

English Educators' Prospective Evaluation of a Reader's Theatre Programme for Indigenous Students in Rural Pahang

Nik Amirul Afiq Nik Hassim^{1*}, Fatihah Hashim², Nik Siti Maisarah Abd Rahman³,
Rusreena Rusli⁴, Nur Syafawati Sabuan⁵

¹Academy of Language Studies, Universiti Teknologi MARA, 40450 Shah Alam, Selangor, Malaysia
Email: nikamirulafiq@uitm.edu.my

²Academy of Language Studies, Universiti Teknologi MARA, 40450 Shah Alam, Selangor, Malaysia
Email: fatihahhashim@uitm.edu.my

³Academy of Language Studies, Universiti Teknologi MARA, 40450 Shah Alam, Selangor, Malaysia
Email: niksitimaisarah@uitm.edu.my

⁴Academy of Language Studies, Universiti Teknologi MARA, 40450 Shah Alam, Selangor, Malaysia
Email: rusreena@uitm.edu.my

⁵Centre for Modern Languages, Universiti Malaysia Pahang Al-Sultan Abdullah, 26600 Pekan, Pahang, Malaysia
Email: nursya@ump.edu.my

ABSTRACT

CORRESPONDING

AUTHOR (*):

Nik Amirul Afiq Nik Hassim
(nikamirulafiq@uitm.edu.my)

KEYWORDS:

Reader's Theatre
Speaking skills
Orang Asli education
Intervention acceptance
English language teaching

CITATION:

Nik Amirul Afiq, N. H., Fatihah, H., Nik Siti Maisarah, A. R., Rusreena, R., & Nur Syafawati, S. (2026). English Educators' Prospective Evaluation of a Reader's Theatre Programme for Indigenous Students in Rural Pahang. *Malaysian Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities (MJSSH)*, 11(9), e004195.
<https://doi.org/10.47405/mjssh.v11i9.4195>

Reader's Theatre may offer a structured and engaging approach to developing English speaking skills, but an intervention intended for Orang Asli adolescents should be assessed prospectively before claims about effectiveness are made. This survey evaluated English educators' opinions and overall acceptance of a proposed Reader's Theatre intervention designed to improve the speaking skills of students aged 13–15 at CEFR A1–B1 levels in rural Pahang. A cross-sectional online survey was completed by a purposive sample of 45 educators with secondary-school English-teaching and Indigenous-student teaching experience. Likert-type items were analysed individually using frequencies, medians, interquartile ranges and favourable-response proportions with Wilson 95% confidence intervals; unable-to-judge responses were retained as a separate category. Evaluations were mixed. Professional fit (59.0%), programme clarity (56.4%), perceived classroom implementability (60.0%) and understanding of the proposed steps (58.1%) received the strongest favourable responses. Overall acceptance was 35.9%, support for proceeding with a monitored pilot was 29.7%, and only 30.0% judged the anticipated burden to be low. Uncertainty was particularly evident for the proposed one-day format, which 28.9% were unable to judge. The most frequently selected requirements were facilitator briefing or training (80.0%), additional rehearsal time (66.7%), and both logistical support and smaller groups or more facilitators (60.0% each). The findings indicate conditional rather than general acceptance. They support culturally reviewed co-design and a closely monitored pilot

before the intervention's effect on speaking skills is evaluated.

1. Introduction

Reader's Theatre is a performance-oriented form of repeated and interpretive reading in which learners use scripts, voice and collaborative rehearsal to communicate meaning without the production demands of conventional theatre. Its combination of supported reading, oral practice and group performance has made it attractive in English-language education, particularly where learners may benefit from a purposeful reason to reread a text. Recent evidence, however, does not justify treating Reader's Theatre as uniformly effective across outcomes and contexts. A systematic review and meta-analysis found overall benefits for reading development while also documenting variation in designs, populations and outcomes (Mastrothanasis et al., 2023). In a Taiwanese seventh-grade study, Reader's Theatre improved reading but not listening comprehension (Lo, Wen, & Lin, 2021), whereas another secondary-school study found that favourable interview accounts coexisted with non-significant quantitative reading results and anxiety during immediate reading (Lo, Lu, & Cheng, 2021). A randomised study in special education similarly underscores that effects depend on the programme model, target outcome and implementation conditions (Hautala et al., 2023).

