IJIET, e-ISSN 2548-8430, p-ISSN 2548-8422, Vol. 10, No. 1, January 2026, pp. 127-139

International Journal of Indonesian Education and Teaching
http://e-journal.usd.ac.id/index.php/IJIET
Sanata Dharma University, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

EVALUATING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF DIFFERENTIATED INSTRUCTION IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE CLASSES

D'aquinaldo Stefanus Fani Seran[1*] and Nur Hidayanto Pancoro Setya Putro[2]
[1,2] Yogyakarta State University, Indonesia
daquinaldo0001pasca.2023@student.uny.ac.id[1] and nur_hidayanto@uny.ac.id[2]
*correspondence: daquinaldo0001pasca.2023@student.uny.ac.id
https://doi.org/10.24071/ijiet.v10i1.13215
received 22 July 2025; accepted 27 January 2026

Abstract
This study aims to evaluate the suitability and effectiveness of the implementation of differentiated learning in English subjects, from the following aspects: student identification, learning objectives, socio-cultural, human resources (teachers and students), learning material planning, availability of facilities and infrastructure, utilization of facilities and learning processes, and outcomes after participating in learning. The methodology used was descriptive quantitative with a qualitative approach. The Context, Input, Process, Product (CIPP) evaluation model is used to evaluate it, while data collection was in the form of questionnaires, observations, document reviews, and interviews. The results of the study show the level of suitability and effectiveness of students: 76%, 82%, 77%, a n d 76%, while non-conformity or ineffectiveness: 24%, 18%, 23%, and 24%. This means that input, process, and output have not been implemented well. Meanwhile, for teachers: 83%, 84%, 86%, 84%, and inappropriate or ineffective: 17%, 16%, 14%, and 16%, which means it has been implemented well. The description above indicates positive results from differentiated learning in English. Teachers stated it was appropriate and effective, while students needed ongoing, specialized support to achieve shared expectations.

Keywords: differentiated learning, English class, CIPP evaluation model, student and teacher evaluation

Introduction

English, as a language of communication, plays a central role in today's global world and digital era. Various educational, technological, business, and scientific resources and information are all presented in English (Sari et al., 2024). The ability to master English correctly and accurately not only enables one to understand diverse sources of knowledge but also facilitates relationships and communication with people from diverse cultural backgrounds and countries. Furthermore, it can expand professional connections and social networks (Alfarisy, 2021).

Data from English First's English Proficiency Index (EF EPI) in 2022 categorizes Indonesians' English proficiency as low (https://www.ef.co.id/epi/, 2023). A study published in the International Journal of Education Best Practices found that the average proficiency level of students taking the TOEFL test was at

This work is licensed under CC BY-SA.
Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

level A2 or "waystage" on the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) scale (Muryanti et al., 2023). This demonstrates that English proficiency is still limited to basic English, with communication limited to family and interpersonal settings.

Research has demonstrated that teaching and learning English in the classroom is hampered by various factors, including uninspiring content delivery, learning materials, learning design, a non-conducive classroom atmosphere, and weak foundational knowledge (Fatah et al., 2021). Research in Yogyakarta also demonstrated that the use of texts remains too common in English teaching and fails to emphasize both local and target cultures, making them appear less relevant to the learning environment (Azizah & Surya, 2017).

The curriculum improves the functioning of the education system. Likewise, the Independent Curriculum for the 2020/2021 academic year was driven by various post-pandemic challenges, a commitment to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), the need for inclusive education, and global trends in education. Differentiated Learning (DI) is a form of implementation of the Independent Curriculum, introduced by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology (Kemendikbudristek) to motivate teacher and student autonomy and flexibility in the process of designing and implementing learning that suits the diverse needs of students.

Differentiated Learning (DI) is more student-centered in its design, giving teachers the freedom to develop teaching methods that address the differences in students within the classroom. The goal of DI is more personalized learning tailored to the unique characteristics of each student. This motivates students to be more actively involved in learning, resulting in more optimal outcomes. When delivering learning content, teachers assess students' readiness levels, interests, and learning styles. Teachers are also encouraged to modify teaching content, processes, products (learning outcomes), and the learning environment based on these factors. Students need freedom in the learning process because a uniform approach is not required for them (Purba et al., 2021).

