

Rethinking Communicative Language Teaching (CLT-Based): Developing a Contextualized Model for Non-English Major University Students

***¹Sujariati, ²Risman Wanci, ³Rampeng, ¹Nurdevi Bte Abdul**

¹Universitas Muhammadiyah Makasar, Indonesia

²Universitas Palangka Raya, Indonesia

³Universitas Bosowa Makassar, Indonesia

Received: 18 February 2026 | Revised: 12 April 2026 | Accepted: 27 April 2026

Correspondence: sujariati@unismuh.ac.id

Abstract

Communicative competence has become a central objective of English language teaching in higher education; however, many non-English major students continue to experience difficulties in developing speaking proficiency because classroom instruction often relies on decontextualized communication tasks that are disconnected from learners' academic and social realities. Addressing this gap, this study aimed to develop and evaluate a Contextualized Communicative Language Teaching (CCLT) model and its accompanying speaking materials to enhance speaking instruction for non-English major students. The study employed a Research and Development (R&D) design adapted from the ADDIE framework, encompassing needs analysis, model and material development, expert validation, limited try-out, revision, and field implementation. The participants consisted of non-English major university students, English lecturers, and expert validators. Data were collected through questionnaires, validation sheets, observation, speaking performance assessments, and interviews, and analysed using descriptive statistics and qualitative thematic analysis. The findings indicate that the developed CCLT model achieved a high level of content and pedagogical validity based on expert evaluation and was perceived as practical and relevant by both lecturers and students. Field implementation further demonstrated notable improvements in students' speaking performance, particularly in fluency, interaction, confidence, and contextual language use. Integrating authentic communicative tasks with learners' disciplinary and everyday contexts enabled students to engage more actively in meaningful communication. These findings suggest that the CCLT model provides a pedagogically sound and context-sensitive framework for speaking instruction and offers an effective alternative for enhancing communicative competence among non-English major learners in higher education.

Keywords: communicative language teaching; contextualized learning; instructional model; speaking instruction.

1. Introduction

Speaking competence has become one of the most essential learning outcomes in English language education, particularly in higher education where graduates are expected to communicate effectively in academic, professional, and intercultural settings. Beyond grammatical accuracy, effective speaking requires learners to negotiate meaning, express ideas spontaneously, respond appropriately to interlocutors, and adapt language use according to communicative contexts. Consequently, contemporary English language teaching has increasingly shifted from language-centred instruction toward communication-oriented pedagogy that positions learners as active participants in authentic interaction rather than passive recipients of linguistic knowledge. This orientation reflects the fundamental principles of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT), which conceptualizes language as a tool for meaningful communication instead of merely a system of grammatical rules (Littlewood, 2014; Richards, 2006). Recent scholarship further argues that successful speaking instruction should provide learners with authentic communicative experiences that closely resemble real-life language use while simultaneously accommodating learners' disciplinary backgrounds and contextual needs (Derakhshan, 2022; Dos Santos, 2020). Developing speaking competence,



therefore, extends beyond improving oral fluency; it also involves cultivating learners' confidence, interactional competence, and ability to participate meaningfully in diverse communicative situations.

Despite the widespread acceptance of CLT, developing speaking competence remains a persistent challenge in many English as a Foreign Language (EFL) classrooms, particularly among non-English major students. In many university contexts, speaking activities continue to rely on predetermined dialogues, isolated role plays, or textbook-based conversations that provide limited opportunities for authentic communication. As a result, students often perform classroom speaking tasks successfully but experience considerable difficulty transferring these skills to spontaneous communication beyond instructional settings. This challenge becomes even more pronounced for non-English major students, whose primary academic interests lie outside language studies and whose exposure to English is generally confined to compulsory language courses. Consequently, speaking instruction frequently lacks contextual relevance to learners' academic disciplines, future professions, and everyday communicative needs, reducing both engagement and opportunities for meaningful language use. Recent studies consistently report that insufficient contextualization, limited interactional practice, and low communicative confidence remain among the most significant barriers to speaking development in EFL higher education (Derakhshan, 2022; Dos Santos, 2020; Sembiente, 2016).

Recognizing these challenges, researchers have proposed various pedagogical approaches to strengthen students' speaking competence. Among them, Communicative Language Teaching has consistently demonstrated positive effects on learners' oral fluency, interactional competence, communicative confidence, and willingness to communicate because it encourages meaningful interaction through authentic language use (Littlewood, 2014; Richards, 2022). More recently, scholars have argued that communication-oriented instruction becomes more effective when communicative tasks are situated within meaningful social, cultural, or disciplinary contexts that reflect learners' real experiences (Dos Santos, 2020; Sharipova, 2026). Alongside CLT, Problem-Based Learning, Task-Based Language Teaching, and project-oriented approaches have also been reported to promote speaking development by encouraging collaborative problem solving, authentic interaction, and learner autonomy (Carless & Boud, 2018; Ellis et al., 2020). Collectively, these studies suggest that communicative pedagogy is most effective when learners perceive clear connections between classroom activities and the communicative situations they encounter outside the classroom.

Although previous studies provide substantial evidence supporting communicative approaches to speaking instruction, several important gaps remain. First, much of the existing research has focused primarily on evaluating the effectiveness of established teaching approaches rather than systematically developing new instructional models that integrate communicative principles with learners' contextual realities. Second, studies involving non-English major students frequently adopt generic communicative tasks that pay limited attention to learners' disciplinary backgrounds and professional communication needs. Consequently, communicative activities often remain detached from students' lived experiences, reducing opportunities for meaningful engagement and sustained language development. Furthermore, while contextual learning has received increasing attention across educational research, relatively few studies have explicitly conceptualized how contextualization can be systematically embedded within Communicative Language Teaching as an integrated pedagogical framework for speaking instruction. This absence leaves both theoretical and practical questions regarding how communicative principles can be adapted better to accommodate learners' authentic academic and social contexts (Sujariati et al., 2021).

