

On Differential English Teaching in Junior Middle Schools under the Background of New Curriculum Reform

Hui Nie ¹, Yun Pei ^{2,*}

¹ Chengdu Shude Experimental Middle School (West District), Chengdu 510100, China

² Emilio Aguinaldo College, Manila 006302, Philippines

*** Correspondence:**

Yun Pei

125354624@qq.com

Received: 16 May 2025/ Accepted: 8 June 2025/ Published online: 10 June 2025

Abstract

Under the background of China's new curriculum reform, differentiated instruction has emerged as a pivotal strategy to meet the increasingly diverse learning needs of junior middle school students, particularly in English classrooms. This instructional approach emphasizes tailoring teaching objectives, content, methods, and assessments based on students' cognitive levels, learning styles, and interests, aiming to realize equitable and high-quality education. This paper first analyzes the connotation and necessity of differentiated English teaching, highlighting the shortcomings of traditional, uniform teaching practices. It then discusses the theoretical basis and implementation strategies of differentiated instruction, focusing on goal design, flexible content selection, diversified teaching methods, and multi-dimensional evaluation. Additionally, the paper investigates current challenges, including insufficient teacher capacity, inadequate resources, limited evaluation frameworks, and lack of home-school collaboration. In response, it proposes a set of systematic improvement measures, such as establishing a professional development system, building intelligent resource platforms, reconstructing evaluation paradigms, and enhancing home-school partnerships. Through a combination of theoretical analysis and case studies, this research aims to provide practical guidance for implementing differentiated English teaching in junior middle schools, thereby promoting student-centered, equitable, and effective language education.

Keywords: New Curriculum Reform; Differentiated Instruction; Junior Middle School; English Teaching; Teaching Strategies; Evaluation System; Individual Differences

1. Introduction

With the continuous deepening of China's basic education curriculum reform, educational philosophies such as "student-centered learning" and "attention to individual differences" have gradually become key guiding principles in modern teaching. The *Compulsory Education

Curriculum Standards (2022 Edition)* clearly emphasize that teachers should focus on the differentiated development of students, practice individualized instruction, and aim to achieve both educational equity and quality. Against this backdrop, differentiated instruction has emerged as a core strategy aligned with this shift in educational values, and it has been increasingly applied across disciplines in junior secondary education—particularly in English language teaching.

As a subject that blends both practicality and humanism, English serves not only as a key tool for students to access global knowledge, but also as a critical medium for developing cross-cultural communication skills and comprehensive language competence. For a long time, junior middle school English instruction in China has adopted a standardized approach in terms of curriculum content, teaching methods, and assessment systems. This uniformity, while promoting consistency, has often overlooked students' inherent differences in cognitive foundations, learning interests, linguistic abilities, and learning styles. Problems such as overemphasis on knowledge transmission, lack of instructional flexibility, and rigid assessment criteria have severely constrained the personalized development of students' language literacy, and run counter to the competency-based approach advocated in the new curriculum reform. Especially in the current context of “large class sizes” and increasing learning polarization, how to ensure effective teaching and successful learning for every student has become a pressing challenge in junior middle school English education.

The emergence of differentiated instruction offers a timely and effective response to this challenge. At its core, differentiated teaching requires teachers to design and adjust learning objectives, content, processes, and assessments based on students' individual differences, creating a diversified, flexible, and student-centered classroom structure. This, in turn, enables the activation of student potential, improves instructional efficiency, and truly realizes the educational ideal of “maximum development for every student.” From conceptual frameworks to practical applications, differentiated instruction is gradually becoming a major trend in teaching practice under the new curriculum reform. In the context of junior secondary education, where students are in a critical period of language acquisition and cognitive development, the implementation of differentiated strategies is especially urgent and strategically significant.

At present, both domestic and international academia have yielded rich theoretical findings on differentiated instruction, covering areas such as instructional design, tiered grouping, personalized support, and differentiated evaluation. However, in actual classroom settings in China, the practice of differentiated English instruction still faces numerous challenges, such as insufficient teacher professional competence, limited resource support, outdated assessment systems, and weak home-school collaboration. These problems call for further optimization of implementation strategies and the construction of localized instructional models tailored to China's educational realities.

