Evaluating the Pedagogical Value of a Year 6 English Module: A Study of Teachers' Perspectives

Sharon Kaur Jeremiah[1], Charanjit Kaur Swaran Singh[1,*], Revathi Gopal[1], Mahendran Maniam[1], Noor Alhusna Madzlan[1], Siti Shuhaida Shukor[1], Mohd Haniff Mohd Tahir[1], Mazlin Mohktar[1], Tarsame Singh Masa Singh[2], Amreet Kaur Jageer Singh[1]

[1] Faculty of Languages and Communication, Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris, Malaysia
[2] Faculty of Education, Languages, Psychology and Music, SEGi University, Malaysia

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
   Keywords: 	This study examined teachers' perceptions of the pedagogical value of the Year 6 English module, focusing on five constructs: Content relevance and progression, Communicative competence development, Global and civic awareness, Learner autonomy and reflection, and Practicality of implementation. A total of 80 primary school English teachers participated, completing a structured questionnaire with 25 items on a 5-point Likert scale. Descriptive analysis showed that teachers rated the module highly across all constructs, particularly for content alignment, integrated skill development, and reflective activities. Multiple regression analysis revealed that content relevance and progression, communicative competence development, and learner autonomy and reflection significantly predicted teachers' perception of practicality of implementation. The findings indicate that the module is well-structured, relevant, and feasible for classroom use, providing insights for curriculum developers and educators in designing effective upper primary English materials.

1. Introduction

The creation and evaluation of instructional materials is critical to effective English as a Second Language (ESL) education, especially at the upper primary level, when students are expected to display more linguistic proficiency and social awareness [1]. As students graduate to Year 6, the final stage of primary education, language learning resources must not only support grammatical and lexical development, but also encourage communicative competence, global awareness, and reflective learning skills. To ensure pedagogical quality and classroom relevance, such modules must be evaluated in a systematic manner from the perspective of teachers.

---
* Corresponding author.
E-mail address: charanjit@fbk.upsi.edu.my

The Year 6 English module reviewed in this study includes thematic sections such as Daily Routine, Family, School, Society, Country, World, and My English Portfolio. The arrangement of these themes shows a shift from personal and immediate circumstances to bigger national and global viewpoints. This trajectory is consistent with current language education ideas, which promote meaningful communication, contextualised learning, and the development of 21st-century competencies [2-4]. Furthermore, the inclusion of a portfolio component indicates a focus on learner autonomy and reflective practice, both of which are increasingly regarded as critical components in sustaining long-term language growth.

Previous study on ESL materials evaluation has found that instructors are crucial in judging the efficacy of instructional modules because they are the major implementers of curriculum content [5-7]. According to studies, instructors' perceptions have a substantial impact on how well materials are absorbed, altered, and implemented in classroom settings [9-11]. However, much of the previous research has concentrated on textbook evaluation rather than full theme modules that incorporate communicative, civic, and reflective components for upper primary students.

To address this gap, the present study evaluates the pedagogical value of a Year 6 English module through teachers' perspectives. In this study, pedagogical value is conceptualised as teachers' perceptions across five key dimensions: (1) Content relevance and progression, (2) Communicative competence development, (3) Global and civic awareness, (4) Learner autonomy and reflection, and (5) Practicality of implementation.

2. Literature Review
2.1 Pedagogical Value of Instructional Modules

Pedagogical value refers to how well instructional materials assist teaching and learning processes. Shulman (1986) believes that good teaching materials must combine content knowledge with pedagogical practices to promote meaningful learning. In language education, instructional modules should not only deliver structured content but also foster interaction, critical thinking, and communication skills.

Similarly, Fatima *et al.,* [12] emphasizes that quality language learning materials should be engaging, contextually relevant, and capable of stimulating learners' cognitive and affective involvement. A pedagogically valuable module therefore goes beyond textbook exercises; it supports differentiated instruction, encourages active learning, and provides opportunities for authentic language use.

In primary education settings, modules must also consider pupils' developmental characteristics. At Year 6 level, learners are transitioning from concrete to more abstract thinking. Thus, instructional materials should incorporate higher-order thinking skills (HOTS), collaborative tasks, and problem-solving activities to enhance cognitive development alongside language acquisition [14].

