

MEETING LEARNERS' NEEDS: THE EFFECT OF DIFFERENTIATED INSTRUCTION ON GRADE 6 ARLING PANLIPUNAN ACHIEVEMENT

MARIEN C. DELOS SANTOS

Institute of Graduate and Professional Studies,
Lyceum-Northwestern University
Dagupan City

Abstract :

This study primarily aimed to evaluate the utilization of differentiated instruction and its relationship to Grade 6 learners' academic achievement in Araling Panlipunan. Specifically, it sought to determine the extent to which Araling Panlipunan teachers apply differentiated instruction in terms of content, process, and products, and to examine the academic performance of Grade 6 learners. A descriptive-correlational research design was employed in this study. The participants included Araling Panlipunan 6 teachers, and data were collected using researcher-made and standardized questionnaires. Descriptive statistics such as frequency, percentage, and mean were used to analyze teachers' profiles and the extent of utilization of differentiated instruction. Correlational analysis was applied to determine the relationship between teachers' profiles and the use of differentiated instruction. Findings revealed that most teachers are middle-aged, female, single, assigned to barangay schools, holders of a BS degree with MA units, with an average teaching experience of nine years, and have attended division-level trainings. Among the three criteria of differentiated instruction, "products" was always utilized, while "content" and "process" were often utilized. The academic performance of Grade 6 learners improved from satisfactory in the first quarter to very satisfactory in the second quarter. Moreover, there was no significant relationship between teachers' profiles and the extent of utilization of differentiated instruction. In conclusion, differentiated instruction is applied to varying degrees, with products being the most consistently utilized. The study highlights the potential of differentiated instruction in enhancing learners' academic achievement in Araling Panlipunan and provides valuable insights for teachers aiming to tailor instruction to meet learners' diverse needs.

Keywords: Differentiated instruction, academic achievement, Grade 6 learners

INTRODUCTION

Social networking sites (SNS) like Facebook have been used for a variety of educational purposes and help students in eDifferentiated instruction is a framework of teaching that involves providing different learners with different learning avenues (often in the same classroom). Students vary in culture, socio-economic status, language, sex, motivation, ability, personal interests and more, and teachers must be aware of these varieties as they plan curriculum. By considering varied learning needs, teachers can develop personalized instruction so that all children in the classroom can learn effectively.

This was confirmed by Tomlinson (2008) when he said that differentiated instruction is the process of ensuring that what a learner learns, how he learns it, and how he demonstrates what he has learned is a match for the students' readiness level, interests, and preferred mode of learning.

Differentiated classroom is a classroom that includes all students and responds to students' variety in readiness levels, interests, and learning profiles. To be successful in the delivery of lessons, a teacher sets different expectations for students' task completion upon their individual needs.

As stressed out by Anderson (2007), differentiation stems from beliefs about differences among learners, how they learn, learning preferences, and individual interests. Therefore, differentiation is an organized, yet flexible way of proactively adjusting teaching and learning methods to accommodate each child's learning needs and preferences to achieve maximum growth as a learner. To understand how the learners, learn and what they know, pre-assessment and ongoing assessment are essential. This provides feedback for both teachers and learners, with the ultimate goal of improving learning. Delivery of instruction in the past often followed a "one size fits all" approach. In contrast, differentiation is individually student centered, with focus on a appropriate instructional and assessment tools that are fair, flexible, challenging, and engage learners in meaningful ways.

Anderson (2002) corroborated that after teaching a lesson, a teacher might break students into small "ability" groups based on their readiness. The teacher then gives each group a series of questions, based on each group's appropriate level of readiness-skills, related to the objectives of the lesson. Another way to group the learners could be based on their learning styles. The main idea behind this is that learners are at different levels and learn in different ways, so a teacher cannot teach them all the same way.

The goals of differentiated instruction are to develop engaging tasks that challenge and enhance learning for each learner. This instructional approach is driven by the data from learners, assessments results, and from the outcomes of other screening tools. Pre-assessments can gather information about each learner's learning needs and preferences. Assessments should be used as a tool to create clear and meaningful instruction that guides each learner towards challenging but not frustrating activities.

Although the Department of Education exerted efforts to improve the quality of education in the country, there still is a gap between the learners' academic performance and standards set by the department. Several trainings and workshops had been conducted to

fully equip the teachers; and differentiated instruction is one of the many strategies that teachers may employ to meet the diverse needs of learners in their respective classes.