In light of this, the present study is grounded in the policy background and educational philosophies of the new curriculum reform. It explores the theoretical foundation, strategic implementation, and practical challenges of differentiated instruction in junior middle school English classrooms. By employing a combination of theoretical and case-based analysis, this paper aims to construct a practical and scalable implementation model, provide valuable

references for frontline English teachers, and contribute to the high-quality development of basic foreign language education in China.

2. Literature Review

Differentiated instruction emphasizes tailoring teaching content, processes, and assessments to accommodate students' differences in ability, interest, learning needs, and styles, so that every student can learn effectively. American scholar Carol Ann Tomlinson defines differentiated instruction as the practice of modifying content, process, and product based on student readiness, interests, and learning profiles, to improve student learning outcomes. Similarly, Chinese scholar Hua Guodong states that differentiated instruction is a method that considers individual differences within a class to maximize each student's potential through targeted instruction. Thus, the essence of differentiated teaching lies in “teaching in accordance with students’ aptitude” and developing individual potential through varied instructional objectives, materials, and evaluation systems designed to meet diverse learning needs.

As China's new curriculum reform and competency-based education advance, differentiated instruction has attracted growing attention from educators and researchers. The new curriculum standards advocate for “autonomy, cooperation, and inquiry,” calling on teachers to innovate instructional strategies and focus more on individual learning development. In recent years, scholars in both China and abroad have explored differentiated teaching practices from perspectives such as personalization, tiered instruction, and diversified evaluation strategies.

In the realm of personalized learning, many studies have noted that traditional “one-size-fits-all” teaching approaches fail to meet the increasingly diverse needs of students. Consequently, Chinese researchers have begun to explore strategies such as integrating educational technology and gamification to create more personalized learning environments and boost student engagement. For example, Huang Junhong (2022) argues that personalized teaching must be grounded in respect for student individuality and should seek to create unique and student-centered classrooms. Recent studies have also highlighted the use of smart classrooms and digital tools to support adaptive instruction.

In terms of tiered instruction, research has shown that grouping students based on their proficiency and learning preferences can lead to improved learning outcomes. Zhao Siyuan (2024) emphasizes the importance of respecting individual differences and implementing tiered assessments to ensure that all students make progress. Huang Hongbin (2024), through empirical investigation, found that proper tiering strategies not only help advanced students lead lower-level peers but also enhance overall motivation and cooperative spirit in class. However, researchers also point out practical challenges, such as teachers’ limited understanding of tiered teaching principles and difficulties in designing layered learning goals and activities.

Regarding evaluation systems, recent literature advocates for constructing multi-dimensional assessment frameworks aligned with differentiated instruction. Zhao Siyuan and colleagues (2024) argue that existing English assessment practices remain overly reliant on standardized paper-based tests and lack mechanisms to reflect students’ individual learning progress. Their

recommendations include designing comprehensive assessment indicators that integrate language skills, learning strategies, and cultural awareness, and adopting formative evaluations such as self-assessments, peer reviews, and project-based presentations.

In summary, existing literature has made significant contributions to enriching the theoretical foundation and practical strategies for differentiated instruction, particularly in enhancing student engagement and learning effectiveness. Research findings affirm the benefits of tiered tasks, personalized feedback, and flexible classroom structures. However, several gaps remain. First, there is a lack of empirical studies with large samples and longitudinal data, as most research still relies on theoretical analysis or isolated case reports. Second, few studies conduct interdisciplinary or cross-context comparisons, limiting the generalizability of findings. Third, while evaluation innovation is often proposed, little is known about the long-term effects of differentiated assessments on student development.

To address these gaps, future research should integrate educational technology, adopt interdisciplinary approaches, and enhance empirical validation of differentiated practices in real classrooms. This study builds upon the existing theoretical foundation and aims to propose context-sensitive implementation strategies for junior middle school English instruction under China's new curriculum reform.