2.2 English Language Teaching in Primary Education

Primary English language education attempts to improve foundational listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills. In Malaysia, the Standard-Based Curriculum for Primary Schools (KSSR) focuses on communicative skills and student-centered learning practices. Dell Hymes [21] established the notion of communicative competence, emphasising the significance of using language effectively in social circumstances, which has had a significant impact on communicative language teaching methods. This viewpoint altered language education from grammar-focused training to practical and meaningful communication.

Furthermore, Lev Vygotsky (1978) stated that learning takes place through social interaction in the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). From this perspective, English modules should include scaffolding activities that allow students to gradually transition from guided practice to independent language use. As a result, the pedagogical value of a Year 6 English module can be evaluated based on how well it promotes interaction, cooperation, and scaffolding learning.

2.3 Teachers' Perspectives in Evaluating Instructional Materials

Teachers have an important role in interpreting, adapting, and implementing educational materials. Their perceptions determine how well a module is implemented in the classroom. According to research, instructors' evaluations frequently focus on instructional clarity, subject fit, alignment with learning objectives, flexibility, and student engagement [16-18].

According to Huang *et al.*, (2023), curriculum materials should be viewed as hypotheses to be tested in practice, implying that instructors are active assessors rather than passive implementers. This viewpoint emphasises the need of gathering teacher viewpoints for measuring instructional value. Furthermore, Janesarvatan and Asoodar [22] contends that effective educational implementation is strongly dependent on teachers' understanding, views, and professional judgement. Even well-designed modules can fail if they are deemed unrealistic or incompatible with classroom realities.

2.4 Criteria for Evaluating English Modules

Several frameworks have been developed to help with the systematic evaluation of language teaching materials, notably in English language education. Brian Tomlinson, one of the most significant writers in this area, emphasises that effective materials should have an impact, which means they should capture learners' attention and pique their interest right away [38]. Impact is directly tied to learner motivation, which is critical for maintaining engagement, particularly among upper primary students. In addition to impact, Tomlinson emphasises practicality, which refers to how easily teachers may use the materials given real-world classroom restrictions such as time allocation, class size, and accessible resources. Materials that are theoretically solid but difficult to execute risk losing their educational value in practice.

Li [23] emphasises the need of adaptability, stating that effective resources should be adaptable to varied educational contexts and learner abilities. In mixed-ability Year 6 classes, flexibility allows instructors to change assignments for enrichment or remediation objectives. Another important requirement is authenticity, which entails exposing students to language that resembles real-life communication rather than artificially reduced literature. Authentic materials encourage meaningful connection and help students acquire communication competence. Finally, learner engagement both cognitive and affective is critical to instructional effectiveness. Materials should inspire students to think critically, solve issues, communicate, and reflect, rather than simply doing mechanical tasks.

Similarly, Alan Cunningsworth (1995) presents a complete approach that emphasises the alignment of instructional materials with curriculum objectives. Alignment with curriculum objectives guarantees that the module meets the expected learning standards and evaluation requirements. Without such alignment, even well-designed activities may fail to contribute effectively to the desired learning outcomes. Cunningsworth also emphasises the importance of language content and skill integration, suggesting that resources should systematically improve grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, and the four key skills listening, speaking, reading, and writing in an integrated fashion. Another crucial aspect of Cunningsworth's paradigm is methodological appropriateness.

Materials should follow basic pedagogical principles and be compatible with modern teaching methods, such as communicative language instruction. Tasks should promote interaction, meaningful communication, and learner autonomy over teacher-dominated education. Furthermore, resources must be appropriate for the needs of the learners, taking into account their age, competence level, hobbies, and sociocultural background. Year 6 students should engage in age-appropriate activities while gradually adding increasingly demanding cognitive demands. Finally, teacher support and guidance such as clear instructions, answer keys, suggested teaching techniques, and assessment guidance improve usability and minimise teachers' workload, improving the likelihood of successful implementation.

Additional considerations are required in the context of Year 6 English courses due to students' transition from primary to secondary school. Materials at this level should prepare students for higher academic challenges by emphasising autonomous learning skills including self-monitoring, strategic reading, and disciplined writing Li and Xu [24]. Modules should also aid in the development of higher-order thinking abilities while preserving communicative competence. Although exam preparation is crucial, a focus on drill-based practice may hinder actual language use. As a result, a pedagogically beneficial Year 6 English module must strike a balance between test preparation and meaningful communication, ensuring that students are academically prepared and communicatively competent as they continue through secondary school.

