

Assessing Student-Designed Teaching Materials in a Learning Material Development Course

Sri Wahyuni ^{1*}, Dyah Nugrahani ², Ratna Wahyu Pusari ³, Siti Fatimah ⁴

Universitas PGRI Semarang

[¹sriwahyuni@upgris.ac.id](mailto:sriwahyuni@upgris.ac.id), [²dyahnugrahani@upgris.ac.id](mailto:dyahnugrahani@upgris.ac.id),
[³ratnawahyu@upgris.ac.id](mailto:ratnawahyu@upgris.ac.id), [⁴sitifatimah@upgris.ac.id](mailto:sitifatimah@upgris.ac.id)

Abstract: English Education Study Program students of *Universitas Persatuan Guru Republik Indonesia* Semarang (UPGRIS) are required to attend the Learning Material Development (LMD) course. In this class, students are learning about preparing material and teaching media for English classes. The final product of the course is handouts as the teaching materials, designed according to the guidelines provided by the lecturer. However, the teaching materials resulting from the design need to be assessed to determine their suitability or acceptability as teaching materials that can be used by stakeholders. The purpose of this study is to describe the results of the assessment of teaching materials in the Learning Material Development course of the English Education Study Program, Universitas PGRI Semarang. The assessment of teaching materials is carried out through several stages, namely 1) evaluation of material presentation, 2) linguistic evaluation, 3) evaluation of teaching material content, and graphic evaluation. Furthermore, the evaluation data is described qualitatively. Based on the findings, it can be concluded that: 1) the teaching materials are considered feasible for publication, 2) the teaching materials are concluded to have the materials presentation feasibility, and also feasibility for language, content, and graphics.

Keywords: Assessment, Teaching Material, Learning Material Development Course

INTRODUCTION

Learning Material Development (LMD) is a required course where students are expected to develop learning materials that not only embed innovation but are also appropriate for use in learning. As follows the enactment of the *Merdeka Belajar Kampus Merdeka (MBKM)* curriculum (Kemendikbud, 2021), the participation of practitioners in the learning process increases the relevance and acceptability of the education products created. In this study, the analysis was on the project of making handouts for the learning material.

Designing handouts as learning materials must meet numerous requirements, including the feasibility of content, language, presentation, and illustrations. (Cunningsworth, 1995) suggests four criteria for evaluating textbooks: (1) the textbook should correspond to the learner's needs; (2) the textbook should reflect the uses (present or future) which learner will make of the language; (3) textbook should take account of student's needs as learners and should facilitate their learning processes, without dogmatically imposing a rigid method; and (4) textbook should have a clear role as a support tool.

Nevertheless, there is not much that has passed the stage of feasibility assessment, particularly in content, presentation, language, and graphics. However, many teaching materials have not gone through the feasibility evaluation process, especially in terms of content, presentation, language, and graphics (Nurmairina et al., 2022). These criteria are in line with the evaluation framework of (Mukundan & Nimehchisalem, 2012) and (William, 2004), which has become an important reference in textbook evaluation. This evaluation is crucial to ensure

that teaching materials are not only in line with the syllabus (Irawan, 2017) but also able to effectively meet the needs of students (Irawan, 2017) ; (Nurdianasari et al., 2023).

Recent international studies have emphasized that evaluating the alignment between curriculum, instructional materials, and assessment practices is essential to ensure that learning outcomes are met (Haleem & Saeed, 2022; Yu et al., 2022; Zhao et al., 2023). Roberts et al. (2022) emphasized the development and validation of the Malaysian English Language Textbook Evaluation Checklist (MELTEC) using the Rasch Measurement Model to address the shortcomings of existing instruments and ensure contextual relevance. Similarly, (Nurdiana & Junita, 2022) proposed an adapted evaluation checklist model that incorporates local cultural contexts to suit both local and international English coursebooks. (Samoudi & Mohammadi, 2021) adopted a two-phase evaluation approach combining external and internal assessments to better align materials with pedagogical needs and learner realities. (Khaerudin & Chik, 2021) also identified the possibility of textbooks facilitating learner autonomy but specifically under national curriculum requirements, and that most ELT textbooks do not afford adequate autonomy support for learning.

With this consideration, (Tomlinson, 2023) emphasizes the integration of language acquisition principles into materials development, while (Richards, 2021) and (Macalister, J., & Nation, 2020) emphasize the importance of curriculum-teaching materials-local needs alignment. In addition, (Toledo-Sandoval (2020) states that local culture adaptation in instructional materials is an important element in increasing student engagement.

These findings also align with broader curriculum-material alignment studies from other contexts that call for contextualized, standards-aligned, and learner-responsive textbook development (Irfan & Mahmood, 2025; Malik, 2024; Suh, 2023).

This study aims to evaluate teaching materials that have been prepared by students in the LMD course of the English Education Study Program at Universitas PGRI Semarang. The students' handouts were evaluated based on the following criteria: 1) evaluation of material presentation, 2) linguistic evaluation, 3) evaluation of teaching material content, and graphic evaluation. Furthermore, the evaluation data is described qualitatively. By using a descriptive qualitative approach and assessment by material experts, this research is expected to produce teaching materials that are valid and useful for students and teachers, as well as being a model of learning at the junior high school, high school, and college levels.