3. Methodology and Procedures

This study adopts a combination of **theoretical analysis** and **case analysis** as its main research methods, aiming to explore the theoretical construction and practical application of differentiated instruction in junior middle school English teaching under the background of China's new curriculum reform. These two methods complement each other to enhance the overall coherence, depth, and applicability of the research.

3.1. Theoretical Analysis

Theoretical analysis serves as the foundational method of this study. It involves systematically reviewing relevant domestic and international theories, policy documents, and pedagogical models to construct a solid theoretical framework for the research. Specifically, the study begins by defining and clarifying key concepts such as “differentiated instruction”, “tiered teaching”, and “personalized learning”, and explores their alignment with core educational principles emphasized in the new curriculum reform—namely, student-centeredness, development of core competencies, and high-quality classroom instruction.

Furthermore, the study examines classical models such as Tomlinson's differentiated instruction theory, the guidelines from China's “2022 English Curriculum Standards for Compulsory Education”, and related research findings from the China Curriculum and Instruction Reform Association. These provide valuable insights into the conceptual underpinnings and strategic orientation of differentiated teaching. Through comparison and synthesis of existing literature, the study identifies current trends in differentiated instruction, evaluates common strategies used in practice, and pinpoints the theoretical gaps that this paper aims to address.

This analytical process not only informs the structure of the study but also provides the rationale for selecting specific strategies, classroom practices, and instructional focuses. It offers a macro-level understanding of how differentiated instruction functions in alignment with educational policy and reform goals.

3.2. Case Analysis

To complement the theoretical framework and ground the research in actual teaching practices, this study employs a case analysis approach. Representative cases of differentiated instruction in junior middle school English classrooms are selected for in-depth examination. These include model teaching practices in key schools, innovative instructional designs from regional teaching research centers, and exemplary public teaching demonstrations by experienced English teachers.

The case analysis focuses on several core aspects:

how instructional goals are designed to reflect layered expectations;

how content is adjusted to align with students' proficiency levels;

whether teaching methods are personalized based on learners' cognitive profiles and language development stages;

how assessments are diversified to motivate student participation and track growth;

and what feedback mechanisms exist between teachers and students in the teaching process.

Through a close examination of these aspects, the study reveals the mechanisms, challenges, and successes of implementing differentiated instruction in real classroom settings. It also sheds light on the practical feasibility and potential obstacles in translating theoretical principles into pedagogical practice.

3.2. Integration and Research Value

The integration of theoretical analysis and case analysis ensures that the research is both conceptually rigorous and practically grounded. Theoretical analysis offers macro-level insights and conceptual structure, while case analysis provides micro-level evidence and actionable strategies. Together, they form a cyclical “theory–practice–theory” model, which enables the study to propose realistic, adaptable, and scalable instructional strategies for junior middle school English teaching under the new curriculum reform.

In conclusion, this dual-method approach not only deepens the understanding of differentiated instruction in the context of China's educational transformation but also provides concrete guidance for frontline English teachers seeking to enhance instructional effectiveness and meet the diverse needs of their students.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1. The Connotation of Differentiated Instruction in Junior Middle School English Education

With the progressive implementation of China's new curriculum reform, the connotation of differentiated English instruction at the junior middle school level has evolved from a conceptual innovation to a concrete pedagogical requirement. The essence of differentiated instruction lies in recognizing the value of student diversity—not as a challenge, but as a resource to be leveraged for educational success. This pedagogical approach acknowledges that students differ in their prior knowledge, cognitive styles, interests, learning paces, and linguistic exposure. It therefore calls on teachers to develop flexible instructional frameworks that tailor learning objectives, content, processes, and outcomes to the specific characteristics of students.

In terms of instructional goals, the shift from uniform, rigid standards toward multi-layered and personalized learning targets is both necessary and transformative. The traditional "one-size-fits-all" approach often suppresses student potential by enforcing a singular benchmark for achievement. In contrast, differentiated instruction affirms the legitimacy of diverse learning paths and encourages students to progress at their own optimal pace. Teachers are thus required to design objectives at multiple levels—foundational, intermediate, and advanced—ensuring that every student, regardless of their starting point, is both supported and challenged.

