

THE EFFICIENCY OF DIFFERENTIATED EXERCISE ON THE KNOWLEDGE PRESENTATION IN MATHEMATICS

Dr. Amilal Kulhari

Professor of Mathematics

Government Lohia PG College, Churu (Rajasthan) - 331001

ABSTRACT

This action research paper is a quantitative study specifically a quasi-experimental research design aimed to determine the effectiveness of differentiated instruction on the learning performance in mathematics among grade - four students of Poo Elementary School based on the preferred learning styles of the students. In the beginning of the study, the researcher adapted a learning style inventory to determine the students learning styles and the one that prevailed were treated with differentiated instruction. In this study, visual learners were the experimental group as the inventory and therefore implemented with DE. Aside from that, a researcher - made test questionnaire was used to determine the significant difference of students treated with DE and those who were part of the whole-class instruction. Before the intervention, a pretest was administered and its' findings revealed that the pre-test scores of the experimental and control group were both marked as did not meet expectations. As it implies, there were no significant difference between the pretest scores of both groups before the intervention. Favorably, after the implementation of DE, the experimental group has an outstanding remark on their post-test scores while the control group has a little improvement with a satisfactory remark. With that being said, the pretest and post-test scores differs significantly which proves that DE produces beneficial effects to students' learning specifically in mathematics. As manifested in this particular study, DE is a great instructional strategy to better meet the diverse needs of the students in the classrooms.

Keyword: *differentiated instruction, learning styles, whole-class instruction, learning performance in Mathematics*

INTRODUCTION: Educators struggle every day to give quality instruction to their student in the classrooms across all academic subjects (Tighes, 2006). One of the subjects in which educators find it hard

to convey their instruction is Mathematics. In fact, mathematical teaching and learning have been a perennial challenge in the Philippine educational curriculum and in different nations as well. Some studies suggested that the complexities and diversities of today's classrooms are significant factors to consider in ensuring the maximum learning competencies of the students. As per Tomlinson (2003), disregarding the variety of the students who occupied the classroom is progressively challenging for educators. To adapt to this variety, instructors need to adjust their instruction, and that implies they need to organize the environmental states of teaching that fit the students' disparities.

Hence, differentiated instruction, where the students' learning styles are labeled and instructions are differentiated, could be a possible response to these. The differentiated instruction approach has been proven to provide different ways to acquire the content and process ideas for each student. Differentiating instruction is acknowledging various student backgrounds, readiness levels, languages, interests, and learning profiles (Hall, 2002). In that case, they are given an equal opportunity to effectively learn the instruction since it will be based on their unique instructional needs.

According to Tomlinson (2001), differentiation is the modification of teaching and learning routines that address

a broad range of learners' readiness levels, interests, and learning modes. It came from the knowledge and a growing understanding of the teacher on how teaching and learning respond to the variety of learners' needs for more independence, more practice to more significant challenges, and more active or fewer approaches to learning. But before conducting differentiated instruction in the classrooms, the students must be profiled as to what kind of learning styles they have. As stated by Shiny & Shiny (2013), profiling them according to these learning styles will allow the teachers to understand how learners acquire the information. It will benefit the teachers in a way that they will have a clearer perspective on the proper instruction and teaching techniques implemented in the class.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE: Mathematics is a basic aspect of human intellect and logic, according to the International Commission on Mathematical Instruction (2008) since it is an effective technique of developing mental discipline for logical reasoning and mental rigor. Along with the definition cited by ICMI, View Sonic Library (2021) added that Mathematics is a significant scholastic subject since it shows fundamental abilities, for example, the capacity to complete number juggling and permits students to interface the ideas to genuine circumstances. According to Umami (2011) and Name (2013), mathematics education is the foundation and an essential tool for the nation's scientific and economic growth. Since mathematics is a gateway to many scientific and technological fields (Rattan et.al, 2012), it should be part of the curriculum not only in the Philippines but to other countries as well. Consequently,

numerous countries take mathematics as a mandatory subject since it is a principal subject for human existence (Make-do, 2020).

Learning and Academic Performance in Mathematics

Mathematics is regarded as the most important subject in Asia and students are encouraged to study it (Latham et.al, 2008). In most Asian countries, guiding techniques on children's mathematical achievements are far more rigorous, as parents exert extra effort to focus on their children's arithmetic learning.

