



The Implementation of Differentiated Instruction in EFL Classroom at SMPN 1 Harau

Nur 'Aisyah^{1*}, Yetti Zainil¹

¹ Universitas Negeri Padang, Indonesia

*Correspondence Email: aisyahnur33321@gmail.com

Volume 15, Number 1, 2026, 15-26

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24036/x504ng89>

Abstract:

This study aims to describe how differentiated instruction is implemented in the EFL classroom at SMP 1 Harau. It also aims to identify the difficulties teachers face in implementing it. This study uses a descriptive method using three instruments: document analysis, classroom observation, and stimulated recall interviews. This study involved three English teachers at SMPN 1 Kec. Harau. The results show that the three English teachers at SMPN 1 Harau have demonstrated efforts in implementing differentiated instruction across a range of approaches. Teachers implemented differentiation in content and process by providing materials that are close to students' daily lives and diverse learning activities. All teachers have also implemented a comfortable and safe learning environment that makes students active in learning. However, the implementation of product differentiation is still not optimal because students are still working on the same assignments. Difficulties faced by teachers include time constraints, inadequate facilities, providing materials appropriate to students' abilities, differences in students' needs and learning styles, and maintaining student focus in learning. Therefore, support is needed from schools in the form of providing adequate learning facilities and provide training for teachers in preparing diagnostic tests, providing tiered assignments, and also increasing collaboration between English teachers in preparing learning to support the implementation of DI more optimally.

Keywords:

Implementation, Differentiated Instruction, EFL Classroom

© The Author(s). Published by Universitas Negeri Padang. This is an open-access article under the Creative Commons License <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

1. INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW

The classroom is a learning environment for students with diverse readiness levels, interests, and learning profiles. The existence of these student differences poses challenges for teachers in Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL), especially at the junior high school level with various student abilities, limited time in preparing teaching materials and in the learning process, as well as high curriculum demands, and inadequate facilities to apply various learning methods that suit students' interests in learning English. The government has required schools to implement differentiated instruction as part of the Kurikulum Merdeka, which was officially introduced in 2022 to address differences in student abilities and learning styles.

Differentiated Instruction (DI) allows teachers to adjust materials according to students' abilities. Teachers prepare various learning models based on students' language proficiency backgrounds (Tomlinson, 2001).

In implementing DI, teachers play a crucial role and must create engaging and adaptable learning models for students with diverse abilities and learning styles. Teachers are required to prepare different teaching materials and learning strategies according to students' knowledge levels and learning styles (Tomlinson, 2001). This is a difficult task for teachers, especially in the context of Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL), where students' English proficiency varies, and some may not even have a basic understanding of the language.

Differentiated Instruction is an approach that adapts content, process, products, and learning environments to suit students' levels of readiness, interests, and learning styles. It aims to create a comprehensive and adaptive learning experience. DI has been widely discussed in international research, but its application in teaching English as a foreign language, particularly in public schools in Indonesia, has not been thoroughly studied.

Teachers face various challenges in implementing DI, such as the lengthy time and effort required to prepare for the learning process, which often lacks support from fellow teachers (Suryati et al., 2023; Talain & Marcado, 2023). Other challenges include limited availability of teaching resources, the heavy burden of administrative responsibilities, and a lack of time to meet the diverse needs of ELL students (Talin & Marcado, 2023). On the other hand, some research said that implementing DI in the classroom makes learning more effective and engaging for students (Astuti et al., 2023). Other research also suggests that DI can improve student achievement and participation in EFL classes (Maruf, 2023).

Based on the previous research mentioned above, it can be concluded that the implementation of Differentiated Instruction in EFL classrooms varies across school and region. Some studies indicate that DI can be implemented effectively in EFL classrooms, while others indicate that teachers face difficulties in implementing it. In this context, SMP N 1 Harau has students from diverse language proficiency backgrounds, with some only beginning to learn the basics of English at the junior high school level. When the researcher conducted PLK at this school, the researcher discussed the issue with the teachers, and it emerged that they faced difficulties in implementing DI. Therefore, the researcher aimed to examine whether teachers could implement it in their classrooms and what difficulties they faced when teaching EFL classes.

Although some research on differentiated instruction has been conducted, most of this research focuses solely on teacher perceptions using interviews and questionnaires (Milinga et al., 2023; Mutmainah et al., 2023; Talain et al., 2023) or on experimental studies examining student learning outcomes (Intang et al., 2025; Otieno, 2025). While these methods are also useful for research, these instruments fail to capture the decision-making process in real-time instruction. This leaves the relationship between teachers' understanding of DI and actual classroom practice underexplored.