Practically, differentiated instruction entails a continuous process of diagnosing students' learning profiles, designing appropriate scaffolds, and adjusting pedagogy based on real-time feedback. English teachers at the junior level must evaluate students' primary school English foundation, assess their interest in language learning, and analyze their receptive and productive skills. This diagnostic work forms the bedrock of differentiated instructional planning, whereby teachers construct layered lesson plans, assign varied tasks, and adopt multi-modal delivery methods to cater to student needs.

4.2. The Necessity of Implementing Differentiated Instruction in Junior English Classrooms

4.2.1. Limitations of Traditional Teaching Approaches

With Traditional English teaching in junior middle schools has been characterized by uniform objectives, rigid lesson structures, and teacher-centered pedagogy. This approach places undue emphasis on grammar, vocabulary, and rote memorization, often at the expense of communicative competence and critical language awareness. Consequently, students are trained to recall knowledge but are ill-equipped to use English meaningfully in real-world contexts.

Moreover, the teaching content in traditional classrooms tends to be confined to textbooks, leading to a narrow knowledge base and a diminished interest in learning. Without access to authentic English materials, such as digital media, literature excerpts, or real-life conversation scenarios, students find it difficult to connect language with life. In large classes, these issues are further compounded by the lack of individualized attention. Learners are treated as a monolithic group, and differentiation is mistakenly perceived as inefficient or unrealistic.

Most critically, the assessment system under traditional paradigms favors summative, high-stakes testing over formative, process-based evaluation. This not only limits opportunities for feedback and growth but also demotivates students who consistently underperform under such pressure. The lack of layered or personalized evaluation methods fails to recognize incremental progress, particularly for struggling learners.

4.2.2. The Rationale for Differentiated Instruction Under the New Curriculum Reform

In response to these limitations, the new curriculum reform advocates for student-centered, inclusive, and competency-based teaching models. Differentiated instruction aligns seamlessly with these objectives. It encourages teachers to acknowledge student diversity, discard the outdated notion of uniformity, and instead construct adaptive learning environments that reflect the multifaceted nature of student development.

By applying differentiated strategies, teachers can ensure equity not through equal treatment, but through equitable opportunity—by giving each student what they need to succeed. For example, lower-performing students may be provided with phonics-based instruction and vocabulary reinforcement through visual aids and repetition, while more advanced learners can engage in content-based language learning, academic writing, or cross-cultural analysis.

Importantly, differentiated instruction does not solely benefit students at the extremes of the achievement spectrum. Average learners also gain from instruction that is tailored to their evolving zone of proximal development (ZPD). As research has shown, differentiated instruction enhances engagement, fosters autonomy, and cultivates a more collaborative learning atmosphere where students support one another's growth through peer mentoring and group interaction.

4.3. The Current Challenges of Implementing Differentiated Instruction in Practice

Despite its theoretical appeal and policy endorsement, the practical implementation of differentiated English instruction in junior middle schools remains uneven and fraught with challenges.

4.3.1. Inadequate Teacher Training and Conceptual Misunderstanding

One of the most pressing barriers is the limited understanding among teachers regarding the depth and scope of differentiated instruction. Many educators equate it with simplistic forms of stratification—such as assigning easier tasks to weaker students—without comprehending the pedagogical nuances involved. A 2022 provincial survey revealed that over 80% of junior English teachers lacked formal training in differentiated instruction, leading to superficial implementation and ineffective results.

Furthermore, lesson plans often mimic templated models of three-tiered goals without aligning with actual student needs or course content. Instructional differentiation is frequently confined to adjusting the difficulty of exercises rather than reconfiguring the learning process itself. Teachers may lack the skills to recognize and respond to varied cognitive styles, language processing strategies, and affective factors like motivation and anxiety—all of which are crucial to language learning.