Although children's math ability is associated with children's individual factors (Kim et.al, 2019), the teacher's teaching efficacy is important as well in building students understanding and interest in math concepts. Thus, positive achievement motivation of teachers and parents are most important to assure learners better achievement in mathematics (Magi et.al, 2010).

The Philippine Department of Education adopted the K-12 curriculum in 2013, which implies that the Philippine Basic Education Program follows Kindergarten plus 12 years to complete (DipEd, 2012). This action is being taken, according to DipEd, because of the poor quality of basic education in the Philippines, as evidenced by Filipino students' low achievement scores in the National Achievement Test and the international test known as Third International Mathematics and Science Study in 2013.

Considering the report posted on 2013, the participation of the Philippines in TIMSS affirmed that the exhibition of Filipino students in national and international reviews on math and science abilities lingers behind its nearby nations like Singapore, South Korea, Hong Kong,

Chinese Taipei, and Japan (Care et al., 2015). Also, on the latest results of TIMSS 2019, an international assessment for mathematics and science for Grade 4 students, the Philippines came in last out of 58 countries. Grade 4 Filipino pupils received an average scale score of 249 in science and 297 in math in that report, placing them bottom in both tests. Meanwhile, a neighboring country, topped tests, scoring 625 in math and 595 in science

Likewise, the results of Program for International Student Assessment 2018 also reported that in the Mathematical Literacy, Filipino students scored 353 points on average, much lower than the average of 489 points. On an average, one in every five Filipino pupils met the required proficiency level in Mathematical Literacy. As a result, among the ASEAN countries, Filipino students came closest to Indonesian students in Mathematical Literacy but were still 26 points behind them.

Factors Affecting the Poor Learning Performance in Mathematics

Studies have shown that a lot of students and even adults had a negative impression towards mathematics (Magana, 2019). People view it as a difficult subject and as a result, their performance was affected as well. The fear of mathematics (math phobia), according to Sparks and Sarah (2011), has led different scholars to conclude that math phobia is a major contributory factor to the challenge of learning and teaching mathematics. This implies that it has a significant impact on elementary students' academic achievement in mathematics. Tata (2013) made his study and emerged with findings that students' negative attitude toward mathematics, apprehension about math,

lacking qualified educators, and deficient teaching materials were only some of the causes of poor performance in mathematics.

The fear on the said subject concurs with many scholars who assert that a review of school-based education research has shown that most secondary school pupils find Mathematics as the most difficult, abstract, deadly, and boring subject (Gregholm & Lenik, 2005). According to Armstrong (2009), teachers' methods, mathematical expertise, evaluation, and the structure of the subject of mathematics may all contribute to students' dread of arithmetic. Some people view mathematics as a tough topic and a challenge, and if they are successful in solving mathematical issues, they feel fulfilled and inspired to pursue higher-level mathematics. Conversely, if they fail the sense of failure results in low self-esteem.

On the other hand, the study by Ale (2000) showed that the lack of appropriate materials for use by mathematics teachers compounds the problem of poor academic performance in the subject. Kale jay (2005) made similar remarks when he stated that teachers need resources and that a variety of textbooks should be read by the teacher and students since they provide different points of view. Lance (2002) made a similar conclusion when the study pointed out that shortages of important materials such as textbooks have an adverse effect on Mathematics as a whole. In his study, Fag bemire (2004) also confirmed that an insufficient supply of textbooks in schools affects the teaching and learning activities in many nations throughout the world.

Researchers observed that unqualified teachers do not have the experience and skills to properly instruct pupils in

mathematical operations can also contribute to the poor academic performance in Mathematics. With that, teachers with a specialty in the subject they teach or in the education of that subject and between 26 and 30 years of teaching experience, according to Armstrong (2009), have a positive impact on student performance. This is consistent with Adenine's (2008) findings, which revealed that teachers' teaching experience influenced students' learning outcomes as measured by their performance. As a result, a lack of relevant teaching expertise may have a negative impact on students' mathematical performance.

Disregarding differences among students in the classroom can also contribute to poor learning outcomes, not only in math but in other courses as well. According to Levy (2008), students come to class with a variety of capabilities, learning styles, and personalities. As a result, educators are required to ensure that all students fulfill district and state standards by developing adequate interventions to give children with the help they require. One such method is to differentiate education based on a student's learning style. According to Lawrence-Brown (2004), students ranging from gifted to those with major disabilities can get an appropriate education in general education classrooms with appropriate supports, including differentiated instruction. It is in this premise, that this study aims to prove the effectiveness of differentiated instruction in the teaching of mathematics in elementary specifically grade-four learners. Proving the efficiency of DE lays, the groundwork for developing research-based strategies and, as a result, developing the best instructional strategy for students.