Differentiated instruction is a pedagogical-didactical approach that provides teachers with a starting point for meeting students' diverse learning needs. Although differentiated instruction has gained a lot of attention in practice and research, not much is known about the status of the empirical evidence and its benefits for enhancing student achievement in secondary education. The current review sets out to provide an overview of the theoretical conceptualizations of differentiated instruction as well as prior findings on its effectiveness. Then, by means of a systematic review of the literature from 2006 to 2016, empirical evidence on the effects of within-class differentiated instruction for secondary school students' academic achievement is evaluated and summarized. After a rigorous search and selection process, only 14 papers about 12 unique empirical studies on the topic were selected for review. A narrative description of the selected papers shows that differentiated instruction has been operationalized in many different ways. The selection includes studies on generic teacher trainings for differentiated instruction, ability grouping and tiering, individualization, mastery learning, heterogeneous grouping, and remediation in flipped classroom lessons. The majority of the studies show small to moderate positive effects of differentiated instruction on student achievement. Summarized effect sizes across studies range from $d = +0.741$ to $+0.509$ (omitting an outlier). These empirical findings give some indication of the possible benefits of differentiated instruction. However, they also point out that there are still severe knowledge gaps. More research is needed before drawing convincing conclusions regarding the effectiveness and value of different approaches to differentiated instruction for secondary school classes.

Differentiation is a hot-topic in education nowadays. Policy-makers and researchers urge teachers to embrace diversity and to adapt their instruction to the diverse learning needs of students in their classrooms (Schleicher, 2016; Unesco, 2017). Differentiation is a philosophy of teaching rooted in deep respect for students, acknowledgment of their differences, and the drive to help all students thrive. Such ideas imply that teachers proactively modify curricula, teaching methods, resources, learning activities, or requirements for student products to better meet students' learning needs (Tomlinson et al., 2003). When teachers deliberately plan such adaptations to facilitate students' learning and execute these adaptations during their lessons we call it differentiated instruction. A number of developments in education have boosted the need for differentiated instruction. First, contemporary classes are becoming relatively heterogeneous because of policies focused on detracking, the inclusion of students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds, and inclusive education in which special education students (SEN) attend classes along with non-SEN students (Rock et al., 2008; Tomlinson, 2015). Since early stratification of students may have unintended effects on the educational opportunities of students with varying background characteristics, addressing students' learning needs by teaching adaptively within heterogeneous classrooms has been proposed as the best choice for a fair educational system (Oakes, 2008; Schütz et al., 2008; Schofield, 2010; OECD, 2012, 2018).

In addition, even within relatively homogeneous classrooms, there are considerable differences between students that need attention (Wilkinson and Penney, 2014). Second, the idea that learners have different learning needs and that a one-size-fits-all approach does not suffice, is gaining momentum (Subban, 2006). Policy makers stress that all students should be supported to develop their knowledge and skills at their own level (Rock et al., 2008; Schleicher, 2016) and there is the wish to improve equity or equality among students (Unesco, 2017; Kyriakides et al., 2018). When the aim is to decrease the gap between low and high achieving students, teachers could invest most in supporting low achieving students. This is called convergent differentiation (Bosker, 2005). Alternatively, teachers may apply divergent differentiation in which they strive for equality by dividing their efforts equally across all students, allowing for variation between students in the learning goals they reach, time they use, and outcomes they produce (Bosker, 2005).

Although the concept of differentiated instruction is quite well-known, teachers find it difficult to grasp how differentiated instruction should be implemented in their classrooms (Van Casteren et al., 2017). A recent study found that teachers across different countries infrequently adapt their instruction to student characteristics (Schleicher, 2016). Struggling students may work on too difficult tasks or, conversely, high ability students may practice skills they have already mastered (Tomlinson et al., 2003). Clearly, more information about effective practices is needed. A recent review and meta-analysis of differentiated instruction practices in primary education shows that differentiated instruction has some potential for improving student outcomes, when implemented well (Deunk et al., 2018). However, these results may not generalize directly to secondary education, since the situation in which teachers teach multiple classes in secondary education is rather different in nature compared to primary education (Van Casteren et al., 2017). For secondary education, evidence for the benefits of differentiated instruction is scarce (Coubergs et al., 2013). The bulk of studies in secondary education focus on differentiation of students between classes by means of streaming or tracking (Slavin, 1990a; Schofield, 2010). Alternatively, the current study seeks to scrutinize which empirical evidence there is on the effectiveness of within-class differentiated instruction in secondary education, how studies operationalize the approach, and in which contexts the studies were performed.