Therefore, researchers used stimulated recall interviews (SRI), which aim to examine teachers' decision-making processes directly in the classroom by reflecting on recorded teaching. During the SRI, teachers were asked to recall the reasons for their decisions at specific moments during the learning process. This activity can be beneficial not only for researchers but also for teachers involved in the research, as these pedagogical reasons cannot be seen through observation alone.

In the context of differentiated instruction (DI) implementation in Indonesian EFL (English as a Foreign Language) classrooms, the use of the Stimulated Recall Interview (SRI) remains quite limited. Most studies examining DI primarily rely on classroom observations or post-lesson

interviews (Azhari, 2023; Rahmat et al., 2024). However, these methods can be affected by factors such as memory decay, social desirability bias, or overly general conclusions. This study aims to explore the implementation of DI in EFL at SMP N 1 Harau and identify the difficulties involved. If any shortcomings are found, the research is expected to serve as a tool for improvement and provide insights for other schools or the government on how DI can be implemented in classrooms.

2. METHOD

This study used a descriptive qualitative method to determine how differentiated instruction is implemented in the EFL classroom and the difficulties teachers face during implementation. According to Gay et al. (2012) stated that descriptive research aims to provide an accurate and comprehensive picture of the phenomenon being studied, including the current conditions and social interactions in the educational context, without manipulating variables. This study was conducted at SMPN 1 Harau, with three teachers in grades 7 and 8 as samples.

Data were collected using three instruments: document analysis, classroom observation, and stimulated recall interviews. In the document analysis section, the researchers collected teachers' teaching modules and analyzed them to determine whether they included differentiated instruction. This analysis was conducted using a previously validated teaching module analysis table. All instruments used in this study have been validated by lecturers from Universitas Negeri Padang

According to Bowen (2009), document analysis is a systematic procedure for reviewing or evaluating documents, both printed and electronic materials. Bowen emphasized that this method allows researchers to study human behavior indirectly through the analysis of written communication within the documents. After analyzing the teachers' teaching modules, the researchers conducted classroom observations using an observation checklist containing key points on implementing DI in the classroom. They also videotaped teachers' teaching in class to conduct stimulated recall interviews. Five classroom observations were conducted for each teacher, totaling 15 meetings.

The researchers conducted stimulated recall interviews (SRI) with each teacher after each classroom observation. The SRI was conducted after the teacher taught in class. The researcher and teacher watched a video of the teacher teaching together. The researcher and teacher were free to pause the video to ask questions or clarify the teaching activities. According to Gass & Mackey (2000), Stimulated Recall (SR) is a data collection method used to collect introspective data, which aims to reveal participants' thought processes when performing a task or activity. This is also supported by Zainil (2017) in her research, which states that SRI is an interview method conducted after the classroom observation process, where teachers are asked to watch video recordings of their teaching activities, then provide comments, explanations, or reflections related to actions and decisions taken during learning. Using stimulated recall interviews (SRI) provides a clearer understanding of the rationale behind the teacher's decisions in class. This SRI is not only beneficial for the researcher but also allows teachers to reflect on their learning. All data collected was analyzed in three stages: data reduction, data display, and conclusions (Miles & Huberman, 1994). The researcher collected all the research data and adjusted it to the research objectives. Afterward, the researcher concluded how DI was implemented in EFL classes at SMP N 1 Harau and the difficulties teachers faced in implementing it.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. The Implementation of Differentiated Instruction

Based on the results of a study using three instruments: document analysis, classroom observation, and stimulated recall interviews conducted with three English teachers at SMPN 1 Kec. Harau, it was found that teachers have not implemented differentiated instruction optimally. Teachers have tried to adapt learning to students, but the differentiation is still given to each student and not adjusted to students' readiness, interests, and learning styles. After conducting observations, the following data was obtained:

Table 1. Implementation of DI in Classroom Observation by Teacher A, B, and C

DI Element	Teacher A	Teacher B	Teacher C	Average
Content Differentiation	22.%	31.2%	55%	36.2%
Process Differentiation	38%	26%	66%	43.3%
Product Differentiation	14%	22%	18%	18%
Learning Environment	10%	100%	100%	100%

Table 1 shows the percentage of occurrence of each DI element in classroom observations of teachers A, B, and C. The table shows that the element that appears most frequently is the learning environment at 100%, followed by process differentiation at 43.33%, then content differentiation at 36.25%, and the least frequent element is product differentiation at 18%.

a. Content Differentiation

After conducting the analysis, it was found that all teachers had attempted to implement content differentiation, but it had not been implemented optimally. Based on the data obtained, the content provided by teachers focused more on simplifying the material and adapting it to students' daily lives. Such as providing examples of texts or sentences that are close to students' daily lives.