4.3.2. Imbalanced Teaching Resources and Support Systems

Another major issue is the scarcity of differentiated teaching materials. Most English resource libraries in schools are dominated by uniform digital content, test-oriented drills, and textbook-aligned worksheets. According to a 2023 inspection by the Ministry of Education, less than 15% of English teaching resources in middle schools were designed with differentiation in mind.

In the context of large-unit or theme-based instruction—now promoted by the new curriculum—teachers struggle to provide materials that support differentiated exploration of topics. As a result, higher-order thinking activities such as project-based learning or creative writing exercises often go unsupported or are simplified to accommodate all learners, diluting their pedagogical value.

4.3.3. Rigid Evaluation Systems and Lack of Diagnostic Tools

Traditional assessment frameworks pose another barrier to effective differentiation. Paper-based exams still dominate classroom evaluation, sidelining formative approaches such as student self-assessments, learning portfolios, or process journals. More than 70% of surveyed teachers in 2023 reported having no mechanism to track student learning growth on an individualized basis.

Without layered assessment rubrics or diagnostic tools, it becomes difficult for teachers to make informed decisions about instructional adjustments. Furthermore, high-performing students may feel unchallenged, while those with learning difficulties may feel stigmatized or marginalized. Both groups risk disengagement.

4.3.4. Weak Home-School Collaboration

Family involvement plays a critical role in supporting differentiated instruction, especially in English, where exposure outside of school significantly shapes learning outcomes. Yet surveys show that nearly 70% of parents misunderstand differentiation as “tracking” or “labeling,” and almost half insist on uniform tutoring strategies regardless of their child's proficiency level.

This disconnect between home and school undermines the coherence of instructional strategies and may worsen learning polarization. Particularly in English, differences in home language environments can either amplify or attenuate the effectiveness of in-school differentiation efforts.

5. Suggestions for Enhancing Differentiated Instruction in Junior Middle School English under the New Curriculum Reform

Based on the core principles of China's New Curriculum Reform, this section puts forward a comprehensive system of improvement strategies aimed at addressing the practical issues currently hindering the implementation of differentiated instruction in junior middle school English classrooms. These issues include inadequate teacher training, underdeveloped teaching resources, a rigid and unbalanced evaluation system, and insufficient home-school coordination. The proposed strategies are designed to construct a long-term and sustainable differentiated teaching system that aligns with educational equity and quality development goals.

5.1. Enhancing Teachers' Differentiated Teaching Competence through Professional Development

The effectiveness of differentiated instruction largely depends on the professional capacity of teachers to diagnose student differences, plan responsive instruction, and adjust dynamically based on ongoing assessment. Currently, many English teachers lack a deep understanding of the theory and practice of differentiated teaching, leading to superficial application or even misunderstanding of its core ideas. To bridge this gap, a structured and sustainable professional development system should be established, comprising three key dimensions: theoretical foundation, practical application, and reflective inquiry.

First, theoretical training must be systematic and evidence-based. Schools and educational departments should organize ongoing workshops and in-service training programs that help teachers build a solid understanding of core theories such as multiple intelligences, constructivist learning, learner variability, and differentiated classroom models. These training sessions should incorporate up-to-date research and contextualized practices to make the concepts accessible and applicable.

Second, practical application should be emphasized through collaborative lesson design, micro-teaching demonstrations, peer mentoring, and action research. Schools can encourage teachers to form Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) centered around differentiated instruction. Within these groups, teachers collaboratively design tiered tasks, co-develop flexible grouping strategies, and analyze classroom data to refine instructional decisions. For instance, a school could host a "Differentiated Teaching Design Week," where teachers showcase unit plans tailored to student readiness and interests, followed by classroom implementation and feedback collection.

Third, reflective inquiry should be embedded as a long-term habit. Teachers should be encouraged to maintain teaching logs, engage in video-based lesson study, and participate in reflective interviews. With the support of instructional coaches, teachers can use data from classroom observations and student assessments to analyze the impact of their instructional choices. Platforms such as the Flanders Interaction Analysis System (FIAS) can be employed to code classroom behavior and generate insights into the balance of teacher-student talk, the use of open-ended questions, and differentiated task engagement.