Differentiated Instruction in the 21st

Century Laboratory

As students in today's schools are becoming more academically diverse, teachers must consider the types of activities they plan for their students. It is therefore important to pay attention to the level and the degree of challenges of these activities by also considering the students choice of learning task based on their readiness, interest, and profile (Sherman & Catalan, 2011).

Chamberlin and Powers (2010) asserted that applying differentiated instruction in the class will give various learning opportunities to the students that ultimately came from the teacher's initiative to differentiate the lesson, the processes and provide support to their students' output. Hence, Marlowe and Page (2005) claim that students' differences are significant enough to be taken into consideration when determining what pupils need to learn, how quick they learn it, and how much support they require from teachers. Students will receive explicit definitions of information, understanding, and abilities when teachers differentiate by defining students' beginning point of their learning experience (Brim join, 2005).

Aside from that, Nevins (2015) confirmed that when teachers differentiate instruction, they are purposefully and conscientiously making the material, methods, and results of instruction more accessible to all students, regardless of the student's race, gender, ethnicity, language, or differing abilities. As a result, it can be said that with the help of DE, teachers can have a more inclusive teaching philosophy which may in turn result in being a more effective teacher.

Hence, the findings of Stavros (2011)

study on DE prove that differentiated instruction was effective and positively affects the diverse pupils' characteristics. The study of Westbrook (2011) also revealed that students' learning has improved after differentiating the instruction based on the learners' preferred learning styles. With that, students are more aware of their preferred learning styles and feel more confident to gain knowledge by the means of it. Moreover, students' test results improved significantly once their preferred learning method was incorporated into the instruction, according to Fine (2003). When students were taught using learning style techniques rather than standard teaching methods, their results were much better. This simply means that when students are differentiated based on their needs and targeted learning outcomes, an increase in students' learning achievement will also occur (Cobb, 2010). However, Mulder (2015) discovered that while differentiation is widely acknowledged to be an important instructional approach for all students, as it is expected to improve each student's learning, there's a little known about the precise relationship between differentiation and student learning. Hayes and Doyle (2001) stressed that it is difficult to determine the potential effects of differentiated instruction on student achievement because the effects of differentiation vary by school and by teachers.

Drawbacks of Differentiated exercise

Nonetheless, instructors cited two major impediments to differentiation, according to McMahon (2019): a lack of time and insufficient resources. Additional to that, according to instructors, include restricted access to differentiated materials, insufficient time to cooperate, trouble

producing resources, and ineffective training (Mahon, 2019). The insufficient knowledge of the teachers proved to be the base factor that may fail the implementation of DI. Dixon (2014) stated that the training courses on DE are essential to prepare the teachers for the challenges differentiated instruction brings and how to face it effectively.

Moreover, time, which includes both preparation and instruction time, is a major determinant of success soul DE implementation (Van, 2017). According to Jaeger (2016), teachers encounter difficulties owing to time constraints, as they do not have the time to attend to various needs and ensure that pupils understand what is being taught. Mike Cession of Applied Educational Systems (2021) likewise expressed that differentiation works best when teachers have the opportunity and energy to profoundly consider the necessities of every student so they can fit their classrooms according to those needs.

Also, there are studies which reveals that despite the preparation of teachers in providing differentiated instruction in teaching of Mathematics, other students do not still have a clear grasp of the lesson in the given learning materials (Tao, 2005). Tao (2005) used Mathematics Trail in his study which is a dynamic activity instead of static learning activity to promote a new attitude to mathematics through the observation and exploration of the environment. However, it was not effective though it mathematics in this context was contextualized to each learners. Same happened in the study of Yang and Run Wu (2010), wherein they concluded that the designed teaching method does not work for all students as there are some who are still have difficulty

in understanding the questions and the lesson at hand. More so, with the experimental study of Little, Coach, and Reis (2014), students under DE provides no difference in their achievement than the learners who are treated with traditional exercise.

Relevance of Differentiated Instruction in Mathematics

According to Ullman (2021), differentiated instruction in mathematics refers to a set of approaches, strategies, and adaptations that a teacher might employ to reach a diverse population of students and make mathematics accessible to all. Furthermore, according to Dr. Karol (2008), former president of the National Council of Supervisors of Mathematics, diversification in math lessons refers to differentiation at the task's entry and exit points to assist student thinking. Furthermore, this teaching approach proposes that students are provided with a variety of learning opportunities in which the teacher differentiates the content of their lesson, the teaching process and support provided to their students, as well as the students' outputs (Chamberlin, 2010).