However, content differentiation had not been implemented optimally due to several issues, such as adapting the content to students' understanding levels, all teachers still use the same learning pace, and Students more often work under teacher guidance than independently. All teachers used a variety of learning media, such as videos, images, and audio. As seen in the interview transcript of one of the teachers, "I use a variety of media such as audio, video, or images. This aims to attract students' attention and keep them focused on learning". This was supported by classroom observations, which showed that teachers sometimes used infocus or printed images during the lessons. However, each student still received the same material.

Furthermore, the results of stimulated recall interviews showed that all teachers selected materials based on the curriculum and the needs of the students as a whole, not individual students. It can be concluded that the content differentiation implemented by these three teachers focused more on simple tasks and materials and provided a variety of media. Each teacher provided the same material to each student, tailoring it to their overall needs. Therefore, this content differentiation was not fully implemented by the teachers, which reflected the students' readiness, interests, and learning styles. This is supported by the results of the percentage of DI element appearances in the description data, which states that differentiated content is in the second lowest order, which is rarely implemented.

b. Process Differentiation

The results of the teaching module analysis show that each teacher applies small group and cooperative learning that increases cooperation between students. In all teaching modules,

each teacher provides activities that can meet students' learning styles, such as audio, visual, and kinesthetic. The activities provided by the teacher are not limited to one type of activity but also involve movement, audio, visuals and also interaction between students.

Furthermore, variations were also found in teachers' consistency in maintaining student concentration during learning. Two teachers consistently implemented it across all modules, while one teacher only implemented it in one of the modules. Given these differences, it can be concluded that the differentiation process has not been optimally implemented by all teachers. Similarly, with HOTS activities, two teachers only implemented it in one module, and one teacher in two modules. This also indicates teacher inconsistency in their implementation.

The findings in the classroom observation strengthen the findings from the analysis of the teacher's teaching module, where everything that has been included in the teacher's teaching module is in accordance with the activities carried out in the classroom, but there is one change in the teaching module of teacher C which includes a mind map for the simple present material but when it is implemented in the classroom there is no mind map. Then in teacher A, the module does not include a mind map but when the learning activity is carried out the teacher includes a mind map on the short message material. It can be seen here that the teacher is inconsistent in its design and implementation in the classroom.

Based on the analysis of the teaching modules and classroom observations, it was found that one teacher demonstrated the most consistency in providing learning with diverse media and student learning styles. This was supported by teacher interviews, "I hope that in one lesson, students' learning styles can be met, at least by varying the media and learning methods, all students' learning styles are met." which indicated that the teacher strives to vary media and learning methods to meet students' learning styles.

It can be concluded that the three teachers have demonstrated efforts to implement process differentiation, utilizing various media and learning styles, as well as group activities that train students to work together. However, in the design and implementation in the classroom, teachers A, B, and C do provide various activities, but they still often provide the same activities without differentiating them according to each student's learning style. Therefore, all teachers have demonstrated efforts to implement process differentiation, but this is not optimal.

c. Product Differentiation

After conducting research, it was found that product differentiation was the least frequently implemented element. Each teacher gave assignments with an outcome for each topic, but each teacher assigned the same final product to every student, thus not differentiating based on student readiness, interests, and learning styles.

Based on the analysis of the teaching module, it was found that each teacher provided various products, such as short texts, sentences using the simple present tense and the present continuous tense, filling out worksheets, and presenting the results of their work to the front of the class. However, these assignments were given in the same format for all students. For example, Teacher A only provided short message texts in groups and also sentences using the present continuous tense. Teacher B gave assignments with products such as family tree diagrams and answering questions. Teacher C had almost the same tasks as Teacher A, namely creating short message texts, making greeting cards, and making sentences using the present continuous tense and the simple present tense. All of these final products were produced by each student without any differences based on the students' readiness or learning style.