These qualifications are especially important when a programme is intended for Orang Asli adolescents in rural Pahang. Research concerning Orang Asli education has often reproduced problem-centred representations rather than examining how institutions and pedagogies can become more responsive (Renganathan, 2022). Angit and Jarvis (2024) likewise caution against deficit narratives and argue that educational leadership should recognise Orang Asli knowledge and culture. In English classrooms in Pahang, the integration of local cultural elements was reported to stimulate interest and was valued by both learners and teachers (Idrus et al., 2023). More broadly, culturally responsive practice requires sustained teacher learning, critical reflection and relationships with Indigenous communities rather than superficial inclusion of cultural content (Bishop & Vass, 2021). These insights make cultural review, learner dignity and community participation central design requirements, not optional enhancements.

The proposed programme was conceived as a carefully planned one-day introductory Reader's Theatre pilot for students aged 13–15 whose English proficiency spans CEFR A1–B1. A short pilot may be operationally attractive, but feasibility cannot be inferred from the pedagogical literature alone. Rural English-language reforms in Malaysia have shown that training can weaken as it moves through a cascade and that teachers' access to resources and sustained support materially affects implementation (Ong & Ahmad Tajuddin, 2021). Contemporary guidance for complex interventions therefore recommends developing a programme with stakeholders, clarifying uncertainties and examining context before moving to outcome or effectiveness evaluation (Skivington et al., 2021). School-based implementation research makes the same distinction: an intervention's theory may be promising while its delivery remains uncertain (Schultes, 2023).

This study addresses that pre-implementation question by evaluating educators' professional opinions and overall acceptance of the proposed Reader's Theatre intervention as an approach intended to improve students' English speaking skills.

Acceptability was treated as multidimensional rather than as a single favourable attitude. The questionnaire drew on constructs represented in the Theoretical Framework of Acceptability, including affective attitude, burden, professional fit, coherence, opportunity cost, expected purpose and self-efficacy. The generic TFA questionnaire can be adapted for prospective assessment, but adapted items still require contextual interpretation and should not be assumed to constitute a validated scale in a new educational setting (Sekhon et al., 2022). Accordingly, the present analysis is descriptive and item based. Its purpose is to identify conditions for responsible programme refinement, not to estimate effects on students' speaking skills.

1.1. Research Objectives

The survey aimed to determine educators' opinions and overall acceptance of a proposed Reader's Theatre intervention intended to improve students' English speaking skills, and to translate their judgements into design requirements. It addressed the following research questions:

- i. What is the level of English educators' overall acceptance of the proposed Reader's Theatre intervention intended to improve students' speaking skills?
- ii. What are English educators' professional opinions of the proposed Reader's Theatre intervention as an approach to improving students' speaking skills?
- iii. How suitable do English educators consider the programme for Orang Asli students aged 13–15 across CEFR A1–B1 levels?
- iv. What training, materials, staffing, logistical support and safeguards do English educators consider necessary for implementation?

2. Literature Review

2.1. Reader's Theatre as a Supported Literacy Practice

Reader's Theatre combines repeated exposure to print with an authentic communicative goal: a comprehensible and expressive group reading. The meta-analytic literature indicates that it can support aspects of reading development, but the available studies differ in duration, instructional design, learner age and outcome measurement (Mastrothanas et al., 2023). This heterogeneity matters for the proposed pilot because a one-day introduction is not equivalent to multi-week programmes that provide repeated rehearsal and teacher feedback. Evidence from adolescent EFL contexts is also mixed. Lo, Wen, and Lin (2021) reported a reading-comprehension advantage after a ten-week intervention but no corresponding listening-comprehension effect. Lo, Lu, and Cheng (2021) found no significant pre-post reading difference, even though interviews suggested perceived benefits; their participants also identified immediate reading as anxiety provoking. The latter finding is particularly relevant when learners may worry about public comparison or pronunciation.