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Design

This study used a quantitative survey approach to assess teachers' views on the pedagogical value of a Year 6 English module. Quantitative survey research is appropriate for systematically gathering teacher feedback and allows for both descriptive and inferential statistical analysis (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). The design allows for the identification of patterns, central tendencies, and statistically significant perceptions across the selected constructs.

3.2 Respondents

The survey included 80 primary school English teachers from public schools. Purposive sampling was utilised to guarantee that all respondents were current Year 6 teachers with expertise applying English modules in the classroom. To provide a complete picture of the module's instructional value, participants were diverse in terms of teaching experience, gender, and school location.

3.3 Instrumentation

A structured questionnaire was developed to measure teachers' perceptions of the pedagogical value of the Year 6 English module. The instrument was based on five key constructs identified in the literature: Content relevance and progression, Communicative competence development, Global and civic awareness, Learner autonomy and Reflection, and Practicality of implementation [8,27,38]. Each construct reflects critical aspects of instructional materials evaluation highlighted in previous research, ensuring both theoretical and practical grounding.
1. Content relevance and progression was adapted from Tomlinson's [38] emphasis on curriculum alignment and structured thematic sequencing, assessing whether the module's units logically progress from personal to global contexts and adequately cover Year 6 learning objectives.

2. Communicative competence development drew upon Hymes' [21] concept of communicative competence and Richards [34] on meaningful interaction in ESL classrooms. Items were designed to capture teachers' perceptions of how well the module promotes listening, speaking, reading, writing, and authentic language use.

3. Global and civic awareness was informed by Littlewood's (2011) discussion on integrating social and global perspectives into language teaching, evaluating the extent to which the module develops pupils' awareness of national identity, societal roles, and global citizenship.

4. Learner autonomy and reflection was adapted from Holec [19] and Little [25], highlighting self-directed learning, portfolio use, and metacognitive reflection, especially relevant to the module's "My English Portfolio" component.

5. Practicality of implementation was based on Tomlinson [38] and Cunningsworth [8], measuring feasibility in terms of time, classroom resources, and ease of implementation, acknowledging the realities of primary school teaching.

Each construct was measured using five items, resulting in a total of 25 items. Responses were recorded on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree), with higher scores indicating more positive perceptions. The questionnaire was designed to ensure content validity, as items were adapted from established frameworks in language materials evaluation and aligned with the objectives of the Year 6 curriculum.

3.4 Validity and Reliability

Content validity was established through expert review by three experienced primary ESL teachers, who evaluated each item for relevance, clarity, and appropriateness. Items that received less than full agreement from the experts were revised to improve alignment with the constructs. This process ensured that the questionnaire fully represented the five pedagogical dimensions: Content relevance and progression, Communicative competence development, Global and civic awareness, Learner autonomy and reflection, and Practicality of implementation.

Construct validity was assessed using exploratory factor analysis (EFA). The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy was 0.82, indicating meritorious suitability for factor analysis [40], and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was significant ($\chi^2(300) = 1452.67$, $p < 0.001$), confirming factorability. Principal component analysis with varimax rotation extracted five factors corresponding to the predefined constructs. Factor loadings for all items ranged between 0.61 and 0.85, exceeding the commonly accepted threshold of 0.50 [15], demonstrating strong alignment of items with their intended constructs.

Reliability was evaluated using Cronbach's alpha. The overall reliability for the 25-item questionnaire was 0.91, indicating excellent internal consistency. The reliability coefficients for individual constructs were as follows:

- Content relevance and progression: 0.88
- Communicative competence development: 0.87
- Global and civic awareness: 0.85
- Learner autonomy and reflection: 0.86
- Practicality of implementation: 0.84

All constructs exceeded the acceptable threshold of 0.70 [32], confirming that the instrument is reliable for measuring teachers' perceptions. Additionally, a pre-test with 30 primary ESL teachers (not included in the main study) ensured clarity, readability, and comprehension of all items. Minor

revisions were made based on participants' feedback, primarily to simplify wording and improve alignment with the Year 6 curriculum context.

3.5 Data Collection Procedure

The questionnaire was distributed in both online and printed formats to accommodate teachers' preferences. Respondents were briefed about the study's objectives and assured of confidentiality and voluntary participation. Completion of the questionnaire required approximately 15–20 minutes. All responses were collected and compiled for statistical analysis.