It can be concluded that the application of product differentiation has not been implemented optimally by teachers A, B, and C. The products produced are still the same for

each student without being differentiated based on the students' readiness, interest, and learning styles.

d. Learning Environment

Based on the analysis of the teachers' teaching modules, it was found that each teacher created a comfortable, active, and conducive learning environment for students. As seen in the teaching modules, each teacher greeted students at the beginning of the lesson and asked how they were, making them feel more comfortable starting the lesson.

Classroom observations, also consistent with the teaching modules, showed that each teacher implemented the instructions outlined in the teaching modules. The most visible example was Teacher C, who provided icebreakers to students, encouraging them to be enthusiastic and active in their learning. Teacher A consistently provided verbal feedback, such as "good job," "excellent," and so on, so that students felt comfortable in their learning. Teacher B also actively approached students who needed assistance as in the following interview transcript, "By circulating the classroom, they ensures that students are focused and following instructions so they don't make noise, and the classroom becomes comfortable and conducive."

Using icebreakers and picking up trash at the beginning of each lesson creates a comfortable learning environment and encourages students to learn enthusiastically. Other teachers also stated that they strive to create a learning environment that encourages students to be active in learning and is a comfortable environment. One way to encourage active learning, according to Teacher A, is by assigning group work so that students collaborate and actively participate in discussions. It can be concluded that overall, all three teachers have created a comfortable, safe, and conducive learning environment, and have engaged students actively in learning.

To answer "how do teachers implement differentiated instruction in the EFL classroom at SMPN 1 Harau?" in the analysis document and classroom observation, several DI indicators were not found in the learning design, but during classroom observations, teachers implemented them. Similarly, in the stimulated recall interview, during the interview, teachers revealed that they implemented DI in the classroom, but there were several things that were not visible during classroom observations. This can be seen from the data description and findings explained previously. It can be concluded that teachers have attempted to implement differentiated instruction with varying levels of implementation, but still need improvement to be more optimal.

3.2. Difficulties in Implementation Differentiated Instruction

After conducting stimulated recall interviews with the three teachers, each teacher faced various difficulties that hindered the implementation of differentiated instruction in the classroom. The main difficulties faced by the three teachers were limited time and learning facilities.

a. Time constraints

The stimulated recall interviews revealed that each teacher faced difficulties related to time. Each teacher stated that implementing differentiated instruction with various media and activities required a long time, while the time available for English learning was insufficient to accommodate all these activities. As stated in the following interview transcript, "The difficulty may be time constraints, as providing a variety of methods in one meeting is quite difficult, as it takes a lot of time to engage students." Teachers C also stated that sometimes, during the

lesson, distractions occurred, causing students to lose focus and requiring time to regain their focus. And also sometimes the planned time does not match what actually happens in class because there are other distractions that cause learning not to go according to plan.

Teacher B also stated that this time constraint was partly due to the interruption of class time with prayer breaks, which can disrupt student focus and require time to refocus to continue learning after the break. Therefore, it can be concluded that time is one of the challenges for all three teachers when implementing differentiated instruction in the classroom.

b. Inadequate facilities

Another frequently encountered difficulty is the limited learning facilities. This difficulty occurred for teachers B and C, where the number of facilities, such as infocus and speakers, was insufficient for each teacher's needs. SMP N 1 Harau does have many classes, and because of this large number of classes, the available infocus is not enough for each class to use simultaneously. Therefore, some teachers inevitably lack infocus or speakers when teaching. This is certainly a difficulty for teachers because implementing differentiated instruction requires various supporting media, and this limitation hinders teachers from applying various methods in the classroom. As stated in the following interview transcript "The main difficulty is the limited facilities, such as the inadequate number of infocus and speakers. And if there are any, the quality of the infocus is also lacking."

However, unlike Teacher A, she did not experience any difficulties related to facilities because she had adaptive strategies to overcome this limitation. She prepared and secured infocus and speakers before the lesson began so that the media could be used in class. This made limited school facilities a non-difficulty for Teacher A. It can be concluded that limited facilities are one of the difficulties faced by teachers, but not for all teachers, as they have strategies before starting learning

c. Providing materials appropriate to students' abilities

Furthermore, there is a difficulty in providing materials appropriate to students' abilities, this difficulty was experienced by one of the teachers, namely teacher A, where preparing materials that are appropriate to students' abilities is not an easy thing to do, students have various abilities in learning English so this is something that is not easy to prepare and apply in the classroom. During the interview, teacher A stated that students have limited vocabulary and poor pronunciation, so this is a difficulty for teacher A when teaching. As stated in the following interview transcript, "finding materials appropriate to students' abilities can be difficult, as many of our students still lack vocabulary and pronunciation."