Research shows that serious attention is needed from the government and schools in developing differentiated learning to meet student needs. Teachers still act as central figures in learning, and there is also a lack of uniformity in student interest levels, learning styles, and preparation. According to Wahyuni (2023), the implementation of differentiated learning has been successful, considering its four components: content, process, product, and learning environment. However, its implementation still faces obstacles such as limited facilities, limited teacher skills, and inadequate infrastructure.

Ainun and Putro (2024) emphasized that the implementation of various differentiated learning strategies in Yogyakarta has supported and assisted teachers in classroom learning. Teachers can design and present content, incorporating various formats, texts, and various reference sources. Differentiated learning also helps students determine learning arrangements that are appropriate to classroom differences. The implementation of differentiated learning at the high school level provides clear benefits for students and teachers, but several obstacles remain in its implementation (Ainun & Putro, 2024).

Magableh and Abdullah (2020) emphasized the positive impacts of differentiated learning. These impacts include improved language skills, increased

motivation, and overall academic achievement. Despite these positive impacts, differentiated learning also presents various challenges, such as the complexity of planning learning materials, a lack of opportunities for professional development, large class sizes, and limited administrative support (Magableh & Abdullah, 2020).

The description above shows that differentiated learning provides significant benefits for students. However, in practice, it requires a long process, thorough planning, and support from various stakeholders. Several studies also indicate gaps in the implementation of differentiated learning. First, teachers' identification of student needs has not been optimal, and learning objectives and student diversity have not been aligned, resulting in unsatisfactory results. Second, an effective learning infrastructure is lacking, including classrooms, learning applications, and technology, as well as inadequate preparation of learning materials. Third, learning strategies implemented in the classroom have not been fully optimized, and not all students are actively involved or participating in the learning process. Fourth, when the materials and methods used are not aligned with the intended learning objectives, differentiated learning cannot produce significant improvements in English language proficiency for all students.

Therefore, a serious evaluation of the implementation of differentiated learning, which has been underway since 2020/2021, is necessary, particularly in eleventh-grade English classes at high schools in Yogyakarta. This evaluation aims to assess the extent to which current classroom practices align with established standards and identify any gaps. This evaluation aims to gather comprehensive information on the implementation of differentiated learning, thus providing a basis for decision-making that aligns with the school's needs. This evaluation is conducted using the Context, Input, Process, and Product (CIPP) model.

In evaluating the context, the focus is on the social and cultural dynamics within the classroom, as well as the articulation of learning objectives. Input evaluation includes examining the readiness of human resources (teachers and students) and the availability of facilities and supporting resources. Process evaluation covers how learning activities are conducted in the classroom and how resources and facilities are used appropriately. Product evaluation includes measuring learning outcomes and student achievement after participating in the learning process. These four components are crucial for determining the overall success and effectiveness of differentiated learning, particularly in the context of teaching English in grade 11 high schools.

Literature Review

Tomlinson (2001) introduced her idea of differentiated learning as an approach through various teaching methods that engage students in learning, taking into account the differences in student interests, and using various levels of instruction, complexity, and difficulty. This approach is proactive and learner-centered, which provides various pathways, and learners can access content, process ideas, and create products (Tomlinson & Imbeau, 2010).

The foundation of differentiated learning, rooted in student diversity, requires flexible instruction that challenges students, regardless of their level of readiness, interests, and learning styles (Tomlinson & Moon, 2013). Tomlinson also emphasized that differentiation is not the same as individualized instruction; rather, it is about creating a variety of learning activity options in a mixed-ability classroom

(Santangelo & Tomlinson, 2012). According to Marlina (2020), differentiated learning is learning that is adapted based on the different needs of students, including differences in readiness, interests, and learning styles. This is emphasized by Wahyuningsari et al. (2022), who emphasized that each lives in a different cultural and environmental context, which is partly shaped by their different geographic environments. Therefore, the uniqueness of each student must be taken into account (Supriyadi et al., 2024).

The explanation above confirms that differentiated learning is a student-centered and highly active teaching approach, where content, processes, products, and learning environments are tailored to students' readiness levels, interests, and learning styles. Therefore, flexibility and support from all parties and stakeholders are needed to achieve these goals. It is necessary to accommodate the diversity and uniqueness of students to achieve optimal success and the ability to apply these learning strategies in real life.