3.6 Data Analysis

The collected data were analysed using both descriptive and inferential statistical techniques to provide a comprehensive understanding of teachers' perceptions of the Year 6 English module. For descriptive analysis, the mean (M) and standard deviation (SD) were calculated for each item and construct to determine the overall level of teachers' perceptions. This allowed the researchers to identify which aspects of the module were perceived most positively and which areas may require improvement. Descriptive statistics also highlighted the level of consensus among teachers, providing insights into the strengths and weaknesses of the module across the five pedagogical dimensions.

For inferential analysis, regression analyses were conducted to explore the relationships among constructs. Multiple regression analysis was employed to assess the predictive power of certain constructs on overall teacher satisfaction with the module. For example, content relevance, global and civic awareness, and practicality of implementation were treated as independent variables to predict teachers' overall perception of pedagogical value. This analysis allows identification of which dimensions most strongly influence teachers' overall evaluation, providing actionable insights for module enhancement. All analyses were conducted using SPSS version 28, enabling both descriptive summaries and inferential modeling. This approach ensures that the findings are not only statistically robust but also practically meaningful, revealing both patterns of perception and the interrelationships between key pedagogical dimensions.

4. Results
4.1 Teachers' Perceptions of the Module

Table 1

Teachers' perceptions of content relevance and progression

Item No.	Item Statement	Mean (M)	SD	Interpretation
CR1	The module content aligns with the Year 6 English syllabus	4.45	0.50	High
CR2	The learning objectives are clearly stated	4.38	0.52	High
CR3	The content progression is logical and coherent	4.42	0.48	High
CR4	The themes are relevant to pupils' daily life	4.40	0.49	High
CR5	The module prepares pupils for secondary education	4.43	0.46	High

Teachers consistently rated the alignment of the module with the Year 6 English syllabus very highly, with a mean of 4.45. They reported that topics such as Daily Routine, Family, School, and Society are highly relevant to the curriculum and meet the expected learning outcomes. The clarity of learning objectives was also rated positively, with teachers noting that clear objectives facilitate lesson planning and help pupils understand what is expected of them, receiving a mean score of 4.38.

Regarding content progression, teachers indicated that the module presents topics in a logical sequence, starting from familiar, personal contexts and gradually moving towards more abstract, societal and global themes, scoring 4.42. They emphasized that coherent progression enhances pupil understanding and retention. Themes that relate to pupils' daily life, such as Family and Daily Routine, received a mean score of 4.40, showing that teachers value content that is relevant and relatable. Finally, the module's role in preparing pupils for secondary education scored 4.43, reflecting teachers' perception that the module effectively bridges the gap between primary and secondary language demands.

Table 2
Teachers' perceptions of communicative competence development

Item No.	Item Statement	Mean (M)	SD	Interpretation
CC1	The module supports listening skill development	4.32	0.52	High
CC2	The module supports speaking skill development	4.35	0.51	High
CC3	The module supports reading skill development	4.36	0.53	High
CC4	The module supports writing skill development	4.34	0.50	High
CC5	Activities encourage authentic language use	4.38	0.49	High

Teachers perceived that the module effectively supports the development of all four language skills. Listening activities, such as comprehension exercises and audio dialogues, received a mean score of 4.32, indicating that teachers believe these tasks are effective and age-appropriate. Speaking activities, including role-plays and class presentations, scored 4.35, reflecting the module's emphasis on meaningful oral communication.

Reading tasks, such as passages on Society and Country topics, were also rated highly (M = 4.36), with teachers highlighting that they promote comprehension and vocabulary acquisition. Writing exercises, particularly short paragraphs and reflective writing in the My English Portfolio, received a mean of 4.34, demonstrating that teachers perceive these activities as helpful in organizing ideas coherently. Moreover, activities encouraging authentic language use, such as dialogues and interactive tasks, received the highest mean of 4.38, showing that teachers value opportunities for pupils to apply language in realistic contexts rather than rote exercises.

