International Journal of Arts and Humanities Studies
ISSN: 2754-4311
DOI: 10.32996/bjahs
Journal Homepage: www.al-kindipublisher.com/index.php/Ijahs

IJAHS
AL-KINDI CENTER FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

| RESEARCH ARTICLE

Principals and Supervisors' Perspectives on Employing Differentiated Instruction Strategies in TEFL

Hatim Mohamed Ahmed Osman
University of West Kordufan, Sudan
Corresponding Author: Hatim Mohamed Ahmed Osman, **E-mail**: brother2009@gmail.com

| ABSTRACT

This study aimed to explore the views of school principals and educational supervisors on the employment of differentiated instruction in teaching English as a foreign language (TEFL). To achieve this aim, the researcher used the descriptive survey approach. A questionnaire was used to assess the extent to which English language female teachers used differentiated instruction strategies, namely problem-solving, gradual activities, and think/pair/share. The study sample included (125) school principals and English language supervisors from Bisha Province. Since differentiated instruction aims to meet the different needs of students through the use of various strategies, the results of the study showed that the degree of teacher's use of the problem-solving strategy in teaching English was high, with an arithmetic mean of (2.34), while the degree of the use of gradual activities and think/pair/share strategies was average, with an average of (1.93). The study also showed that differentiated instruction in general was average, with an arithmetic mean of (2.19). Based on the results, the researcher presented several recommendations, most notably the need to enhance the use of problem-solving strategies in teaching English in particular, and in teaching other subjects in general.

| KEYWORDS

Differentiated Instruction, Problem-solving Strategy, Gradual Activity Strategy, Think/pair/share Strategy

| ARTICLE INFORMATION

ACCEPTED: 02 January 2026 **PUBLISHED:** 11 January 2026 **DOI:** 10.32996/Ijahs.2026.6.1.1

Introduction

Teaching and learning English is one of the essential roles of a teacher, as it plays a significant part in preparing an informed and educated generation within the education system. Therefore, teachers must be well-prepared to equip learners to use the English language effectively in the future, meeting the needs and requirements of their society. The importance of the teacher's role in the educational process has been emphasized at various conferences, including the Third International Educational Conference titled "Towards Better Preparation for the Teacher of the Future" (2004). The recommendations from this conference stressed the need for teacher training and the implementation of assessments to evaluate their knowledge. It also called for fostering teachers' interests in developing learners' abilities and creating an appropriate educational environment, as these learners are the future of society.

Mustafa (2014) emphasizes that educational goals cannot be achieved solely through a well-prepared educational environment; a teacher with the necessary knowledge and experience to effectively employ appropriate methods and techniques in the educational process is also essential. Consequently, the education system prioritizes comprehensive teacher preparation, equipping educators to address the problems and challenges they may encounter (Al-Ghamdi & Abdul Jawad, 2010).

The Ministry of Education in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia has been committed to organizing courses and training workshops for female teachers to develop their skills and keep them informed about the latest developments in the field of

teaching, especially in light of rapid changes and the expansion of global knowledge. Keeping pace with these developments requires updating curricula and education systems, as well as teaching strategies and methods, to achieve better learning outcomes. Differentiated instruction is considered an educational system that includes specific foundations, principles, forms, and strategies tailored to meet the needs of learners, enhancing the effectiveness of learning and making the learner more active and engaged according to their interests. Al-Jubouri & Al-Janabi (2020) state that "differentiated instruction aims to achieve unified educational outcomes through diverse procedures, processes, and tools. Advocates of this type of education emphasize the difficulty of achieving uniform educational goals through a single teaching level and a standardized teaching method in the presence of differences among learners."

Shawahin (2014) indicates that differentiated instruction is based on the principle of "one size does not fit all," allowing each learner to learn in a way that suits them. It also emphasizes quality over quantity. Differentiated instruction relies on psychological, legal, and educational foundations, enhancing its effectiveness by addressing all aspects of the learner during the learning process.

Differentiated instruction is important in identifying individual differences among learners, which is essential for facilitating their understanding and information acquisition in ways that match their levels. This approach encourages them to learn without the boredom and disengagement resulting from imposing uniform teaching methods. Al-Tuwairqi (2013) noted that ignoring the needs and differences of learners can lead to neglecting some students, resulting in the acquisition of skills that do not meet the required standards, ultimately producing a group of neglected learners in society. To address this issue, Al-Suwaifi (2018) recommended the integration of differentiated instruction in elementary schools to meet the needs of learners.

Differentiated instruction encompasses various strategies that allow teachers to diversify tasks and design lessons according to learning objectives and students' differences (Ali et al 2020). The choice of a specific strategy depends on several factors, including understanding learner's differences, setting objectives, available resources, appropriate timing, and the teacher's skills in implementing strategies such as creativity in activity design, diversity, and observing differences among learners while monitoring groups (Kojak et al., 2008). When teachers correctly use these strategies, they can effectively observe the differences in learners' learning styles (Tomlinson, 2016).

By reviewing studies on differentiated instruction, including those by Bonsnjak & Krizanac (2012) and Al-Qarni (2017), the researchers found consistent evidence supporting the effectiveness of this approach in enhancing the educational process and improving student achievement. Most of these studies focused on implementing differentiated instruction to raise achievement levels among learners. In contrast, this study explores how female teachers use differentiated instruction in teaching English from the perspectives of female school principals and educational supervisors. This exploration focuses on several aspects: first, the extent to which elementary English teachers use problem-solving strategies; second, the extent to which they employ tiered activities; and third, the extent to which they use the "Think-Pair-Share" strategy.

This study examines the extent to which English language female teachers use differentiated instruction in teaching English from the perspectives of school leaders and educational supervisors. This exploration focuses on several aspects: first, the extent to which elementary female English teachers utilize problem-solving strategies; second, the extent to which they employ gradual activities strategy; and third, the extent to which they use the "Think-Pair-Share" strategy.