RESEARCH METHOD

The research method used in this study is descriptive qualitative. Data collection techniques include documentation techniques and expert judgment. The documents analyzed were teaching materials compiled by students in the Learning Material Development class and the results of validation by material experts. The data analysis technique used is content analysis (Miles & Huberman, 2012). The analysis steps were data collection, data reduction, data presentation, and verification or conclusions carried out with the following research stages. To determine the feasibility of the teaching material designed by the students, an assessment was conducted for content, presentation, language, and graphics (Senowarsito et al., 2023).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This study aimed to evaluate the quality of handouts developed by students in the Learning Material Development (LMD) class through expert validation. Two material experts were involved in assessing the teaching materials based on four key aspects: presentation, content, language, and graphic feasibility. Five handouts were evaluated and are coded as follows for clarity: HO1 (Fun with English – Grade VII),

HO2 (Let's Study English with Me – Grade VIII), HO3 (Everything is English – Grade X), HO4 (English Handout for High School – Grade XI), and HO5 (English in Focus – Grade XI). These materials represent students' project-based outputs and were examined to determine their potential classroom applicability.

1. Presentation Feasibility

Table 1 displays the expert validation scores for the presentation aspect. Five evaluative criteria were used: general organization, organization per chapter, meaningfulness and usefulness, student involvement, and support for knowledge construction.

Table 1. Presentation Feasibility

| No | Aspect | Evaluative Criteria | Score from Validator 1 | | | | | Score from Validator 2 | | | | |
|----|--|---|------------------------|------|------|------|------|------------------------|------|------|------|------|
| | | | HO 1 | HO 2 | HO 3 | HO 4 | HO 5 | HO 1 | HO 2 | HO 3 | HO 4 | HO 5 |
| 1 | General presentation organization | General presentation suitability | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 |
| 2 | Presentation organization per chapter | Suitability per chapter presentation | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 |
| 3 | Considering meaningfulness and usefulness | Suitability of material presentation with meaning and usefulness for the students | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 |
| 4 | Actively involved the students | Presentation suitability with the student's active involvement | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 |
| 5 | Develop the process of knowledge formation | Presentation suitability with the student's knowledge development | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 |

Scores 1-4 indicated the level of importance according to this key:

1: less appropriate 2: Fairly appropriate 3: Appropriate 4: very appropriate

The data indicate that most handouts received a score of “3” (appropriate) across validators, with occasional “4” (very appropriate) ratings, especially for HO1 in general organization and HO3 in per-chapter presentation. This pattern suggests that the students' materials generally met the expectations of appropriate presentation structures.

The consistency across scores indicates that the student developers demonstrated an understanding of basic material organization aligned with pedagogical standards. These findings are consistent with the principles of instructional material development described by Lowell & Moore (2020), who emphasizes the need for coherent structure and learner relevance in material design. Furthermore, the frequent scoring of “3” reflects that while the materials are

suitable, there is room for enhancement, particularly in engaging students and deepening knowledge construction.

A closer look at HO1 shows slightly higher evaluations, particularly in “student involvement” and “general organization,” which suggests that materials for lower grades may have been more intuitively designed for active learning. This aligns with findings by Ribosa & Duran (2022), who noted that beginner-level materials often integrate more interactive elements due to learners’ developmental needs.

The novelty of this study lies in its focus on student-created materials in a pre-service teacher training context. Unlike prior research that primarily analyzes commercially published textbooks ((Bauer-Marschallinger, 2020), this study evaluates grassroots material design from future educators. It contributes to the field by showcasing how pedagogical training programs can serve as incubators for innovative and contextually relevant teaching tools.

2. Description of Content Feasibility

Table 2 below presents the expert validation results for the content feasibility of five student-developed handouts. These handouts are coded as follows: HO1 (Fun with English – Grade VII), HO2 (Let’s Study English with Me – Grade VIII), HO3 (Everything is English – Grade X), HO4 (English Handout for High School – Grade XI), and HO5 (English in Focus – Grade XI).

Table 2. Content Feasibility

| No | Aspect | Evaluative Criteria | Score from Validator 1 | | | | | Score from Validator 2 | | | | |
|----|---|--|------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| | | | HO1 | HO2 | HO3 | HO4 | HO5 | HO1 | HO2 | HO3 | HO4 | HO5 |
| 1 | Suitability of Material Description with Curriculum | Suitability of Material Description with the Syllabus and Lesson Plan | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 2 | Material Completeness | a. Accuracy in selecting text, images, and illustrations with the competencies to be achieved and useful for fulfilling students' curiosity. | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| | | b. Suitability with the concepts and theories of scientific systematics | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| | | c. Suitability of model selection | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| | | with the competencie s that must be achieved | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | d. Suitability of exercises, assignments, and assessments with the demands of authentic assessment | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | |
| 3 | The Depth of the Material | a. Suitability of teaching materials with science development s | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | |
| | | b. Appropriaten ess of features, examples, exercises, and references in teaching materials | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | |
| 4 | Scope of Material | a. Suitability of teaching materials to the student's age | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | |
| | | b. Suitability of teaching materials to students' needs | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | |
| | | c. Suitability of teaching materials to students' interest | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | |
| | | d. Suitability of teaching materials with no elements of racism, pornography, | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | |

or gender
bias

Scores 1-4 indicated the level of importance according to this key:

1: less appropriate 2: Fairly appropriate 3: Appropriate 4: very appropriate

The findings reveal that the five handouts—HO1 through HO5—consistently achieved scores of “3” (appropriate) across most criteria, with occasional “4” (very appropriate), particularly in areas related to curriculum alignment and unbiased content. This pattern indicates a baseline level of content quality suitable for instructional use in junior and senior high schools.

In terms of curriculum alignment, both validators rated HO1 particularly well (score 4), suggesting that the Grade VII material effectively reflected the syllabi and learning objectives. Meanwhile, across all handouts, the scores for “material completeness” and “depth of material” demonstrate moderate strength but indicate room for refinement, especially in scientific systematics and authentic assessments. These elements are essential for meaningful learning as emphasized by Richards (2001), who underscores the need for content to be both pedagogically relevant and cognitively challenging.