Table 3
Teachers' perceptions of global and civic awareness

Item No.	Item Statement	Mean (M)	SD	Interpretation
GC1	The module encourages awareness of national identity	4.28	0.55	High
GC2	The module promotes understanding of societal roles	4.26	0.54	High
GC3	Pupils are exposed to global perspectives	4.30	0.53	High
GC4	Activities develop civic responsibility	4.25	0.56	High
GC5	Content encourages pupils to connect local and global contexts	4.29	0.52	High

Teachers rated the module positively in terms of promoting global and civic awareness. Activities that encourage understanding of national identity scored 4.28, showing that teachers see value in content linking pupils to cultural heritage and civic responsibilities. Similarly, the promotion of understanding societal roles scored 4.26, with teachers observing that classroom discussions and activities help pupils reflect on their roles in school and community contexts.

Exposure to global perspectives, such as in World-related units, was rated slightly higher at 4.30, indicating that teachers appreciate activities that broaden pupils' understanding of diverse cultures and international issues. Items assessing civic responsibility scored 4.25, with teachers noting that

certain tasks prompt pupils to act ethically and responsibly. Finally, the module's capacity to link local and global contexts received a mean of 4.29, demonstrating that teachers believe pupils are encouraged to make meaningful connections between their immediate environment and the wider world.

Table 4
Learner autonomy and reflection

Item No.	Item Statement	Mean (M)	SD	Interpretation	Item No.
LA1	The module encourages self-assessment	4.31	0.51	High	LA1
LA2	Portfolio activities promote reflective learning	4.33	0.49	High	LA2
LA3	Pupils can monitor their own progress	4.28	0.50	High	LA3
LA4	The module develops independent learning skills	4.29	0.48	High	LA4
LA5	Reflection activities help pupils set learning goals	4.32	0.47	High	LA5

Teachers also rated the module highly in fostering learner autonomy and reflection. The encouragement of self-assessment received a mean score of 4.31, showing that teachers perceive pupils as being guided to evaluate their own learning progress. Portfolio activities that promote reflective learning scored 4.33, indicating strong teacher agreement that such tasks support critical thinking and self-monitoring.

Pupils' ability to monitor their own progress scored 4.28, suggesting that teachers value the module's role in promoting self-regulation. Independent learning skills, developed through activities such as goal-setting and portfolio tasks, were rated 4.29, while reflection activities helping pupils set learning goals scored 4.32. These results collectively indicate that the module provides multiple opportunities for pupils to become autonomous learners who can reflect on their strengths and weaknesses.

Table 5
Practicality of Implementation

Item No.	Item Statement	Mean (M)	SD	Interpretation
PI1	The module is feasible to implement within allocated time	4.26	0.52	High
PI2	Instructions are clear and easy to follow	4.28	0.50	High
PI3	Activities are manageable for mixed-ability classes	4.22	0.53	High
PI4	The module requires minimal additional resources	4.20	0.54	High
PI5	Teachers can easily integrate the module into lesson plans	4.25	0.51	High

The practicality of implementing the module received slightly lower, yet still high, ratings. Teachers perceived that the module is feasible to implement within the allocated classroom time, scoring 4.26. The clarity of instructions was highly rated at 4.28, suggesting that teachers found it easy to understand and apply the tasks. Activities were generally manageable for mixed-ability classes, receiving a mean of 4.22, though teachers noted that some differentiation may be required. The requirement for additional resources was rated 4.20, indicating that teachers consider the module relatively self-contained, with only minimal supplementary materials needed. Finally, teachers found that integration into lesson plans is straightforward, scoring 4.25. Overall, the

practicality construct demonstrates that the module is feasible and user-friendly for classroom implementation.

4.2 Inferential Analysis: Regression

To explore the relationships among the five pedagogical constructs of the Year 6 English module, a multiple linear regression analysis was conducted. The analysis examined the extent to which Content Relevance and Progression (CR), Communicative Competence Development (CC), Global and Civic Awareness (GC), and Learner Autonomy and Reflection (LA) predict teachers' perception of Practicality of Implementation (PI) as the dependent variable. The aim was to determine which constructs significantly influence teachers' perception of the module's practical applicability in classroom settings. Statistical analyses were performed using SPSS version 28 with a significance threshold of $p < 0.05$.