Ultimately, cultivating a group of English teachers who are not only well-versed in differentiated theory but also skillful in its practical enactment is essential for transforming classroom culture and achieving the goals of the New Curriculum Reform.

5.2. Constructing an Adaptive and Inclusive Teaching Resource Ecosystem

The availability and quality of differentiated teaching resources are directly linked to the feasibility of implementation in daily classroom instruction. However, the current resource infrastructure is plagued by homogenization, limited digital diversity, and a lack of tiered materials that reflect varying cognitive levels and learning styles. To resolve this structural imbalance, a multi-dimensional and intelligent teaching resource ecosystem should be developed based on three pillars: diagnostic precision, content adaptability, and resource co-construction.

First, an intelligent diagnostic system should be established using educational technology and artificial intelligence (AI). By administering pre-instructional assessments and cognitive style surveys, schools can build personalized learner profiles that map students' vocabulary mastery, grammar understanding, discourse comprehension, and cognitive preferences. AI tools can synthesize this data to suggest appropriate entry points for each student, enabling teachers to group learners and assign content more effectively. For example, an AI-enhanced English diagnostic platform may identify that a group of students excels in listening comprehension but struggles with academic vocabulary, prompting targeted instructional intervention.

Second, teaching content should be modularized and multi-tiered according to the CEFR (Common European Framework of Reference for Languages) standards. English resource libraries should include three levels of materials (A1–B1), and each unit should contain task packages across three tiers: foundational consolidation, skill enhancement, and creative inquiry. Teachers can curate or create multimedia resources such as graded readers, real-world dialogues, scaffolded writing prompts, and differentiated listening exercises. Additionally, interactive platforms like digital learning portfolios or task banks can allow students to select tasks aligned with their own development plans.

Third, a mechanism for regional and school-based resource co-creation and sharing must be established. Using the “central kitchen” model, districts can coordinate expert teams to develop differentiated lesson modules and task templates, while schools contribute their local adaptations and case-based experiences. The Minhang District model in Shanghai offers a reference: its English differentiated teaching platform includes over 2,800 level-specific micro-lessons, teacher commentary, and student project exemplars, which are open-access and customizable. Cloud-based resource hubs should be integrated into daily instruction to reduce teacher preparation burdens and promote sustained innovation.

By integrating technology with pedagogical insight, this adaptive resource ecosystem empowers teachers to offer personalized learning paths and ensures that differentiated teaching is not hindered by material limitations.

5.3. Reforming the Evaluation System to Support Differentiated Growth

The current evaluation system in junior middle school English education often emphasizes summative, standardized assessment tools that fail to reflect individual learning trajectories or provide formative feedback for development. To support differentiated instruction, the assessment paradigm must shift toward a “three-dimensional and four-body” model that aligns with the goals of core competency education and student-centered learning.

In terms of evaluation dimensions, a comprehensive framework encompassing language competence, learning strategies, and cultural awareness should be constructed. Assessments should go beyond linguistic accuracy to evaluate students' ability to navigate tasks, collaborate, reflect, and demonstrate intercultural understanding. Each objective can be scaled by level—basic proficiency, developing competency, and exemplary literacy—so that students can track their own growth within differentiated standards.

Regarding evaluation subjects, a four-party collaborative mechanism must be formed among teachers, students, parents, and AI-based learning systems. For instance, teachers provide ongoing observations and commentary, students conduct self- and peer-assessments using rubrics, parents contribute feedback via home observation journals, and AI systems track data from online learning logs and quizzes. This diverse evidence base enhances evaluation credibility and personalization.

In terms of methodology, a hybrid approach combining embedded assessment and project-based demonstration is recommended. Embedded tasks—such as reflective journals, classroom discussions, and exit slips—can provide real-time diagnostic information. Meanwhile, project-based tasks at different challenge levels can demonstrate applied language ability. For example, in a unit on environmental issues, A-level students might complete sentence-level descriptions, B-level students create posters and give brief oral explanations, and C-level students deliver a comparative presentation on global climate policies.