Problem of the Study:

The elementary stage is one of the most important educational stages, that lays the foundation for subsequent stages. Therefore, employing teaching strategies and methods, that consider individual differences and student interests can help engage their attention and achieve learning objectives. Preparing content according to the principle of differentiated instruction and varying activities and procedures based on learners' needs positively impacts their understanding and achievement. This conclusion has been supported by several studies, including those by Faraj (2017), Radi & Muhammad (2017), Abu Al-Hamael (2019), Abu Obaid (2019), and Al-Mahdawi & Abdul Rahman (2019).

Despite the Ministry of Education in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia's efforts to introduce an English language curriculum in the early elementary school grades, starting from the first grade to higher levels, there remains a notable weakness and decline in student achievement. Studies by Al-Hamoud (2009), Alaymat et al. (2013), Al-Abyad et al. (2013) and Al-Enizy (2015) have shown that the reasons for this include a lack of motivation among learners, the difficulty of the material and lack of understanding, insufficient communication between the school and families, and teachers' shortcomings in employing modern teaching strategies that promote engagement and interaction in the educational process.

Based on the results of previous studies, the researcher conducted interviews with English language teachers to assess the extent to which they apply the principle of differentiated instruction. The exploratory sample included (25) teachers, and their

responses indicated that the use of differentiated instruction was high at 25%, medium at 35.7%, and low at 39.3%. This variation is attributed to several obstacles that hinder its implementation.

In light of the lack of studies addressing employing differentiated instruction and its strategies in teaching English in Saudi Arabia, the study problem is to identify the extent to which differentiated instruction is used in teaching English at the elementary level. The main research question is: To what extent do elementary English language teachers apply the principle of differentiated instruction from the perspectives of school principals and educational supervisors?

Objectives of the Study:

This study aims to:

1. identify the extent to which differentiated instruction is applied in teaching English at the elementary stage in Saudi Arabia.

2. examine elementary English language teachers' practices of differentiated instruction from the perspectives of school principals and educational supervisors.

3. determine the most commonly used strategies of differentiated instruction in elementary English language classrooms.

4. identify the main obstacles that hinder the effective implementation of differentiated instruction in teaching English at the elementary level.

Review of Literature:

Differentiated Instruction (DI):

Al-Kareem (2017) defined differentiated instruction (DI), as the organization of information and educational experiences employing modern multimedia. Al-Khalifa and Matawa (2018) indicated that it is a strategy aimed at raising the achievement levels of all students according to their potential and characteristics, not just those who face difficulties in learning. Salman (2021) described it as various methods, activities, and approaches that provide students equal opportunities to understand and apply concepts daily. Abdul Sattar (2017) explained that DE relies on offering multiple entry points that meet the needs of each learner in the classroom, helping to unlock their latent potential.

In light of the above, the researchers believe that the previous definitions indicate that DE focuses on diversifying learning methods according to learners' differences and potential to achieve effective learning. They adopt Al-Kareem's (2017) definition, which does not classify DE as a strategy, in contrast to other definitions, such as those provided by Atiyah (2008), which tend to classify it as a strategy. Therefore, they view DE as encompassing strategies that teachers use after grouping students based on individual differences and learning styles, aligning with the characteristics of each group to achieve educational goals.

Objectives of DI:

Salman (2021) and Abdul Sattar (2017), manifested several points about the objectives of DE. These include diverse and innovative teaching strategies, providing opportunities for all learners to succeed, and empowering them to choose learning methods that align with their interests and abilities. Differentiated instruction also relies on assessment as a fundamental tool to enhance learning, helping learners reach higher stages of growth. This educational system requires support to develop the competencies of teachers and administrators in its implementation while considering learners' readiness levels. Furthermore, DE prepares learners to face various life challenges. Abu Daka (2018) adds that this approach enhances different learning styles (kinesthetic, visual, auditory), increases learners' motivation and challenge, and allows space for discovering their creativity and developing their innovative abilities. Finally, the researchers point out that DI contributes to the lasting impact of learning by employing methods that meet learners' needs.

Foundations of DI:

Kojak et al. (2008) pointed to several foundations upon which DI is based, including legal, psychological, and educational. Legally, the right of children to receive a distinguished and high-quality education is considered a fundamental right, requiring that education be tailored to the child's characteristics and abilities, without discrimination based on gender, physical or mental abilities, or socioeconomic status.

The psychological foundations highlight that learners have different learning methods and multiple types of intelligence, indicating that each learner has the capacity and desire to excel. Regarding educational foundations, the teacher plays the role of facilitator in the educational process, with the learner. This requires teaching important concepts that benefit learners while avoiding overwhelming them with unrelated information.

Comprehensive and ongoing assessment is emphasized to identify learners' needs and capabilities. DI treats the classroom as a flexible environment that includes diverse learners. It encourages active participation by enhancing learners' awareness of their abilities and learning styles, which contributes to achieving desired goals.

Steps of DI:

Al-Maghrabi (2018) noted that implementing DI in the learning context requires following specific steps. It starts with conducting a pre-assessment for learners to determine their backgrounds, and prior knowledge, as well as their abilities, needs, interests, and learning styles. Following this, learners are grouped according to the assessment results, and the learning environment is prepared to meet their requirements.

It is also essential to define lesson objectives and expected outcomes to choose appropriate strategies and learning resources for each group. Ensuring that the specified objectives are achieved involves selecting tasks and activities that assist learners in reaching the lesson goals. This includes designing and executing a lesson plan and conducting formative and summative assessments to measure learning outcomes.

The researchers emphasize the importance of preparing DI with all the necessary resources. This preparation enables the teacher to implement DE and its strategies. It also helps learners to learn in ways that align with their interests and preferences.

Designs of DI:

Learning style is the preferred way a learner receives information. It is divided into three types: auditory, visual, and kinesthetic. Collaborative learning involves activities that learners engage in under the teacher's supervision, relying on their cooperation and interaction (Al-Mousawi, 2015). It can become DE by organizing and dividing tasks according to their interests and learning styles (Obaidat & Abu Al-Smeid, 2013). Therefore, the researchers emphasize the importance of diversifying differentiated teaching methods during lesson planning to ensure that the various needs of learners are met.