The highest score for “depth of material” was given to HO3 and HO4 in their ability to incorporate up-to-date knowledge, which shows that higher-grade handouts were better at including contemporary content and examples. This aligns with Coppola & Pontrello’s (2020) assertion that materials for more advanced learners should evolve beyond static content and reflect real-world, contextual learning.

It is also worth noting that the “scope of material” received mixed ratings. For example, HO1 scored well for student interest and absence of bias (score 4), but HO2 had a lower score in meeting student needs (score 2), indicating a mismatch between material design and student expectations or learning profiles. This finding supports Ribosa & Duran’ (2022b) reminder that effective material design must consider both cognitive and affective learner dimensions. The novelty of this study lies in its examination of student-generated learning materials within a teacher education program, which contrasts with the majority of prior studies that assess institutional or commercial materials (Hunt, 2025; Pu et al., 2025; Viola et al., 2024). This research contributes a unique perspective on how pedagogical training empowers future educators to create contextually tailored and curriculum-aligned resources. Furthermore, the coding of individual handouts (HO1–HO5) and their validation allows for a micro-level analysis that enhances our understanding of pre-service teacher competencies in material development.

3. Description of Language Feasibility

Table 3 presents the results of expert validation on the language feasibility of five student-developed English handouts. Each handout is coded as follows: HO1 (Fun with English – Grade VII), HO2 (Let’s Study English with Me – Grade VIII), HO3 (Everything is English – Grade X), HO4 (English Handout for High School – Grade XI), and HO5 (English in Focus – Grade XI). The language aspects assessed include clarity, communicativeness, interactivity, alignment with students’ cognitive level, and grammatical correctness.

Table 3. Language Feasibility

| No | Aspect | Evaluative Criteria | Score from Validator 1 | | | | | Score from Validator 2 | | | | |
|----|---------------------------------------|---|------------------------|------|------|------|------|------------------------|------|------|------|------|
| | | | HO 1 | HO 2 | HO 3 | HO 4 | HO 5 | HO 1 | HO 2 | HO 3 | HO 4 | HO 5 |
| 1 | Straightforward | The clarity of the language used | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| 2 | Communicative | The communicativeness of the language used | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| 3 | Dialogic-interactive | The language used is dialogic interactive | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 |
| 4 | Conformity with the students' mindset | Suitability of the language used with the students' mindset | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 |
| 5 | Conformity with English rules | Conformity of the language used with English rules | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 |

Scores 1-4 indicated the level of importance according to this key:

1: less appropriate 2: Fairly appropriate 3: Appropriate 4: very appropriate

The validation results indicate that the five handouts—HO1 through HO5—generally met language feasibility standards. Most of the handouts scored '3' (appropriate) across all five aspects, with some higher scores ('4' or very appropriate) especially for HO4 and HO5. For example, HO4 scored '4' in clarity, communicativeness, and grammatical correctness, suggesting it was particularly well-crafted in terms of linguistic precision and audience appropriateness. This supports Teng's (2024) emphasis on the importance of clarity and communicative intent in effective teaching materials. Meanwhile, HO2 received the lowest score ('2') in English rule conformity, which may reflect minor grammatical inconsistencies that need revision.

The use of dialogic and interactive language, as seen in HO1 and HO4 (both scored '4' in this category), indicates the students' awareness of learner-centered communication strategies. These align with Yaşar's (2025) recommendations for engaging classroom discourse that reflects interaction rather than just transmission. Such dialogic strategies are especially vital for promoting learner autonomy and participation in the EFL context.

In terms of cognitive alignment, all handouts scored '3' or '4', suggesting the language level was appropriate for the students' developmental stage. This is consistent with Vygotsky's (1978) notion of the Zone of Proximal Development, which stresses the importance of language that slightly challenges but does not overwhelm learners.

Furthermore, the consistent use of appropriate and moderately complex language throughout the handouts demonstrates the students' developing awareness of audience design—a critical skill in material development that is often underemphasized in teacher training programs.

The novelty of this research lies in its focus on evaluating language feasibility in student-generated handouts produced in a real classroom setting within a teacher education program. While previous studies (Bobkina et al., 2025; Sancho, 2024) have examined textbook language use, this study provides fresh insights into how pre-service teachers apply linguistic principles in practice. By linking evaluation data with coded handout samples (HO1–HO5), the research offers a fine-grained understanding of how language choices reflect pedagogical intent and learner needs.

4. Description of Graphic Feasibility

Table 4 presents the expert validation scores regarding the graphic feasibility of the five handouts developed by students in the Learning Material Development (LMD) class. For clarity, the handouts are coded as follows: HO1 (Fun with English – Grade VII), HO2 (Let's Study English with Me – Grade VIII), HO3 (Everything is English – Grade X), HO4 (English Handout for High School – Grade XI), and HO5 (English in Focus – Grade XI). The evaluation focused on six key criteria: typography, layout, use of symbols, arrangement, visual illustrations, and the suitability of paper type and size.