Responding to these gaps, the present study develops a Contextualized Communicative Language Teaching (CCLT) model that extends conventional CLT by systematically integrating contextual learning principles into communicative speaking instruction. Rather than treating context merely as supplementary classroom content, the proposed model positions learners' academic disciplines, professional aspirations, and everyday communicative experiences as central resources for designing speaking activities, instructional procedures, and learning materials. The study therefore contributes to the literature in three

important ways. First, it proposes a pedagogically grounded instructional model specifically designed for non-English major learners. Second, it develops contextualized speaking materials aligned with the principles of the model. Third, it empirically evaluates the validity, practicality, and effectiveness of both the instructional model and the accompanying materials through a Research and Development approach. By integrating model development with empirical evaluation, the study provides a comprehensive framework that extends existing understandings of communicative language teaching beyond its traditional implementation.

Given the continuing need for speaking instruction that is both communicatively meaningful and contextually relevant, this study aims to develop, validate, and evaluate a Contextualized Communicative Language Teaching (CCLT) model and its accompanying speaking materials for non-English major students. Specifically, the study investigates the validity of the developed model and materials, examines their practicality during classroom implementation, and evaluates their effectiveness in enhancing students' speaking competence. By addressing these objectives, the study seeks to provide an evidence-based instructional framework that supports more contextualized, learner-centered, and communicatively meaningful speaking instruction in higher education.

2. Method

2.1 Research Design

This study adopted a Research and Development (R&D) design to develop and evaluate a Contextualized Communicative Language Teaching (CCLT) model for improving the English-speaking competence of non-English major university students. Unlike conventional experimental studies that primarily examine the effectiveness of an existing instructional intervention, Research and Development focuses on generating educational products through systematic design, validation, implementation, and evaluation while simultaneously examining their pedagogical quality and practical applicability (Branch, 2009; Ellis & Levy, 2010). This approach was considered appropriate because the present study sought not only to investigate students' speaking performance but also to construct an instructional model that addressed the contextual communication needs of learners outside English-related disciplines.

The development process was guided by the ADDIE instructional design framework, consisting of the phases of Analysis, Design, Development, Implementation, and Evaluation. The framework was selected because it offers a systematic yet flexible structure for translating instructional needs into educational products through continuous refinement based on empirical evidence and expert feedback (Aldoobie, 2015; Peterson, 2003). Throughout the study, each phase informed the subsequent stage, allowing the instructional model to evolve iteratively before its final implementation. The overall quality of the developed model was evaluated through three complementary dimensions commonly adopted in educational product development, namely validity, practicality, and effectiveness, using both quantitative and qualitative evidence collected during the development process (Creswell & Creswell, 2018).

2.2 Research Context and Participants

The study was conducted at a private university in Makassar, Indonesia, where English is offered as a compulsory general course for undergraduate students from non-English major programs. Although English is expected to support students' academic communication and future professional development, many learners experience persistent difficulties in oral communication due to limited opportunities for authentic language use and the predominance of teacher-centered instructional practices. These contextual challenges provided the rationale for developing a Contextualized Communicative Language Teaching (CCLT) model that aligns speaking instruction with students' disciplinary backgrounds and real-world communication needs.

Participants were selected purposively according to their roles within the research and development process. The study involved two experts in English language teaching and instructional design who were

responsible for validating the conceptual framework, instructional procedures, and learning materials of the proposed model. In addition, two English lecturers participated in the implementation stage by applying the developed model in classroom instruction and providing pedagogical feedback regarding its practicality. The field implementation involved 50 undergraduate students from non-English major programs enrolled in General English courses. These students represented the intended users of the instructional model and participated in the classroom implementation, speaking performance assessment, and response questionnaire. The involvement of experts, classroom practitioners, and target learners enabled the instructional model to be evaluated from multiple perspectives throughout the development process. Such participant selection is consistent with the principles of educational design research, which emphasize the importance of involving both specialists and end users to ensure that educational products are theoretically valid, practically feasible, and responsive to learners' instructional needs (McKenney & Reeves, 2018; McKenzie & Reeves, 2025).

2.3 Development Procedures

The development of the Contextualized Communicative Language Teaching (CCLT) model followed the ADDIE instructional design framework, which consists of five interconnected phases: Analysis, Design, Development, Implementation, and Evaluation (Branch, 2009). Rather than functioning as a strictly linear process, the framework allowed iterative refinement throughout the study, enabling evidence gathered at each stage to inform subsequent revisions. The major activities undertaken during each phase and their corresponding outputs are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1

Development Procedures of the CCLT Model

ADDIE Phase	Main Activities	Expected Output
Analysis	Classroom observation, lecturer interviews, syllabus and material analysis, literature review, identification of students' speaking needs	Identification of instructional needs and design specifications
Design	Formulation of learning objectives, development of the CCLT framework, preparation of lesson plans, contextual speaking tasks, instructional materials, and assessment procedures	Initial prototype of the CCLT model and instructional materials
Development	Expert validation, review of instructional components, revision based on expert recommendations	Validated and revised CCLT prototype
Implementation	Classroom try-out with non-English major students, observation of instructional practices, collection of speaking performance and questionnaire data	Empirical evidence regarding practicality and effectiveness
Evaluation	Integration of validation results, classroom observations, speaking assessments, and users' feedback to refine the model	Final CCLT model

As presented in Table 1, the development process began with a comprehensive needs analysis to identify students' communicative difficulties and the instructional challenges encountered by English lecturers. The findings from this phase informed the design of the CCLT model, including its instructional objectives, contextualized learning activities, speaking tasks, learning materials, and assessment strategies. The resulting prototype was subsequently reviewed by experts in English language teaching and instructional design to evaluate its conceptual soundness, pedagogical appropriateness, and contextual relevance before being revised accordingly.