Fields of DI:

Differentiation in education is achieved through several key aspects. First, teachers should set varied objectives when planning lessons. These objectives include practical, analytical, and cognitive goals. They should take into account the individual differences and needs of learners. Second, differentiation occurs through teaching methods. Each group is assigned different activities that match their interests. These activities may include self-directed learning through drawing and writing, project implementation, or problem-solving. Third, teachers need to accept diverse learning outcomes. Some learners may achieve limited results, while others attain a deeper understanding (Obaidat & Abu Al-Smeid, 2013). The researchers believe that applying differentiation enhances learners' confidence, as they share characteristics and interests with their peers, unlike traditional learning, which may diminish their confidence when participating in high-achieving groups.

Many studies have supported the effectiveness of differentiation at the elementary stage. These studies show improvements in reading, writing, and thinking skills. They indicate increases in motivation and self-confidence. They also reflect an enhancement in learner achievement. These are corroborated by studies conducted by Ahmad (2019), Abdul Qadir (2019), Abu Al-Hamael (2019), Abdul Aziz (2019), Faraj (2019), Al-Shafii (2018), and Nasr (2014).

Methodology:

The researcher employed a descriptive survey method in the current study, as it aligns with the nature of the study's problem and contributes to achieving its objectives. Suleiman (2014) notes that the descriptive method is not limited to merely collecting data about a phenomenon, but also involves gathering, analyzing, and interpreting that data.

Population and Sample:

The study population consisted of the principals of primary schools in Bisha Province, totalling (177) principals, as well as (7) English language supervisors. These numbers were stated according to the statistics from the Planning and Development Department of the Education Directorate for the year 2023/2024. Robert Mason's formula was used to determine the appropriate sample size based on the population size. It resulted in a requirement that the study sample should not be fewer than 125 principals

and supervisors. Subsequently, the study was conducted on a randomly selected sample. The questionnaire was distributed electronically, resulting in (126) responses from the principals and supervisors representing the study population. This is shown in Table (1).

Table 1: Frequency and Percentage of Study Population Categories by Study Variables

Variable	Variable Categories	Frequency	Percentage
Job title	Supervisor	7	5.6%
	Leader	119	94.4%
Qualification	Diploma	20	16%
	Bachelor	106	84%
	Master	0	0%
	PhD.	0	0%
Experience	Less than 5 years	5	4%
	5 – 10 years	18	14%
	11 – 15 years	39	31%
	More than 15 years	64	51%
Training Courses	Less than 5 years	0	0%
	5 – 10 years	0	0%
	More than 10 years	126	100%

Instrument Development

The researcher used a questionnaire for data collection because it suited the study's objectives and methodology. The questionnaire was constructed after reviewing several educational literature and previous studies. Based on the study's data, questions, and objectives, the final version of the questionnaire was prepared after being reviewed by experts. It consisted of three sections and thirty statements. The researcher followed the following steps in building the questionnaire:

The Purpose of the Questionnaire:

The questionnaire aimed to measure the extent of differentiated instruction used in teaching English at the elementary level. The measurement focused on teachers' use of DI through strategies, such as the Gradual Activities Strategy, Problem-Solving Strategy, and Think-Pair-Share Strategy.

The Sections of the Questionnaire:

The questionnaire was divided into three sections, which are as follows:

- Practices related to the Problem-Solving Strategy.

- Practices related to the Gradual Activities Strategy.

- Practices related to the Think-Pair-Share Strategy.

Formation of the Statements:

Thirty statements were formulated, with ten under each section reflecting the teaching practices related to those strategies. Each statement in the questionnaire was paired with three options employing a three-point Likert scale. These options were (Always, Sometimes, Never). The language of the statements was crafted to be simple and clear for both the school leaders and educational supervisors.

Response Levels and Relative Weights:

The response levels were determined based on the weighted average value in light of the cutoff scores of the study tool. The following criterion was used to estimate the response level, based on the three-point Likert scale used in this tool (ranging from 1 to 3). The range was calculated (3 - 1 = 2), which was then divided by the number of response intervals (three) to obtain the interval length (2/3 = 0.67). This value was then added to the lowest value in the questionnaire, which is (1), to determine the upper limit of the first interval. The same process was applied for the remaining intervals, as shown in the table below:

Table 2: Determining the Level of Practice, Importance, Relative Weights, and Averages

No.	Duration	Mean Score	Response Degree
1	1 to less than 1.67	1 – 1.67	Never
2	1.67 to less than 2.34	1.67 – 2.34	Sometimes
3	2.34 to less than 3	2.34 - 3	Always

Validity and Reliability:

Face Validity of the Questionnaire:

To assess the validity of the questionnaire statements and ensure what they are intended to measure, the initial version was presented to many specialized reviewers in the field of curricula and methods of teaching English. Twelve reviewers, including English language teachers and supervisors, were asked to evaluate the quality of the questionnaire in terms of its ability to measure what it was designed to measure and to assess its relevance to the study's objectives. They provided feedback on the clarity of each statement, its alignment with the section, and its linguistic accuracy. They suggested suggestions, modifications, and additions to the questionnaire statements.

Internal Consistency Validity:

The questionnaire's internal consistency, validity and reliability were verified by applying it to a pilot sample from the research population of (36) elementary education leaders and an English language supervisor. Additionally, the internal consistency validity was assessed by calculating the Pearson correlation coefficient between the total score of each section and the overall score of the questionnaire, as well as the score of each statement and the total score of the section to which that statement belongs, as shown in Tables (3) and (4).

Table (3): Pearson Correlation Coefficients Between the Total Score of Each Section and the Overall Score of the Questionnaire

No.	questionnaire Sections	Pearson correlation coefficient	Level of significance
1	Section One: Practices Related to the Gradual Activities Strategy	0.944**	0.000
2	Section Two: Practices Related to the Problem-Solving Strategy	0.908**	0.000
3	Section Three: Practices Related to the Think-Pair-Share Strategy	0.916**	0.000

** Correlation is significant at the level of 0.01

Table 3 indicates that the correlation coefficients between each section of the questionnaire and the overall score were large and acceptable. These coefficients are statistically significant at 0.01, indicating the consistency of all questionnaire sections.

