effectively, teachers need to use tiered activities (item 16) through small group sessions (item 17) with M = 4.19 and 3.96; SD = 0.708 and 0.937 respectively. The participants also confirmed that teachers need to know that students' interest arises when topics evoke curiosity and passion in them (item 18); as a result, they will be engaged in learning (item 19) with M = 4.43 and 4.50; SD = 0.650 and 0.654 respectively. Most of the PTs were also aware that learning profile refers to students' preferences for learning (item 20), which are shaped by learning style, intelligence preference,

culture, and gender (item 21) and when different modes of learning are offered, more students successfully complete learning tasks (item 22) with M= 3.94, 4.14 and 4.09; SD = 0.961, 0.822 and 0.928 respectively.

Regarding qualitative data collected from the interviews, it was revealed that most of the interviewees (7 out of 10) were aware of the concepts or principles of DI. For example, "DI is an instructional method in which, *teachers may employ a variety of teaching methods to meet their needs and interests*" (PT2); or "*…. students should be divided into small groups of similar levels*" (PT4). "*Teachers should create tasks with varying levels of difficulty to match students' abilities and interests*" *(PT6)*. Teachers are required to be "*flexible and creative*" (PT9) and create a "*more engaging and flexible learning environment that encourages language development*" (PT10).

It can be concluded that based on the data collected from both questionnaire and interviews, most of the PTs' expressed consistent perceptions and high level of awareness of DI. However, qualitative data also revealed that several PTs were still not much aware of some concepts or principles of DI.

3.1.2. PTs' beliefs about the benefits and challenges of using DI in EFL classes

To address research question 2, the data displayed in Table 2 below show that almost all the PTs strongly believed that using DI in EFL classes may not only bring students benefits (11 items) with M = 4.28 and SD = 0.608, but also cause a variety of challenges (10 items) for them with M = 4.18 and SD = 0.892.

Table 2. *Descriptive Statistics of PTs' Beliefs about Benefits and Challenges of Using DI*

No	Categories	N	M	SD
1	PTs' beliefs about the benefits of using ID in EFL classes	70	4.28	0.608
2	PTs' beliefs about the challenges of using ID in EFL classes	70	4.18	0.892

Beliefs about benefits of using DI

In terms of benefits of using DI, the PTs strongly agreed that DI is effective for different students (item 23), gives them more options on how they can learn material (item 24), requires them to be more responsible for their own learning (item 25), and allows them to be more engaged in learning English (item 26), and think critically, creatively, and independently (item 27) with M = 4.24, 4.33, 4.30 and 4.14; SD = 0.788, 0.775, 0.753 and 0.840 respectively. In addition, the participants also believed that DI boosts students' academic performance and achievement in English (item 28) because every student has access to learning in a way that works for them (item 29) and DI creates an educational environment where every student has the opportunity to succeed (item 30) with M = 4.27, 4.29 and 4.17; SD = 0.700, 0.801 and 0.722 respectively. Furthermore, the PTs also believed that DI helps teachers customize learning activities to align with individual interests, strengths, and challenges (item 31), and have more flexibility and creativity (item 32) in supporting students in the application of learning to real-world situations and problems (item 33) with M = 4.20, 4.44 and 4.43; SD = 0.844, 0.651 and 0.554 respectively.

Regarding qualitative data collected from the interviews, it is really interesting to report that all the interviewees expressed that DI can bring a variety of benefits to students and teachers. For instance, PT1 expressed, "*DI increases students' confidence and motivation when they can learn at their own pace and thanks to lessons tailored to their interests*"; "*…. meets students' diverse learning needs*" (PT2); "*…. weak students can receive more attention and feedback from teachers to improve their knowledge and skills. They will not feel shy and embarrassed about their English ability*" (PT4).

In conclusion, both quantitative and qualitative data revealed that all the PTs believed that DI could bring a variety of benefits to EFL students. Having those beliefs in mind, PTs will be confident in the application of DI in their teaching in the future.

PTs' beliefs about challenges of using DI

Concerning beliefs about challenges in using DI in EFL classes, quantitative data revealed that the implementation of DI may be hindered by teachers' load of administrative responsibilities (item 34), limited classroom space (item 35) and a big number of students in EFL classrooms (item 36) with M = 4.04, 4.03 and 4.43; SD = 0.970, 0.977 and 0.976 respectively. For teachers, they may experience difficulty identifying the strengths and weaknesses of on large class size (item 37) and providing individualized attention to each student in a large EFL class (item 38) and finding the right materials for DI can be a burden to them (item 39) with M = 4.29, 4.30 and 4.26; SD = 0.965, 0.922 and 0.829 respectively. Moreover, the PTs believed that there is limited material source to accommodates students' different learning backgrounds (item 40) and it is difficult for teachers to understand students' prior knowledge and learning strategies (item 41) with M = 4.19 and 4.01; SD = 0.967 and 0.909 respectively. Particularly, most of the PTs thought that EFL teachers may have insufficient knowledge of DI (item 42) and face difficulties because many students may have weak motivation for learning English (item 43) with M = 4.23 and 4.14; SD = 0.904 and 0.982 respectively.