Following expert validation, the revised model was implemented in authentic classroom settings involving non-English major students. During this phase, data regarding students' speaking performance, classroom interaction, and users' responses were collected to examine the practicality and effectiveness of the instructional model. Finally, evidence obtained throughout the development process was synthesized to produce the final version of the CCLT model. This iterative procedure ensured that every revision was

supported by empirical evidence rather than theoretical assumptions alone, thereby strengthening the instructional quality and practical applicability of the developed model (McKenney & Reeves, 2018).

2.4 Research Instruments

Several research instruments were employed to generate comprehensive evidence throughout the development and evaluation of the Contextualized Communicative Language Teaching (CCLT) model. Their selection was aligned with the objectives of each stage of the ADDIE framework to ensure that the collected data adequately addressed the quality dimensions of the instructional product, namely validity, practicality, and effectiveness. During the analysis phase, classroom observation sheets, semi-structured interview protocols, and document analysis guidelines were used to identify students' speaking difficulties, existing instructional practices, and curriculum requirements. These preliminary findings provided the empirical basis for designing the instructional model and its accompanying learning materials.

During the development phase, expert validation sheets were employed to evaluate the content validity, instructional design, language appropriateness, and contextual relevance of the proposed CCLT model and learning materials. Following revision, the implementation phase utilized a speaking performance assessment to examine students' oral communication skills after learning through the developed model, while students' response questionnaires were administered to evaluate the practicality, clarity, and perceived usefulness of the instructional model. The use of multiple instruments across different stages enabled methodological triangulation by integrating evidence from experts, lecturers, and students, thereby strengthening the comprehensiveness and credibility of the evaluation process (Creswell & Creswell, 2018; Fraenkel et al., 2023).

2.5 Data Collection Procedures

Data collection was conducted sequentially throughout the development process in accordance with the ADDIE framework, allowing evidence generated at each phase to inform subsequent revisions of the instructional model. The process began with the analysis phase, during which classroom observations, semi-structured interviews with English lecturers, and document analysis were carried out to identify students' speaking needs, instructional challenges, and curriculum requirements. The findings obtained from this preliminary stage served as the empirical foundation for designing the Contextualized Communicative Language Teaching (CCLT) model and its accompanying instructional materials.

Following the development of the initial prototype, expert validation was conducted to evaluate the conceptual framework, instructional procedures, and learning materials before classroom implementation. After incorporating the experts' recommendations, the revised model was implemented in General English classes involving non-English major students. During this stage, students' speaking performance was assessed using a standardized speaking rubric, while classroom observations documented the implementation process and students' participation in contextualized communicative activities. At the conclusion of the implementation, students completed a response questionnaire to evaluate the practicality and perceived usefulness of the developed model. Collectively, these procedures generated complementary quantitative and qualitative evidence that formed the basis for evaluating the validity, practicality, and effectiveness of the CCLT model.

2.6 Data Analysis

The collected data were analyzed using complementary quantitative and qualitative procedures to provide a comprehensive evaluation of the developed Contextualized Communicative Language Teaching (CCLT) model. Quantitative data obtained from expert validation, students' speaking performance, and response questionnaires were analyzed using descriptive statistics, including mean scores, percentages, and predetermined interpretation criteria. Expert validation scores were used to determine the content validity of the instructional model, while students' speaking assessment results and questionnaire responses were analyzed to evaluate its effectiveness and practicality during classroom implementation. Descriptive statistical analysis was considered appropriate because the primary objective of the study was to determine

the quality of the developed instructional product rather than to test causal relationships among variables (Fraenkel et al., 2023).

Qualitative data derived from classroom observations, semi-structured interviews, document analysis, and experts' written feedback were analyzed using qualitative content analysis. The analysis followed an iterative procedure involving repeated reading of the data, open coding, categorization of similar ideas, identification of recurring patterns, and interpretation of emerging themes relevant to the development and implementation of the CCLT model (Miles et al., 2020; Schreier, 2021). The identified themes were subsequently compared across multiple data sources to identify convergent and divergent evidence, thereby providing deeper explanations for the quantitative findings.

To enhance the credibility of the findings, data triangulation was employed by integrating evidence obtained from experts, lecturers, students, classroom observations, interviews, and documentary sources. Rather than relying on a single source of evidence, the interpretation of the findings was established through the convergence of multiple datasets collected throughout the development process. This triangulated analytical approach strengthened the trustworthiness of the study and provided a more comprehensive evaluation of the validity, practicality, and effectiveness of the developed instructional model (Creswell & Creswell, 2018; Miles et al., 2020).

3. Findings

3.1 Integration of CLT Principles into the Developed CCLT Model

The first research question sought to examine how the principles of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) were operationalized in developing the Contextualized Communicative Language Teaching (CCLT) model for speaking instruction. The development process was informed by the findings of the needs analysis and a review of the communicative language teaching literature, resulting in the identification of three core CLT principles that were adapted to the characteristics and communicative needs of non-English major university students. These principles subsequently served as the pedagogical foundation for constructing the instructional model and designing the contextualized speaking materials. The operationalization of the identified CLT principles is summarized in Table 2.