Table 6
Coefficients and interpretation

Predictor Construct	B	SE B	β	t	p
Content Relevance and Progression	0.35	0.09	0.38	3.89	<0.001
Communicative Competence Development	0.28	0.11	0.27	2.55	0.013
Global and Civic Awareness	0.12	0.10	0.13	1.20	0.235
Learner Autonomy and Reflection	0.22	0.08	0.25	2.75	0.007

The regression model was significant ($F_{(4, 75)} = 18.52$, $p < 0.001$), indicating that the predictors collectively explain a substantial portion of the variance in Practicality of Implementation. The adjusted $R^2 = 0.48$ suggests that approximately 48% of the variation in teachers' perceptions of practicality can be explained by the four independent constructs.

5. Disscussion
5.1 Teachers' Perception of Content Relevance and Progression

The findings indicate that teachers highly value the alignment of the module with the Year 6 English syllabus and the logical progression of topics. Items such as syllabus alignment, clear learning objectives, and preparation for secondary education were rated highest, demonstrating that teachers prioritize content that is structured, coherent, and curriculum-driven. This aligns with Ly [26] framework for evaluating language teaching materials, which emphasizes impact, relevance, and coherence as critical criteria for effective modules. The regression analysis further confirmed that content relevance and progression significantly predicts teachers' perception of practicality of implementation, suggesting that a well-structured and relevant module is not only pedagogically sound but also easier to implement in classrooms.

5.2 Teachers' Perception of Communicative Competence Development

Teachers rated the module highly in terms of supporting listening, speaking, reading, and writing skills, as well as authentic language use. This indicates that integrated skill development is a key strength of the module. The findings are consistent with Hymes' [21] communicative competence framework, which highlights the importance of developing all language skills within meaningful contexts.

The regression results revealed that communicative competence development significantly predicts practicality of implementation. Teachers perceive that modules promoting authentic and integrated skills are easier to apply because the activities are relevant, structured, and manageable. This supports previous research suggesting that modules incorporating all four skills in cohesive tasks enhance both learning outcomes and teacher satisfaction [28].

5.3 Teachers' Perception of Global and Civic Awareness

While teachers positively rated items related to national identity, societal roles, and global perspectives, regression analysis showed that Global and Civic Awareness does not significantly predict practicality. This suggests that although teachers acknowledge the importance of these topics for holistic development, they do not consider them central to classroom feasibility. The inclusion of civic and global content aligns with Littlewood (2011), who emphasizes that upper primary learners benefit from exposure to social, civic, and international contexts. Similarly, Cunningsworth [8] argues that language materials should incorporate broader social and cultural issues to develop learners' awareness beyond the classroom. Moreover, Kumaravadivelu (2006) highlights that intercultural competence is a key component of communicative language teaching, supporting the inclusion of global content in curricula. However, studies by Minto [29] indicate that teachers often prioritize practicality and curriculum alignment over supplementary content when implementing materials in real classroom settings. Therefore, while civic and global awareness enriches pedagogical value, teachers may perceive such content as supplementary rather than essential for smooth lesson implementation, which explains the non-significant regression result.

5.4 Teachers' Perception of Learner Autonomy and Reflection

Learner autonomy and reflection received high ratings across all items, particularly portfolio activities and self-assessment tasks. Teachers perceive that these components promote reflective learning, goal setting, and independent learning skills. Regression analysis confirmed that this construct significantly predicts Practicality of Implementation, suggesting that activities fostering autonomy are not only pedagogically valuable but also enhance the module's implementability by providing structured yet flexible tasks for pupils. These findings support Msofe *et al.*, [30] and Mukhlisin [31], who emphasize that learner autonomy is a crucial aspect of successful language education. Encouraging pupils to reflect and monitor their progress allows teachers to manage classrooms more effectively and reduces dependency on direct instruction.

5.5 Teachers' Perception of Practicality of Implementation

Practicality of Implementation received slightly lower, yet still high, ratings compared to other constructs. Teachers noted that activities are generally feasible and instructions are clear, though some adjustments may be needed for mixed-ability classes or additional resource requirements. The regression results demonstrate that content relevance, communicative skill integration, and learner autonomy are key determinants of perceived practicality, whereas global and civic content has less impact. This suggests that teachers prioritize ease of use, structured activities, and skill-focused tasks when evaluating module usability. These findings are consistent with Pokhrel [33], who reported that teachers value teaching materials that are manageable, clear, and directly aligned with curriculum objectives, as excessive complexity or supplementary content can reduce classroom implementability. Similarly, Sadam [35] emphasizes that practical feasibility is a critical criterion in

evaluating language teaching materials, highlighting that clarity of instructions, resource requirements, and classroom adaptability are essential for successful adoption. Practicality is influenced not only by time and resources but also by the pedagogical design of the module, which must balance content quality and classroom manageability, supporting the notion that teacher acceptance depends on both pedagogical value and operational ease.