d. Differences in students' needs and learning styles

Designing differentiated learning according to students' abilities and learning styles is a crucial step for teachers when implementing differentiated instruction. Teacher C stated this as one of the difficulties faced when implementing DI. Students' diverse needs and learning styles demand teachers' creativity and dedication to creating learning that is tailored to their needs. This requires significant time to design learning that suits each student's needs and learning styles. As stated in the following interview transcript, "Another difficulty is to recognize each of them and then create media that is appropriate for the students, and teachers must be willing to sacrifice their time to create learning media so that the learning media can meet their different needs." Therefore, Teacher C stated that she faces the difficulty of understanding each student's individual needs and learning styles and preparing learning materials accordingly.

e. Maintaining student focus

The results of the study showed that keeping students focused during learning hours is one of the difficulties in implementing DI. This difficulty was experienced by teacher C, where the English lesson hour for teacher C was in the last hour, which is the hour when many students are sleepy and starting to get tired of learning. As stated in the following interview transcript, "This lesson is in the last hour where students are starting to get tired and sleepy, so it is a challenge for me to get students to focus again on learning." So the teacher must create things that keep students focused and interested in learning. Based on the results of observations, it was also seen that students were starting to be inactive in learning. Therefore, Teacher C created a strategy by using icebreakers to restore student focus so that students were interested in learning again. From this difficulty, it shows that the time the learning was carried out and what students felt became difficulties in keeping students focused during learning.

It can be concluded that each teacher faces difficulties, including time constraints, inadequate facilities, providing materials appropriate to students' abilities, differences in students' needs and learning styles, and maintaining student focus in learning. The difficulties faced by all teachers were time constraints.

3.3. Discussion

The Implementation of Differentiated Instruction

After conducting research using document analysis, classroom observations, and stimulated recall interviews with three teachers. The results showed that teachers at SMP N 1 Harau had not yet optimally implemented differentiated instruction. As stated by Tomlinson (2014), DI adapts content, process, product, and learning environment according to the readiness, interests, and learning profiles of students. Meanwhile, based on findings, teachers do not apply DI to product elements, where teachers provide the same product to each student.

The results of the study indicate that teachers have not fully implemented content differentiation in learning in accordance with Tomlinson's (2017) principles, which state that each DI element is tailored to the readiness, interests, and learning profiles of students. Although teachers A, B, and C provided different topics and examples in their materials, these variations were not fully differentiated based on the readiness, interests, and learning profiles of students. The variations provided by teachers only focused on making the material interesting and close to the students' daily lives without differentiating it based on students' needs (Massey, 2025). These findings indicate that providing material relevant to students' daily lives does not yet demonstrate optimal implementation of DI. This aligns with research by Tajik et al. (2024), which found that teachers adapt material to students' daily lives without adapting it to individual student differences.

Furthermore, in the process of differentiation, the process is how students gain an understanding of learning and how teachers teach in the classroom (Levy, 2008). Research has shown that teachers implement a variety of activities to help students understand the material being taught. These activities include role-playing, group discussions, writing exercises, watching videos, answering questions, and so on. All students complete the same tasks or activities, but to achieve these goals, teachers provide varied activities to meet students' different learning styles. It shows that the teacher has attempted to implement process differentiation in a simple form by providing diverse activities, but this diversity of activities has not fully demonstrated the implementation of differentiation based on learning profiles, readiness, or student interests. Likewise, research conducted by Sapkota (2025) stated that teachers create varied activities but do not differentiate them according to the characteristics of each student. As in the analysis

document, teachers implemented process differentiation in the module by 54.26% and in the observation class by 43.33%, which can be concluded that it has not been implemented optimally.

Next, product differentiation is the element that is least frequently implemented by teachers because, based on the research results, the percentage of implementation in teaching modules is 26.67% and in classroom observations is 18%, which is the smallest number of other DI elements. It was found that teachers do provide assignments with diverse activities, but optimal product differentiation has not been seen because teachers still often provide assignments with the same final results for all students without giving students the freedom to choose according to their readiness, interests, and learning profiles. This contradicts the principle of Tomlinson (2014), which states that the products produced by students are in accordance with the interests, readiness, and learning profiles of each student. Similar to the research conducted by Lee and Hung (2025) which stated that product is an element that is difficult to implement because it requires a long time and assessment to prepare it, making the product one of the elements that is rarely applied by teachers. It can be concluded that teachers seem to be trying to implement product differentiation but have not fully fulfilled it according to the principle of differentiated instruction.