Moreover, differentiated instruction mandates that teachers create chances for students to access, analyze, and display learning through structured lessons (Goddard, 2015). As a result, when teachers adapt instruction depending on students' readiness, learning styles, and interests, they may develop a curriculum that are engaging, authentic, and rigorous (Hedrick, 2012). This approach further implies that applying various tools and strategies in teaching mathematics, an educator can help every student maximized their learning experiences.

The National Council of Teachers of

Mathematics also encourages educators to differentiate the math instruction considering the differences in learning as well as the ability, interest, and confidence (Ullman, 2021). Hence, according to Hillier (2011) it must be considered that to differentiate the math instruction, it must support all learners by targeting and addressing specific needs of groups and individual students. As a result, learners' will perform best in the classroom if the content and interaction are matched to their learning styles and academic ability (Adam, 2004)

According to Maggio and Saylor (2013), in mathematics, teachers should meet students' needs by matching their readiness to the level of content delivered. Albertan (2021) stated that students who were taught using differentiated instruction in math performed better than those taught using a conventional instructional approach. Similarly, Ball (2016) discussed differentiated instruction, noting that it is significant in the context of mathematics since it contains multiple levels of sensitivity that enriches learning environments. In As a result, rather of utilizing a one-size-fits-all technique, this connection can help students accelerate their achievement mathematics (IRIS Center, 2022).

More so, the facilitation of differentiation in teaching and planning is so important that Alperon (2014) affirmed that a well-planned differentiation includes addressing different depths of the lessons and create a powerful task that help all students' progress. The tasks therefore should be engaging and accessible in accordance with the individual students' access to the lesson without changing the veracity of mathematics (Baker & Harter, 2015).

Therefore, this study focuses on the

effectiveness of differentiating the instruction in mathematics based on the students' learning styles in the essence of utilizing one learning style in the group of students. With that, the three learning styles mentioned in this study which is the visual learners, auditory learners and kinesthetic learners will be expounded as to their corresponding teaching strategy.

Students who are visual learners process information most effectively when they can see what they are learning (Heaton, 2002). Rodger (2009), stated that to differentiate instruction of the visual information, the teacher can present the content in different formats, such as images, flowcharts, diagrams, video, simulations, graphs, cartoons, coloring books, slide shows/PowerPoint decks, posters, movies, games, and flash cards. Visual information can help clarify, establish, and correlate understandings, which can help visually inclined learners activate and engage in learning. Graphical visual representation in the form of Pictorial Base-10 Blocks is a great strategy to help the learners in mathematical solving.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study utilized a quantitative research design, specifically, a quasi-experimental design. Quantitative research examines the relationship between variables to assess theories. These variables can then be measured using tools, resulting in numerical data that can be examined using statistical processes (Creswell, 2009). The researcher also used a pre and post-test design. The use of this design in this study was to determine the effectiveness of differentiated instruction to grade-four students at Poo Elementary School. According to Frey (2018), pre-

experimental research is a study in which participants take a pretest and a post-test before and after treatment to determine the effect of the variable under investigation by comparing the average score of the pretest and post-test.

Research Instrument

The research instruments utilized in this study was a learning style inventory adapted from Conquering Math Anxiety (2010) of Dr. Cynthia A. Aram and a researcher-made test questionnaire. More so, the learning style inventory was used to identify the students' learning styles. Three styles are included in the Learning Styles Preference Inventory (Math Specific): Visual, Auditory, and Kinesthetic. Among the learning styles, the one that prevailed was treated with differentiated instruction, and the other was part of the whole-class instruction. Aside from that, the researcher utilized a researcher-made test questionnaire which is a competency-based test used to measure the effectiveness of differentiated instruction. The test underwent the tests of validity and reliability. The validity test was done by comparing the questionnaire's content to the curriculum guide by an expert in the field. The reliability test was done using the Cranach's Alpha in SPSS Statistics, revealing a score of 0.736 (value ≥ 0.7), which is interpreted as acceptable.