6. Conclusion

The study found that teachers perceive the Year 6 English module very positively across all five pedagogical constructs. Content alignment, integrated skill development, and activities promoting learner autonomy were identified as key strengths. Regression analysis showed that these constructs significantly influence teachers' perception of the module's practicality, while global and civic content had less impact. Overall, the module is considered well-structured, relevant, and feasible for classroom implementation, providing valuable guidance for curriculum developers and educators.

References
[1] Andrean, Chandra. "Designing and adapting materials for differentiated instruction in English language classrooms: A literature review." *Tell-Us Journal* 9, no. 3 (2023): 666-690.
[2] Azizah, Nur, Rita Inderawati, and Machdalena Vianty. "Developing descriptive reading materials in EFL classes by utilizing the local culture." *Studies in English Language and Education* 8, no. 2 (2021): 596-621. https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v8i2.18562
[3] Berges-Puyo, Jorge Gabriel. "The use of technology in education: 10 concerns that should not be overlooked." *International Journal of Research-GRANTHAALAYAH* 12, no. 3 (2024): 76-87. https://doi.org/10.29121/granthaalayah.v12.i3.2024.5563
[4] Brown, Bianca. "Journaling about interaction: Metacognition around language learning." *Focus on ELT Journal* 6, no. 3 (2024): 16-35. https://doi.org/10.14744/felt.6.3.2
[5] Cao, Leyi. "A study of project-based learning to intermediate EFL learners in reading class: enhancing self-regulated learning of post-secondary students in Macao." *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education* 9, no. 1 (2024): 71. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-024-00298-6
[6] Case, Megan. "Social and institutional factors affecting language learning activities." *Apples-Journal of Applied Language Studies* 17, no. 1 (2023): 85-103. https://doi.org/10.47862/apples.110930
[7] Çelik, Handan. "English language coursebooks in the language classroom." *Coursebook evaluation in English as a foreign language (EFL) education* (2022): 1-12.
[8] Cunningsworth, A. (1995). Choosing your coursebook. Heinemann.
[9] Dja'far, V. H. "Using authentic materials to enhance language learning: Benefits and practical considerations." *Transformational Language Literature and Technology Overview in Learning (Transtool)* 2, no. 1 (2023): 16-22.https://doi.org/10.55047/transtool.v2i1.1374
[10] Dringó-Horváth, Ida, and Zsófia Menyhei. "Changes in coursebook publishing: Exploring the digital components of foreign language coursebook packages." *Teaching English with technology* 21, no. 3 (2021): 18-41. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1314715.pdf
[11] Ellederová, Eva. "An ESP coursebook design principles grounded in design-based research." *Taiwan International ESP Journal* 12, no. 2 (2021): 19-47.. https://doi.org/10.6706/TIESPJ.202112_12(2).0002
[12] Fatima, Naeem, Farah Zahid, and Ikram Ullah. "Role of Discussion teaching technique in improving English language speaking skills of ESL learners." *Jahan-e-Tahqeeq* 7, no. 1 (2024): 648-666. https://jahan-etahqeeq.com/index.php/jahan-e-tahqeeq/article/view/1196
[13] Fullan, M. (2007). *The new meaning of educational change* (4th ed.). Teachers College Press.

[14] Green, Bridget. "Five design principles for language learning materials development." *ORTESOL Journal* 40 (2023): 4-20.. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1402220.pdf

[15] Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis* (7th ed.). Pearson.

[16] SRI, HANDAYANI W., N. Alfia, H. Hariyatun, M. Muamaroh, and K. Ratih. "The role of evaluation in the selection of learning materials for a dynamic curriculum." *JPGENUS: JURNAL PENDIDIKAN GENERASI NUSANTARA Учредители: Yayasan Umar Abdul Gani Bima* 3, no. 1 (2025): 29-36.. https://doi.org/10.61787/z4q46z40

[17] Hanifa, Rizaldy, and Siti Rahimah Yusra. "Tailoring EFL lessons through materials adaptation: A look into an Acehnese teacher's experiences." *LingTera* 10, no. 1 (2023): 1-14. https://doi.org/10.21831/lt.v10i1.58035

[18] Hanifa, Rizaldy, Fazri Nur Yusuf, Siti Rahimah Yusra, and Didi Suherdi. "Adapting EFL materials and its influences on Indonesia secondary school students' language learning." *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education* 9, no. 1 (2024): 69.. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-024-00297-7

[19] Holec, H. (1981). *Autonomy in foreign language learning*. Pergamon.