Table (4): Pearson Correlation Coefficients for the Correlation of Each Statement with the Overall Score of the Dimension

No	PC	LS	No	PC	LS	No	PC	LS	No	PC	LS
Axis One: Practices Related to the Strategy of Gradual Activities											
1	0.673**	0.000	2	0.783**	0.000	3	0.759**	0.000	4	0.828**	0.000
5	0.749**	0.000	5	0.785**	0.000	7	0.812**	0.000	8	0.780**	0.000
9	0.797**	0.000	10	0.842**	0.000						
Axis Two: Practices Related to the Problem-Solving Strategy											
1	0.795**	0.000	2	0.780**	0.000	3	0.814**	0.000	4	0.761**	0.000
5	0.780**	0.000	6	0.833**	0.000	7	0.886**	0.000	8	0.814**	0.000
9	0.799**	0.000	10	0.843**	0.000						
Axis Three: Practices Related to the Think/Pair/Share Strategy											
1	0.762**	0.000	2	0.818**	0.000	3	0.905**	0.000	4	0.839**	0.000
5	0.829**	0.000	6	0.931**	0.000	7	0.826**	0.000	8	0.890**	0.000
9	0.795**	0.000	10	0.775**	0.000						

P. C. = Pearson Coefficient LS = Level of Significance

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level

Table 4 showed that all correlation coefficients between the score of each statement and the total score of the section were large and acceptable, and statistically significant at the 0.01 level. This indicated the consistency of all statements within each section, demonstrating the tool's validity for application to the study sample.

Reliability of the Questionnaire:

Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient was used to verify the reliability of the questionnaire statements. Table (5) shows the values of Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients for each section of the questionnaire and the overall reliability of the tool.

Table (5): Values of Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficients

No	Axes	Statements	Reliability Coefficient
1	First Axis: Practices Related to the Strategy of Gradual Activities	10	0.927
2	Second Axis: Practices Related to the Problem-Solving Strategy.	10	0.940
3	Third Axis: Practices Related to the Think/Pair/Share Strategy.	10	0.950
Overall Reliability of the Questionnaire		30	0.972

Table (5) indicates that the reliability coefficient is high, reaching 0.972. This showed that the questionnaire has a high degree of reliability. The reliability coefficient is high for each section of the questionnaire, indicating that the tool is reliable. This allows for its application to the study sample and supports confidence in its results.

Data Analysis:

Analysis of the First Axis:

The frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations were calculated for each statement in the first axis: "Practices Related to the Gradual Activities Strategy." The means were then arranged in descending order to identify the highest statements. The results are presented in the following table:

Table (6): Means and Standard Deviations of the Statements in "Section One: Practices Related to the Gradual Activities Strategy" Ordered in Descending Order by Mean (N=126)

No	First Axis: Practices Related to the Strategy of Gradual Activities		Degree of Practice			Arithmetic Mean	Standard Deviation	Ranking	Degree
			Never	Sometimes	Always				
1	The teacher identifies a problem that arouses the student's interest and motivation.	T	23	77	26	2.02	0.626	8	Sometimes
		%	18.3	61.1	20.6				
2	The teacher chooses a problem that suits the levels and abilities of the students.	T	39	68	19	1.84	0.662	9	Sometimes
		%	31	54	15.1				
3	The teacher varies her planning for problems that match the levels of the students, presenting each group with what suits them.	T	69	42	15	1.57	0.698	10	Never
		%	54.8	33.3	11.9				
4	"The teacher connects the problem to the student's environment.	T	7	73	46	2.31	0.572	6	Sometimes
		%	5.6	57.9	36.5				
5		T	12	74	40	2.22	0.605	7	Sometimes

	The teacher applies the steps of the problem-solving strategy.	%	9.5	58.7	31.7				
6	The teacher encourages the students to participate in finding solutions to the problem.	T	4	29	93	2.71	0.523	4	Always
		%	3.2	23	73.8				
7	The teacher provides the students with enough time to think about solving the problem.	T	2	27	97	2.75	0.468	2	Always
		%	1.6	21.4	77				
8	The teacher discusses the proposed solutions with the students to solve the problem.	T	6	54	66	2.48	0.589	5	Always
		%	4.8	42.9	52.4				
9	The teacher clarifies the correct solutions to the problem with the students.	T	4	17	105	2.80	0.474	1	Always
		%	3.2	13.5	83.3				
10	The teacher uses the problem-solving strategy, to develop higher-order thinking skills.	T	5	25	96	2.72	0.531	3	Always
		%	4	19.8	76.2				

Table (6) indicated that the mean values for the first axis ranged between 1.37 and 2.76. This showed that teachers' gradual activities strategy in this section generally varies from "Always" to "Never." Three statements received a rating of "Always."

Statement (10) stated "The teacher assesses the students after learning to ensure that the intended concepts and skills have been achieved," ranked first with a mean of 2.76. It was followed in second place by statement 9, which stated, "The teacher provides students with feedback," with a mean of 2.66. Ranking third was statement 7, "The teacher monitors and encourages students during their implementation of activities," with a mean of 2.48.

Three statements received a rating of "Sometimes." Statement 2, which states, "The teacher identifies the concepts and skills to be achieved through the activity," ranked fourth with a mean of 2.00. This was followed in fifth place by statement 6, which states, "The teacher varies the learning resources to suit the activities," with a mean of 1.84. Ranking sixth was statement 3, which states, "The teacher explains to the students how to apply the strategy so they can perform the activities presented to them," with a mean of 1.79.