Table 2

Operationalization of Core CLT Principles in the Developed CCLT Model

CLT Principle	Operationalization in the CCLT Model	Expected Pedagogical Contribution
Presentation of language items through meaningful activities	Language input is introduced through contextualized situations that are familiar to students before communicative practice begins.	Builds contextual understanding and prepares students for meaningful communication.
Maximizing communicative use of available resources	Students utilize visual prompts, authentic learning materials, peer interaction, and contextual tasks to accomplish communicative objectives.	Encourages authentic interaction, learner autonomy, and active participation in communication.
Drilling to support fluency and accuracy	Controlled speaking practice is integrated before students engage in freer communicative activities.	Reinforces pronunciation, vocabulary, grammatical accuracy, and speaking fluency.

As presented in Table 2, the three CLT principles were systematically embedded within the instructional framework rather than being implemented as separate teaching techniques. Together, they informed the organization of classroom learning by combining contextual language input, guided communicative practice, and opportunities for authentic interaction. These operationalized principles subsequently shaped the structure of the developed CCLT model, which is presented in Table 3.

Table 3*The Developed Contextualized Communicative Language Teaching (CCLT) Model*

Instructional Stage	Learning Focus	Major Classroom Activities	Instructional Purpose
Opening	Contextual language preparation	Introducing contextual topics, activating prior knowledge, presenting vocabulary, pronunciation practice, and useful expressions	To prepare students with the linguistic resources required for subsequent communicative activities.
Main Activity	Meaningful communicative practice	Guided drilling, role plays, pair and group discussions, information-gap activities, games, and contextual speaking tasks	To engage students in authentic communication through structured collaborative interaction.
Closing	Reflection and communicative reinforcement	Classroom reflection, teacher feedback, peer feedback, learning summary, and follow-up speaking tasks	To reinforce learning outcomes and strengthen students' confidence in spoken communication.

As shown in Table 3, the developed CCLT model organizes speaking instruction into three interconnected instructional stages that progressively guide students from language preparation to communicative performance and reflective reinforcement. Each stage integrates contextual learning situations with communicative activities that reflect students' academic and everyday experiences, allowing speaking practice to develop in a structured yet meaningful manner. The sequence of learning activities provides opportunities for students to activate prior knowledge, participate in collaborative communication, and consolidate newly acquired speaking skills through continuous interaction and reflection.

Before the classroom implementation, the initial version of the CCLT model underwent expert validation involving specialists in English language teaching and instructional design. The reviewers agreed that the overall instructional framework was appropriate for implementation while recommending several refinements to improve its pedagogical quality. The suggested revisions focused primarily on reorganizing the sequence of learning activities, clarifying instructional procedures, strengthening the integration of contextual elements across instructional stages, and refining the assessment descriptors to ensure closer alignment with the intended learning outcomes. All recommendations were incorporated into the revised version of the instructional model before it proceeded to classroom implementation.

3.2 Effectiveness of the Developed Contextualized Communicative Language Teaching (CCLT) Model

The second research question examined the effectiveness of the developed Contextualized Communicative Language Teaching (CCLT) model in supporting students' speaking development during classroom implementation. Following expert validation and subsequent revision, the model was implemented in General English classes involving non-English major university students. Students' speaking performance was assessed before and after the instructional programme using an analytical speaking rubric consisting of four assessment components: vocabulary, pronunciation, fluency, and accuracy. The descriptive comparison of students' speaking performance is presented in Table 4.

Table 4*Descriptive Comparison of Students' Speaking Performance Before and After the Implementation of the CCLT Model*

Speaking Component	Pre-test Mean	Post-test Mean	Gain
Vocabulary	2.75	4.90	2.15
Pronunciation	2.10	3.80	1.70
Fluency	1.80	4.00	2.20
Accuracy	1.85	3.60	1.75
Overall Mean Score	8.50	16.30	7.80

As presented in Table 4, students obtained higher scores across all assessed speaking components following the implementation of the developed instructional model. Vocabulary showed an increase from 2.75 to 4.90, fluency increased from 1.80 to 4.00, pronunciation improved from 2.10 to 3.80, and accuracy rose from 1.85 to 3.60. Collectively, these improvements contributed to an increase in the overall mean speaking score from 8.50 in the pre-test to 16.30 in the post-test, representing an overall gain of 7.80 points. To provide a clearer description of students' achievement, the pre-test and post-test scores were subsequently classified according to the predetermined speaking performance categories. The distribution of students across performance levels is presented in Table 5.

Table 5

Distribution of Students' Speaking Performance Before and After Classroom Implementation

Performance Category	Score Range	Pre-test n (%)	Post-test n (%)
Very Good	86–100	0 (0%)	1 (5%)
Good	71–85	0 (0%)	17 (85%)
Fair	56–70	4 (20%)	2 (10%)
Poor	41–55	5 (25%)	0 (0%)
Very Poor	0–40	11 (55%)	0 (0%)

As shown in Table 5, the distribution of students' speaking performance changed considerably following the implementation of the CCLT model. Prior to the intervention, the majority of students were classified within the very poor (55%) and poor (25%) performance categories, while no students achieved either the good or very good levels. After the instructional programme, most students (85%) reached the good category, one student (5%) achieved the very good category, and the remaining students (10%) were classified as fair. None of the students remained in either the poor or very poor categories at the end of the implementation. The classroom implementation further demonstrated that the developed instructional model could be applied consistently throughout the planned instructional sequence. Students participated in a series of contextualized communicative activities that progressively required them to use English for authentic interaction in academic and everyday situations. The completion of all instructional stages and the observed changes in students' speaking performance provided empirical evidence for evaluating the practicality of the developed model, which is presented in the following section.