One of the primary goals of effective teaching is to foster children's learning outcomes and help them become self-directed, problem-solvers, and creative thinkers. These attributes are necessary to be successful in life, not just at school. As such, schools must provide these opportunities within the curriculum to help students practice and develop these skills (Maduakolam & Ogo, 2010). However, the balancing act deals with standards and classrooms containing diverse learners with different socio-economic statuses, interests, and learning styles. Children do not all learn the "same thing in the same way on the same day." Consequently, teachers must consider each learner within the learning community based on needs, readiness, preferences, and interests. In order to effectively do this, teachers need to adopt a method that enables them to plan strategically and provide various options to reach targeted standards, goals, and objectives successfully. Differentiated Instruction (DI) allows teachers to meet learners where they are and offers challenging, appropriate options for them to achieve success. A close look at educational institutions may reveal that many instructors teach and assess learners similarly without paying attention to learners' diverse learning needs. One way to accomplish this is to emphasize differentiated instruction not merely as an instructional strategy but as a critical teaching and learning philosophy that all prospective

teachers should use in teacher education programs (Ireh & Ibeneme, 2010). According to Tomlinson & Imbeau (2010), this teaching philosophy follows this set of beliefs.

- That learners who are the same age differ in their readiness to learn, their interests, their styles of learning, their experiences, and their life circumstances;
- The differences in learners are significant enough to make a major impact on what pupils need to learn;
- Learners will learn best when they can make connections between the curriculum and their interests and life experiences;
- The main job of schools is to maximize the capacity of each child. Contemporary classroom teachers, therefore, will need to develop classroom routines that attend to, rather than ignore, learners' differences in readiness, interest, and learning profile. In addition, educational institutions must implement systems that support effective teaching and modeling of differentiated instruction. Tomlinson and Imbeau (2010) describe differentiation as "classroom practice with a balanced emphasis on individual pupils and course content. They posit that differentiation at the core of the classroom practice is the modification of curriculum-related elements, such as content, process, and product, based on learner readiness, interest, and learning profile in mixed-ability classrooms. Differentiation is not at all a new concept. It is a teaching theory based on the premise that teaching must cater to the individual learner's diverse needs and the different abilities of pupils in a classroom (Gregory, 2003; Tomlinson, 2009). By its nature, differentiated instruction supports the constructivist learning theory with empirical research on influencing factors of learner readiness, interest, and intelligence preferences toward pupils' motivation, engagement, and academic growth within schools (Tomlinson & Allan, 2000). Differentiated Instruction tailors' lessons to meet each learner's interests, needs, and strengths. Teaching this way gives the learner flexibility and helps teachers personalize learning. The teacher, who entails the key to successful differentiated instruction, is challenged to facilitate learning for pupils of different readiness levels, interests, and learning profiles. Many teachers still employ a one-size-fits-all approach in their classes, disregarding the uniqueness of each student, even though they are aware of the need to respond to student variety (Tomlinson, 2009). This will enable interaction between instructors and students within scientific principles and foundations that ensure students fully understand the most relevant information and facts (Tulbure, 2011). Differentiated instruction is therefore regarded as a crucial teaching strategy that many nations have started to use and implement to take into account students' various needs, inclinations, and interests, as well as differences in their levels of understanding, which could aid in boosting their academic achievements (Njagi, 2015). As differential education has gained popularity as a means of raising students' academic achievement, there are several gaps in the empirical research on this subject. The relationship between differential instruction and academic achievement has been the subject of numerous studies. Some of these studies Alsalmi et al. (2021); Yavuz (2020) found a significant and positive relationship, while others El Masry (2017); Güvenç (2021); Yavuz (2020) found no relationship between differential instruction and academic achievement. These investigations have demonstrated that the results of earlier studies were inconsistent. Furthermore, prior research Alsalmi et al. (2021); El Masry (2017); Yavuz (2020) paid little attention to Iraqi English instead of focusing mostly on other nations and other themes. For both individuals and global society, English plays a crucial practical role. It improves people's analytical and problem-solving abilities to enhance pupils' functioning capabilities.

According to Boaler (2002) findings, different teaching strategies for males and females have other effects on academic performance when students are instructed to follow their interests, learning preferences, and readiness levels to promote personal development and learning. Equity in social justice and education can be attained by adopting differentiated instruction to meet the various students' learning needs. Numerous gaps have been discovered while keeping in mind prior discussions. For instance, prior research has focused mostly on the relationship between different instructional methods and academic successes in other nations.