Four statements received a rating of "Never." Statement 4, which states, "The teacher prepares the learning environment for implementing gradual activities," ranked seventh with a mean of 1.54. Statement 5, which states, "The teacher designs activities that vary in difficulty according to the students' abilities and levels," ranked eighth with a mean of 1.48. Following this, statement 8, which states, "The teacher assigns students graded homework based on their levels," came in ninth place with a mean of 1.38. Finally, statement 1, which states, "The teacher divides students into groups according to their levels and cognitive abilities to perform suitable activities," ranked tenth with a mean of 1.37.

Analysis of the Second Axis:

The frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations were calculated for each statement in the second axis: "Practices Related to the Problem-Solving Strategy." The means were then arranged in descending order to identify the highest statements. The results are presented in the following table:

Table (7): Means and Standard Deviations of the Statements in "Section Two: Practices Related to the Problem-Solving Strategy" Ordered in Descending Order by Mean (N=126)

No	Second Axis: Practices Related to the Strategy of Gradual Activities		Degree of Practice			Arithmetic Mean	Standard Deviation	Ranking	Degree
			Never	Sometimes	Always				
1	The teacher identifies a problem that arouses the interests,	T	23	77	26	2.02	0.626	8	Sometimes
		%	18.3	61.1	20.6				

	inclinations, and motivation of the students								
2	The teacher selects a problem that matches the students' levels and abilities.	T	39	68	19	1.84	0.662	9	Sometimes
		%	31	54	15.1				
3	The teacher variates in planning problems that suit the students' levels, ensuring that each group is presented with appropriate tasks.	T	69	42	15	1.57	0.698	10	Never
		%	54.8	33.3	11.9				
4	The teacher connects the problem to the student's environment.	T	7	73	46	2.31	0.572	6	Sometimes
		%	5.6	57.9	36.5				
5	The teacher applies the steps of the problem-solving strategy.	T	12	74	40	2.22	0.605	7	Sometimes
		%	9.5	58.7	31.7				
6	The teacher encourages the students to participate in finding solutions to the problem.	T	4	29	93	2.71	0.523	4	Always
		%	3.2	23	73.8				
7	The teacher allows the students enough time to think about solving the problem.	T	2	27	97	2.75	0.468	2	Always
		%	1.6	21.4	77				
8	The teacher reviews the students' proposed solutions for addressing the problem.	T	6	54	66	2.48	0.589	5	Always
		%	4.8	42.9	52.4				
9	The teacher clarifies the correct solutions for solving the problem with the students.	T	4	17	105	2.80	0.474	1	Always
		%	3.2	13.5	83.3				
10	The teacher uses the problem-solving strategy, which helps develop higher-order thinking skills.	T	5	25	96	2.72	0.531	3	Always
		%	4	19.8	76.2				

Table (7) showed that the mean values for the second axis ranged between 1.57 and 2.80. This indicated that teachers' use of the problem-solving strategy varies from "Always" to "Never." Five statements received a rating of "Always," while four statements received a rating of "Sometimes," and one statement was rated "Never."

Statement (9), which states, "The teacher clarifies the correct solutions to the students for solving the problem," ranked first with a mean of 2.80. It was followed in second place by statement (7), which states, "The teacher allows students enough time to think about solving the problem," with a mean of 2.75. Statement (10), which states, "The teacher uses problem-solving strategies that help develop higher-order thinking skills," ranked third with a mean of 2.72. In fourth place was statement (6), which states, "The teacher encourages students to participate in finding solutions to the problem," with a mean of 2.71, followed by statement (8), "The teacher discusses the proposed solutions of the students to solve the problem," with a mean of 2.48.

Statement (4), "The teacher connects the problem to the student's environment," ranked sixth with a mean of 2.31, followed by statement (5), "The teacher applies the steps of the problem-solving strategy," with a mean of 2.22 in seventh place. In eighth place was statement (1), "The teacher identifies a problem that sparks the interest, inclinations, and motivation of the students," with a mean of 2.02. Statement (2), "The teacher selects a problem that matches the students' levels and abilities," ranked ninth with a mean of 1.84. Lastly, statement (3) states, "The teacher varies in planning problems that suit the students' levels by presenting suitable issues for each group," ranked tenth with a mean of 1.57.

Analysis of the Third Axis

The frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations were calculated for each statement in "Section Three: Practices Related to the Problem-Solving Strategy." The means were then arranged in descending order to identify the highest statements. The results are presented in the following table:

Table (8): Means and Standard Deviations of the Statements in "Section Three: Practices Related to the Think-Pair-Share Strategy" Ordered in Descending Order by Mean (N=126)

No	Third Axis: Practices Related to the Strategy of Gradual Activities		Degree of Practice			Arithmetic Mean	Standard Deviation	Ranking	Degree
			Never	Sometimes	Always				
1	The teacher divides the students into groups, assigning a number to each student.	T	N	44	18	1.63	0.722	9	Never
		%	64	34.9	14.3				
2	The teacher explains the rules for employing the strategy to the students.	T	50.8	49	51	2.20	0.759	7	Sometimes
		%	26	38.9	40.5				
3	The questions posed are appropriate for the student's level.	T	20.6	65	44	2.21	0.665	6	Sometimes
		%	17	51.6	34.9				
4	The teacher engages all the students in the group to think about answering the posed question.	T	13.5	40	78	2.56	0.614	5	Always
		%	8	31.7	61.9				
5	The teacher allows the students to think and discuss their answers.	T	6.3	25	96	2.72	0.531	2	Always
		%	5	19.8	76.2				
6	The teacher varies her selection of students in the group, ensuring that all students in the class participate.	T	4	54	34	1.97	0.758	8	Sometimes
		%	38	42.9	27				
7	The teacher uses the strategy to create an atmosphere of activity and participation in the educational situation.	T	30.2	36	85	2.63	0.560	3	Always
		%	5	28.6	67.5				
8	The teacher exchanges information with the students and discusses it.	T	5	41	80	2.60	0.568	4	Always
		%	4	32.5	63.5				
9	The teacher clarifies the correct answer for all the groups.	T	3	15	108	2.83	0.434	1	Always
		%	2.4	11.9	85.7				
10	The teacher changes the numbering of the students in each group repeatedly.	T	67	40	19	1.62	0.736	10	Never
		%	53.2	31.7	15.1				

Table (8) illustrated that the mean values for the third section ranged between 1.62 and 2.83, indicating that the practices in this section generally vary from "Always" to "Never." Five statements received a rating of "Always," while three statements received a rating of "Sometimes," and two statements were rated "Never."