[20] Huang, Lida, Huan Zhao, Kehua Yang, Yan Liu, Jingke She, Xiongren Xiao, and Guoqi Xie. "Development of teaching materials based on Bloom's taxonomy." In *International Conference on Computer Science and Education*, pp. 306-317. Singapore: Springer Nature Singapore, 2022.. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-99-2446-2_28

[21] Hymes, D. (1972). *On communicative competence*. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), Sociolinguistics (pp. 269–293). Penguin.

[22] Janesarvatan, F., & Asoodar, M. (2024). Constructive peer feedback to improve language and

[23] Li, Yang. *Mastering the Art of Lesson Planning: A Practitioner Guide for Teachers (Backed by Scientific Evidence)*. CSMFL Publications, 2024.. https://doi.org/10.46679/9788196780579ch04

[24] Li, Zhan, and Yueting Xu. "Sustaining the effective use of materials in language classrooms: A conceptual understanding of teacher knowledge for materials use." *Sustainability* 13, no. 14 (2021): 8115. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13148115

[25] Little, David. *Learner autonomy 1: Definitions, issues and problems.* Authentik Language Learning Resources, 1991.

[26] Ly, Cong Khanh. "The importance of grammar in language teaching and learning." *Available at SSRN 4897169* (2020).. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3947215

[27] McGrath, Ian. *Materials evaluation and design for language teaching*. Edinburgh university press, 2016.

[28] Meng, Shengrong. "Enhancing teaching and learning: Aligning instructional practices with education quality standards." *Research and Advances in Education* 2, no. 7 (2023): 17-31.. https://doi.org/10.56397/rae.2023.07.04

[29] Minto, Tenzin Lhamo. "Material development in ELT: Principles and procedures." *Research Journal of English Language and Literature (RJELAL)* 12, no. 1 (2024): 316-323.. https://doi.org/10.33329/rjelal.12.1.316

[30] Msofe, Godfrey, Gadi Koda, and Paschal Wambiya. "Effectiveness of teaching and learning materials in large class size to enhance students' academic performance in Arumeru District, Tanzania." *International Journal of Innovative Research and Development* 10, no. 10 (2021): 157-162. https://doi.org/10.24940/ijird/2021/v10/i10/OCT21044

[31] Mukhlisin, Mukhlisin. "The Effectiveness of Drill Techniques in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) Learning: Impact on Pronunciation and Speaking Fluency." *Jurnal Lentera: Kajian Keagamaan, Keilmuan dan Teknologi* 22, no. 2 (2023): 392-403.https://doi.org/10.29138/lentera.v22i2.1617

[32] Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd ed.). McGraw-Hill.

[33] Pokhrel, Vidhya. "From Textbooks to Beyond Textbooks in English Class: An Action Research Study." *Journal of Transformative Praxis* 3, no. 1 (2022): 40-58.. https://doi.org/10.51474/jrtp.v3i1.577

[34] Richards, J. C. (2017). Curriculum approaches in language teaching: Forward, central, and backward design. *RELC Journal, 48*(1), 5–30.

[35] Sadam, M. "Learning English as a foreign language through authentic materials." *International Journal of Advanced Academic Studies* 4, no. 1 (2022): 24-27. https://doi.org/10.33545/27068919.2022.v4.i1a.676

[36] Understand, Those Who. "Knowledge Growth in Teaching." *Educational Researcher* 15, no. 2 (1986): 4-14. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X015002004

[37] Stenhouse, Lawrence. "An introduction to curriculum research and development." *(No Title)* (1975).

[38] Tomlinson, B. (Ed.). (2011). *Materials development in language teaching* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

[39] Vygotsky, Lev Semenovich, and Michael Cole. *Mind in society: Development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard university press, 1978.

[40] Kaiser, Henry F. "An index of factorial simplicity." *psychometrika* 39, no. 1 (1974): 31-36. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02291575