Additionally, earlier research has produced contradictory results and has focused mostly on other topics while paying little attention to the English discipline and, in particular, university students. These disparities motivate researchers to investigate how differentiating education affects academic attainment. The current study aims to ascertain how different instructional approaches affect Iraqi students' academic performance at various levels. There were five chapters in the research. The introduction comprised the first chapter, while the literature section of the second chapter covered both theoretical and empirical literature. The third chapter covered the study technique and went through the demographic, sample size, and data collection method. Data analysis and a discussion of the results are in the fourth section. Finally, the debate, conclusion, and suggested actions were covered.

A number of researches had been conducted showing the efficacy of differentiated instruction in improving the academic performance of students. However, studies on the utilization of teachers on differentiated instruction are limited. Moreover, studies conducted on this area are mostly foreign and seldom can we find studies conducted in the Philippines.

Anchored in the foregoing situation and the tremendous gap in literature, the researcher believes that further research in this area is warranted especially on the utilization of differentiated instruction. This could also be a basis in conducting, creating, monitoring, and evaluation plans of school heads on the teachers' utilization of differentiated instruction.

Statement of the Problem

This study sought to assess the utilization of differentiated instruction and grade 6 learners' academic achievement in Araling Panipunan in Schools Division Office of Tarlac Province during the school year 2024-2025.

Specifically, it sought to answer the following sub-problems:

1. What is the profile of the Grade 6 Araling Panlipunan teachers in terms of the following:
 - 1.1 age;
 - 1.2 sex;
 - 1.3 civil status;
 - 1.4 school assignment;
 - 1.5 highest educational attainment;
 - 1.6 length of teaching experience; and

1.7 relevant trainings and seminars attended.a

2. What is the extent of utilization of differentiated instruction on the following:
 - 2.1 content
 - 2.2 process; and
 - 2.3 products
3. Is there a significant relationship between the profile of the grade 6 Araling Panlipunan teachers and their extent of utilization of differentiated instruction?
4. What is the academic achievement of Grade 6 learners during the first and second quarters?
5. Based on the findings, what intervention program can be proposed to improve the performance of Grade 6 learners in Araling Panlipunan through the utilization of differentiated instruction?

METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the research design, respondents, sampling scheme, instrument and its validation and the statistical treatment of data.

Research Design

This study utilized the descriptive-correlational research design. It is considered appropriate for this study because it gives a better and deeper understanding of a phenomenon on the basis of an in-depth study, which provides the basis of improving the utilization of differentiated instruction, leading to the learners' academic achievement.

Sources of Data

There were 130 Araling Panlipunan teachers of Schools Division Office of Tarlac Province who served as respondents of this study. They were purposely chosen because they are utilizing differentiated instruction in their respective classes.

Instrumentation and Data Collection

This study utilized both a researcher made and standardized survey questionnaire to elicit the data needed in the study.

Part I determines the profile of the Araling Panlipunan 6 teachers in Schools Division Office of Tarlac Province in terms of: age, sex, civil status, school assignment, educational attainment, length of teaching experience as teacher; and trainings and seminars attended related to differentiated instruction. Part II ascertains the extent of utilization of differentiated instruction in line with the content, process, and product. The items in this questionnaire were taken from the Teacher Self-Reflection on Differentiated Instruction by Tolimson (2013). Part III elicits the academic achievement of Grade 6 learners.

The data gathering procedure essentially involved the following activities: construction, editing, and production of the adequate copies of questionnaire; asking permission from the Schools Division Superintendent to conduct the study; distributing and retrieving the survey questionnaires from the respondents; grouping and tabulating the gathered data; treating the data statistically with analysis and interpretations; and drawing out of implications, findings, conclusion, and recommendations.

As soon as the data were in, these were collated, tallied, analyzed, and interpreted using a 5-point rating scale. The level of utilization of differentiated instruction was categorized using the following scale and description.

Range Description

- 4.4 – 5.0 Always utilized
- 3.7 – 4.3 Often utilized
- 2.8 – 3.6 Frequently applied and utilized
- 1.9 – 2.7 Rarely utilized
- 1.0 – 1.8 Not utilized

Tools for Data Analysis

To derive valid and accurate results, appropriate statistical measures were employed.

Data in this study were analyzed using the following: Descriptive statistics such as frequency counts, simple percentage, and weighted mean were used to determine the profile of the Araling Panlipunan teachers, extent of utilization of differentiated instruction, and academic achievement of the learners. The Pearson r correlation and Chi-square correlation were also used to determine the significant relationship among the variables of the study.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter deals in the presentation, analysis and interpretation of the data gathered relative to sub-problems in the study.