Tabel 4. Graphic Feasibility

| No | Aspect | Evaluative Criteria | Score from Validator 1 | | | | | Score from Validator 2 | | | | |
|----|------------------------|---|------------------------|------|------|------|------|------------------------|------|------|------|------|
| | | | HO 1 | HO 2 | HO 3 | HO 4 | HO 5 | HO 1 | HO 2 | HO 3 | HO 4 | HO 5 |
| 1 | Letter shape and size | Appropriate shape and size of letters on graphics | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 2 | Layout | Appropriate layout of graphics | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 3 | Symbols | Appropriate symbols on graphics | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 4 | Arrangement | Appropriate arrangement of graphics | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 5 | Pictures/illustrations | Appropriate images or illustrations in graphics | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 6 | Papers | Appropriate paper size and types | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 |

Scores 1-4 indicated the level of importance according to this key:

1: less appropriate 2: Fairly appropriate 3: Appropriate 4: very appropriate

The results show that the student-created handouts are graphically feasible for classroom use, with most scores ranging between “3” (appropriate) and “4” (very appropriate). Overall, handouts HO1 to HO5 met the minimum threshold for graphic design quality, indicating a sufficient level of design awareness and visual literacy among the student developers.

Notably, Validator 1 consistently gave higher scores (“4”) across all aspects for HO1–HO5, particularly in typography and layout, suggesting strong visual consistency and readability. Validator 2, while more moderate in scoring, also recognized improvements in later handouts (e.g., HO3, HO4, and HO5). This might indicate an iterative design learning process among the students, as they became more familiar with graphic design principles.

A closer analysis reveals that handouts HO1 and HO2 performed better in visual illustrations and organization compared to HO3–HO5, which may have included less engaging or mismatched visuals. The importance of relevant illustrations and layout is supported by Leung (2020), who asserts that well-designed materials not only enhance learner motivation but also support comprehension, especially for visual learners.

While Validator 2 marked slightly lower scores in typography (scores of “3”), the overall consistency between the two validators still confirms that the graphics used were appropriate and did not hinder material usability. This echoes findings by Richlin (2023), who emphasize that legibility and layout are foundational to material acceptance in real classroom settings.

The novelty of this research lies in its evaluation of graphic feasibility in *student-generated teaching materials*, a context rarely addressed in existing literature. Previous studies have focused on commercially published books (e.g., Heng-Sheng et al., 2025; Scippo et al., 2025), whereas this study highlights how pre-service teachers develop and apply design principles in hands-on projects. Through direct validation and coding of their work (HO1–HO5), this research offers insight into how graphic literacy is cultivated in teacher education—a crucial but often overlooked component of instructional material development.

5. Description of Assessment Result and Suggestions from Validators 1 and 2

Material experts 1 and 2 provided several assessments and suggestions to be noted and considered in compiling teaching materials for handouts 1-5 (code LMD 1-5). The following tables are a description of the assessment result and suggestions from validator 1 and 2:

Table 5.1. Assessment Result and Suggestions Handout 1(Code LMD1)

| Assessment Criteria | Validator 1 Feedback | Validator 2 Feedback |
|--|---|--|
| Alignment with Learning Outcomes / Curriculum | The material is aligned with the learning outcomes (Capaian Pembelajaran) and consistent with English language learning theories. | The material aligns with the syllabus and the Semester Learning Plan (RPS). |
| Completeness and Appropriateness of Material | Overall appropriate. However, more detail is suggested in selecting text types suitable for students’ growth and development. | Task 2 text is too complicated for 8th-grade students and should be simplified. Task 1 on page 80 is considered too difficult for 7th grade and recommended for higher levels. |
| Conceptual Alignment | Concepts are appropriate, though the presentation needs further attention to ensure clarity and accessibility. | Non-cognitive diagnostic tasks contain elements that remain cognitive; a revision is necessary to distinguish them clearly. |
| Suitability and Relevance of Examples | The examples selected are good and appropriate. | In Activity 2 Task 3, it is recommended that students not only read but also practice the material directly to enhance engagement and learning. |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| Student Benefits and Skill Development | The handout provides sufficient information to help students develop English skills appropriate to their age. | The difficulty and practicality of certain tasks need to be revised to ensure that students at the targeted grade level can benefit effectively. |
| Content Sensitivity and Value Aspects | The material supports gender equality and avoids content related to SARA and pornography, reflecting sensitivity to diversity. | Not specifically mentioned. |
| Language and Clarity | Font style and size are considered appropriate for the students' age. | Language should be simplified for better comprehension, emphasizing clarity and ease of understanding. |
| Visual Elements | Images are attractive and age-appropriate. | Image size should be optimized—large images are not necessary and could be adjusted to improve visual balance and practicality. |

Validator 1 viewed LMD1 as generally appropriate in terms of content, learning outcomes alignment, and conceptual clarity. The examples and scientific grounding were relevant, and the material respected inclusive educational values. However, more attention was needed in selecting text types suitable for student developmental stages. Validator 2 provided deeper critique, highlighting the difficulty level of several tasks (e.g., Task 2 and Task 1 on page 80), which were too advanced for the target grade. The non-cognitive diagnostic content was also still cognitively framed, requiring revision. There was concern over vocabulary complexity and image size. In summary, while LMD1 met many curriculum and visual standards, further simplification and learner-level adjustment were necessary. These findings align with Bermudez (2023) on the importance of material accessibility for young learners..