Qualitative data collected from the interviews revealed that all the PTs raised challenges related to students' different levels, classroom management, learning resources, time constraints, teachers' workload, teacher training, identification of students' needs and learning styles. For instance, PT3 expressed, "*….in my opinion, some challenges related to implementing differentiated instruction include: difficulty in accessing suitable materials, lack of time to prepare, overloaded teaching schedules, classroom management, and the need for training and teacher support….*" In addition, PT10 believed that "*It is hard to integrate DI without falling behind on the required syllabus/textbook and without adequate support or resources.*"

To conclude, through the survey and interviews, all the participants expressed their similar beliefs about the challenges that teachers and students may encounter in EFL classes. It is believed that being aware of those challenges may help them find ways to better their teaching in their future career.

3.2. Discussion

The findings of the study have revealed that the majority of PTs are aware of DI at from a moderate to an extreme level, and they hold strong beliefs that using DI in EFL classes not only brings benefits to students and teachers, but also causes challenges to them.

Regarding awareness of DI, the findings of the current study are in alignment with that of a study conducted by Tzanni [10] showing that the PTs hold a firm understanding of concepts, characteristics, and principles of DI. It can be inferred that they understand the importance of DI implementation in EFL classes. If they are well-equipped with the knowledge and skills of DI, they will develop their confidence in designing and organizing learning activities more effectively in their future teaching career. According to Santangelo and Tomlinson [15, p.309], absence of DI in most classrooms is due to "teachers' lack of awareness about the DI model's conceptual principles and practical approaches". Nonetheless, it has been found in the current study that most of the PTs are much aware of principles of DI although few of them have experienced the implementation of DI in their classes. It can be inferred that most of the PTs in this study may understand that when academic tasks are poorly matched to students' readiness levels or too simple for their skills levels, their achievement and feelings of self-worth may decrease [16]. In addition, the finding of the study may imply that more or less the PTs have experienced DI in their teacher preparation programs, or at least they have made efforts to read materials written about ID. However, it is a long distance from theory to practice. Only understanding principles of DI does not mean that they will be able to put it into practice effectively. All, not most PTs, need to receive efficient education before graduating from the university [17], and they should be shown how to apply DI in the right way in their context. Therefore, further training in how to implement DI and skills practical will be a good alternative solution to the problem.

In terms of beliefs about benefits of using DI in EFL classes, both quantitative and qualitative data confirm that the participants believe that using DI in EFL classes will bring diverse benefits for teachers and students. This finding of the study is consistent with theory and the findings of other previous studies [18] proving that DI is effective in enhancing students' English skills and knowledge; and DI is an effective instructional design to cope with classrooms with students of different ability levels [3], [4]. The participants believe that DI helps develop students' motivation and engagement in learning, their skills and attitudes towards learning so that they can boost their academic achievement.

In terms of beliefs about challenges of using DI in EFL classes, it is really surprising when most of the PTs anticipate several challenges that they may face when they apply DI in their classes. This finding is in alignment with that discovered by Sukarno et al. [19, p. 47] highlighting challenges PTs encounter, such as "time constraints, limited resources, and large class sizes, teachers' workload, identification of students' diverse needs and interests, and teachers' insufficient knowledge of DI". DI may take a lot of time of the teachers. Their workload may increase because to implement DI effectively, they are required to search for resources, plan diverse activities for teaching and assessment.

It is evident that the PTs in the context clearly understand basic concepts and principles of DI as well as its benefits and challenges, but there is no evidence that they will be able to implement it effectively in practice in the near future. Therefore, a commitment and collaborative efforts from stakeholders are needed to successfully implement DI in EFL classes.