In the implementation of differentiated learning, four key elements need to be considered by students and teachers, especially in the learning process (Tomlinson, 2001): a) Content – this is about what students learn. This also includes learning materials and curriculum, which must be adapted to the needs and abilities of different students (Muliyah et al., 2020). b) Process – this is about how students understand information and ideas. Given the diversity of learning styles and preferences among students, classrooms must be modified by teachers to effectively address these diverse learning needs (Tomlinson & Moon, 2013). c) Product – represents how students demonstrate what they have learned. Product – this is about the result of learning, which is used to demonstrate students' skills, knowledge, and understanding after completing a learning unit or lesson (Tomlinson & Allan, 2000). d) Learning Environment – This is about the social, personal, and physical settings of the classroom. The learning environment needs to be aligned with students' readiness, interests, and learning preferences, so as to ensure high engagement and motivation in the learning process (Tomlinson & Imbeau, 2010).

Regarding the CIPP evaluation model proposed by Daniel Stufflebeam to assess this topic, it can be briefly explained as follows: First, Context: This element identifies the needs, problems, and objectives of an activity. The context element ensures that the goals of the activity align with the learners' needs and remain relevant. Second, Input: This element evaluates the plans, strategies, and resources used to achieve the objectives of the activity. Input is crucial to support the effective implementation of the activity. Third, Process: This element examines the implementation of the activity and its alignment with the planning. The process element addresses any issues, assesses the quality of implementation, and provides necessary feedback during the activity to facilitate continuous improvement. Fourth, Product: This element measures the outcomes of the activity, including both intended and unintended results. It also considers the short-term and long-term impacts of the activity, as well as its benefits for learners and other relevant stakeholders (Halim & Suseno, 2022).

Method

This research uses a quantitative descriptive approach, supported by qualitative data. Therefore, the quantitative descriptive data were obtained from observations, document reviews, questionnaires, and interviews as qualitative data.

The evaluation model used in this study is the CIPP model (Context, Input, Process, Product). The CIPP evaluation model was selected because the aspects reviewed in this model are considered more comprehensive compared to other evaluation models.

The research was conducted at five senior high schools in the Special Region of Yogyakarta, namely SMA Stella Duce 2 DIY, SMA BOPKRI 1 DIY, SMA N 4 Yogyakarta City, SMA N 9 Yogyakarta City, and SMA Pangudi Luhur Yogyakarta. These schools have implemented differentiated instruction, particularly in the English subject for grade XI students. The respondents/participants of this study were all English teachers teaching grade XI who had implemented differentiated instruction, as well as grade XI students, specifically those enrolled in the English follow-up classes across the five schools. Two follow-up classes were selected from all grade XI classes at each school. The total sample size, based on the established criteria, was 289 students and 15 teachers from the five schools. Sampling was conducted using a purposive sampling technique, meaning that the researcher selected the sample because it was the most relevant and provided the necessary information for the study. All participants provided verbal informed consent after an explanation of the purpose and procedures. Data were kept confidential, and participation was voluntary.

The success criteria in the evaluation of differentiated learning in the English subject for Grade XI students at senior high schools in Yogyakarta are determined based on the normal distribution measurement categories as outlined by Azwar (2021). These categories include: very good, good, fairly good, poor, and very poor. The determination of success criteria is carried out by comparing the achievement scores in each evaluated aspect (context, input, process, and product) with the established standard of success, which is set at 100% (Modified from: Learning and Assessment Guidelines).

Findings and Discussion

This section presents the results and discussion of the four aspects: context, input, process, and product in differentiated instruction within the Grade XI English subject. The evaluation aims to examine the extent of alignment and effectiveness of these aspects in implementing differentiated instruction in Grade XI English classes at senior high schools in Yogyakarta.

Context aspect in differentiated instruction implementation in the English subject

According to Stufflebeam, this evaluation component identifies the object, such as individuals, populations, or institutions, and establishes directions for improvement. Therefore, it is essential to prioritize needs and select goals that most effectively support the success of the activity (Arikunto, 2013). Contextual aspects, in addition to identifying the needs and objectives of the activity, also relate to social, economic, and political conditions. There are three important components of differentiated learning that need to be considered: student identification, communication of learning objectives, and social and cultural conditions within the classroom (Purmananingwulan & Purwanto, 2025).