3.3 Practicality of the Developed Contextualized Communicative Language Teaching (CCLT) Model

The third research question examined the practicality of the developed Contextualized Communicative Language Teaching (CCLT) model during classroom implementation. Practicality was evaluated based on lecturers' and students' responses after implementing the developed contextualized speaking materials. The evaluation focused on three aspects: usability, usefulness, and appearance. The lecturers' evaluation is presented in Table 6, followed by students' responses in Table 7.

Table 6

Lecturers' Evaluation of the Practicality of the Developed CCLT-Based Speaking Materials

Evaluation Aspect	Percentage	Classification
Usability	75.0%	Practical
Usefulness	75.0%	Practical
Appearance	62.0%	Practical
Overall Mean	70.6%	Practical

As presented in Table 6, lecturers evaluated the developed speaking materials positively across all assessed aspects. The highest ratings were obtained for usability and usefulness, each receiving 75.0%, while appearance obtained 62.0%. Overall, the instructional materials achieved a mean practicality score of 70.6%,

indicating that they were considered practical for classroom implementation. Students' perceptions of the developed instructional materials were subsequently collected to evaluate their practicality from the users' perspective. The results are presented in Table 7.

Table 7

Students' Evaluation of the Practicality of the Developed CCLT-Based Speaking Materials

Evaluation Aspect	Percentage	Classification
Usability	92.4%	Very Practical
Usefulness	89.3%	Very Practical
Appearance	84.9%	Very Practical
Overall Mean	88.9%	Very Practical

As shown in Table 7, students reported highly favorable responses to the developed speaking materials across all evaluated aspects. Usability received the highest rating (92.4%), followed by usefulness (89.3%) and appearance (84.9%). The overall practicality score reached 88.9%, which was classified as very practical, indicating that students perceived the developed materials as easy to use, beneficial for speaking practice, and appropriate for classroom learning. The findings from lecturers and students indicate that the developed CCLT-based speaking materials were implemented successfully under classroom conditions and were positively received by both instructors and learners during the field implementation.

4. Discussion

The present study provides additional evidence that the effectiveness of communicative language instruction depends not only on the adoption of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) principles but also on how those principles are translated into learning experiences that reflect learners' communicative realities. Although CLT has consistently promoted meaningful interaction, authentic communication, and learner-centred instruction as its defining characteristics, its classroom implementation has frequently been challenged by contextual constraints, particularly in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) settings where opportunities to use English beyond the classroom remain limited (Littlewood, 2014; Richards, 2006). Within such contexts, communicative activities may lose much of their intended value when learners perceive classroom interaction as disconnected from their own academic or social experiences. The findings of the present study indicate that embedding communicative activities within familiar contexts offers a practical means of narrowing this gap. Rather than introducing a new pedagogical approach, the developed Contextualized Communicative Language Teaching (CCLT) model extends the application of CLT by systematically aligning communicative tasks with situations commonly encountered by non-English major university students. This adaptation appears to transform communication from a classroom exercise into a purposeful activity that students recognize as relevant to their immediate learning environment. Such an interpretation complements contemporary discussions arguing that communicative competence develops more effectively when interaction is situated within authentic, meaningful, and socially relevant contexts rather than being treated as an isolated classroom objective (Burns, 2019; Sato & Loewen, 2019; Derakhshan, 2022).

An important implication emerging from these findings is that contextualization should not be regarded merely as a strategy for increasing learner motivation. Instead, it appears to function as the instructional mechanism through which communicative activities become cognitively accessible and pedagogically meaningful. Throughout the implementation, students were consistently required to communicate about situations, places, routines, and interactions that reflected their own academic lives. Because the communicative context was already familiar, learners could devote greater attention to selecting appropriate language, organizing ideas, and maintaining interaction rather than simultaneously attempting to interpret unfamiliar situations. This observation resonates with constructivist perspectives on learning, which argue that new knowledge is more readily constructed when connected to learners' existing experiences and prior

knowledge (Johnson, 2002; Tomlinson, 2013). More recent studies in language pedagogy have similarly reported that contextual relevance promotes deeper engagement, encourages active participation, and supports more sustainable language development because learners perceive classroom activities as meaningful rather than artificial (Dao, 2024; Macalister & Nation, 2020; McGrath, 2013; Mishan & Timmis, 2015). Consequently, the contribution of the present study extends beyond confirming the value of CLT; it illustrates how contextualization can strengthen communicative pedagogy by increasing the authenticity of classroom interaction without altering the fundamental principles upon which CLT is built.

The improvement observed across all assessed speaking components further strengthens this interpretation. Rather than demonstrating progress in only one aspect of oral proficiency, learners showed observable development in vocabulary, pronunciation, fluency, and accuracy following the implementation of the CCLT model. This pattern deserves particular attention because speaking competence is widely recognized as a multidimensional construct in which linguistic knowledge, discourse organization, strategic competence, and interactional ability operate simultaneously during communication (Canale & Swain, 1980; Celce-Murcia, 2007). From this perspective, improvement across multiple components suggests that the instructional model supported speaking development as an integrated process rather than encouraging isolated gains in discrete language skills. Such an outcome is pedagogically meaningful because authentic communication rarely requires learners to employ vocabulary, pronunciation, grammar, or fluency independently. Instead, successful oral interaction demands the coordinated use of these competencies while responding to unpredictable communicative situations. Similar patterns have been documented in recent classroom-based investigations demonstrating that contextualized communicative instruction encourages learners to mobilize multiple linguistic resources simultaneously, thereby supporting more balanced development of speaking competence (Burns, 2019; Nation, 2022; Webb & Nation, 2023). Viewed alongside these studies, the present findings reinforce the argument that speaking instruction should be organized around authentic communicative performance rather than separated into disconnected linguistic components.