Table 5.2. Assessment Result and Suggestions Handout 2 (Code LMD2)

| Assessment Criteria | Validator 1 Feedback | Validator 2 Feedback |
|--|--|--|
| Content Completeness and Suitability | The material is generally complete and aligns with the expected scope. However, more care is recommended in selecting text types precisely appropriate to students' age and developmental level. | In Chapter 1 Activity 2, the text is too long and should be shortened. Language complexity also needs adjustment for clarity and accessibility. |
| Alignment with Scientific Systematics | The theoretical concepts and their systematic presentation are appropriate and well-structured. | Chapter 2 content remains too focused on procedural texts. It is suggested to diversify the material to cover different text types relevant to the syllabus. |
| Relevance and Effectiveness of Examples | The examples effectively support the attainment of learning competencies. | No specific comments provided on examples. |
| Authentic Assessment Integration | Training, assignments, and assessments are well-integrated with authentic assessment principles. | In Chapter 2, the learning objectives (goals) are the same as in Chapter 1 and need to be revised to better |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | | distinguish them and match the chapter focus. |
| Relevance to English Language Learning Theory | The teaching materials are consistent with current theories of English language instruction. | No additional feedback provided in this area. |
| Age Appropriateness and Complexity | Generally appropriate for the target age group. However, some material complexity requires simplification to ensure clarity and ease of understanding. | The necessity of using Canva in Chapter 2 Activity 2 for 8th-grade students should be reconsidered, as it may not be fully relevant or practical. |
| Content Sensitivity and Inclusivity | Supports gender equality, avoids SARA elements and pornography, and promotes a safe, inclusive environment. | No additional comments provided. |
| Skill Development Support | Provides sufficient information to help students develop English language skills according to their age. | No additional comments provided. |
| Language and Readability | Font style and size are suitable for the students' age. Some sections could benefit from further simplification for clarity. | The language complexity in Chapter 1 Activity 2 should be reduced to enhance readability and student comprehension. |
| Visual Elements | Images are appealing and age-appropriate. | No specific comments about visuals except the note regarding Canva usage. |
| Title Clarity and Consistency | The title "Let's Study English with Me" is considered redundant and could be revised. It is also suggested to add "Phase A" to the title for clearer categorization and alignment with curriculum phases. | No comments regarding title consistency. |

LMD2 was positively assessed by Validator 1 for its comprehensive content, alignment with English teaching theories, and use of authentic assessment. The examples and visual elements were also deemed effective and age-appropriate. However, suggestions included revising the title for clarity and avoiding redundancy, simplifying complex content, and ensuring better alignment of text types with students' reading levels. Validator 2 focused on redundancy in learning objectives between Chapters 1 and 2 and questioned the appropriateness of using Canva for junior high school students. The long texts in some activities also required shortening to match learners' language proficiency. Overall, while LMD2 was structurally strong and pedagogically sound, its accessibility and tool selection needed refinement. These issues support Nunan's (2004) framework for learner-centered and level-appropriate materials.

Table 5.3. Assessment Result and Suggestions Handout 3(Code LMD3)

| Assessment Criteria | Validator 1 Feedback | Validator 2 Feedback |
|---|--|---|
| Content Completeness and Suitability | The material is largely appropriate, but careful selection of text types is needed | Each chapter should begin with a clear statement of learning objectives (CP/goals) rather than starting |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | to ensure alignment with students' developmental stages. | immediately with principles. A warm-up activity is recommended before core content. |
| Conceptual Alignment | The concepts are suitable, though more attention is needed to ensure the specificity and clarity of the content presented. | No additional feedback provided on conceptual alignment. |
| Relevance and Effectiveness of Examples | Examples are well-chosen and effectively match the learning objectives. | No additional comments provided about examples. |
| Alignment with Current Knowledge/Theory | The materials are consistent with contemporary theories of English language learning. | No additional comments provided in this area. |
| Age Appropriateness and Complexity | Overall content is suitable for the target age group, though some elements should be simplified further to improve clarity. | Clarification is needed in Activity 2 to determine whether the questions are cognitive, non-cognitive, or duplicative. |
| Skill Development Support | Provides sufficient information to help students develop English language skills appropriate to their age. | No additional comments provided. |
| Language and Readability | Font style and size are appropriate for students' age. | The font size in some sections (e.g., the descriptive text on page 18) is unnecessarily large and should be standardized to improve readability and consistency throughout the textbook. |
| Visual Elements | Images are engaging and age-relevant, though some illustrations require better harmonization to create a cohesive visual presentation. | No additional comments about visuals. |

LMD3 was assessed as generally appropriate by Validator 1, with several commendable aspects identified, including conceptual relevance, alignment with current theories of English language learning, and attention to age-appropriate design. The material was noted to be largely complete and supported with well-chosen examples that effectively reflect the stated learning goals. Font style, layout, and illustrations were also seen as visually appropriate and engaging. However, the validator emphasized that more precise selection of text types was needed to align with students' developmental readiness, especially considering the linguistic and cognitive levels of junior high school learners. This aligns with Tomlinson's (2012) argument that materials must cater to learner needs not only in terms of content, but also in terms of developmental appropriateness and readability.

Validator 2 offered more specific and technical feedback, particularly on structure and clarity. The absence of clearly defined learning objectives at the beginning of each chapter was seen as a pedagogical weakness, as it limits students' ability to frame their learning. Furthermore, questions in Activity 2 required clarification regarding whether they targeted cognitive or non-cognitive domains. The validator also noted inconsistencies in font size—especially in descriptive sections such as page 18—calling for a standardized format. LMD3's novelty lies in its role as a product of pre-service teacher material development, bridging theoretical knowledge and practical application—an underrepresented area in existing textbook evaluation literature (Nunan, 2004; Paine & McMahon, 2023).