Lastly, the learning environment. The present research found that each teacher created a positive, comfortable learning environment that supported students' active participation in learning. This was evident in the various strategies teachers employed to maintain student focus and create a conducive learning environment. These strategies demonstrated that teachers had implemented a comfortable learning environment for students.

A safe and comfortable learning environment is essential in differentiated instruction (Krikaleli & Serol, 2024; Tundreng et al., 2025). In this study, teachers implemented this by providing positive affirmations to students, providing engaging activities to prevent students from getting bored, including icebreakers and other activities that keep students focused and interested in learning. Therefore, it can be concluded that teachers have implemented a comfortable, safe learning environment that makes students active in learning.

It can be concluded that teachers at SMPN 1 Harau has shown efforts to implement differentiated instruction, as evidenced by their efforts to adapt content, processes, and a learning environment that is comfortable for students. However, the deeper implementation of differentiated instruction, such as content and products tailored to students' readiness, interests, and learning profiles, has not been optimally implemented. As stated by Fox and Hoffman (2011), the goal of differentiated instruction is to meet the diversity of student needs by using a flexible approach for each student. Therefore, the results of this study indicate that although teachers have demonstrated efforts in implementing DI, improvements are still needed, especially in content and products.

Difficulties in Implementing Differentiated Instruction

After conducting stimulated recall interviews with teachers, it was discovered that they faced several difficulties in implementing differentiated instruction. All three teachers stated that the main challenges in implementing DI were limited school facilities and time constraints. SMPN 1 Harau has a large number of classes, but the availability of facilities, especially infocus and speakers, cannot meet the needs of every teacher. Therefore, if teachers want to implement DI, they must use various media, and one of the most popular media for students is video displayed on the infocus. This aligns with Yanto (2015) state that limited facilities and an unsupportive learning environment significantly impact the effectiveness of the English language learning process in these schools.

Furthermore, there is a time constraint, which to meet the diverse needs of students requires various and complex types of activities so that to implement all of them in the classroom certainly requires a long time, while English class hours are only once a week and the curriculum requires several materials that must be completed in one semester, this automatically implement DI not run optimally. According to previous research by Suryati et.al (2023), the curriculum necessitates a wide range of materials; however, in practice, teachers often face time constraints that limit their ability to complete the required materials, exercises, and other learning activities. Consequently, the learning process cannot proceed optimally.

The next difficulty that teachers face is providing learning that is tailored to students' abilities and learning styles. Research shows that teachers need a long time to prepare learning that is suited to students' abilities and learning styles. This is consistent with research conducted by Suryati et al. (2023), which states that preparing differentiated learning according to students' abilities and learning styles requires a long time, while teachers are required to handle other matters such as administration, which limits their time to design learning that suits students' needs.

One of the difficulties teachers face is keeping students engaged in learning. In the study of three teachers, two taught during the last period of the day. This time is often when students tend to lose focus, feel sleepy, and grow tired of studying. As a result, teachers must find ways to keep students attentive and motivated. To combat this issue, they implement a variety of activities designed to enhance students' focus, such as icebreakers and other engaging tasks that help prevent drowsiness and reenergize the class.

4. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this study aimed to determine how teachers implement differentiated instruction in EFL classes at SMPN 1 Harau and the difficulties they face in implementing it. The results show that the three English teachers at SMP N 1 Harau has demonstrated efforts to implement differentiated instruction. DI implementation is more evident in content, process, and learning environment, but improvements are still needed, especially in product differentiation. English teachers at SMP N 1 Harau has demonstrated efforts to implement differentiated instruction, particularly through variations in activities, the relevance of content to students' lives, and the creation of a conducive, comfortable learning environment. However, the implementation of DI still needs improvement in terms of the suitability of its content, processes, and products to students' readiness, interests, and learning profiles. Difficulties faced by teachers include time constraints, inadequate facilities, providing materials appropriate to students' abilities, differences in students' needs and learning styles, and maintaining student focus in learning.