A closer examination of the classroom implementation also offers a plausible explanation for why vocabulary and fluency demonstrated comparatively greater improvement than the remaining speaking components. Throughout the instructional programme, vocabulary was introduced within communicative situations and subsequently recycled through pair work, role plays, discussions, and contextual speaking tasks. This recursive exposure enabled learners to retrieve and reuse lexical items repeatedly under varying communicative conditions, rather than relying on memorization alone. Such repeated retrieval has consistently been identified as one of the strongest predictors of long-term vocabulary retention and spontaneous language production (Nation, 2022; Webb & Nation, 2023). Likewise, fluency develops primarily through repeated opportunities to communicate under conditions that encourage learners to prioritize meaning while maintaining interaction, rather than through excessive attention to linguistic accuracy (Segalowitz, 2016; Tavakoli & Hunter, 2018). Interestingly, the present findings also indicate that improvements in pronunciation and accuracy occurred concurrently, albeit at a more gradual pace. This variation should not be interpreted as evidence that contextualized instruction is less beneficial for these components. Instead, it reflects the inherently different developmental trajectories of speaking dimensions. Pronunciation and grammatical accuracy generally require sustained exposure, continuous feedback, and repeated communicative practice before stable improvement becomes evident (Derwing & Munro, 2015). The progressive gains observed across all assessed components therefore suggest that the instructional design provided learners with opportunities to revisit linguistic resources under increasingly demanding communicative conditions, allowing different dimensions of speaking competence to develop at their own pace while remaining integrated within authentic communication.

Beyond improvements in speaking performance, the findings also highlight an equally important aspect of instructional innovation: its practicality under authentic classroom conditions. Many pedagogical interventions demonstrate promising theoretical foundations but encounter considerable difficulties when

implemented because they require extensive preparation, sophisticated technological resources, or instructional procedures that exceed teachers' everyday classroom realities. The present study presents a different picture. Both lecturers and students evaluated the developed CCLT model positively, suggesting that the instructional procedures, contextualized speaking materials, and classroom activities were not only pedagogically acceptable but also manageable within routine instructional practice. This finding is noteworthy because the long-term sustainability of any educational innovation depends not only on its effectiveness but also on its practicality and usability in real classrooms (Nieveen, 2010; Plomp, 2013). In language education, materials that are perceived as overly complicated or disconnected from teachers' instructional routines frequently fail to be adopted despite demonstrating positive learning outcomes. Conversely, innovations that are relatively simple to implement while maintaining pedagogical quality are more likely to be sustained beyond the duration of a research project. The favorable responses reported by both lecturers and students therefore strengthen the practical value of the developed model and suggest that contextualization can enhance classroom instruction without imposing unnecessary instructional complexity. Similar observations have been reported in studies on communicative materials development, where contextual relevance has been shown to improve both teacher acceptance and learner participation because classroom activities become easier to organize and more meaningful for learners (Mishan & Timmis, 2015; McGrath, 2013; Tomlinson, 2013; Tomlinson & Masuhara, 2017).

Another aspect that deserves attention is the relationship between contextualization and learner engagement. Although the present study did not directly measure engagement as an independent variable, the positive classroom responses and the observable improvement in speaking performance suggest that contextualized communicative tasks encouraged learners to participate more actively throughout the instructional process. Previous studies have consistently argued that learners are more willing to communicate when classroom interaction reflects situations that they perceive as authentic, achievable, and personally meaningful (Hiver et al., 2021; MacIntyre et al., 1998; Mercer & Dörnyei, 2020; Peng, 2024). Within the present study, communicative activities were organized around familiar academic situations rather than abstract conversational topics. Such contextual familiarity may have reduced hesitation and encouraged students to contribute more confidently during classroom interaction because they were communicating about experiences they already understood rather than constructing entirely unfamiliar communicative scenarios. This interpretation is consistent with contemporary perspectives on willingness to communicate, which emphasize that communicative behavior is shaped not only by linguistic competence but also by learners' perceptions of task relevance, contextual familiarity, and psychological readiness to engage in interaction (MacIntyre et al., 1998; Mystkowska-Wiertelak & Pawlak, 2017; Sato & Loewen, 2019). From this perspective, the positive responses observed during classroom implementation appear to represent more than simple satisfaction with the instructional materials; they indicate that contextualization may create learning conditions that encourage sustained communicative participation.

At the same time, the present findings should not be interpreted as suggesting that contextualization alone guarantees successful speaking instruction. Previous investigations have demonstrated that communicative approaches may produce inconsistent outcomes when learners possess limited linguistic resources, when classroom interaction is constrained by examination-oriented teaching, or when teachers receive insufficient pedagogical support for implementing communicative activities (Ellis, 2020; Littlewood, 2007; Littlewood, 2014). These observations remain highly relevant because contextualization cannot compensate for weaknesses in instructional planning or insufficient opportunities for meaningful language use. The encouraging outcomes reported in the present study are therefore more plausibly explained by the interaction of several complementary elements, including contextual learning materials, carefully sequenced communicative tasks, explicit linguistic preparation, and continuous opportunities for collaborative interaction. Rather than functioning independently, these elements appear to have created a coherent instructional environment in which learners could gradually develop confidence and communicative competence. This interpretation offers a more balanced understanding of the findings by acknowledging that

contextualization is unlikely to be effective when implemented in isolation from broader principles of communicative pedagogy.