Hautala et al. (2023) demonstrated the value of testing clearly specified Reader's Theatre models rather than treating the label as a uniform intervention. Taken together, the recent literature supports a plausible pedagogical rationale, not a guarantee of impact. Script difficulty, modelling, rehearsal time, grouping, role differentiation and the emotional climate are likely to affect what learners experience. A prospective educator survey can therefore identify implementation concerns before students are exposed to a pilot,

although only a later outcome study with appropriate comparison and repeated measurement could assess effectiveness.

2.2. Prospective Acceptability and Implementation Readiness

Acceptability is frequently reduced to general satisfaction, but the TFA treats it as a set of distinct judgements: how people feel about an intervention, how burdensome it appears, whether it fits their values, whether it makes sense, what it displaces, whether it seems capable of meeting its purpose and whether they feel able to participate. Sekhon et al. (2022) developed a generic questionnaire intended as an adaptable starting point for prospective and retrospective assessment. For an educational programme that has not yet been delivered, expected usefulness must be distinguished from observed effectiveness. The wording and interpretation should therefore retain conditional language such as 'could' and 'appears', and unable-to-judge responses should remain visible rather than being converted into neutral ratings.

Implementation guidance also argues for attention to programme–context interactions. Skivington et al. (2021) frame complex intervention research as an iterative process in which programme theory, stakeholder perspectives, context and uncertainties inform development and feasibility work. For school-based interventions, implementation evaluation can clarify reach, fidelity, adaptation, acceptability and contextual barriers before an efficacy conclusion is attempted (Schultes, 2023). Thus, low or uncertain prospective ratings are not simply negative verdicts; they identify aspects requiring redesign, specification or direct testing.

2.3. Cultural and Rural-Context Responsibilities

A programme for Orang Asli learners should be grounded in respect for heterogeneous communities rather than an assumption that all Indigenous learners share the same needs. Renganathan's (2022) review shows how research can overemphasise learner deficits while paying less attention to structural conditions and Indigenous perspectives. Angit and Jarvis (2024) similarly argue that educational inclusion requires recognition of Orang Asli epistemologies and experience. In practical terms, this means that scripts, characters, humour, images and performance expectations should be reviewed with local educators and community members. Idrus et al. (2023) provide context-specific evidence from Pahang that culturally integrated English lessons can generate interest, while also challenging one-size-fits-all curriculum assumptions. Bishop and Vass (2021) locate such responsiveness within ongoing professional learning and critical dialogue, rather than a checklist of cultural symbols.

Operational conditions are equally consequential. Ong and Ahmad Tajuddin (2021) documented gaps in CEFR-aligned professional learning in rural Malaysia, including weakened training transfer and resource-related constraints. For a Reader's Theatre pilot, implementation readiness therefore encompasses more than access to scripts. It includes facilitator preparation, differentiated language support, manageable groups, suitable space, transport and welfare arrangements, adequate rehearsal, and safeguards for photography and public performance. These conditions informed both the questionnaire and the neutral interpretation of its results.

3. Research Methods

3.1. Design and Study Purpose

A cross-sectional descriptive survey was used to evaluate educators' opinions and overall acceptance of a proposed Reader's Theatre intervention intended to improve students' English speaking skills. The survey was administered before implementation and contained no student outcome data, intervention exposure or pre-post measurement. Consequently, the design can describe perceived acceptance, professional opinions, suitability and conditions that may influence implementation, but it cannot estimate improvement in speaking skills, programme effectiveness, impact or change. Feasibility items were interpreted as supporting evidence about acceptance and implementation readiness rather than as a separate research question. The unit of analysis was the individual educator response.

3.2. Participants and Sampling

Non-probability purposive sampling recruited 45 educators who met two selection criteria: they had taught English as their major subject at the secondary-school level, and they had previously taught or were currently teaching English to Indigenous students in schools. These criteria ensured direct relevance to the proposed intervention. Participation was voluntary. Respondents could select multiple current or professional roles; therefore, English-teaching, senior-school and teacher-education roles could overlap. The sample provided an informed prospective appraisal rather than statistical representation of all Malaysian English teachers.