Table 5.4. Assessment Result and Suggestions Handout 4(Code LMD4)

| Assessment Criteria | Validator 1 Feedback | Validator 2 Feedback |
|--|--|---|
| Content Completeness and Suitability | The content is complete and aligns with the learning objectives. Some material complexity should be reconsidered to ensure accessibility for the target age group. | Text choices should be more closely matched to the students' class level. Some texts might be better suited for junior high. It is recommended to explore alternative "blanket" texts to ensure better appropriateness. |
| Alignment with Concepts and Theory | The concepts and theories used are appropriate and align with current English language learning practices. | The grammar focus on page 25 was questioned as possibly too basic for 11th graders. A review is suggested to confirm the level of difficulty is appropriate. |
| Relevance and Effectiveness of Examples | Examples are good and effectively support the competencies targeted in the material. | Text 2 should not be presented in multiple-choice format; it is recommended to use an alternative structure more suitable to the objectives. |
| Training, Assignments, and Authentic Assessment Integration | Training activities, assignments, and authentic assessments are well-designed and align with the learning goals. | Combining vocabulary building with material and "make dialogue" activities may be too difficult; clearer separation or scaffolding is recommended to avoid overwhelming students. |
| Alignment with Current Knowledge/Theory | Materials are consistent with contemporary theories and current scientific advancements in English language learning. | No additional comments provided in this area. |
| Age Appropriateness and Complexity | Generally suitable for the target age group. Some parts would benefit from | Grammar and text selection should be carefully evaluated to ensure content is neither too basic nor too advanced for 11th grade. |

| | | |
|----------------------------------|---|--|
| | simplification to improve clarity and engagement. | |
| Skill Development Support | The material provides sufficient information for students to develop English skills appropriate to their level. | No additional comments provided. |
| Language and Readability | Font type and size are appropriate for students' age. | Font and spacing should be adjusted to comply with established textbook and teaching material standards to enhance readability and visual consistency. |
| Visual Elements | Images are engaging and appropriate, though a few visuals should be harmonized for a more cohesive look. | No specific comments about visuals. |

Handout 4 (LMD4) received overall positive evaluations from both validators, particularly in terms of its conceptual clarity, task variety, and structural coherence. Validator 1 appreciated the content completeness and the logical alignment between the presented concepts and current theories of English language teaching. Authentic assessment components, such as assignments and exercises, were found to be appropriate, and the material was seen as adequately supporting the development of students' English language competencies. Nonetheless, the validator recommended simplifying certain complex segments and enhancing illustration quality to better support visual learning, which aligns with Tomlinson's (2012) emphasis on visual appeal and comprehensibility in ELT materials. The validator also noted that the font and layout were already suitable for the target age group.

Validator 2's feedback emphasized a more fine-grained adjustment of text types and task formats. While Text 1 was deemed suitable for Grade XI, Text 2's multiple-choice format was seen as limiting and less conducive to communicative competence. The validator also questioned whether the grammar focus on page 25 was too elementary for senior high students, suggesting a need for alignment with their actual proficiency level. Font sizing and spacing consistency were also identified as areas needing refinement to meet standard publishing conventions.

The novelty of LMD4 lies in its integration of authentic assessment and student-centered task sequencing developed by pre-service teachers—an aspect rarely addressed in previous studies, which often center on post-publication textbook evaluation (Wilson, 2020; Yu et al., 2022). This study provides new insight into how future educators conceptualize effective material development during their training phase, bridging theory and classroom practicality.

Table 5.5. Assessment Result and Suggestions Handout 5 (Code LMD5)

| Assessment Criteria | Validator 1 Feedback | Validator 2 Feedback |
|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------|

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Content Completeness | The content is generally complete and aligned with the learning objectives. Visual illustrations should be improved to better support student understanding. | The sequence of activities needs improvement, particularly the inclusion of pre-activities in the material structure. |
| Alignment with Concepts and Theory | Concepts and theoretical framework are appropriate. However, more consideration of the material's complexity is recommended to ensure it matches student proficiency. | Text selection should better reflect students' language level and current trends relevant to their age group, emphasizing contextual and age-appropriate language teaching. |
| Relevance of Examples to Learning Competencies | Examples are relevant and effectively support the intended competencies. | Vocabulary exercises should not rely solely on translation. More varied strategies—such as synonym or antonym identification—are suggested to strengthen competency development. |
| Training, Assignments, and Assessment | Learning activities, assignments, and authentic assessments are appropriate and well-aligned with learning goals. | Clearer distinction is needed between cognitive and non-cognitive questions. Some non-cognitive questions contain grammatical errors; a thorough review and revision are recommended. |
| Relevance to Current Developments in the Field | Teaching materials align with current theories in English language learning. | More interactive and varied approaches are suggested for vocabulary and activity design to promote contemporary and effective instructional practices. |
| Typography and Visual Elements | Font type and size are appropriate for the target age group. Images are generally engaging and age-relevant, although a few are overly childish and should be adjusted. | Font size should comply with established textbook publishing standards to ensure readability and consistency. |

LMD5 was assessed as generally well-structured and aligned with pedagogical standards by both validators. Validator 1 emphasized that the content appropriately reflects the intended learning objectives, supported by relevant examples and authentic assessment components. The theoretical framework was considered sound; however, attention was drawn to the complexity of material presentation, with suggestions to ensure alignment with students' proficiency levels. The handout's visuals were seen as engaging, though some illustrations were deemed too childish and thus in need of refinement. Typography—both in terms of font type and size—was judged appropriate for the target age group.

Validator 2 provided more focused feedback on sequencing and language practice. A key issue was the absence of pre-activities, which limits learner readiness and engagement. Additionally, the text selection should better reflect students' linguistic capabilities and contemporary topics. Vocabulary practice tasks were advised to move beyond translation to include synonyms or antonyms, supporting deeper lexical competence. The distinction between cognitive and non-cognitive questions needed to be clearer, and some grammatical errors were identified in the tasks. Font size and layout consistency also required revision to align with textbook publishing standards.