Table 1 shows the profile of the Araling Panlipunan 6 teachers in terms of age, sex, civil status, school assignment, educational attainment, length of teaching experience as Araling Panlipunan 6 teachers, and trainings and seminars attended related to differentiated instruction.

Age. Table 1 shows that 90 or 69.2 percent are between 31-45 years (middle age), while no one is 60 years old and above. Generally, the Araling Panlipunan teachers are in the middle age. This implies that they are still very active in the service, but still have more years ahead for growth and development.

Table 1. Profile of the Araling Panlipunan 6 Teachers

Age	F	%
60 years old and above (senior)	0	0
46-59 years old (old age)	10	7.7
31-45 years old (middle-age)	90	69.2
30 years old and below (young)	30	23.1
Total	130	100
Sex		
Male	20	15.38

Female	110	84.62
Total	130	100
Civil Status		
Single	70	52.8
Married	60	46.2
Total	130	100
School Assignment		
Rural School	20	15.38
Urban School	110	84.62
Total	130	100
Educational Attainment		
	f	%
Doctorate Degree Holder	10	7.69
MA Degree with Doctoral Units	10	7.69
Master's Degree Holder	40	30.77
BS Degree with MA Units	60	46.15
BS Degree Holder	10	7.69
Total	130	100
Length of Teaching Experience		
10 years and above	20	15.4
6-9 years	50	38.5
2-5 years	40	30.8
1 year and below	20	15.4
Total	13	100
Trainings and Seminars Attended		
Regional	10	7.7
Division	70	53.8
District	20	15.4
School	20	15.4
None	10	7.7
Total	130	100

Sex. Results show that 110 or 84.6 percent are female, while 20 or 15.4 percent are male. This manifests that most of the Araling Panlipunan 6 teachers are females.

Civil status. As presented, 70 or 52.8 percent are single, and 60 or 46.2 percent are married. This indicates that there are more single Araling Panlipunan 6 teachers than married ones.

School assignment. As indicated, 20 or 15.38 percent were assigned in urban schools while 110 or 84.62% were assigned in rural school, which implies majority of the respondents are in barangay school.

Educational attainment. As further reflected in Table 1, 60 or 46.2 percent are BS Degree with MA Units, and 10 have doctorate degree. It could be noted that most of the Araling Panlipunan teachers have only masteral units. This implies that they were not engaged in professional growth and development.

Length of teaching experience. The table reveals that 50 or 38.5 percent have been teaching for 6-9 years, while only 20 or 15.4 percent have 10 years and above teaching experience. The results indicate that most of the Araling Panlipunan 6 teachers are experienced, but not seasoned teachers.

Trainings and seminars attended related to differentiated instruction. The Table shows that 70 or 53.8 percent have attended trainings in the division level, while only one in the regional level. This means that the Araling Panlipunan 6 teachers need more trainings and seminars in related to differentiated instruction to become equipped with the necessary skills and knowledge in meeting the diverse needs of the 21st century learners.

Extent of utilization of differentiated instruction

This section highlights the extent of utilization of differentiated instruction in terms of its: content, process, and product. These are presented in Tables 2-4.

Table 2. Extent of Utilization of Differentiated Instruction on Content

Indicators	WM	Interpretation
Follows the curriculum that is based on major concepts and generalizations.	4.80	Always Utilized
Follows the curriculum that is based on major concepts and generalizations.	4.20	Often utilized
Uses variety of materials other than the standard text.	4.10	Often utilized
Provides variety of support strategies (organizers, study guides, study buddies).	4.10	Often utilized
Does some research to supplement the lesson to be delivered.	4.20	Often utilized
Taps the assistance from my co-teachers to lessons unfamiliar.	3.80	Often utilized
Knows individual learner interest and can relate it to instruction.	4.30	Often utilized
Knows individual learner culture and expectations and can relate to instruction.	3.80	Often utilized
Knows individual learner life situations and how it may impart their learning.	4.00	Often utilized

Aware of learners' learning disabilities and handicaps and how to address them in lessons so as not to impair learning.	4.20	Often utilized
Pre-assesses learners before instructing.	4.30	Often utilized
Pre-assesses readiness to adjust the lesson	4.20	Often utilized
Determines learners' learning styles.	4.40	Always utilized
AWM	4.20	Often utilized

Content. As shown in Table 2, the weighted means obtained ranged from 3.80 to 4.80 interpreted as often utilized and always utilized. It is interesting to note that out of 13 indicators, only two were interpreted as always utilized with weighted means of 4.80 and 4.40. These indicators are: 'following the curriculum based on major concepts and generalizations' and 'determining learners' learning styles.' The result implies that the Araling Panlipunan 6 teachers strictly abide the curriculum and determine the learning styles of their learners.