A successful case is the “English Learning Growth Passport” launched by a top-tier Beijing middle school. The passport compiles students’ formative evaluations, project work, learning reflections, and parent-teacher feedback to create a holistic, narrative-based assessment profile. This model not only highlights student progress but also fosters intrinsic motivation and lifelong learning habits.

5.4. Strengthening Home–School Collaboration for Sustained Differentiation

Effective differentiated instruction requires alignment between school teaching and family support. However, in current practice, there is often a disconnect: many parents misunderstand differentiation as “tracking” or “labeling,” and default to uniform extracurricular tutoring regardless of individual student needs. Especially in English instruction, where family language environments differ significantly, the lack of targeted home support can deepen learning disparities.

To resolve this issue, a “dual-track, three-dimensional” home-school collaboration framework is proposed. First, build home-school cognitive communities to promote awareness and understanding of differentiated instruction. Schools can host regular parent seminars, workshops, and forums that explain the goals and value of equitable, tailored education. By emphasizing that fairness means giving each student what they need, not treating everyone the same, schools can alleviate parental concerns.

Second, develop personalized home guidance platforms. Schools can distribute level-based English learning kits that include booklists, recommended apps, pronunciation guides, and family conversation prompts. For example, beginner-level students receive simple picture books and phonics apps, while advanced students access TED Talks and writing blogs. These packages bridge classroom strategies and home practices.

Third, create dynamic communication mechanisms. Using smart home-school communication tools, teachers can push customized learning reports, noting students' recent strengths, areas needing reinforcement, and specific family strategies to support development. A successful model is the “English Learning Partnership Program” initiated by a junior high school in Hangzhou,

where each student's family receives a weekly "instructional alignment sheet" that maps school-level strategies to home routines, such as targeted vocabulary games, reading times, and discussion prompts.

Such collaboration increases consistency across learning environments and reinforces student identity as capable learners within both domains.

5.5. Encouraging Policy and Administrative Support for Systemic Implementation

Beyond classroom practice, the institutionalization of differentiated instruction requires coordinated support at the policy and administrative levels. Local educational authorities should embed differentiated teaching requirements into professional standards, teacher appraisal frameworks, and school development goals. Additionally, funding policies must prioritize innovation in differentiated instruction, including incentives for resource development, technological upgrades, and pilot programs.

School leaders should also play a proactive role in scheduling flexible class time, allowing for small-group instruction, resource exploration, and interdisciplinary collaboration. Differentiated instruction cannot flourish under rigid, test-centered administrative cultures. Instead, schools must cultivate an adaptive ecosystem where experimentation, reflection, and feedback are valued. Leadership should recognize teachers who effectively implement differentiation through awards, open lesson exhibitions, and opportunities to mentor others.

Lastly, academic journals, online platforms, and educational research centers should encourage publications, case reports, and action research on differentiated English teaching to spread successful models and fuel a nationwide movement toward inclusive, student-centered education.

6. Summary

Under the background of the new curriculum reform, in order to meet the demands of modern education and cultivate high-quality talents for the new era, English teachers must adopt a variety of instructional approaches. Among these, differentiated instruction stands out as one of the most effective and practical teaching models currently available. By tailoring instructional strategies to the diverse personal characteristics of students in junior middle schools, teachers can set clear, layered learning objectives, implement flexible and diverse teaching content, utilize varied instructional methods, and adopt differentiated and stratified evaluation criteria. These measures collectively create a positive and inclusive classroom environment that values diversity, fosters emotional support, unlocks students' potential, and ensures that every student receives an education suited to their individual needs.

In the junior middle school English classroom, teachers should develop a deep understanding of each student's individual learning traits. Based on this understanding, teachers should design personalized learning plans that align with students' interests, learning styles, and developmental stages. In addition, by helping students establish their own goals for academic progress and success, and by offering continuous encouragement, teachers can foster a strong sense of self-efficacy and confidence in learning. Ultimately, through the implementation of differentiated

instruction, every student will be better positioned to achieve steady growth and long-term academic development.