3.3. Questionnaire

The questionnaire contained seven analytic components. Section A recorded professional background and relevant experience. Section B used eight context-adapted items to examine prospective acceptability: attitude, anticipated burden, professional fit, programme coherence, opportunity cost, expected ability to meet its immediate purpose, self-efficacy and overall acceptability. The item set was informed by the generic TFA questionnaire (Sekhon et al., 2022) but was not treated as a validated educational scale. Section C contained 12 professional-perception items concerning engagement, participation, comprehension, expression, collaboration, communication, enjoyment, classroom value, implementability, understanding and support for a pilot. Section D contained eight suitability items relating to objectives, age, CEFR-level scaffolding, script adaptation, differentiated roles, cultural safeguards, avoidance of embarrassment and the one-day format. Section E contained eight feasibility items relating to schedule, materials, space, group size, preparation, staffing, classroom adaptation and overall feasibility. Section F was a multiple-response checklist of implementation supports. Open-ended prompts were available, but the fields contained only dash entries ("-") and no substantive comments across the dataset. The open-ended entries therefore did not constitute analysable qualitative data, and no thematic analysis was attempted.

Most evaluative items used a five-point response scale, where higher ratings were more favourable. Two acceptability items were directionally different: lower ratings indicated lower burden and lower interference with other responsibilities. Respondents could also select 'Unable to judge'. This category was not assigned a numerical score because uncertainty is substantively different from a neutral midpoint.

3.4. Data Analysis

Analysis was conducted at item level. For each Likert-type item, the number able to judge, median and interquartile range (IQR) were calculated. A favourable response was defined as a rating of 4 or 5; for anticipated burden and opportunity cost, the desirable response was a rating of 1 or 2. Favourable/desirable percentages used only respondents who made a substantive 1–5 judgement. Wilson 95% confidence intervals (CIs) were calculated for those proportions. Unable-to-judge responses were reported separately as a percentage of all 45 respondents. Multiple-response support selections were summarised as frequencies and percentages of the full sample, with each option counted independently. Medians were retained as ordinal summaries; no composite scores were created, and no hypothesis tests, factor analyses or regression models were used. This approach matched the descriptive research questions, modest sample size, non-probability purposive recruitment and heterogeneous item content.

3.5. Ethical Considerations

Ethical approval was granted by the Research Ethics Committee, Universiti Teknologi MARA. The online questionnaire opened with participant information and an electronic consent item. All 45 respondents provided consent and confirmed that they had reviewed the programme brief. Participation was voluntary, and findings are reported only in aggregate.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1. Participant Profile

The purposive sample comprised educators with secondary-school English-teaching and current or previous Indigenous-student teaching experience (Table 1). Professional roles were non-exclusive: 80.0% identified as lecturers or teacher educators, 66.7% as English teachers and 51.1% as senior teachers or heads of panel. Overall, 57.8% had at least six years of teaching experience. Among respondents with valid data, 85.0% had up to three years of experience teaching Indigenous students. Reader's Theatre familiarity was no or slight for 46.7% and moderate or very for 53.3%.

Table 1: Selected Participant Characteristics (N = 45)

Characteristic	Category	n	%
Current role ¹	Lecturer/teacher educator	36	80.0
	English teacher	30	66.7
	Senior teacher/head of panel	23	51.1
Total teaching experience	5 years or less	19	42.2
	6–10 years	9	20.0
	More than 10 years	17	37.8
Secondary-school English experience ²	3 years or less	23	56.1
	4–10 years	11	26.8

Characteristic	Category	n	%
Teaching Indigenous students ³	More than 10 years	7	17.1
	3 years or less	34	85.0
	4 or more years	6	15.0
Reader's Theatre familiarity	No or slight familiarity	21	46.7
	Moderate or very familiar	24	53.3

Note. ¹Multiple responses were permitted, so percentages exceed 100%. ²Valid n = 41. ³Valid n = 40. Experience percentages use the valid denominator; other percentages use N = 45.

4.2. Prospective Acceptability

Acceptability ratings were neither uniformly favourable nor uniformly unfavourable (Table 2). Professional fit (59.0%) and programme coherence (56.4%) were the strongest dimensions. Half of respondents able to judge felt confident that they could participate or support implementation, but overall acceptability was favourable for 35.9%. Only 30.0% judged the anticipated burden to be low and 35.7% anticipated little interference with other priorities. These results suggest that the idea made sense to many respondents while the practical cost of delivery remained unresolved. The distinction is important: a coherent, professionally aligned proposal can still be unacceptable if time, workload or competing responsibilities are not addressed.