On the other hand, the two indicators that obtained the lowest weighted means are: 'tapping the assistance from co-teachers to lessons unfamiliar,' and knowing individual student culture and expectations and can relate to instruction.' The average weighted mean of 4.20 interpreted as often utilized manifests that the Araling Panlipunan 6 teachers are efficient as to the content in differentiated instruction.

Table 3. Extent of Utilization of Differentiated Instruction on Process

Indicators	WM	Interpretation
Groups learners for learning activities based on readiness, interests, and/or learning preferences.	4.30	Often utilized
Sees to it that classroom environment is structured to support a variety of activities including group and/or individual work.	4.20	Often utilized
Assesses during the unit to gauge understanding.	4.20	Often utilized
Assesses at the end of the lesson to determine knowledge acquisition.	4.40	Always utilized
Teaches up by assuring each learner works towards their highest potential.	4.20	Often utilized
Utilizes varied materials to adjust learners reading/interest abilities	4.10	Often utilized
Lets learners play a role in designing work assignments.	4.20	Often utilized
Gives learners the right to select their learning activities.	4.20	Often utilized
Adjusts for diverse learner needs with scaffolding and provide learner choice in learning tasks.	4.40	Always utilized
Provides activities that require learners to apply and extend understanding.	4.60	Always utilized
AWM	4.20	Often utilized

Process. Table 3 shows the weighted means obtained ranging from 3.8 to 4.60 interpreted as often utilized and always utilized. The indicator that obtained the highest weighted mean (4.60) is on providing activities that require learners to apply and extend understanding, which means that the teachers use appropriate activities suited to the different learners' abilities. This also manifests that they gave activities that challenges the understanding of their learners. On the other hand, the lowest weighted mean (3.80) is on using the learner preference groups/or learning preference centers. This means that the teachers believe that learners learn best in their preferred groups and environment.

The average weighted mean obtained was 4.20 interpreted as often utilized. This suggests that teachers are flexible and effective in the delivery of the process of their lessons, ensuring transfer of learning.

Table 4. Extent of utilization of differentiated instruction on products

Indicators	WM	Interpretation
Provides multiple modes of expression in the final product.	3.90	Often utilized
Provides learners with the choice to work alone, in pairs or small group.	4.10	Often utilized
Assures that the product/output connects with learners' interest.	4.40	Always utilized
Provides variety of assessment tasks.	4.50	Always utilized
Asks the learners things vague and unfamiliar to them for remediation, re-enforcement and enrichment.	4.50	Always utilized
Makes an achievement chart to let them show their academic performance.	4.00	Often utilized
Allows comments and suggestions coming from the learners for teaching improvement.	4.30	Often utilized
Encourages the learners to improve their performance if there is still enough time to do so.	4.60	Always utilized
Reminds them to ask questions during the checking of their outputs to have a clear understanding of lesson.	4.70	Always utilized
Provides feedback mechanisms from the learners.	4.50	Always utilized
Schedules portfolio day to let the parents know the performance of their children.	4.80	Always utilized
AWM	4.40	Always utilized

Products. As shown in Table 4, the weighted means obtained ranged from 3.90 to 4.80 interpreted as often utilized and always utilized. The indicator that obtained the highest weighted mean is on the indicator 'scheduling portfolio day to let the parents

know the performance of their children' interpreted as always utilized. This manifests that providing feedback to parents regarding their children's performance has yield great impact in the improved learners' academic achievement. Meanwhile, the indicator that obtained the lowest weighted mean is on providing multiple modes of expression in the final product interpreted as often utilized. This means that the teachers are aware of the different ways on how learners demonstrate their final output.

Generally, the average weighted mean of 4.40 interpreted as always utilized. This implies that the Araling Panlipunan teachers are efficient in the utilization of differentiated instruction in terms of products. This further means that the teachers are always particular on the learning outcomes of the learners.

Academic Achievement of Learners

Table 5 shows the academic achievement of learners in the first and second quarters.