4. Conclusion

The aim of the study is to investigate PTs' awareness and beliefs about the use of DI in EFL classes. The current study has been conducted before the participants graduate from university. Therefore, the findings may help the PTs themselves to implement DI in the future more effectively. This study attempts to make a contribution to English teacher education in EFL contexts by emphasizing awareness and beliefs about DI. It is expected that the findings of the current study will help PTs learn more about the importance of beliefs in English teaching and pay more attention to the improvement of their teaching strategies [20]. Moreover, the study also sheds light on the importance of professional development, providing English stakeholders with more evidence about the PTs' beliefs about DI so that adjustments to teacher education programs can be made to better prepare teachers for classroom teaching. Although the study has uncovered beliefs about DI as the potential of providing valuable insights into the preparation of teacher education courses at HUTECH University and similar EFL contexts, several limitations cannot be avoided such as a small sample and a single research site. Therefore, it is suggested that more extensive research be conducted in the future with more participants and research locations so that the findings can be generalized to more similar EFL contexts; or future researchers should conduct studies to compare beliefs about DI of in-service and PTs in different EFL contexts.

REFERENCES

[1] C. A. Tomlinson and M. B. Imbeau, *Leading and managing a differentiated classroom,* 2nd ed., Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 2023.

[2] C. A. Tomlinson, *Differentiation of instruction in the elementary grades*. ERIC Digest, 2000.

[3] P. Alavinia and S. Farhady, "Teaching vocabulary through differentiated instruction: Insights from multiple intelligences and learning styles," *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods,* vol. 2, no. 4, pp. 72-82, 2012.

[4] M. Aliakbari and J. K. Haghighi, "Impact of differentiated instruction strategies and traditional-based instruction on the reading comprehension of Iranian EFL students," *Research in Applied Linguistics*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 109-129, 2014.

[5] Y. J. Hung, "Practice of differentiated instruction and alternative assessments with young EFL learners in Taiwan," *TESOL International*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 48-63, 2015.

[6] P. Alavinia and A. Viyani, "Role of differentiated listening instruction via attending to learners' multiple intelligences in enhancing listening performance of Iranian learners," *International Journal of English Language and Translation Studies*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 12-21, 2018.

[7] B. E. El-naggar and N. L. A. El-halim, "The effectiveness of a differentiated instruction-based program in developing the EFL preparatory stage students' speaking skills," *Journal of Studies and Searches of Specific Education*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 159-170, 2019.

[8] A. C. Yavuz, "The effects of differentiated instruction on Turkish students' L2 achievement, and student and teacher perceptions," *Eurasian Journal of Applied Linguistics,* vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 313-335, 2020.

[9] J. Aftab, "Teachers' beliefs about differentiated instructions in mixed ability classrooms: A case of time limitation," *Journal of Education and Educational Development*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 94-114, 2015, doi: 10.22555/joeed.v2i2.441.

[10] V. Tzanni, "Exploring differentiated instruction in TESOL: The teachers' beliefs and practices in Greece," *Research Papers in Language Teaching and Learning,* vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 149-165, 2018.

[11] N. Maruf, "The interplay of teachers' beliefs, attitudes, and the implementation of differentiated instruction in Indonesian EFL contexts," *English Review: Journal of English Education*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 357-364, 2023, doi: 10.25134/erjee.v11i2.7251.

[12] S. Joseph, "Differentiating instruction: Experiences of pre-service and in-service trained teachers," *Caribbean Curriculum,* vol. 20, pp. 31-51, 2015.

[13] Ministry of Education and Training (MoET), *Draft of the new general education program,* August 2015.

[14] Ministry of Education and Training (MoET), *The new general education program,* 2018.

[15] T. Santangelo and C. A. Tomlinson, "Teacher educators' perceptions and use of differentiated instruction practices: An exploratory investigation," *Action in Teacher Education*, vol. 34, no. 4, pp. 309-327, 2012, doi: 10.1080/01626620.2012.717032.

[16] M. Csikszentmihalyi, K. Rathunde and S. Whalen, *Talented teenagers: The roots of success and failure*: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

[17] A. A. Yenmez and I. Özpinar, "Pre-service education on differentiated instruction: Elementary teacher candidates' competences and opinions on the process," *Journal of Education and Practice,* vol. 8, no. 5, pp. 87-93, 2017.

[18] S. Joseph, M. Thomas, G. Simonette, and L. Ramsook, "The impact of differentiated instruction in a teacher education setting: successes and challenges," *International Journal of Higher Education*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 28-40, 2013, doi: 10.5430/ijhe.v2n3p28.

[19] S. Sukarno, M. V. Riyadini, M. Jinabe, and A. E. Lestari, "Unveiling pre-service English teachers' perceptions of differentiated instruction," *Diksi,* vol. 32, no. 1, pp. 45-60, 2024, doi: 10.21831/diksi.v32i1.66720.

[20] V. T. Le, K. H. Tran, and T. M. H. Vo, "Undergraduate pre-service teachers' beliefs about teaching English as a foreign language to Vietnamese young learners," *TNU Journal of Science and Technology*, vol. 229, no. 3, pp. 228-237, 2024, doi: 10.34238/tnu-jst.9648.