Table 2: Item-Level Prospective Acceptability

Item	Median [IQR]	Favourable/desired n/N; % [95% CI]	Unable to judge n (%)
B1 Affective attitude	3 [2–4]	16/39; 41.0 [27.1–56.6]	6 (13.3)
B2 Low anticipated burden ²	3 [2–4]	12/40; 30.0 [18.1–45.4]	5 (11.1)
B3 Professional fit	4 [3–4.5]	23/39; 59.0 [43.4–72.9]	6 (13.3)
B4 Programme coherence	4 [2–4.5]	22/39; 56.4 [41.0–70.7]	6 (13.3)
B5 Low opportunity cost ²	3.5 [2–5]	15/42; 35.7 [23.0–50.8]	3 (6.7)
B6 Expected immediate purpose	3 [2–4]	17/37; 45.9 [31.0–61.6]	8 (17.8)
B7 Self-efficacy	3.5 [2–5]	19/38; 50.0 [34.8–65.2]	7 (15.6)
B8 Overall acceptability	3 [2–5]	14/39; 35.9 [22.7–51.6]	6 (13.3)

Note. Favourable = rating 4–5 among respondents able to judge. ²For burden and opportunity cost, desired = rating 1–2. Unable-to-judge percentages use N = 45. Wilson confidence intervals are shown in brackets.

4.3. Professional Perceptions

Professional perceptions were also mixed (Table 3). Classroom implementability received the highest favourable proportion (60.0%), followed by understanding the basic

implementation steps (58.1%), anticipated comprehension or recall of scripts (56.8%) and active participation (56.1%). By contrast, only 30.8% judged Reader's Theatre to be a useful approach overall, and 29.7% supported proceeding with a monitored pilot. This apparent tension should not be smoothed into a single average. Some educators could envision the mechanics of implementation while remaining unconvinced that the present design should proceed. Uncertainty was highest for oral communication (24.4% unable to judge), a reasonable response because no student performance had yet been observed.

Table 3: Professional Perceptions of the Proposed Approach

Item	Median [IQR]	Favourable n/N; % [95% CI]	Unable to judge n (%)
C1 Engagement	4 [2–4]	23/43; 53.5 [38.9–67.5]	2 (4.4)
C2 Active participation	4 [2–4]	23/41; 56.1 [41.0–70.1]	4 (8.9)
C3 Script comprehension/recall	4 [2.75–5]	25/44; 56.8 [42.2–70.3]	1 (2.2)
C4 Creativity/expression	3 [2–4]	20/43; 46.5 [32.5–61.1]	2 (4.4)
C5 Confidence in expression	3 [3–4]	19/41; 46.3 [32.1–61.3]	4 (8.9)
C6 Collaboration	3 [2–4]	17/39; 43.6 [29.3–59.0]	6 (13.3)
C7 Oral communication	4 [2–4]	18/34; 52.9 [36.7–68.5]	11 (24.4)
C8 Enjoyment	4 [2–5]	22/43; 51.2 [36.8–65.4]	2 (4.4)
C9 Useful approach overall	3 [2–4]	12/39; 30.8 [18.6–46.4]	6 (13.3)
C10 Classroom implementability	4 [2–4.25]	24/40; 60.0 [44.6–73.7]	5 (11.1)
C11 Understanding basic steps	4 [2.5–4.5]	25/43; 58.1 [43.3–71.6]	2 (4.4)
C12 Support monitored pilot	3 [2–4]	11/37; 29.7 [17.5–45.8]	8 (17.8)

Note. Favourable = rating 4–5 among respondents able to judge. Unable-to-judge percentages use N = 45. Wilson confidence intervals are shown in brackets.