Table 5. Academic Achievement of Learners

Rating	First Quarter		Second Quarter	
	F	%	f	%
90-100 (Outstanding)	39	14.5	55	20.4
85-89 (Very Satisfactory)	93	34.6	109	40.5
80-84 (Satisfactory)	108	40.1	83	30.8
75-79 (Fairly Satisfactory)	29	10.8	21	7.8
Below 75 (Did Not Meet Expectations)	0	0	1	0.4
Total	269	100	269	100

The Table shows that in the first quarter, 108 or 40.10 percent obtained grades of 80-84 interpreted as satisfactory, while no one has a grade of below 75 interpreted as 'did not meet expectations. In the second quarter, 109 or 40.50 percent obtained grades of 85-89 interpreted as very satisfactory, while there was one who got a grade of below 75 or did not meet expectations. The results further reveal that in the first quarter, most of the learners got satisfactory grades, while in the second quarter, most got a very satisfactory grades. The results imply that there is an increase of the learners' academic achievement from the first to second quarter; however, it is interesting to note that there was one who obtained a grade below 75 during the second quarter, which shows a decrease in the grade.

Relationships of Variables

This section presents the hypotheses tested in the study. The significant relationship among the variables are shown in Tables 6-8. Profile and Extent of Utilization. The significant relationship between the profile of the Araling Panlipunan teachers and the extent of utilization of differentiated instruction is shown in Table 6.

Table 6. Significant relationship between the profile of the Araling Panlipunan teachers and the extent of utilization of differentiated instruction

Variables	X ²	df	p-value	Decision
Sex	7.239	9	.511	Accepted
Civil Status	10.988	8	.444	Accepted
School Assignment	13.000	8	.112	Accepted
Educational Attainment	22.208	24	.567	Accepted
Variables	r-value	p-value		Decision
Age	-.147	.633		Accepted
Length of Experience	-.505	.078		Accepted
Trainings	-.068	.852		Accepted

As shown in the Table, the p-value of the profile variables on sex (.511), civil status (.444), school assignment (.112), and educational attainment (.567) are lesser than its tabled value of 7.239, 10.988, and 39.000 respectively. The results show that there is no significant relationship between these profile variables to the extent of utilization of differentiated instruction.

On the other hand, the p-value of the profile variables: age (.633), length of experience (.078), and trainings and seminars (.852) are greater than the tabled value of -.147, -.505, and -.068 respectively. The results show that there is a significant relationship between these profile variables to the extent of utilization of differentiated instruction. Thus, the hypothesis, which says that there is no significant relationship between the profile of the Araling Panlipunan teachers and the extent of utilization of differentiated instruction is accepted; except for the age, length of experience, and trainings.

Profile and Achievement.

The significant relationship between the profile of the teachers and the learners' academic achievement is presented in

Table 7.

Table 7. Significant relationship between the profile of the Araling Panlipunan teachers and learners' academic achievement

Variables	χ^2	df	p-value	Decision
Sex	9.159	11	.607	Ho Accepted
Civil Status	10.988	11	.444	Ho Accepted
School Assignment	5.958	11	.876	
Educational Attainment	39.000	33	.218	Ho Accepted
Variables	r-value	Sig. (2-tailed)		Decision
Age	.075	.808		Ho Rejected
Length of Experience	.202	.508		Ho Rejected
Trainings	.094	.797		Ho Rejected

Table 7 shows that the p-value of the profile variables on sex (.607), civil status (.444), school assignment (.876), and educational attainment (.218) are lesser than its tabled value of 9.159, 10.988, 5.958, and 39.000 respectively. The results show that there is no significant relationship between these profile variables to the extent of utilization of differentiated instruction.

On the other hand, the p-value of the profile variables: age (.808), length of experience (.508), and trainings and seminars (.797) are greater than the tabled value of .075, .202, and .094 respectively. The results show that there is a significant relationship between the profile variables to the learners' academic achievement. Thus, the hypothesis, which says that there is no significant relationship between the profile of the Grade V teachers and the learners' academic achievement is accepted; except for the age, length of experience, and trainings.

Extent of Utilization and Achievement.

The significant relationship between the extent of utilization of differentiated instruction and the learners' academic achievement is presented in Table 8.

Table 8. Significant relationship between the extent of utilization of differentiated instruction and learners' academic achievement

Variables	r-value	Sig.(2-tailed)	Decision
Content and Learners' Academic Achievement	.418	.155	Ho Accepted
Process and Learners' Academic Achievement	.396	.181	Ho Accepted
Products and Learners' Academic Achievement	.247	.416	Ho Rejected

Table 8 shows that the p-value of content (.155) and process (.181) are lesser than its tabled value of .418 and .396 respectively, signifying no relationship. Meanwhile, the p-value of products (.416) is greater than its tabled value of .247, which signifies a significant relationship. Thus, the hypothesis, which states that there is no significant relationship between the extent of implementation of differentiated instruction and the learners' academic achievement is accepted except for products. The results could mean that the teachers are still improving in their utilization.