Respondents of the Study: The respondents of this study were the 16 Grade-Four students at Poo Elementary School. Complete enumeration, or the use of the entire population as a sample method, was a deliberate choice. Complete enumeration, according to Hale (2011), allows the researcher to look at the population with a specific set of features.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION: This

chapter discusses the results obtained from analyzed data of pretest and post-test with a supported review of related literature from previous studies. The discussion was arranged in order based on the objectives of the study: to determine the learner's dominant learning styles; to determine the pretest scores between control and experimental group; to determine the mean comparison between the pretest scores of control and experimental group; to determine the post-test scores of control and experimental group; to determine the mean comparison between the post-test scores of control and experimental group, and lastly; to determine the mean comparison between pre and post-test scores of control and experimental group.

The Learner's Dominant Learning Style according to: Visual; Auditory; and Kinesthetic

The visual learners comprised (9) 55% of the class respondents and were treated with differentiated instruction for it came out as the prevailing learning style. Visual learning is described by Rodger et al. (2009) as the integration of knowledge from visual formats. While the other (7) 45% of the class population was categorized as the control group and treated with the whole – class instruction. As such, this study focused on the effectiveness of differentiating the instruction in mathematics based on the students' learning styles, utilizing one learning style which in this case it is the auditory, reading, writing 14,13,12 visual learning style.

Table 1 Frequency distribution table of the students' learning style

S. N o	Learnin g Style	Students frequenc y	Probabilit y
--------	-----------------	---------------------	--------------

1	Visual	09	1.334
2	Kinetics	07	0.032
3	Auditory	14	1.234
4	Reading	13	0.987
5	Writing	12	1.002

Pretest Scores between the Control and the Experimental Group

Table 2 presents the learners level of learning performance in mathematics before differentiating the instruction. As seen, both groups scored very low in their pretest. The total score for each category was converted to percentages and interpreted using the Department of Education's description.

Table 2. Pretest scores between the control and experimental group

Group	Total Score	Standard Deviation	Value	Percentage	Remark
Control	12	2.41	5.14	71.42	Did Not Meet Expectation
Experimental	12	1.67	4.44	68.50	Did Not Meet Expectation

As observed, both groups got a descriptor interpretation of “did not meet expectancy”. This means that students are still grasping the basic contexts of the subject and are still adjusting with the topic at hand. The result was in consonance to the Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study in 2013 and its findings, which shows that in comparison to Singapore, South Korea, Hong Kong, Chinese Taipei, and Japan, Filipino pupils perform poorly in national

and international assessments on mathematics and science competencies (Care, 2015).

Additionally, according to the most recent TIMSS 2019 findings, the Philippines placed last out of 58 countries in the international examination for mathematics and science for Grade 4 students. Their report showed that Grade 4 students scored 249 in science and 297 in mathematics, placing them bottom in both examinations administered by the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement. Meanwhile, Singapore, a neighboring country, topped both tests scoring 625 in math and 595 in science. The findings were also in line with Program for International Student Assessment results from 2018. According to the assessment, fifteen-year-old Filipino pupils scored lower in reading, mathematics, and science than students from most of the countries and economies that took part in PISA 2018. It means that early childhood education in the Philippines has severe challenges that must be addressed in the coming years.

Despite the low performance of Filipino students and the diversity of Philippine classroom conditions, Sheena and Tomb (2008) found that Filipino students have the highest level of enthusiasm in learning science and math. It can be seen in their desire to learn and their eagerness to study certain subjects. Filipino pupils, according to Felipe (2006), are developmentally equipped to study abilities assigned by curriculum designers. It may be observed in the way Filipino students are always receptive to change, especially in the educational system that the government has mandated. Finally, Sang cap (2010) stated that Filipino students' motivation

and interest in learning can help them improve their math skills.

4.3 Significant Difference in the Pretest Scores between Control and the Experimental Group

Table 3 presents the paired t-test for the significant difference in the overall mean scores of the two compared groups based on their learning performance in mathematics before differentiating the instruction.

Table 3. Mean comparison between pretest scores of control and experimental group

Group	va	Stan	p.	Q	remarks
Group	lu	dard	val	p-	Interpretation
	e	Devi	ue	va	
Contro	5.1	2.41			scores between the two groups do not differ significantly.
Experi	4.4	1.67	0.65	0.5	
mental	4		5	27	

The researcher inferred that the learning performance of both groups did not vary that much as the mean of the control group is not far from the experimental group. Since $t=.655$, $p=.527$, with the p -value being higher than the Alpha level of significance of $.05$. It is reasonable to assume that there is no significant difference in the learning performance of the control and experimental groups, before differentiating the instruction. The findings of the result only proves that the participants have a varying level of intellectual capacity as it reveals that the variance results are not that big which signify that both groups are heterogeneous; meaning the pupils were of differing level of intelligence. This is a good starting point because the data imply that the study groups are nearly identical in terms of how the scores are distributed. This means that the students are divided into groups based

on their abilities (Francis et al., 2016).