First, according to Daniel Stufflebeam, it is crucial to ensure alignment between goals and participant needs by identifying individual participant needs in an activity, assessing relevance and effectiveness, differentiation and personalization, and student participation and engagement (Ibrahim, 2018).

Identifying student needs in the context of differentiated learning is a crucial step at the beginning of classroom learning. This identification process aims to recognize the diverse abilities, needs, and characteristics of students in the classroom. This relates to each student's readiness, interests, and learning style.

Second, within the context, it is important to communicate the objectives of the activity. According to Daniel Stufflebeam, this communication must be clear and effective about the objectives to be achieved in the learning process (Rama et al., 2023). Learning objectives need to be communicated so that teachers can adapt methods and materials to suit the differences in students in the class.

Third, social and cultural conditions. This is crucial for classroom learning. For Stufflebeam, it is crucial to consider the economic and social context of the classroom. This attention is crucial for preventing mismatches and rejection, recognizing differences, and ensuring sustainable activities. In differentiated learning, understanding social and cultural conditions is crucial so that all methods, materials, and assignments are relevant and appropriate to the diverse needs of learners.

From each survey of students and teachers, there were quite striking differences. Students' responses yielded a percentage of 76%, with a gap of 23%, indicating that the context aspect of the learning process falls within the good category. Meanwhile, teachers' responses resulted in 85%, with a gap of 15%, suggesting that the context aspect in the learning process is classified as very good.

Table 1. Evaluation results of the context aspect from students and teachers

Indicator	Students		Teacher		Ideal Score
	Average	Gap	Average	Gap	
Identification of needs	75%	25%	85%	15%	100%
Communication of Learning Objectives	75%	25%	85%	15%	100%
Social and Cultural Conditions	77%	23%	84%	16%	100%

The table above shows that the student questionnaire results regarding the indicators of identifying students' needs, conveying learning objectives, and the social and cultural conditions in the classroom fall into the "good" category, yet they have not fully met the established standards. There remains a gap in implementation. This gap arises because the identification of students' needs has not been carried out as rigorously as expected in Differentiated Instruction (DI); the communication of learning objectives has not been fully understood by all students; and the social and cultural conditions are still not entirely supportive of classroom learning. Meanwhile, the teacher questionnaire results fall into the "very good" category and have met the set standards. Nonetheless, they have not reached the 100% benchmark established. The existing gap in implementation is due to the identification of students' needs not being fully realized as intended in DI, and the social and cultural conditions within the classroom are not yet entirely conducive to learning.

Identifying student needs, in its implementation, is necessary to ensure learning that is appropriate to student differences; it is also necessary to simplify the communication of learning objectives so that they are more easily understood by students. Meanwhile, cultural and social situations in the classroom require ongoing guidance, so that classroom conduciveness can be maintained.

For a teacher, contextual aspects can support students in implementing differentiated learning in eleventh-grade English. Identifying student needs is crucial in implementing the learning process with diverse student circumstances. Furthermore, a conducive classroom atmosphere must be created and directed to facilitate effective learning.

Input aspect of differentiated instruction implementation in the English subject

Daniel Stufflebeam defines the input component of evaluation as numerous critical factors, including human resources, planning and strategy, supporting facilities and infrastructure, funds or budgeting, and the appropriate processes and rules (Widoyoko, 2018). In the context of differentiated education, the input aspect is critical to its successful implementation. Two critical components of the input aspect are the availability of qualified human resources and supporting facilities and resources.

First, Stufflebeam defines the availability of human resources as those who actively participate in carrying out a specific task. The success of a program or activity is greatly influenced by educators, trainers, and other staff members who possess the requisite abilities and expertise (Kheryadi et al., 2022). When it comes to differentiated education, the caliber and proficiency of teachers play a critical role in creating lessons that suit the diversity of learners. Effective teaching techniques that actively include students in the learning process must also be a skill that teachers possess. Students are expected to exhibit a certain level of preparedness to engage in classroom learning, in addition to teachers.