4.4. Suitability for the Intended Learners and Format

No suitability item achieved a favourable majority (Table 4). Ratings for the target age group (46.2%), CEFR A1–B1 scaffolding (44.7%) and script adaptability (46.3%) were close to evenly divided once uncertainty was excluded. Lower favourable proportions concerned differentiated role lengths (33.3%), cultural safeguards (34.9%) and protection from embarrassment or public comparison (29.5%). These are not peripheral concerns. They indicate that the programme should not proceed on the assumption that a generic script and performance structure are culturally or emotionally safe. The one-day format drew the highest uncertainty in the survey: 28.9% were unable to judge its suitability. Among those able to judge, 46.9% responded favourably, but the confidence interval was wide. The result supports testing a revised format rather than treating one day as an established dosage.

Table 4: Perceived Suitability for the Intended Learners

Item	Median [IQR]	Favourable n/N; % [95% CI]	Unable to judge n (%)
D1 Relevance of objectives	3 [2–4]	15/38; 39.5 [25.6–55.3]	7 (15.6)
D2 Age 13–15 appropriateness	3 [3–4]	18/39; 46.2 [31.6–61.4]	6 (13.3)
D3 CEFR A1–B1 scaffolding	3 [2–4]	17/38; 44.7 [30.1–60.3]	7 (15.6)
D4 Script adaptability/access	3 [2–5]	19/41; 46.3 [32.1–61.3]	4 (8.9)
D5 Differentiated role lengths	3 [2–4]	13/39; 33.3 [20.6–49.0]	6 (13.3)
D6 Cultural safeguards	3 [2–4]	15/43; 34.9 [22.4–49.8]	2 (4.4)
D7 Avoid embarrassment/comparison	3 [2–4]	13/44; 29.5 [18.2–44.2]	1 (2.2)
D8 One-day introductory pilot	3 [2–5]	15/32; 46.9 [30.9–63.6]	13 (28.9)

Note. Favourable = rating 4–5 among respondents able to judge. Unable-to-judge percentages use N = 45. Wilson confidence intervals are shown in brackets.

4.5. Implementation Feasibility as Supporting Evidence

Feasibility ratings remained conditional (Table 5). Adaptability to regular English lessons was the only item with a favourable majority (54.8%). Overall feasibility was favourable for 47.7%, while the remaining operational items ranged from 37.5% for group manageability to 45.9% for reasonable preparation. The medians were mostly 3, and the confidence intervals were wide. These findings do not show that implementation is infeasible; rather, they show that no operational arrangement other than potential classroom adaptation commanded clear support. Respondents' uncertainty regarding schedule and preparation reinforces the need to specify the programme timetable, staffing ratios and rehearsal expectations before asking educators to endorse a pilot.

Table 5: Perceived Feasibility of the Proposed Pilot

Item	Median [IQR]	Favourable n/N; % [95% CI]	Unable to judge n (%)
E1 One-day schedule	3 [2–5]	16/37; 43.2 [28.7–59.1]	8 (17.8)
E2 Accessible materials	3 [2–4]	18/40; 45.0 [30.7–60.2]	5 (11.1)
E3 Manageable spaces	3 [2–4]	16/42; 38.1 [25.0–53.2]	3 (6.7)
E4 Groups of approximately 10	3 [2.75–4]	15/40; 37.5 [24.2–53.0]	5 (11.1)
E5 Reasonable preparation	3 [2–4]	17/37; 45.9 [31.0–61.6]	8 (17.8)
E6 Realistic staffing	3 [2.5–4.5]	19/43; 44.2 [30.4–58.9]	2 (4.4)
E7 Adaptable to regular lessons	4 [2–4.75]	23/42; 54.8 [39.9–68.8]	3 (6.7)
E8 Overall feasibility	3 [2–4]	21/44; 47.7 [33.8–62.1]	1 (2.2)

Note. Favourable = rating 4–5 among respondents able to judge. Unable-to-judge percentages use N = 45. Wilson confidence intervals are shown in brackets.