Table 4 Mean comparison between post-test scores of control and experimental group

Group	value	Standard	remarks
Group	Mean	Deviation	Interpreta
Control	7.29	3.30	Post test scores between
Experime ntal	11.00	1.12	

It was deduced that there is a significant difference between the mean of the control group and experimental group, since $t = -2.851$, $p = .024$ with the p-value is lower than the Alpha significance level of .05. A significant difference in the students' mathematics learning performance after the intervention was performed.

It is consistent with Fine's (2003) study, which found a significant increase in students' test scores after their preferred learning style was incorporated into the instruction. When students were instructed using learning style approaches rather than traditional teaching methods, their performance improved significantly (Fine, 2003). As a result, these students' attitudes toward learning improved significantly since they felt their strengths were being accommodated. Albertan's study (2021) also confirmed that students taught using differentiated instruction outperformed those taught using a traditional instructional approach.

CONCLUSION: Based on the above-mentioned findings, the following conclusions were made. This study demonstrates that differentiated instruction accommodating students' learning styles, has a positive impact on the academic progress of the students. As the pre-test scores elucidated that the participants failed to reach the desired level of performance, it implies that in the

beginning of the study, the experimental and control group has a low understanding as to their current topic in Mathematics.

After the implementation of differentiated instruction, the post-test scores showed that the experimental group taught with differentiated instruction had a remarkably better score as compared to control group who were taught the whole-class instruction. This implies that the two groups differ significantly as the average score of the experimental group is higher than the control group.

The pretest and post-test scores differ significantly as the data elucidated that the experimental group's performance highly improved after being exposed to differentiated instruction. Therefore, before implementing DI, a learning style inventory should be administered first since this will provide the educator with the necessary information on how to differentiate lessons based on the students' preferences and interests (Keene, 2007).

The researcher would like to recommend that educators and curriculum makers may integrate differentiated instruction and used the approach in teaching pupils in Mathematics, especially in a heterogeneous class as it improves their classroom performances. As manifested in this study, DI is a great instructional strategy to better meet the diverse needs of students through analyzing formative data. Next, educators may implement differentiated Exercise for a longer amount of time. Differentiation works best, according to Mike Cession of Applied Educational Systems (2021), when instructors have the time and energy to think deeply about the requirements of each of their students and customize their classes to meet those needs. Additionally,

to obtain a better understanding of differentiated Exercise, the researcher advises that teachers receive in- service training on the method.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Adam, A. (2004) *Enhancing students' learning through differentiated approaches to teaching and learning: A Maltese perspective* *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*, 4(2), 917.
- [2]. Albertan, J. (2021) *Differentiated Instruction in Plane Trigonometry Class*. *Asian Research Journal of Mathematics ARJOM*, 16 (12): 65-73, 2020; Article no. ARJOM.64796
- [3]. Aram, C. A. (2010) *Conquering math anxiety: a self-help work book*. 3rd ed. Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole Engage Learning.
- [4]. Baker, K. & Harter, M. (2015). *A living metaphor of differentiation: A met ethnography of cognitively guided instruction in the elementary classroom*. *Journal of Mathematics Education at Teachers College*,6(2), 27-35.
- [5]. Care, E. et.al. (2015) *Large-scale assessments for use in the Philippines* Retrieved from <http://bit.ly/2G0PvYq>
- [6]. Cession, M. (2021) *the pros and cons of differentiated instruction in CTE*. *Applied Educational Systems*
- [7]. Chamberlin, M. & Powers, R. (2010). *The promise of differentiated instruction for enhancing the mathematical understandings of college students* *Teaching Mathematics and Its Applications* 1-27, doi: 101093/team at/hrq006
- [8]. Creswell, J. (2009). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed-Method Approaches*.
- [9]. Department of Education (2019). *PISA 2018: National Report of the Philippines*. <https://www.deped.gov.ph/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/PISA-2018-Philippine-National-Report.pdf>
- [10]. Dixon, F. et.al. (2014) *Differentiated instruction, professional development, and teacher efficacy*. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 37(2), 111-127.