Summary

This study primarily aimed to evaluate the utilization of differentiated instruction and learners' academic achievement.

This study utilized the descriptive-correlational research design involving Araling Panlipunan teachers as respondents of the study. With the aid of researcher-made and standardized questionnaire as the main instrument in gathering the data, the following findings were obtained:

Most of the teachers are middle age, female, single, are assigned in barangay school, BS degree with MA units, have teaching experience of 9 years, and have attended trainings in division level. Of the three criteria on the extent of utilization of differentiated instruction, only "products" is always utilized, while both the "content" and "process" are often utilized. There was an increase in the learners' academic achievement from satisfactory to very satisfactory during the first and second quarter respectively. There is no significant relationship between the profile of the Araling Panlipunan teachers and the extent of utilization of differentiated instruction. In the light of the findings derived from the study, it can be concluded that the extent of utilization of differentiated instruction on content and process is often, while products is always utilized.

Conclusion

In the course of the findings of this study, the following conclusions are formulated:

The study generally aimed to determine the impact of the utilization of differentiated instruction on the academic achievement of Grade 8 learners in La Union Division. The findings are presented as follows:

Profile of Araling Panlipunan teachers. Most of the teachers are middle age, female, single, are assigned in barangay school, BS degree with MA units, have teaching experience of 9 years, and have attended trainings in division level.

Extent of utilization of differentiated instruction. Of the three criteria on the extent of utilization of differentiated instruction, only "products" is always utilized, while both the "content" and "process" are often utilized.

Academic achievement of Grade 8 learners. There was an increase in the learners' academic achievement from satisfactory to very satisfactory during the first and second quarter respectively.

Relationship of Variables. There is no significant relationship between the profile of the Grade 8 teachers and the extent of utilization of differentiated instruction; except for the age, length of experience, and trainings; there is no significant relationship between the profile of the Grade 8 teachers and the learners' academic achievement; and there is no significant relationship between the extent of implementation of differentiated instruction and the learners' academic achievement.

Recommendations

In the light of the findings derived from the study, it can be concluded that the extent of utilization of differentiated instruction on content and process is often, while products is always utilized.

1. The teachers should continue pursuing higher studies and trainings in order to be kept abreast with the new trends and innovations in dealing with the new breed and diversity of learners.
2. The Department of Education through School Based Management should emphasize the utilization of differentiated instruction to address the needs of all learners in the classroom; thus, the saying "no one should left behind."
3. School heads must include in their supervisory plans the utilization of differentiated instruction.
4. School heads must do constant monitoring to ensure the effectiveness of utilization of differentiated instruction.
5. A follow-up study utilizing a broader scope and wider coverage is hereby recommended.

REFERENCES

- All students". Preventing School Failure. 51 (3): 49-54.
- Anderson, K. M. (2007). "Tips for Teaching: Differentiating Instruction.
- Carolan, J. and Guinn, A. (2007). Differentiation: Lessons from master teachers. Classrooms. Virginia: ASCD.
- Coil, C. (2007). Successful teaching in the differentiated classroom. Saline, MI: Curriculum Educational Leadership 64(5), 44-47.
- Ellis, E.; Gable, R.A.; Gregg, M.; Rock, M. L. (2008). "REACH: A framework for differentiating classroom instruction". Preventing School Failure. 52 (2): 31-47.
- Gardner, H. (1989). "Multiple intelligences go to school: Educational implications General Curriculum, 5(7).
- Hall, T., Strangman, N., & Meyer, A. (2003). Differentiated Instruction.
- Holloway, J.H. (2000). Preparing teachers for differentiated instruction. Educational Leadership 58(1), 82-83.
<https://en.m.wikipedia.org>
<https://www.learning-theories.com>
- Kingore, B. (2007). Reaching All Learners: Making Differentiation work. Austin.
- Kuhn, D. (2000). "Metacognitive Development". Current Direction in Psychological McNaughton & Gunn, Inc.
- Meyer, A. (2011). Differentiated Instruction and Implications for UDL Implementation of the theory of multiple intelligences" (PDF). Educational Research.
- [15] Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. (2002). Family/Educator Guide Science, 9. Pp 178- 181.
- [16] Tation. Wakefield, MA: National Center on Accessing the General To Washigton State Special Education Services.
- [17] Tomlinson, C.A. (2001). How to Differentiate Instruction in Mixed-Ability TX: Professional Associates Publishing.

Copyright & License:



© Authors retain the copyright of this article. This work is published under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0), permitting unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.