Author Contributions:

Conceptualization, Hui Nie; Methodology, Hui Nie; Software, Hui Nie; Validation, Hui Nie; Formal analysis, Hui Nie; Investigation, Hui Nie; Resources, Hui Nie; Data curation, Hui Nie; writing—original draft preparation, Hui Nie; writing—review and editing, Hui Nie; visualization, Hui Nie; supervision, Yun Pei; project administration, Yun Pei. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding:

Not applicable.

Institutional Review Board Statement:

Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement:

Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement:

Not applicable.

Conflict of Interest:

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

- García-López, J.S., & Yelinek, J. (2019). Emotions in storybooks: A comparison of storybooks that represent ethnic and racial groups in the United States. *Psychology of Popular Media Culture*, 8(3), 207-217.
- Brown, T., Wilson, H., Davis, K., & Taylor, M. (2021). Artificial intelligence in healthcare: A systematic review. *Health Technology Journal*, 10(4), 205-220.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017). Effective teacher professional development. Learning Policy Institute.
- Fullan, M. (2007). The new meaning of educational change (4th ed.). Teachers College Press.
- Guskey, T. R. (2002). Professional development and teacher change. *Teachers and Teaching*, 8(3), 381–391.
- Hargreaves, A., & Fullan, M. (2012). Professional capital: Transforming teaching in every school. Teachers College Press.
- Kennedy, M. M. (2016). How does professional development improve teaching? *Review of Educational Research*, 86(4), 945–980.

- Knight, J. (2007). *Instructional coaching: A partnership approach to improving instruction*. Corwin Press.
libguides.sjf.edu+[fordham.libguides.com](https://libguides.fordham.edu)+[Verywell Mind](https://www.verywellmind.com)+3
- Liu, S., & Meng, L. (2009). Perceptions of teachers, students and parents of the characteristics of good teachers: A cross-cultural comparison of China and the United States. *Educational Assessment, Evaluation and Accountability*, 21(4), 313–328.
- OECD. (2019). *Innovating education and educating for innovation: The power of digital technologies and skills*. OECD Publishing.
- Penuel, W. R., Fishman, B. J., Yamaguchi, R., & Gallagher, D. J. (2007). What makes professional development effective? Strategies that foster curriculum implementation. *American Educational Research Journal*, 44(4), 921–958.
- Reeves, D. B. (2006). *The learning leader: How to focus school improvement for better results*. ASCD.
- Schleicher, A. (2012). *Preparing teachers and developing school leaders for the 21st century: Lessons from around the world*. OECD Publishing.
- Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57(1), 1–22.
- Timperley, H., Wilson, A., Barrar, H., & Fung, I. (2007). *Teacher professional learning and development: Best evidence synthesis iteration*. Ministry of Education, New Zealand.
- Vescio, V., Ross, D., & Adams, A. (2008). A review of research on the impact of professional learning communities on teaching practice and student learning. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24(1), 80–91.
- Wang, H., & Zhang, L. (2014). The impact of teacher professional development on student achievement: Evidence from randomized evaluation in China. *China Economic Review*, 30, 342–357.
- Wei, R. C., Darling-Hammond, L., Andree, A., Richardson, N., & Orphanos, S. (2009). *Professional learning in the learning profession: A status report on teacher development in the United States and abroad*. National Staff Development Council.
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge University Press.
- Yoon, K. S., Duncan, T., Lee, S. W. Y., Scarloss, B., & Shapley, K. (2007). *Reviewing the evidence on how teacher professional development affects student achievement*. Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.
- Zhao, Y. (2012). *World class learners: Educating creative and entrepreneurial students*. Corwin Press.
- Zhu, C., & Wang, D. (2014). Key competencies and characteristics for innovative teaching among secondary school teachers: A mixed-methods research. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 15(2), 299–311.