Statement (9) which states, "The teacher clarifies the correct answer for all groups," ranked first with a mean of 2.83. It was followed in second place by statement (5), which states, "The teacher provides students with the opportunity to think and discuss their answers," with a mean of 2.72. Statement (7), which states, "The teacher creates an active and participatory atmosphere in the educational setting employing the strategy," ranked third with a mean of 2.63. Following this, statement (8), which states, "The teacher exchanges information with the students and discusses it," came in fourth place with a mean of 2.60. In fifth place was statement (4), which states, "The teacher engages all students in the group to think about the posed question," with a mean of 2.56.

Ranking sixth was statement (3), which states, "The posed questions are appropriate to the students' level," with a mean of 2.21. Statement (2), which states, "The teacher explains to the students the rules for employing the strategy," ranked seventh with a mean of 2.20. Statement (6), which states, "The teacher varies her selection of students in the group to ensure all students participate in the classroom," came in eighth place with a mean of 1.97.

Statement (1), which states, "The teacher divides the students into numbered groups," ranked ninth with a mean of 1.63. Finally, statement (10), which states, "The teacher ensures to change the numbering of the students in each group from time to time," came in tenth place with a mean of 1.62.

Based on the results of the previous sub-questions related to each strategy of the DI strategies included in the questionnaire, we can arrive at an answer to the main question. To address this question, the means and standard deviations for the total score of each section of the study tool were calculated, and the means were arranged in descending order to identify the highest section. The results are presented in the following table:

Table (9): Means and Standard Deviations of the Questionnaire Sections Ordered in Descending Order by Mean (N=126)

No	Questionnaire Axes	Arithmetic Mean	Standard Deviation	Ranking	Degree
1	First Axis: Practices Related to the Strategy of Gradual Activities	1.931	0.464	3	Sometimes
2	Second Axis: Practices Related to the Strategy of Gradual Activities	2.343	0.350	1	Always
3	Third Axis: Practices Related to the Strategy of Gradual Activities	2.298	0.401	2	Sometimes
Total of the questionnaire as a whole.		2.190	0.347	-	Sometimes

Table (9) showed that the mean values for the sections ranged between 1.931 and 2.298, indicating that the degree of the sections varies from "Sometimes" to "Always."

"The second axis: Practices Related to the Problem-Solving Strategy" ranked first with a rating of "Always" and the highest mean of 2.346. It was followed by "The third axis: Practices Related to the Think-Pair-Share Strategy" in second place with a rating of "Sometimes" and a mean of 2.298. "The first axis: Practices Related to the Gradual Activities Strategy" came last with a rating of "Sometimes" and the lowest mean of 1.931.

Thus, the overall mean for employing the mentioned strategies was 2.190, leading the researcher to conclude that employing differentiated instruction by English language teachers in the primary stage was at a moderate level.

Discussion

The study results indicated that the most commonly used strategy for differentiated instruction is the problem-solving strategy, with teachers employing it at a high level, reflected in a mean of 2.34. The researcher attributes this to the fact that this strategy is effective in teaching, as it helps learners develop their critical thinking skills. This is supported by the findings of Al-Momani's study (2017). Additionally, it aids learners in connecting their prior knowledge with what they are learning, and its effectiveness in improving student achievement has motivated teachers to use it in their instruction.

Next is the Think-Pair-Share strategy, where the degree of teachers' use of this strategy was moderate, with a mean of 2.29. The researcher attributes the limited use of this strategy to several factors: the large number of students in the classroom, especially after school consolidations compared to the size of the classroom, and the teacher's lack of awareness of the importance of this strategy in encouraging students to think, participate, and overcome their fear and hesitation in presenting their answers in front of others. Additionally, the heavy workload on teachers and the high teaching load may hinder their application of the strategy and the diversification of instructional strategies. This aligns with the findings of Al-Otaibi's study (2018). The study by Al-Shoun & Majid (2016) also recommended incorporating the Think-Pair-Share strategy into the modern teaching strategies presented in teacher training courses.

Finally, regarding the Gradual Activities strategy, the study results indicated that the degree of teachers' use of this strategy was moderate, with a mean of 1.93. The researcher attributes the limited use of this strategy to the teachers' lack of knowledge about how to implement it, how to manage the classroom during its application, and the insufficient time to plan activities according to the levels of the students in each group, or the inappropriateness of the time for applying the strategy. Al-Omari (2018) recommended providing well-equipped labs with resources and technologies to implement differentiated instruction strategies and emphasized the importance of programs that focus on the practical aspect.

Based on the findings regarding the extent of teachers' use of the mentioned strategies, an answer was reached to the main question, "To what extent do English language teachers in the primary stage implement differentiated instruction from the perspective of school leaders and educational supervisors?" The answer indicates that employing differentiated instruction by

teachers was at a moderate level, with a mean of 2.190. The researcher attributes the limited use of differentiated instruction to several factors: teachers' focus on learning outcomes rather than on the content and the method of delivery, which reduces their use of it.

Thus, the results of the current study align with the studies of Al-Habashneh (2020), Al-Shamrani (2019), Al-Ghamdi (2019), Al-Harbi (2018), Al-Lozi (2017), and Al-Baltan (2017). However, they differ from the studies of Al-Shamrani (2019) and Al-Otaibi (2018), where differentiated instruction was used to a large extent. In contrast, the studies of Al-Ghamdi (2013) and Al-Azayza (2020) reported a low level of differentiated instruction use.