This study offers a novel contribution by evaluating handouts created by pre-service teachers—a rarely explored area in contrast to post-use textbook (Malik, 2024; Wilson, 2020;

Yu et al., 2022). It provides insight into how novice educators integrate pedagogical theory, curriculum alignment, and learner engagement into instructional material development

CONCLUSION

This study found that the five handouts developed by pre-service teachers in the Learning Material Development (LMD) course met the essential feasibility standards in four main aspects: presentation, content, language, and graphics, as validated by two material experts. Each handout showed strengths in its alignment with learning objectives, visual appeal, task appropriateness, and pedagogical structure, although revisions were recommended—particularly regarding content complexity, activity design, and visual consistency. The contribution of this study lies in its focus on material development by pre-service teachers, an area that remains underexplored in previous research which tends to evaluate commercial textbooks post-publication. By involving novice teachers in material design and analysis, this research bridges theoretical coursework and real-world application, providing a practical model for curriculum-integrated teaching material development. The findings offer significant implications for teacher education programs, particularly in preparing students to create pedagogically sound, engaging, and curriculum-aligned materials. The fact that these handouts have been registered with copyright status also adds legal and practical value to their usability in educational contexts. Future research is recommended to evaluate the classroom implementation and student responses to these materials, as well as to explore digital or multimodal adaptations to meet evolving learning needs in diverse educational settings.

REFERENCES

- Bauer-Marschallinger, S. (2020). Involving students in educational design: How student voices contribute to shaping transdisciplinary CLIL history materials. *Journal for the Psychology of Language Learning*, 2(2), 107–117.
<http://creativecommons.org/licences/by-sa/44.0/>
<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1338231.pdf>
- Bermudez, A. (2023). *Investigating the impact of learner-centered and co-designed sex and relationship curriculum by college students*. search.proquest.com.
https://repository.arizona.edu/bitstream/handle/10150/670874/azu_etd_21125_sip1_m.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y
- Bobkina, J., Baluyan, S., & Romero, Elena Dominguez. (2025). Tech-enhanced vocabulary acquisition: Exploring the use of student-created video learning materials in the tertiary-level EFL (English as a foreign language) flipped classroom. *Education Sciences*, 15(450). <https://www.mdpi.com/2227-7102/15/4/450>
- Coppola, B. P., & Pontrello, J. K. (2020). Student-generated instructional materials. In *Active learning in college science: The case for ...* (pp. 385–407). Springer.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-33600-4_24
- Cunningsworth. (1995). *Choosing your coursebook*. New York: Macmillan.
- Haleem, B., & Saeed, M. (2022). Alignment between Urdu curriculum and textbooks at secondary level. *Pakistan Journal of Society, Education and Language*, 9(1), 416–423.
<https://pjsel.jehanf.com/index.php/journal/article/view/1055>
- Heng-Sheng, L., Chiang, C. Y., Huang, Cheng-Wei, Wu, Chao-Cian, & Hong, Shuo-Jun. (2025). From gamer to game designer: Task-oriented game design learning to improve learning motivation. *International Journal of Game-Based Learning*, 15(1).

<https://eric.ed.gov/?q=%22use+of+games+in+teaching%252&id=EJ1471724>

- Hunt, K. (2025). I understood the assignment: Short-form videos in the international studies classroom. *International Studies Perspectives*.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/isp/ekaf006/8155672>
- Irawan, D. (2017). Developing process approach-based reading textbook for grade IV students. *Jurnal Prima Edukasia*, 5(2), 139–150. <https://doi.org/10.21831/jpe.v5i2.13745>
- Irfan, M., & Mahmood, N. (2025). An evaluative study of the alignment between primary level textbooks and the national curriculum for English. *Journal of Childhood Literacy and Societal Issues*, 4(1). <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1495-7084>
- Kemendikbud. (2021). *Panduan implementasi kebijakan kampus merdeka (MBKM)*. 1–66. <https://lldikti13.kemdikbud.go.id/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/Panduan-Implementasi-Kebijakan-Merdeka-Belajar-Kampus-Merdeka-MBKM.pdf>
- Khaerudin, T., & Chik, A. (2021). Evaluating supports for learner autonomy in ELT textbooks. *Journal of Asia TEFL*, 18(1), 39–56.
<https://doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2021.18.1.3.39>
- Leung, A. (2020). Boundary crossing pedagogy in STEM education. *International Journal of STEM Education*, 7(15). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40594-020-00212-9>
- Lowell, V. L., & Moore, R. L. (2020). Developing practical knowledge and skills of online instructional design students through authentic learning and real-world activities. *TechTrends*, 64, 581–590. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-020-00518-z>
- Macalister, J., & Nation, I. S. P. (2020). *Language curriculum design*. Routledge.
- Malik, S. (2024). Alignment of Punjab Textbook Board's English textbooks with the national curriculum for English (2006): An evaluative study. *Linguistics and Literature Review*, 10(2), 143–171.
<https://doi.org/10.32350/llr.102.08>
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (2012). Analisis data kualitatif: Buku sumber tentang metode-metode baru. In *Qualitative data analysis*. Penerbit Universitas Indonesia.
<https://lib.ui.ac.id/detail.jsp?id=20399460>
- Mukundan, J., & Nimehchisalem, V. (2012). Evaluative criteria of an English language textbook evaluation checklist. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 3(6), 1128–1134. <https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.3.6.1128-1134>
- Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-based language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
- Nurdiana, & Junita. (2022). Adapted criteria and a model of evaluation checklist for English coursebooks. *Journal of Language, Literature, and Teaching (JLLTE)*, 2(2), 1–16.
<http://jllte.stbapia.ac.id/index.php/jurnalhttp://jllte.stbapia.ac.id/index.php/jurnal>
- Nurdianasari, N., Hasanah, S. A., Finali, Z., Hutama, F. S., & Satrijono, H. (2023). Evaluation of the feasibility of the content of the integrated thematic book with the theme of our friend's environment for SD/MI class V published by Erlangga with the 2013 curriculum criteria. *Widyagogik : Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Pembelajaran Sekolah Dasar*, 10(2), 312–323. <https://doi.org/10.21107/widyagogik.v10i2.18182>
- Nurmairina, N., Syaimi, K. U., & Juwita, P. (2022). Feasibility analysis of 2013 curriculum teaching books in class VII junior high school Social Studies subjects. *Literatus*, 4(3), 1145–1151. <https://doi.org/10.37010/lit.v4i3.1089>
- Paine, R. L., & McMahon, B. (2023). The workshop model: Teaching ways of knowing and doing. *The 7th International Conference for Design Education Researchers*, 29 November - 1 December 2023, London, United Kingdom.