4.6. Required Supports and Safeguards

The support checklist clarifies what a more acceptable pilot would require (Table 6). Facilitator briefing or training was selected by 80.0% of the full sample, and 66.7% selected rehearsal beyond a single day. Sixty per cent selected transport, meals and welfare support, while the same proportion selected smaller groups or additional facilitators. Language, cultural and performance safeguards were also commonly selected: pronunciation or vocabulary support and local cultural review were each selected by 57.8%, while differentiated scripts, suitable space and photo/recording safeguards were each selected by 53.3%. The response pattern aligns with implementation scholarship: training, resource access and contextual adaptation are part of the intervention rather than external administrative details (Ong & Ahmad Tajuddin, 2021; Schultes, 2023).

Table 6: Supports Selected as Necessary for Implementation

Support or safeguard	n	% of N = 45
Facilitator briefing or training	36	80.0
Additional rehearsal time beyond one day	30	66.7
Transport, meals and welfare arrangements	27	60.0
Smaller groups or more facilitators	27	60.0
Pronunciation and vocabulary support	26	57.8
Cultural review by local educators/community	26	57.8
Differentiated scripts for CEFR A1/A2/B1	24	53.3
Suitable rooms and performance space	24	53.3
Photography, recording and performance safeguards	24	53.3
School leadership and parent/community support	19	42.2

Note. Multiple selections were permitted. Two respondents did not select any option; percentages use the full sample to avoid overstating endorsement.

4.7. Integrated Interpretation and Design Implications

Across the four research questions, the central finding is conditional acceptance. Educators could see professional alignment, understand the proposed mechanics and imagine classroom use, yet fewer endorsed the programme overall or supported proceeding with the present pilot design. This is not a contradiction. The TFA distinguishes understanding and value alignment from burden, opportunity cost and confidence (Sekhon et al., 2022). Here, favourable coherence and professional fit coexisted with concerns about workload, competing priorities, role differentiation, emotional safety and cultural safeguards. A single composite mean would have concealed this profile.

The findings support four revisions. First, the one-day model should be reframed as an orientation or culminating event within a longer preparation sequence, because two-thirds of respondents requested more rehearsal time. Second, scripts should be tiered for CEFR A1, A2 and B1 learners, with shorter and longer roles that confer equal status rather than publicly signalling proficiency. Third, local educators and community

representatives should review scripts, characterisation, humour, visual materials and consent procedures. Such collaboration responds to the cultural concerns raised in the survey and to research that prioritises Indigenous knowledge over deficit framing (Angit & Jarvis, 2024; Idrus et al., 2023; Renganathan, 2022). Fourth, a facilitator protocol should specify modelling, pronunciation support, group size, staffing, learner choice, withdrawal from performance and restrictions on photography or recording.

A subsequent feasibility pilot should document recruitment, attendance, rehearsal exposure, adaptations, implementation fidelity, adverse or embarrassing experiences, and stakeholder acceptability after participation. Student perspectives, including unable-to-judge options before exposure and retrospective accounts after exposure, should be central. Only after feasibility and safeguards are demonstrated should a separate outcome study test reading, oral communication, anxiety or willingness to communicate. That later study would require clear outcomes, baseline and follow-up measurement, an adequate comparison strategy and an analysis plan matched to the design. The present data cannot substitute for that evidence.

4.8. Limitations

Several limitations bound the interpretation. The small, voluntary purposive sample was non-probability based; its percentages are descriptive rather than population estimates. Eligibility ensured relevant secondary-school English-teaching and Indigenous-student teaching experience but not statistical generalisability. Current or professional roles overlapped, and respondents varied in Reader's Theatre, CEFR and Indigenous-education experience. The questionnaire adapted an acceptability framework to a new educational context, but the adapted items were not psychometrically validated. Item-level reporting was therefore more defensible than composite scoring. The survey described a proposed programme; respondents had not observed or delivered it, so uncertainty and expectation are intrinsic to the data. Confidence intervals were correspondingly wide. Although the questionnaire included open-ended items, the fields contained only dash entries ("-") and no substantive written comments across the dataset. The study therefore contains no analysable qualitative data to explain, contextualise or triangulate the quantitative ratings. Most importantly, the study contains no student responses or learning outcomes and cannot establish that Reader's Theatre improves English proficiency, confidence, anxiety or communication.