Second, Daniel Stufflebeam defines the availability of facilities and supporting resources as the physical infrastructure—such as classrooms, learning aids, and various technical infrastructures—that facilitates the execution of activities. The smooth operation of operations, process optimization, implementation quality improvement, and the accomplishment of desired objectives all depend on the availability of such facilities and resources. The availability of facilities and auxiliary materials is crucial for developing responsive and successful learning experiences that take into account the diversity of students in the context of differentiated teaching. All students, regardless of their unique learning styles or aptitudes, are provided equal opportunity to participate in the learning process when they have sufficient access to such facilities.

Similar results were found based on the questionnaires that teachers and students filled out. According to student responses, the input component of the lesson is "very good," with an 82% proportion and an 18% gap. Similarly, the teachers' answers provided an 84% percentage with a 16% gap, classifying the input component as "very good."

Table 2. Evaluation results of the input aspect based on the student and the teacher

Indicator	Students		Teacher		Ideal score
	Average	Gap	Average	Gap	
The availability of human resources	81%	19%	83%	17%	100%
The availability of facilities and supporting resources	84%	16%	86%	14%	100%

The table above shows that the student survey results regarding indicators of student readiness and the availability of facilities and supporting resources fall into the "very good" category and meet the established standard. However, they have not reached the 100% benchmark set, as there remains a gap in implementation. This disparity arises because some students have not completely realized their own skills, while others are not ready to follow the teacher's instructions when completing activities based on their varied abilities. In terms of facilities and auxiliary materials, not all software and instructional videos are now available, and network outages can occasionally make it more difficult for students to obtain information online. The findings of the teacher survey, however, are likewise rated as "very good" and satisfy the predetermined criteria. However, there is still a gap. This disparity results from teachers' incomplete integration of educational apps and videos into their lessons, their lack of flexibility and adaptability in presenting content to satisfy the varied requirements of their students, and the occasional disruption caused by internet access.

The results indicate that from the standpoint of the students, the input component of differentiated instruction in Grade XI English classes at senior high schools in Yogyakarta is extremely appropriate, well-executed, and completely supportive. However, while putting it into practice, focus needs to be placed on how well-prepared pupils are to do the tasks they are given and how well-aware they are of their own talents. To enhance the learning process, it is also necessary to take into account the accessibility of programs, educational videos, and reliable internet connectivity. The input component also exhibits a high level of appropriateness, implementation, and readiness to assist children in learning English, according to the teachers. However, to meet the varied requirements of students, the implementation calls for more focus on the flexibility and adaptation of teachers in presenting instructional content. In the teaching and learning process, the accessibility of instructional apps, videos, and internet connectivity is all crucial.

Process aspect in the implementation of differentiated instruction in English learning

Daniel Stufflebeam defines the process aspect as the degree to which plans are applied in practice and how they are implemented. As a result, this part deals with how activities are actually carried out, including the degree of participation and the use of resources, money, and materials in actual environments. According to Dethan et al. (2024), the process component of education includes the utilization of resources and facilities to facilitate learning as well as the execution of training, mentoring, and instructional activities. The execution of learning activities in the classroom and the use of facilities and auxiliary resources are two essential elements of the process component of differentiated teaching. Utilizing facilities and auxiliary materials is essential to assisting students in learning in the methods that work best for them. In the meantime, it's critical to observe the learning process in order to develop effective communication between teachers and students as well as their interactions (Mardhatillah & Suharyadi, 2023).

Based on the results of the student and teacher questionnaires, there were different results. Students scored 77%, with a 23% gap, indicating that the process aspect of learning met the criteria of good. Meanwhile, the teacher questionnaire scored 86%, with a 14% gap, indicating that the process aspect of learning met the

criteria of very good.

First, according to Daniel Stufflebeam, the use of facilities and supporting resources refers to how all available assets are optimally utilized to support the implementation of activities or programs. In differentiated instruction, the use of facilities and supporting resources pertains to everything employed to create a learning environment that accommodates the diversity of students. This also includes how all existing infrastructure and equipment are organized and presented in such a way that they help students achieve their learning objectives.

Second, the process or implementation of activities/programs, according to Stufflebeam, is a crucial component in evaluation. This process refers to how the activity or program is carried out in accordance with the planning and intended goals. According to Tomlinson, in differentiated instruction, the learning process involves efforts to adjust instruction to meet the diverse needs of students. In this learning process, it is necessary to apply flexible approaches tailored to student diversity, to pay attention to student interaction and engagement, and to foster each student's independence in exploring and expressing themselves.