Viewed more broadly, the present study contributes to ongoing discussions concerning the adaptation of Communicative Language Teaching to diverse educational settings. Much of the existing literature has focused on evaluating the effectiveness of CLT across different countries, educational levels, and language programs. Comparatively less attention has been devoted to explaining how communicative principles can be systematically redesigned to address the instructional characteristics of learners outside English-related disciplines. The CCLT model contributes to this gap by demonstrating that contextualization should be considered a design principle rather than merely a classroom technique. In other words, context is not simply incorporated through examples or topics; instead, it becomes the organizing framework through which communicative objectives, learning activities, instructional materials, and classroom interaction are connected. This distinction extends previous work on communicative pedagogy because it positions contextual relevance as a structural component of instructional design rather than as an optional enhancement to existing communicative practices (Burns, 2019; Littlewood, 2014; Richards, 2006; Tomlinson & Masuhara, 2017). Such a perspective may provide a useful conceptual foundation for future studies seeking to adapt communicative language teaching to other disciplinary contexts and learner populations.

The pedagogical implications of these findings are equally important. For English lecturers teaching non-English major students, the findings suggest that improving speaking competence does not necessarily require sophisticated technologies or entirely new teaching approaches. Instead, substantial benefits may be achieved by redesigning existing communicative activities so that they more closely reflect learners' academic, professional, and social realities. Contextualized speaking tasks, familiar communicative scenarios, and progressively sequenced interaction appear to provide a practical means of supporting oral language development while maintaining the learner-centered philosophy of CLT. Curriculum developers may also consider incorporating contextual relevance more explicitly into speaking materials, ensuring that instructional content reflects students' disciplinary backgrounds and future communicative needs. Such adaptations may increase not only learning outcomes but also the perceived relevance of English learning among students who often regard English as peripheral to their primary field of study.

Taken together, the present findings suggest that contextualization should not be viewed simply as a supplementary feature of communicative instruction but as an integral element that strengthens the implementation of Communicative Language Teaching in higher education. By integrating meaningful contexts with communicative interaction, structured instructional sequencing, and authentic speaking tasks, the developed CCLT model provides an example of how established pedagogical principles can be adapted to respond to the realities of non-English major learners. Although further research involving larger samples, different disciplines, and longer implementation periods is needed to examine the model's wider applicability, the present study provides empirical support for the argument that contextual relevance can strengthen both the effectiveness and the practicality of communicative language instruction. These findings therefore contribute not only to the continuing development of communicative pedagogy but also to the broader discussion on designing language instruction that is simultaneously theoretically grounded, contextually responsive, and pedagogically sustainable.

5. Conclusion

This study developed and evaluated a Contextualized Communicative Language Teaching (CCLT) model designed to improve speaking instruction for non-English major university students. The development process demonstrates that contextualizing communicative language teaching extends beyond selecting familiar classroom topics; it requires the systematic integration of learners' academic, social, and communicative experiences into instructional objectives, learning activities, and speaking materials. The resulting model achieved satisfactory levels of validity, practicality, and effectiveness, indicating that it is

pedagogically appropriate for classroom implementation. The improvement observed across vocabulary, pronunciation, fluency, and accuracy further suggests that contextualized communicative activities can create learning environments in which students participate more confidently and use English more meaningfully. These findings reinforce the view that communicative competence develops more effectively when language learning is connected to contexts that learners recognize and experience in their daily academic lives. The study also contributes to the continuing development of Communicative Language Teaching by positioning contextualization as a pedagogical design principle rather than a supplementary classroom strategy. This perspective offers practical guidance for English lecturers and curriculum developers seeking to design speaking instruction that is communicatively meaningful while remaining responsive to learners' disciplinary backgrounds and future communication needs. Although the study was conducted in a single institutional setting with a limited number of participants, the findings provide a foundation for adapting the CCLT model to different higher education contexts. Future research may examine its implementation across diverse disciplines, institutional settings, and longer instructional periods to understand better how contextualized communicative learning can support sustained speaking development and broader communicative competence.

6. Acknowledgement

The authors sincerely thank the university, participating lecturers, expert validators, and undergraduate students who contributed to the development and implementation of this study. Their valuable participation, constructive feedback, and willingness to engage throughout the research process were essential to the refinement and evaluation of the Contextualized Communicative Language Teaching (CCLT) model. The authors also appreciate the support provided by colleagues and reviewers whose comments helped improve the quality of this manuscript.

7. Declaration of AI Use

During the preparation of this manuscript, the authors used ChatGPT (OpenAI), Grammarly, and Consensus AI to assist with language editing, writing improvement, and literature exploration. These tools were used solely to improve the clarity and presentation of the manuscript. They were not involved in the research design, data collection, data analysis, interpretation of the findings, or the conclusions. All AI-assisted outputs were critically reviewed and verified by the authors, who take full responsibility for the content of this manuscript.