5. Conclusion

This survey evaluated educators' opinions and overall acceptance of a proposed Reader's Theatre intervention intended to improve the English speaking skills of Orang Asli adolescents in rural Pahang. Acceptance was mixed and conditional. The programme was often perceived as professionally aligned, understandable and potentially implementable, but overall acceptability, low anticipated burden, support for a monitored pilot and key safeguards did not receive majority favourable endorsement. Respondents most clearly requested facilitator training, additional rehearsal, logistical provision, manageable groups, differentiated language support and cultural review. The appropriate next step is therefore not an effectiveness claim or immediate scale-up. It is co-design: refine the programme with local educators and community stakeholders, specify learner-protection procedures, resource a small pilot and evaluate actual implementation. Such a sequence respects both the limits of the evidence and the responsibility to develop culturally

responsive English-language opportunities with, rather than merely for, Indigenous learners.

Ethics Statement

Ethical approval was granted by the Research Ethics Committee, Universiti Teknologi MARA. All respondents provided electronic informed consent before completing the questionnaire.

Acknowledgement

The authors thank the educators with secondary-school English-teaching and Indigenous-student teaching experience who reviewed the proposed programme and contributed their professional judgements.

Funding

This research was sponsored as part of a grant approved by the Academy of Language Studies, Universiti Teknologi MARA (APB UiTM).

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

- Angit, S., & Jarvis, A. (2024). An Indigenous view of social justice leadership in the Malaysian education system. *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples*, 20(1), 215–224. <https://doi.org/10.1177/11771801241235422>
- Bishop, M., & Vass, G. (2021). Talking about culturally responsive approaches to education: Teacher professional learning, Indigenous learners and the politics of schooling. *The Australian Journal of Indigenous Education*, 50(2), 340–347. <https://doi.org/10.1017/jie.2020.30>
- Hautala, J., Ronimus, M., & Junttila, E. (2023). Readers' theater projects for special education: A randomized controlled study. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 67(5), 663–678. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2022.2042846>
- Idrus, F., Hussin, M. E., & Gulca, M. (2023). The integration of cultural elements in the English language classrooms: A case study of selected Orang Asli schools in Pahang, Malaysia. *Journal of Nusantara Studies*, 8(1), 26–45. <https://doi.org/10.24200/jonus.vol8iss1pp26-45>
- Lo, C.-C., Lu, S.-Y., & Cheng, D.-D. (2021). The influence of Reader's Theater on high school students' English reading comprehension—English learning anxiety and learning styles perspective. *SAGE Open*, 11(4). <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211061576>
- Lo, C.-C., Wen, H., & Lin, Y.-S. (2021). The effect of Readers Theater on EFL seventh-graders' reading and listening comprehension. *SAGE Open*, 11(3). <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211038388>
- Mastrothanasis, K., Kladaki, M., & Andreou, A. (2023). A systematic review and meta-analysis of the Readers' Theatre impact on the development of reading skills.

- International Journal of Educational Research Open*, 4, Article 100243. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedro.2023.100243>
- Ong, J. W., & Ahmad Tajuddin, A. J. (2021). Investigating cascade training of CEFR-aligned Standards-Based English Language Curriculum (SBELC) in rural Malaysia. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 20(7), 100–117. <https://www.ijlter.org/index.php/ijlter/article/view/3920>
- Renganathan, S. (2022). Research concerning the Indigenous Orang Asli and education: A review of problem representations. *Diaspora, Indigenous, and Minority Education*, 16(3), 200–211. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15595692.2021.2007073>
- Schultes, M.-T. (2023). An introduction to implementation evaluation of school-based interventions. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 20(1), 189–201. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17405629.2021.1976633>
- Sekhon, M., Cartwright, M., & Francis, J. J. (2022). Development of a theory-informed questionnaire to assess the acceptability of healthcare interventions. *BMC Health Services Research*, 22, Article 279. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-022-07577-3>
- Skivington, K., Matthews, L., Simpson, S. A., Craig, P., Baird, J., Blazeby, J. M., Boyd, K. A., Craig, N., French, D. P., McIntosh, E., Petticrew, M., Rycroft-Malone, J., White, M., & Moore, L. (2021). A new framework for developing and evaluating complex interventions: Update of Medical Research Council guidance. *BMJ*, 374, n2061. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n2061>