Table 3. Evaluation results of the process aspect from students and teachers

Indicator	Students		Teacher		Ideal score
	Average	Gap	Average	Gap	
The use of facilities and supporting resources pertains	78%	23%	86%	14%	100%
Learning process in the classroom	76%	24%	86%	14%	100%

Based on the table above, the student questionnaire results related to the indicators of the use of facilities and supporting resources, as well as the learning process in the classroom, fall into the good category but have not yet met the established standards. There remains a gap in its implementation. This gap arises because students have not fully understood the use of applications and videos in learning, and the utilization of projectors and other supporting tools has not optimally helped students to focus on the learning process. Regarding the learning process itself, students have not been fully actively engaged and participative in the learning activities. Meanwhile, the teacher questionnaire results fall into the very good category and are within the established standards. However, there is still a gap in its implementation. This gap occurs because teachers have not fully motivated students to learn according to their diverse needs, and teachers have not yet mastered the use of applications and videos comprehensively. Additionally, internet connectivity issues occasionally disrupt the learning process.

It can be concluded that the process aspect in the implementation of differentiated instruction in the English subject for 11th-grade high school students in Yogyakarta, from the students' perspective, is appropriate, well-executed, and ready to support students in the learning process of the English subject. However, in its implementation, attention needs to be given to students' active and participative involvement, as well as the use of applications, instructional videos, and internet connectivity. Meanwhile, from the teachers' perspective, it shows a very appropriate, well-executed, and highly prepared effort to assist students in learning English. Nevertheless, it is necessary to optimize motivation and

enthusiasm towards students and to pay close attention to the use of applications, videos in learning, as well as internet access for information retrieval.

Product aspect in the implementation of differentiated instruction in the English subject

Stufflebeam defines the product aspect as the assessment of the results obtained both during and after the execution of an activity. In essence, the goal of this product evaluation is to determine how well the activity's goals have been achieved. Additionally, it looks at the long-term effects and offers knowledge and insights for future advancements, which promotes accountability and trust. Determining the quality of a particular activity or program becomes difficult without assessing the final product (Halim & Suseno, 2022). The product element in differentiated instruction, according to Tomlinson, refers to the results that students exhibit following their participation in the learning process. These outcomes could include abilities, inspiration, final projects, or tasks that let pupils demonstrate their learning. According to Purwowidodo and Zaini (2023), the product component is essential for raising student motivation and engagement, encouraging innovation and resilience, giving more accurate feedback, and boosting overall accountability.

Different results were found based on the questionnaire that was given to teachers and students. According to the students' comments, the product component of differentiated teaching is classified as "good" with a 76% percentage and a 24% gap. In the meantime, 84% of teachers responded, a 16% difference, indicating that the learning process's product component is rated as "very good."

Table 4. Results of the evaluation of the product aspects of students and teachers

Indicator	Students		Teacher		Ideal Scor
	Average	Gap	Average	Gap	
Outcomes after completing the learning process	76%	24%	84%	16%	100%

Although they have not yet reached the predetermined standard, the findings of the student questionnaire pertaining to indicators of learning outcomes following participation in classroom teaching fall into the "good" category, as shown in the above table. The implementation is still lacking. This disparity results from students' incomplete demonstration of growth in their ability to read, write, and express themselves in English, as well as their lack of confidence and excitement for the language. However, the findings of the teacher questionnaire are within the set criteria and fall into the "very good" category. The anticipated level hasn't been quite met yet, though. There is still an implementation gap. This is because not every student has made enough progress in reading, writing, expressing themselves, gaining confidence, expanding their vocabulary, or exhibiting a passion for learning English.

Consequently, it can be said that the product component of diversified teaching in Grade XI English classrooms at senior high schools in Yogyakarta is suitable, efficient, and ideally situated to aid students in their educational journey. Nonetheless, it should always be implemented in tandem with ongoing student progress monitoring and development. According to the teachers, this element is

very suitable, very successful, and demonstrates a great willingness to help kids learn English. However, to guarantee that they continue to make significant progress throughout the learning process, students need constant coaching when putting it into practice.