The results of the study also to improve the implementation of differentiated instruction in the classroom, diagnostic tests are needed for teachers to adjust learning to students' needs, implement flexible group learning, and provide tiered assignments to meet the needs of each student. This research is expected to enrich the literature on the implementation of differentiated instruction in the EFL classroom and can also be a reflection material for teachers and schools to provide training for teachers in preparing diagnostic tests, providing tiered assignments, and also increasing collaboration between English teachers in preparing learning so that DI is implemented more optimally.

REFERENCES

- Astuti, Y. F., Syafei, M., & Suryani, F. B. (2023). English Junior High School teachers' and students' perspectives of Differentiated Instruction practices in Kurikulum Merdeka. *Simple: International Journal of English Education*, 1(1), 30–34. <https://doi.org/10.24176/simple.v1i1.10614>
- Azhari, Z. (2023). *Differentiated teaching and learning applied in English classes of phase F of senior high school*. (Undergraduate thesis, Universitas Negeri Padang).
- Gass, S. M., & Mackey, A. (2000). *Stimulated recall methodology in second language research*. Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian, P. W. (2012). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and applications* (10th ed.). Pearson Education.
- Intang, N., Elpisah, H., & Hartini, H. (2025). Applying differentiated instruction to enhance student engagement and learning outcomes in integrated social studies in junior high school. *International Journal of Studies in International Education*, 2(1), 25–39. <https://doi.org/10.62951/ijisie.v2i1.142>
- Kirikaleli, N. O., & Serol, N. (2024). Views of mathematics teachers regarding creating classroom climate. *Journal of Education and Learning (EduLearn)*, 18(3), 647-655.
- Lee, T.-K., & Hung, A. C. Y. (2025). Implementing differentiated instruction through lesson study: Reflections from Taiwanese EFL teachers. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 133, 102720. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2025.102720>
- Maruf, N. (2023). The interplay of teachers' beliefs, attitudes, and the implementation of differentiated instruction in Indonesian EFL contexts. *English Review: Journal of English Education*, 11(2), 357-364.
- Massey, S. (2025). *Teachers' Challenges With Implementing Differentiated Instructional Strategies in Grade 5 through 8 Classrooms* (Doctoral dissertation, Walden University)
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.
- Milinga, J. R., Amani, J., & Lyakurwa, S. E. (2023). Teachers' perceptions of differentiated instruction for academically high-achieving secondary school students in Tanzania. *Journal of Advanced Academics*, 34(1), 68-102.
- Mutmainah, M., Sundari, H., & Juhana, J. (2023). English teachers' perceptions and practices of differentiated instruction (DI) in the Merdeka Curriculum. *Linguistic English Education and Art (Leea) Journal*, 7(1), 151-171.
- Otieno, A. D. (2025). Experimental study on the effect of differentiated instruction learning model on inclusive classrooms. *Journal of Education Innovation and Curriculum Development*, 3(1), 38-45
- 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>
- Sapkota, H. P. (2025). Differentiated instruction in EFL classrooms: A systematic review. *Journal of Natural Language and Linguistics*, 3(1), 201–208. <https://doi.org/10.54536/jnll.v3i1.5775>
- Suryati, I., Ratih, K., & Maryadi, M. (2023). Teachers' challenges in implementing differentiated instruction in teaching English at junior high school. *Eduvest-Journal of Universal Studies*, 3(9), 1693-1708.
- Tajik, O., Noor, S., & Golzar, J. (2024). Investigating differentiated instruction and the contributing factors to cater EFL students' needs at the collegial level. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, 9, 74. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-024-00299-5>
- Talain, A., & Mercado, F. (2023). Teachers' perspectives on the use of differentiated instruction for English language teaching. *The Normal Lights*, 17(2). <https://doi.org/10.56278/tnl.v17i2.2152>
- Tomlinson, C. A. (2001). *How to differentiate instruction in mixed-ability classrooms*. ASCD.
- Tomlinson, C. A. (2014). *The differentiated classroom: Responding to the needs of all learners* (2nd ed.). ASCD.
- Tomlinson, C. A. (2017). *How to differentiate instruction in academically diverse classrooms* (3rd ed.). ASCD.
- Tundreng, S., Yawan, H., & Marhamah, M. (2025). Implementing differentiated instruction in Indonesian secondary schools: Opportunities and challenges from language teachers. *English Review: Journal of English Education*, 13(1), 93-106.
- Zainil, Y. (2017). *Stimulated recall: unpacking pedagogical practice of code-switching in Indonesia*. (Doctoral dissertation, Deakin University).