Conclusion

The study results revealed that English language teachers' use of the problem-solving strategy ranked first at a high level, with a mean of 2.34. Meanwhile, the Think-Pair-Share strategy occupied the second rank with a mean of 2.29, indicating a moderate level of use. In contrast, the Gradual Activities strategy ranked third, with a mean of 1.93. It reflected moderate use. Moreover, the use of DI by English language teachers in the primary stage was at a moderate level, with a mean of 2.19.

Summary of Results

1. The problem-solving strategy was the most frequently used, applied at a high level, due to its effectiveness in developing critical thinking.

2. The Think-Pair-Share strategy was used at a moderate level, with limited use attributed to large class sizes, heavy teaching workload, and teachers' lack of awareness of its benefits.

3. The Gradual Activities strategy was also applied at a moderate level, with constraints including insufficient planning time, classroom management challenges, and limited teacher knowledge about its implementation.

4. The use of differentiated instruction by elementary English teachers was moderate, influenced by teachers' focus on learning outcomes rather than on instructional content and delivery methods.

Recommendations

In light of the study's results, the researcher recommended several points, the most prominent being the employment of problem-solving strategies in teaching English specifically, and other subjects in general. They emphasize the need to enhance the use of this strategy in English language teaching, as well as to develop the Gradual Activities and Think-Pair-Share strategies, along with training teachers on how to implement them more effectively to achieve better-differentiated instruction. The study recommends conducting intensive training courses for English language teachers to promote the use of the Think-Pair-Share strategy. It also stresses the necessity of equipping the educational environment with tools and devices that assist teachers in applying differentiated instruction. Finally, it calls for practical training courses for teachers that focus on the effective use of differentiated instruction rather than limiting training to theoretical aspects only.

REFERENCES

[1]. Abdul Aziz, R. A. F. (2019). *The effectiveness of employing differentiated instruction strategies on self-confidence and some learning outcomes in breaststroke swimming.* Scientific Journal of Physical Education and Sports Sciences, Vol. (87), 1-66.
[2]. Abdul Qadir, M. H. A. (2019). *The impact of employing differentiated instruction on primary school students' acquisition of certain linguistic structures and development of their language performance skills*. Journal of Educational and Psychological Studies, Vol. 42 (2), 337-367.
[3]. Abdul Sattar, J. A. A. (2017). *Teaching strategies between authenticity and modernity*. Amna Publishing and Distribution House.
[4]. Abu Al-Hamael, A. bin A. M. bin A. (2019). *The effectiveness of differentiated instruction strategies in teaching science to enhance achievement and basic science process skills among sixth-grade students in Jeddah Province*. Journal of the College of Education
[5]. Abu Daka, M. S. M. (2018). *Differentiated instruction*. Noor Al-Hassan Library.
[6]. Abu Obaid, A. A. K. (2019). *The impact of employing differentiated instruction strategies on developing creative thinking skills and improving attitudes toward the mathematics curriculum among second-secondary students.* Journal of Educational and Psychological Sciences, Vol. 3 (10), 41-62.

[7]. Al-Abyad, A. A. M., et al. (2013). *An exploratory study of the reasons for the low achievement levels of students in the preparatory year at Northern Borders University in the English language from the perspectives of students and faculty members and treatment methods*. Journal of Education, Vol. 3 (152), 78-161.

[8]. Ahmad, N. A. S. (2019). *The effectiveness of a gradual program based on the differentiated instruction approach in developing reading skills among primary school students of varying achievement levels*. Scientific Research Journal, Vol. 11 (20), 1781-1830.

[9]. Alaymat, A. R., Al-Zyadat, I. A., & Al-Saaida, M. H. (2013). *Reasons for low academic achievement in the English language curriculum among secondary school students in the public schools of Al-Salt from teachers' perspectives and proposed solutions for improving achievement levels.* Journal of the College of Education, Vol. 29 (2), 433-468.

[10]. Ali, Mona Saeed, Hamdi, Ahmed Mohammed & Zaki, Suad Mohammed (2020). *Differentiated instruction: Modern strategies in teaching and learning*. Itrak for Printing, Publishing, and Distribution.

[11]. Atiyah, M. A. (2008). *Modern strategies in effective teaching*. Safa Publishing and Distribution House.

[12]. Al-Azayza, M. A. H. (2020). *The reality of early childhood teachers' implementation of differentiated instruction in public schools in Qatar* (Unpublished master's thesis, Qatar University).

[13]. Bosnjak, S & Krizanac, B. (2012). Impact of Differentiated Instruction on Achievement in Teaching Mathematics to Lower-Stage Grades. Metodicki obzori,7(2),17-29. http://dx.doi.org/10.21474/IJAR01/7070

[14]. Al-Baltan, I. bin A. S. (2017). *The reality and requirements of science teachers' use of differentiated instruction and the barriers to its implementation from their perspective*. Journal of Shaqra University, Vol. (7), 61-102.

[15]. Al-Enizy, I. (2015). Problems Encountering English Language Learning in Secondary Schools in Saudi Arabia from the Perspective of Male Students, Teachers, and Fathers [unpublished Master's thesis]. university of Jordan.

[16]. Faraj, K. W. I. (2019). *The effectiveness of employing differentiated instruction in developing thinking skills and scientific curiosity among fourth-grade students*. (Master's thesis, Kafr El-Sheikh University, Egypt). Dar Al-Manzoma Information Database.

[17]. Faraj, W. M. M. (2017). *The effectiveness of employing differentiated instruction strategies on academic achievement in the English language curriculum among primary school students in Al-Anbar Province, Iraq: An applied study on Quba Primary School* (Unpublished master's thesis). Nilein University.

[18]. Al-Ghamdi, H. bin A., & Abdul Jawad, N. A. M. (2010). *The development of the education system in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.* (3rd ed.). Rashid Library.

[19]. Al-Ghamdi, F. b. A. b. A. (2019). *The degree of implementing differentiated instruction for supporting gifted female students in regular classes from the perspective of art education teachers in Mecca*. Journal of Educational Sciences, Vol 46 (2), 279-301.