Conclusion

The students' assessment of the context component reveals a 76% appropriateness level with a 24% gap. In the meantime, the teachers' assessment of the context component shows a 15% gap and an 85% appropriateness level. According to the students' assessment of the input component, there is an 18% gap and an 82% appropriateness level. According to the instructors' input, there is a 16% gap and an 84% appropriateness level. Students' assessment of the process component yields a 77% appropriateness level with a 23% gap. From the teachers' perspective, the process aspect shows a suitability level of 86%, with a gap of 14%. According to the students' assessment of the product aspect, there is a 24% gap and a 76% appropriateness level. However, according to the teachers, the product aspect has an 84% appropriateness level with a 16% gap. Based on these results, it can be said that teachers and students show a comparatively high degree of agreement with the use of differentiated teaching in the context, input, process, and product domains. However, there are still noticeable gaps, especially from the perspective of the students, which suggests that these four assessed areas require ongoing attention in order to guarantee that the various learning needs of the students are met as best they can.

Recommendation

The evaluation's findings could be used as a reference and a useful factor to improve the way differentiated instruction is implemented, especially when teaching English. The varied needs of students should, however, be consistently and clearly identified by educational institutions in practice. Learning objectives should be communicated in an easy-to-understand manner, and teacher quality should be continuously enhanced through cooperation between and within schools and continual professional development. In order to improve learning quality and preparedness, it is advised that students participate in intra- and inter-school competitions.

Furthermore, in order to facilitate successful training, facilities and related resources should be made available on a constant basis. Regular training on how to oversee dynamic and captivating learning processes should also be provided to teachers. Consistently holding English language contests encourages pupils to develop a new learning habit by highlighting the value of studying the language. Last but not least, it is critical to consistently create a more thorough assessment and evaluation system that gauges not just knowledge and abilities but also other crucial elements, including attitudes, affective components, creativity, and portfolio-based accomplishments.

References

Ainun, F., & Putro, N.H.P.S. (2024). English teachers' strategies in implementing differentiated instruction in three public senior high schools. *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding, 11*(11), 700–707. http://dx.doi.org/10.18415/ijmmu.v11i11.6535

Alfarisy, F. (2021). Kebijakan pembelajaran bahasa Inggris di Indonesia. *Jurnal Ilmiah Profesi Pendidikan, 6*(3), 303–313. https://dx.doi.org/10.29303/jipp.v6i3.207

Arikunto, S. (2013). *Dasar-dasar evaluasi pendidikan* (2nd ed.). Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.

Azizah, D. M., & Surya, A. (2017). Implementasi pembelajaran bahasa Inggris SD berbasis budaya di Yogyakarta. *DWIJA CENDEKIA: Jurnal Riset Pedagogik, 1*(1), 10–18. https://doi.org/10.20961/jdc.v1i1.13052

Dethan, M. J. S., Bire, A. L. , & Sitorus, E. (2024). Evaluasi program pembelajaran berdiferensiasi pada sekolah dasar dengan model CIPP. *Jurnal Inovasi Kurikulum*, *21*(1), 167-180.

EF.co.id. (2025). Daftar peringkat terbesar berdasarkan kemampuan bahasa Inggris di negara dan wilayah terbesar dunia. Retrieved from https://www.ef.co.id/

Fatah, M., Suud, F. M., & Chaer, M. T. (2021). Jenis-jenis kesulitan belajar dan faktor penyebabnya sebuah kajian komprehensif pada siswa SMK Muhammadiyah Tegal. *Psycho Idea, 19*(1), 89-102. https://doi.org/10.30595/psychoidea.v19i1.6026

Halim, N., & Suseno, M. (2022). Evaluasi program bahasa Inggris bertujuan khusus dengan pendekatan. *Jurnal Ilmiah Untuk Peningkatan Mutu Pendidikan, 9*(1), 117–130. https://doi.org/10.21009/improvement.v9i1.27791

Ibrahim, M.M. (2018). *Penelitian evaluasi bidang pendidikan (pendekatan kualitatif)*. Makassar: Alauddin University Press.

Kheryadi, K., Ghufron, M. A., & Syafi'i, A. (2022). Evaluation of differentiated instruction implementation in English language teaching: A CIPP model approach. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics, 7*(3), 563-578.