References

- Aldoobie, N. (2015). ADDIE model *American International Journal of Contemporary Research*, 5 (6), 68-72. Retrieved on 12: 2018.
- Branch, R. M. (2009). *Instructional design: The ADDIE approach*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-09506-6>
- Burns, A. (2019). Concepts for teaching speaking in the English language classroom. *LEARN Journal: Language Education and Acquisition Research Network Journal*, 12(1), 1-11. <https://so04.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/LEARN/article/view/168564>
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1-47. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/I.1.1>
- Carless, D., & Boud, D. (2018). The development of student feedback literacy: enabling uptake of feedback. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 43(8), 1315-1325. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1463354>
- Celce-Murcia, M. (2007). Rethinking the role of communicative competence in language teaching. In E. Alcón Soler & M. P. Safont Jordà (Eds.), *Intercultural language use and language learning* (pp. 41-57). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-5639-0_3
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods*

- approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Derakhshan, A. (2022). Positive psychology in second and foreign language education. *ELT Journal*, 76(2), 304–306. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccac002>
- Derwing, T. M., & Munro, M. J. (2015). *Pronunciation fundamentals: Evidence-based perspectives for L2 teaching and research*. John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/llt.42>
- Dao, P. (2024). *Learner engagement in online second language classrooms*. Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-71750-5>
- Dos Santos, L. M. (2020). The discussion of communicative language teaching approach in language classrooms. *Journal of Education and e-Learning Research*, 7(2), 104–109. <https://doi.org/10.20448/journal.509.2020.72.104.109>
- Ellis, R. (2020). *Reflecting on task-based language teaching*. Multilingual Matters.
- Ellis, R., Skehan, P., Li, S., Shintani, N., & Lambert, C. (2020). *Task-based language teaching: Theory and practice*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108643689>
- Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2023). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (8th ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Hammond, J., & Gibbons, P. (2005). Putting scaffolding to work: The contribution of scaffolding in articulating ESL education. *Prospect*, 20(1), 6–30.
- Hiver, P., Al-Hoorie, A. H., & Mercer, S. (Eds.). (2021). *Student engagement in the language classroom*. Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/HIVER92226>
- Johnson, E. B. (2002). *Contextual teaching and learning: What it is and why it is here to stay*. Corwin Press.
- Littlewood, W.T. (2007). Communicative and task-based language teaching in East Asian classrooms. *Language Teaching*, 40(3), 243–249. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444807004363>
- Littlewood, W. (2014). Communication-oriented language teaching: Where are we now? Where do we go from here? *Language Teaching*, 47(3), 349–362. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444812000134>
- Macalister, J., & Nation, I. S. P. (2020). *Language curriculum design* (2nd ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429424465>
- MacIntyre, P. D., Clément, R., Dörnyei, Z., & Noels, K. A. (1998). Conceptualizing willingness to communicate in a L2: A situational model of L2 confidence and affiliation. *The Modern Language Journal*, 82(4), 545–562. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1998.tb05543.x>
- McGrath, I. (2013). *Teaching materials and the roles of EFL/ESL teachers: Practice and theory*. Bloomsbury Academic.
- McKenney, S., & Reeves, T. (2018). *Conducting Educational Design Research* (2nd ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315105642>
- McKenney, S., & Reeves, T. C. (2025). Educational design research for relevant & robust scholarship. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education*, 37(3), 614–638. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12528-025-09456-2>
- Mercer, S., & Dörnyei, Z. (2020). *Engaging language learners in contemporary classrooms*. Cambridge University Press.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2020). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Mishan, F., & Timmis, I. (2015). *Materials development for TESOL* (1st ed.). Edinburgh University Press.
- Mystkowska-Wiertelak, A., & Pawlak, M. (2017). *Willingness to communicate in instructed second language acquisition: Combining a macro- and micro-perspective*. Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783095926>
- Nation, I. S. P. (2022). *Learning vocabulary in another language* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Nation, I. S. P., & Newton, J. (2020). *Teaching ESL/EFL listening and speaking* (2nd ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429203114>
- Nieveen, N. (2010). Formative evaluation in educational design research. In T. Plomp & N. Nieveen (Eds.), *An*

- introduction to educational design research* (pp. 89–102). Netherlands Institute for Curriculum Development (SLO).
- Peng, J.-E. (2024). *Willingness to communicate in a second language*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009417884>
- Peterson, C. (2003). Bringing ADDIE to life: Instructional design at its best. *Journal of Educational Multimedia and Hypermedia*, 12(3), 227–241.
- Plomp, T. (2013). Educational design research: An introduction. In T. Plomp & N. Nieveen (Eds.), *Educational Design Research* (pp. 11–50). Netherlands Institute for Curriculum Development (SLO).
- Richards, J. C. (2006). *Communicative language teaching today*. Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C. (2022). Exploring emotions in language teaching. *RELC Journal*, 53(1), 225–239. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688220927531>
- Sato, M., & Loewen, S. (2019). *Evidence-based second language pedagogy: A collection of instructed second language acquisition studies* (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351190558>
- Schreier, M. (2021). *Qualitative content analysis in practice* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Sembiante, S. F. (2016). Translanguaging and the multilingual turn: Epistemological reconceptualization in the fields of language and implications for reframing language in curriculum studies. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 46(1), 45–61. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03626784.2015.1133221>
- Segalowitz, N. (2016). *Second language fluency: Cognitive foundations of second language fluency*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315771083>
- Sharipova, M. (2026). Communicative language teaching in higher education: Methods, challenges and outcomes. *International Bulletin of Medical Sciences and Clinical Research*, 6(4), 226–230. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19969793>
- Tavakoli, P., & Hunter, A.-M. (2018). Is fluency being 'neglected' in the classroom? Teacher understanding of fluency and related classroom practices. *Language Teaching Research*, 22(3), 330–349. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168817708462>
- Tomlinson, B. (2013). *Developing materials for language teaching* (2nd ed.). Bloomsbury Academic.
- Tomlinson, B., & Masuhara, H. (2017). *The complete guide to the theory and practice of materials development for language learning*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Webb, S., & Nation, I. S. P. (2023). *How vocabulary is learned* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.