[20]. Al-Ghamdi, F. bin A. bin Y. (2013). *The extent of primary Islamic education teachers' responsiveness to classroom students' needs in light of differentiated teaching skills.* Journal of Education, Vol. 2 (152), 385-416.

[21]. Al-Habashneh, M. H. S. (2020). *The reality of mathematics teachers' use of differentiated learning strategies in Karak Province from their perspective*. Journal of Educational Sciences, Vol. 28 (2), 495-537.

[22]. Al-Hamoud, A. bin A. bin A. (2009). *Indicators and causes of low skills among intermediate school students in remote villages of Mecca in the English language from the perspectives of teachers and supervisors*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Umm Al-Qura University.

[23]. Al-Harbi, K. bin H. H. (2017). *The reality of employing differentiated instruction strategies at the Arabic language institute for non-native speakers from the faculty members' perspective*. Arab Studies in Education and Psychology, Vol. (88), 219-242.

[24]. Al-Jubouri, K. D. K., & Al-Janabi, I. A. H. (2020). *Differentiated instruction: Foundations, theories, strategies.* Al-Wifaq House for Publishing and Distribution.

[25]. Kojak, Kawthar Ahmed, Abdo, Ali Ismail, Ezzat, Afaf, & Gadallah, Enas (2008). *Diversifying teaching in the classroom: A teacher's guide to improving teaching and learning methods in Arab schools*. UNESCO Regional Office.

[26]. Al-Kareem, R. A. I. (2017). *Effective teaching strategies between educational competencies and learning theories*. Dar Al-Academians Publishing and Distribution Company.

[27]. Al-Lozi, A. M. A. (2017). *The reality of home economics teachers' use of differentiated instruction and its relationship to teaching effectiveness.* Journal of Quality Education Research, Vol. (45), 152-216.

[28]. Al-Maghribi, Samia Hashem. (2018). Differentiated Instruction for Education that Enhances Teachers' Potential and Embraces Learners' Needs. No Publisher.

[29]. Al-Mahdawi, Marzouq Ali Abdullah, & Abdulrahman, Gamal El-Din Mohamed Muzakki. (2019). The Effectiveness of the Differentiated Instruction Strategy in Developing the Comprehension of Certain Concepts in the Physics Curriculum for Second-Year Secondary Students in Al-Laith, Saudi Arabia. Al-Rasikhun Journal, 5(1), 59-79.

[30]. Al-Momani, Hiyam Oqla Salem. (2017). The Effect of the Problem-Solving Strategy on Developing Critical Thinking Skills among Ninth-Grade Students in History. Childhood and Education Journal, 9(32), 187-221.

[31]. Al-Mousawi, Najm Abdullah. (2015). Cooperative Learning: Concepts, Perspectives, Ideas. Dar Radwan for Publishing and Distribution.

[32]. Mustafa, Afaf Othman Othman. (2014). Effective Teaching Strategies. Dar Al-Wafa for Printing and Publishing.

[33]. Obaidat, D., & Abu Al-Smeid, S. (2013). *Teaching strategies in the 21st century: A guide for teachers and educational supervisors*. De Bono for Printing, Publishing, and Distribution.
[34]. Al-Omari, N. bin M. (2018). *The practice of middle school mathematics teachers in differentiated instruction strategies*. Journal of Educational Sciences. Vol. 26 (1), 320-366.
[35]. Al-Otaibi, S. S. M. (2018). *The reality of employing differentiated instruction strategies in teaching my beautiful language curriculum from the perspective of Arabic language teachers and supervisors at the primary stage.* Journal of the College of Education, Vol. 34 (3), 327-372.
[36]. Al-Qarni, M. A. A.-H. (2017). *The impact of employing differentiated instruction strategies on academic achievement in my language curriculum among fifth-grade students*. Journal of Scientific Research in Education. Vol. 2 (18), 243-280.
[37]. Radi, Z. J., & Mohammad, M. S. (2017). *The impact of differentiated instruction strategies on students' achievement in art elements*. Journal of Arts, Literature, Humanities, and Social Sciences. Vol (17), 203-227.
[38]. Salman, Z. M. (2021). *Differentiated instruction and effective teaching methods.* Al-Rayah Publishing and Distribution.
[39]. Al-Shafii, S. A. R. A. (2018). *The effectiveness of differentiated instruction strategies in developing scientific thinking skills and motivation to learn among first-year female preparatory students in home economics.* Western Studies in Education and Psychology. Vol. (100), 23-81.
[40]. Al-Shamrani, S. A. M. (2019). *The reality of mathematics teachers' use of differentiated instruction strategies from their perspective at Al-Ardhiyah education office*. Masalik for Sharia, Linguistic, and Human Studies. Vol. (5), 287-351.
[41]. Shawahin, K. S. (2014). *Differentiated instruction and curriculum design*. Modern World of Books for Publishing and Distribution.
[42]. Al-Shoun, H. K., & Majid, I. A. (2016). *The effectiveness of the think-pair-share strategy on physics achievement and developing science processes among fifth grade science students.* Journal of Humanities Sciences. Vol. 23 (1), 400-417.
[43]. Suleiman, A. R. S. (2014). *Research methodologies*. House of World Books.
[44]. Al-Suwifi, W. S. M. S. (August 2018). *The effectiveness of employing differentiated instruction strategies in teaching reading to develop vocabulary and reading comprehension among third-grade students of varying achievement levels* (Unpublished Research).
[45]. Third Educational Conference, "Towards Better Preparation for the Future Teacher" (2004). Sultan Qaboos University - College of Education, Muscat, from March 1-3. Available online at: https://search.mandumah.com/Record/33571 Date of retrieval. 30.1.2024
[46]. Tomlinson, C. A. (2016). *Differentiated classroom.* (Dhahran Private Schools, translated). Educational Book House for Publishing and Distribution. (Original work published 1999).
[47]. Al-Tuwairqi, H. M. A. R. (2013). *Differentiated instruction and its impact on motivation, thinking, and academic achievement*. Khwarizmi Scientific.