Magableh, I., & Abdullah, A. (2020). The effect of differentiated instruction on EFL learners: Teachers' perspective. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 10*(5), 626-641. http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v10-i5/7235

Mardhatillah, M., & Suharyadi, S. (2023). Differentiated instruction: Challenges and opportunities in EFL classroom. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics, 8*(1), 69-77. https://doi.org/10.21462/jeltl.v8i1.1022

Marlina, M. (2020). *Strategi pembelajaran berdiferensiasi di sekolah inklusif*. Padang: CV Afifa Utama.

Muliyah, P., & Aminatun, D. (2020). Teaching English for specific purposes in vocational high school: Teachers' beliefs and practices. *Journal of English Teaching, 6*(2), 122-133. https://doi.org/10.33541/jet.v6i2.1756

Muryanti, M., Ayub, D., & Syafitra, V. (2023). Revisiting English proficiency and its policy in higher education: The case of the University of Riau. *International Journal of Educational Best Practices (IJEBP), 7*(1), 105-116. https://doi.org/10.32851/ijebp.v7n1.p105-116

Purba, M., Purnamasari, N., Soetantyo, S., Suwarma, I. R., & Susanti, E. I. (2021). *Prinsip pengembangan pembelajaran berdiferensiasi (differentiated instruction)* (1st ed.). Jakarta: Pusat Kurikulum dan Pembelajaran.

Purnamaningwulan, R. A., & Purwanto, A. R. (2025). Differentiated instruction strategies to enhance EFL learning in a mixed-proficiency seventh-grade classroom. *Elsya: Journal of English Language Studies, 7*(1), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.31849/elsya.v7i1.22076

Purwowidodo, A., & Zaini, M. (2023). *Teori dan praktik model pembelajaran berdiferensiasi implementasi Kurikulum Merdeka Belajar*. Penerbit: Penebar Media Pustaka.

Rama, A., Ambiyar, A., Rizal, F., Jalinus, N., Waskito, W., & Wulansari, R. E. (2023). Konsep model evaluasi context, input, process, dan product (CIPP) di sekolah menengah kejuruan. *JRTI: Jurnal Riset Tindakan Indonesia, 8*(1), 82-86. https://doi.org/10.29210/30032976000

Santangelo, T., & Tomlinson, C. A. (2012). Teacher educators' perceptions and use of differentiated instruction practices: An exploratory investigation. action in teacher education. *Action in Teacher Education, 34*(4), 309–327. https://doi.org/10.1080/01626620.2012.717032

Sari, G.I., Winasis, S., Pratiwi, I., Nuryanto, U.W., & Basrowi, B. (2024). Strengthening digital literacy in Indonesia: Collaboration, innovation, and sustainability education. *Social Science & Humanities Open, 10*, 101100. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2024.101100

Supriyadi, S., Barus, R. A., Rusilowati, A., Isnaeni, W., Susilaningsih, E., Djuniadi, D., Sun'an, U. N., Rapi, M., Fardiana, R., & Suraji, S. (2024). Improving differentiated learning literacy through differentiated learning training and guidebooks. *Community Development Journal: Jurnal Pengabdian Masyarakat, 5*(1), 1466–1476.

Tomlinson, C. A. (2001). *How to differentiate instruction in mixed-ability classrooms* (2nd Ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.

Tomlinson, C. A., & Allan, S. D. (2000). *Leadership for differentiating schools & classrooms.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Tomlinson, C. A., & Imbeau, M. B. (2010). *Leading and managing: A differentiated classroom.* Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Tomlinson, C. A., & Moon, T. R. (2013). *Assessment and student success in a differentiated classroom.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Wahyuni, S. (2023). The implementation of differentiated learning in Merdeka curriculum in learning English at high school. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and English, 1*(01), 27–33.

Wahyuningsari, D., Mujiwati, Y., Hilmiyah, L., Kusumawardani, F., & Sari, I. (2022). Pembelajaran berdiferensiasi dalam rangka mewujudkan merdeka belajar. *Jurnal Jendela Pendidikan, 2*(04), 529-535. https://doi.org/10.57008/jjp.v2i04.301

Widoyoko, S. E. P. (2018). *Evaluasi program pembelajaran: Panduan praktis bagi pendidik dan calon pendidik*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.