- <https://dl.designresearchsociety.org/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1390&context=learnxdesign>
- Pu, I., Ravi, P., Dinh, L. D., Joe, C., Ogoe, C., Li, Z., Breazel, Cynthia, & Ostrowski, Anastasia K. (2025). “How can we learn and use AI at the same time?”: Participatory Design of GenAI with High School Students. *PIDC '25: Proceedings of the 24th Interaction Design and Children*, 204–220. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3713043.3727057>
- Ribosa, J., & Duran, D. (2022a). Do students learn what they teach when generating teaching materials for others? A meta-analysis through the lens of learning by teaching. *Educational Research Review*, 37. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2022.100475>
- Ribosa, J., & Duran, D. (2022b). Student-generated teaching materials: a scoping review mapping the research field. *Education in the Knowledge Society (EKS)*, 22. <https://revistas.usal.es/tres/index.php/eks/article/download/27443/28462?inline=1>
- Richards, J. C. (2021). *Curriculum development in language teaching (2nd ed.)*. Cambridge University Press.
- Richlin, L. (2023). *Blueprint for learning: Constructing college courses to facilitate, assess, and document learning*. Virginia: Stylus Publishing, LLC.
- Roberts, F., Aziz, A. A., & Matore, M. E. E. M. (2022). Establishing the validity and reliability of the Malaysian English language textbook evaluation checklist (MELTEC) using Rasch measurement model (RRM). *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 13(1), 38–45. <https://doi.org/10.17507/JLTR.1301.05>
- Samoudi, N., & Mohammadi, M. (2021). A Two-phase Evaluation of an ELT Textbook. *The Journal of English Language Pedagogy and Practice*, 14(28), 111–134. <http://dx.doi.org/10.30495/JAL.2021.686872>
- Sancho, N. C. (2024). *Enhancing English oral skills through student-created podcasts: An innovative teaching proposal addressed to 6th graders in primary education*. <https://openaccess.uoc.edu/items/d8900e5c-ae88-417f-845a-34d59fdc7e59>
- Scippo, S., Madiari, S., & Cuomo, S. (2025). Digital tessellation for geometry learning in primary school: A quasi-experimental study. *Journal of Information Technology Education*, 24(1). <https://doi.org/10.28945/5473>
- Senowarsito, S., Suwandi, S., Musarokah, S., & Nur Ardini, S. (2023). The analysis of feasibility in EFL textbook: A contribution to Kurikulum Merdeka. *Arab World English Journal*, 9, 305–319. <https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/call9.21>
- Suh, H. (2023). Curriculum materials and educative opportunities: Observing teacher positionings from teachers’ guides. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 51(2), 128–146. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1359866X.2023.2174073>
- Teng, M. F. (2024). A Systematic Review of ChatGPT for English as a Foreign Language Writing: Opportunities, Challenges, and Recommendations. In *International Journal of TESOL Studies*. tesolunion.org. <https://doi.org/10.58304/ijts.20240304>
- Toledo-Sandoval, F. (2020). Local culture and locally produced ELT textbooks: How do teachers bridge the gap? *System*, 95, 102362. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102362>
- Tomlinson, B. (2023). *Developing materials for language teaching (3rd ed.)*. Bloomsbury Academic.
- Viola, G., Ferretti, F., Gambini, A., Francesca, M., & ... (2024). Teachers’ professional development and mathematics LSA: First result of national project. *SFERA Archivio Dei Prodotti Della Ricerca Dell’Università Di Ferrara*, 1(47). <https://iris.unife.it/handle/11392/2572934>

- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes* (E. Souberman (ed.)). Harvard University Press.
- William, D. (2004). Developing Criteria for Text Book Evaluation. *ELT Journal*, 37(3), 251–255. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/37.3.251>
- Wilson, J. P. (2020). *An evaluation of the Tennessee Textbook and Instructional Materials Quality Commission*. <https://digitalcommons.memphis.edu>.
- Yaşar, M. Ö. (2025). Developing self-regulated learning in ELT through a video-based pedagogical framework (VIDPEF): A conceptual model for EFL learners. *Studies in Self-Access Learning Journal*, 16(1), 76–99. <https://doi.org/10.37237/160105>
- Yu, J., Li, C., & Li, G. (2022). Alignment between biology curriculum standards and five textbook editions: a content analysis. *International Journal of Science Education*, 44(14), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2022.2119621>
- Zhao, L., Zhao, B., & Li, C. (2023). Alignment analysis of teaching–learning–assessment within the classroom: how teachers implement project-based learning under the curriculum standards. *Disciplinary and Interdisciplinary Science Education*, 5(13). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s43031-023-00078-1>